# 1NC v Strake Loyola R3

## 1

### 1NC- New Aff Bad(Long)

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose affirmative frameworks, advocacy texts, and advantage areas thirty minutes before round if they haven’t read the affirmative before

#### Violation: They didn’t screenshots in the doc

Graphical user interface

Description automatically generated with medium confidence

#### Standards:

#### 1] Clash- Not disclosing incentivizes surprise tactics and poorly refined positions that rely on artificial and vague negative engagement to win debates. Their interpretation discourages third- and fourth-line testing by limiting the amount of time we have to prepare and forcing us to enter the debate with zero idea of what the affirmative is. Negatives are forced to rely on generics instead of smart contextual strategies destroying nuanced argumentation.

#### 2] Reciprocity – They get an infinite amount of time to frontline their aff to write the most efficient and effective answers to anything we could say against it while we get only four minutes in round. This gives them a tremendous advantage over us that makes it impossible to win substance.

#### 3] Shiftiness- Not knowing enough about the affirmative coming into round incentivizes 1ar shiftiness about what the aff is and what their framework/advocacy entails. That means even if we could read generics or find prep, they’d just find ways to recontextualize their obscure advocacy in the 1ar.

#### Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

#### Drop the debater

#### a). dta makes zero sense in the context of this shell

**b). deterrence key to deterring future abuse**

**c). normsetting-key to setting better norms**

#### Use competing interps – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter and collapses, youy use an offense-defense paradigm\

**No rvis**

**a). illogical-you shouldn’t get to win for being fair**

**b). they’ll bait theory**

## 2

### 1NC Shell

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all constructive positions on open source with the full text of all cards with highlighting on the 2019-20 NDCA LD wiki after the round in which they read them.

#### Violation –

A screenshot of a computer

Description automatically generated

#### 1] Debate resource inequities—you’ll say people will steal cards, but that’s good—it’s the only way to truly level the playing field for students such as novices in under-privileged programs.

Antonucci 05 [Michael (Debate coach for Georgetown; former coach for Lexington High School); “[eDebate] open source? resp to Morris”; December 8; http://www.ndtceda.com/pipermail/edebate/2005-December/064806.html //]

a. Open source systems are preferable to the various punishment proposals in circulation. It's better to share the wealth than limit production or participation. Various flavors of argument communism appeal to different people, but banning interesting or useful research(ers) seems like the most destructive solution possible. Indeed, open systems may be the only structural, rule-based answer to resource inequities. Every other proposal I've seen obviously fails at the level of enforcement. Revenue sharing (illegal), salary caps (unenforceable and possibly illegal) and personnel restrictions (circumvented faster than you can say 'information is fungible') don't work. This would - for better or worse. b. With the help of a middling competent archivist, an open source system would reduce entry barriers. This is especially true on the novice or JV level. Young teams could plausibly subsist entirely on a diet of scavenged arguments. A novice team might not wish to do so, but the option can't hurt. c. An open source system would fundamentally change the evidence economy without targeting anyone or putting anyone out of a job. It seems much smarter (and less bilious) to change the value of a professional card-cutter's work than send the KGB after specific counter-revolutionary teams.

#### Open source does equal the playing field

Overing 18 – Bob Overing, LD Scholar (“Holiday Disclosure Post #6 – 10 Things Edition” JANUARY 12, 2018. http://www.premierdebate.com/disclosure-post-6/)

**Open source improves on usual disclosure practices** in the obvious way – **you can read their evidence for better prep**aration – and in a number of smaller ways too. **It solves the analytics problem** I discussed above, **so round-altering uncarded arguments are available** (though this doesn’t really apply to Harvard-Westlake), **and it gives access to evidence from paywalled articles**. **Every season I coach debaters who lack access to major databases; for schools without robust online library offerings or teams without college coaches, this matters a lot**.

#### 2] Evidence ethics – open source is the only way to verify pre-round that cards aren’t miscut or highlighted or bracketed unethically. That’s a voter – maintaining ethical ev practices is key to being good academics and we should be able to verify you didn’t cheat

#### 3] Depth of clash – it allows debaters to have nuanced researched objections to their opponents evidence before the round at a much faster rate, which leads to higher quality ev comparison – outweighs cause thinking on your feet is NUQ but the best quality responses come from full access to a case.

