# CD – Rodl Example

#### Interpretation: Debaters must word all proposed theoretical interpretations (defined as proposed rules for the debate pertaining to the enforcement of fairness or education) as agential statements.

^ This interp sets the norm for what debate should be – it says that interpretations must have an actor or indicate an actor.

#### Violation: Their interp for K links to the aff indicates that K links must do the interp not that debaters or the aff or the neg must do it so its indicating a rule upon a state of affairs as opposed to an actor.

^ The violation on a specific line in the 1AC – the line “K links must quote lines from the 1AC” does not have an agent actor – it says that inanimate things, which are the “K links,” need to do an action.

#### Standard –

#### Norm Setting – Demands absent an agent are unintelligible

#### **RÖDL**

Sebastian Rödl In Sergio Tenenbaum (ed.), Desire, Practical Reason, and the Good. Oxford University Press 138--160 (2010)

However, the fact that it would be good if p were the case need not speak in favor of thinking it good to bring it about. Even if it would be good if p, it may be that I must not bring it about. Perhaps it is someone else’s office, or duty, or privilege to bring it about, or perhaps its goodness depends on its not being brought about by anyone. This may seem to show that we must include in the outcome not only what in a strict sense is the result of the act, but furthermore the fact that I am producing or have produced it. The thought from which I derive an act of the will is not “It would be good if p,” but “It would be good if . . . [I, see to it that p ] . . . .” However, I cannot reason from this premise to “It is good to see to it that p ” or “I should see to it that p .” For while “It would be good if . . . [I see to it that p” is not originally a first-person thought, “It is good to see to it that p ” is. And without further premises, an originally first-person thought cannot be derived from a thought that is not originally first personal. 19 Adapting an example from Anselm W. Müller, 20 we can bring this out by turning to the second person. “You must drink this glass of water” addresses a demand to you**:** In virtue of its form, it presents itself as capable of determining your will. By contrast, “It must be the case that you drink this glass of water” refers to you and to the glass in the same manner; it no more addresses a demand to you than it does so to the glass. There is no way to derive a demand from it without relying on a demand already in place. An act of the will in virtue of its form is productive and therefore first personal. The alleged thought that it would be good if p were the case is not. This remains so no matter what is plucked into the content of “ p .” Hence, this alleged thought never provides a self-standing basis for a thought about what is good to do. 21 This shows that there is no self-standing use of good in application to states of affairs. An illusion of intelligibility arises when we unwittingly give the relevant phrase a sense that we do understand: relating a state of affairs to a given end. It is easy to fall prey to this illusion. It is well-nigh impossible not to fall prey to it when one does not even notice the difference between the use of good or ought as indicating a form of predication (which is productive and therefore first personal) and as a sentential operator.

#### Implications – a) Enforceability – proves your interp can’t be enforced in debate which hijacks every reason why it’s good. You can’t obligate arguments to do things as they don’t have wills so your interp fails to set a coherent norm for debate which o/w on longevity. Also means I meet the interp b) Precision – My interp encourages precise language in theory debate which is key since we should be able to look back at theory to determine directly what we as agents have to change to generate more fair and educational practices.

^ the Rodl card explains why it is bad – some theory shells, like topicality, will contain carded evidence which is usually used to show why the debater violates some semantical rule. The bolded text underneath explains why this is important.

#### DD – a) deter abuse b) I spent time reading theory c) The round has already been skewed

#### CI – a) Reasonability is arbitrary since idk your BS meter b) It fosters the best norms through encouraging the fairest rule c) Reasonability collapses by debating the brightline

#### No RVI – a) It’s illogical to vote for you for being fair b) Rounds without theory would be irresolvable c) It incentivizes you to bait theory and win off a scripted CI

^ These are the voters which indicate how the shell should be viewed – for a more in-depth explanation, see the (CD) Condo Bad Example document.