#### Evaluate the debate after the 1NC and before the 1ar to limit judge intervention and so we can all do our homework. Evaluating after the 1nc means after my speech you look at your flow and extend all of my arguments because there’s no response so you assume they’re true and vote on the dropped truth testing + definitions bc they prove the aff is incoherent or on log con bc the aff wont happen or theory because it means they were abusive and you need to drop the debater

### 3

#### I am ye, an Evil Demon from the Nether, and I have one goal: This ballot. I will wreak havoc and stop at nothing until l get this dub, then I will go back to Nether. I have taken over ye’s Body, Fear me and my threat. No rules will constrain me as the application of rules, even when justified, are not inherent.

#### Everest is now under my control, I have hypnotized them during prep time and they are now my Puppet.

#### To demonstrate this, I will make them do a couple of things.

#### In their 1ar, they will make arguments about why you should vote me down and why you should vote them up. But know this: through telepathy, I have learned that their true intention was to lose this round; They planned to forfeit in the 1ar. It appears I didn’t need to hypnotize them in the first place. No amount of evidence can ever prove objective knowledge. Searle,[[1]](#footnote-1)

#### You could have the best possible evidence about other people’s behavior and still be mistaken about their mental states. You could have the best possible evidence about the past and still be mistaken about the future. You could have the best possible evidence about your own perceptual experiences and still be mistaken about the external world. This is so because you could be dreaming,having hallucinations, be a brain in a vat, or be deceieved systematically by an evil demon. Strange situations, yes, but it is impossible to disprove the potentiality for any of thesescenarios.”

#### I have programmed them to think that they are not hypnotized, that they want to win the round, and that they think what I am saying is very silly. But no matter our empirical observations, their intentions are indeterminate. Kant Immanuel, The Critique of Pure Reason. Translated by J.M.D. Meiklejohn. 1781. Under heading “Exposition of the Cosmological Idea of Freedom in Harmony with the Universal Law of Natural Necessity.” available online: <http://www.gutenberg.org/dirs/etext03/cprrn10.txt> SJCP//JG The real morality of actions’--their merit or demerit, and even that of our own conduct, is completely unknown to us. Our estimates can relate only to their empirical character. How much is the result of the action of free will, how much is to be ascribed to nature and to blameless error, or to a happy constitution of temperament (merito fortunae), no one can discover, nor, for this reason, determine with perfect justice.

#### Of course, I have no intention of keeping them as my puppet, (I have too many). When they say

#### “I am forfeiting this round, yes this is serious, and this comes before all other arguments. To clarify- I am kicking every single argument I made and asking you to vote for ye” and then stop speaking, then they will wake up and you will know they are no longer under my command. Until then, I am the puppet-master.:

## 4

#### Permissibility and presumption negate

#### 1] Obligations- the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove an obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation

#### 2] Falsity- Statements are more often false than true because proving one part of the statement false disproves the entire statement. Presuming all statements are true creates contradictions which would be ethically bankrupt.

#### 3] Negating is harder – A] Aff gets first and last speech which control the direction of the debate B] Affirmatives can strategically uplayer in the 1ar giving them a 7-6 time skew advantage, splitting the 2nr C] They get infinite prep time

## 5

**Interpretation: If the affirmative defends anything other than [Insert Topic] then they must provide a counter-solvency advocate for their specific advocacy in the 1AC. *(To clarify, you must have an author that states we should not do your aff, insofar as the aff is not a whole res phil aff)***

**Violation:**

**Standards:**

**[1] Fairness – This is a litmus test to determining whether your aff is fair –**

**[A] Limits – there are infinite things you could defend outside the exact text of the resolution which pushes you to the limits of contestable arguments, even if your interp of the topic is better, the only way to verify if it’s substantively fair is proof of counter-arguments. Nobody knows your aff better than you, so if you can’t find an answer, I can’t be expected to. Our interp narrows out trivially true advocacies since counter-solvency advocates ensure equal division of ground for both sides. [B] Shiftiness-Having a counter-solvency advocate helps us conceptualize what their advocacy is and how it’s implemented. Intentionally ambiguous affirmatives we don’t know much about can’t spike out of DA’s and CP’s if they have an advocate that delineates these things.**

**[2] Research – Forces the aff to go to the other side of the library and contest their own view points, as well as encouraging in depth-research about their own position. Having one also encourages more in-depth answers since I can find responses. Key to education since we definitionally learn more about positions when we contest our own.**

#### [3] Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

#### [4] Drop the debater – a) the 1AR is too short for theory and covering substance so a ballot implication is key, b) only dropping the debater deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

#### [5] Use competing interps – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter and collapses, youy use an offense-defense paradigm\

## 6

### 1NC Shell V1

#### Interpretation: All arguments concerning fairness or education that the negative could violate must be read first in the affirmative speech. To clarify, theory arguments must be read at the top of the affirmative case before all substantive arguments.

#### Violation:

#### Standards:

#### [1] Neg strat – theory spikes and interpretations drastically change negative strategy because they operate on the highest layer of the debate. If the aff reads all their substance and then reads theory arguments, the neg is at a disadvantage because any substantive thinking would be nullified by your theory arguments. The neg should know what they have to meet before planning a strategy.

## 7

### Truth Testing

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement –

#### anything else moots 7 minutes of the nc – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that a world is better than another before you adopt it.

#### They justify substantive skews since there will always be a more correct side of the issue but we compensate for flaws in the lit.

#### Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – T/F binary is descriptive and technical.

#### Negate because either the aff is true meaning its bad for us to clash w/ it because it turns us into Fake News people OR it’s not and it’s a lie that you can’t vote on for ethics

#### no 1ar arguments bc they require intervention to evaluate them against the nc

#### a priori's 1st – even worlds framing requires ethics that begin from a priori principles like reason or pleasure so we control the internal link to functional debates. Truth Testing comes before theory because it questions the validity of theory and your ability to test its true which means it’s a procedural framing question of what arguments should look like.

#### The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – five dictionaries[[2]](#footnote-2) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[3]](#footnote-3) as to prove true so it's constitutive and jurisdictional. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I've met my burden.

#### 8] Good Samaritan Paradox -- affirming negates because in order to say you want to fix x problem, that assumes x problem exists in the first place, thus eliminating nukes presupposes nukes exist which means negation is a prior question

#### 9] Zeno’s Paradox – motion is impossible, because moving half way causes half more and half more which is infinitely regressive and means elimination of arsenals is logically impossible

#### **10] The holographic principle is the most reasonable conclusion**

Stromberg 15[Joseph Stromberg- “Some physicists believe we're living in a giant hologram — and it's not that far-fetched” <https://www.vox.com/2015/6/29/8847863/holographic-principle-universe-theory-physics> Vox. June 29th 2015] War Room Debate AI

Some physicists actually believe that the universe we live in might be a hologram. The idea isn't that the universe is some sort of fake simulation out of The Matrix, but rather that even though we appear to live in a three-dimensional universe, it might only have two dimensions. It's called the holographic principle. The thinking goes like this: Some distant two-dimensional surface contains all the data needed to fully describe our world — and much like in a hologram, this data is projected to appear in three dimensions. Like the characters on a TV screen, we live on a flat surface that happens to look like it has depth. It might sound absurd. But when physicists assume it's true in their calculations, all sorts of big physics problems — such as the nature of black holes and the reconciling of gravity and quantum mechanics — become much simpler to solve. In short, the laws of physics seem to make more sense when written in two dimensions than in three. "It's not considered some wild speculation among most theoretical physicists," says Leonard Susskind, the Stanford physicist who first formally defined the idea decades ago. "It's become a working, everyday tool to solve problems in physics." But there's an important distinction to be made here. There's no direct evidence that our universe actually is a two-dimensional hologram. These calculations aren't the same as a mathematical proof. Rather, they're intriguing suggestions that our universe could be a hologram. And as of yet, not all physicists believe we have a good way of testing the idea experimentally.

#### 11] Paradox of tolerance- to be completely open to the aff we must exclude perspectives that wouldn’t be open to the aff which means it’s impossible to have complete tolerance for an idea since that tolerance relies on excluding a perspective.

#### 12] Decision Making Paradox- in order to decide to do the affirmative we need a decision-making procedure to enact it, vote for it, and to determine it is a good decision. But to chose a decision-making procedure requires another meta level decision making procedure leading to infinite regress since every decision requires another decision to chose how to make a decision.

#### Permissibility Negates

#### A] aff has burden of proof and any eeason they’re wrong negates

#### B] you believe statements are false until proven true which is why you don’t believe in things like simulations and demons

## Case

1. Searle, John R. Mind, Language, and Society: Philosophy in the Real World. New York: Basic Books; 2000. (27). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. *Dictionary.com – maintain as true, Merriam Webster – to say that something is true, Vocabulary.com – to affirm something is to confirm that it is true, Oxford dictionaries – accept the validity of, Thefreedictionary – assert to be true* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)