# 1NC

## 1

#### Interpretation: Debaters may not justify 1ar theory is dtd, no rvi, competing interps, no 2n theory paradigm issues , and it’s the highest layer

#### Violation: its all in the underview

#### Standard: Infinite Abuse - their norm justifies the affirmative auto winning every round since they can read a risk free 1AR shell with DTD and Competing interps which I cannot answer since the theory shell since they make paradigm issues like evaluate the theory debate after the 1ar in the 1ar. And since I don’t have 2n paradigm issues I can’t contest it. Even if I try to uplayer the shell and read meta theory to get an out in the 2NR I can’t since your shell is the highest layer and nor can I go for paradigm issues like reasonability to gut check the shell since you denied that as well. Norming is an independent voter since justifying the value of debate necessarily justifies the norms of the activity being good in order for debate to be valuable.

#### Fairness and education are voters – its how judges evaluate rounds and why schools fund debate

#### Neg theory is DTD - 1ARs control the direction of the debate because it determines what the 2NR has to go for – DTD allows us some leeway in the round by having some control in the direction

#### Competing interps – Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation – it also collapses since brightlines operate on an offense-defense paradigm

#### No RVIs – A – Going all in on theory kills substance education which outweighs on timeframe B - Discourages checking real abuse which outweighs on norm-setting C – Encourages theory baiting – outweighs because if the shell is frivolous, they can beat it quickly D – its illogical for you to win for proving you were fair – outweighs since logic is a litmus test for other arguments E - Kills norm setting since debaters can never admit they’re wrong – outweighs since norm setting is the constitutive purpose of theory F – They are the logic of criminalization that over-punish people-of-color for trying to create productive discourse

#### I get 2nr theory anything else allows them to sever which kills me.

## 2

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must specify a measurement unit to measure the coastline of States and what territories are included. Weiner 18:

Sophie Weiner, “Why it's Impossible to Accurately Measure a Coastline” march 3, 2018. https://www.popularmechanics.com/science/environment/a19068718/why-its-impossible-to-accurately-measure-a-coastline/. //LHP AV

Try **measur**ing **the coastline of the U**nited **S**tates, **and it's** almost guaranteed **you'll find a different answer than anyone** before you. Even **official sources** like the Congressional Research Institute, the CIA, and NOAA **came up with** wildly **different answers** (29,093 miles, 19,924 miles, and 95,471 miles, respectively). How could their measurements be so different? **Meet the Coastline Paradox**. As explained in this video from RealLifeLore, the Coastline Paradox has been vexing researchers and cartographers since its discovery by mathematician Lewis Fry Richardson in 1951. The explanation for the paradox is surprisingly simple: unlike human-drawn geometrical shapes, **a coastline is full of nooks and crannies made by nature**. **The more one zooms in** on the coastline, **the more these inconsistencies multiply**. **This means that the length of a coastline is** completely dependent **on** what size of measurement unit **you use to study it**. For example, the coastline of the UK is only 2,800 kilometers long when measured in lengths of 100 kilometers. Shrink that to 50 kilometer measurements and suddenly the coastline is 3,400 kilometers. Coastlines are like fractals--the further you zoom in, the more complex it gets (famed fractal researcher Benoit Mandelbrot expanded Richardson's work on the paradox). If you were to try to measure a coastline on an atomic level, the length would approach infinity.

#### Violation: they didn’t

#### Vote Neg:

#### [1] Resolvability – there’s no way to determine whether arguments apply because there’s no basis for determining whether it’s part a States territory or under their jurisdiction – that’s an impact – every round needs a winner and else the judge makes an arbitrary decision

#### [2] Engagement – [a] the neg can never clash with case because we don’t know whether our args will apply – this is especially true with stuff close to borders – they’ll just shift in the 1ar, pigeonholing us into stale generics that destroy innovative education and quality neg ground

## 3

#### 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 meaning it’s a lie that you can’t vote on for ethics

#### 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.

#### The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) 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.

#### Also, evaluate the theory debate after the 2nr to prevent new 2ar responses.

## 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

#### 4] Affirmation theory- Affirming requires unconditionally maintaining an obligation

#### **1] 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.

#### 2] 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.

#### 3] 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.

#### 4] The Place Paradox- if everything exists in a place in space time, that place must also have a place that it exists and that larger place needs a larger location to infinity. Therefore, identifying ought statements is impossible since those statements assume acting on objects in the space-time continuum.

#### 5] Grain Paradox- A single grain of millet makes no sound upon falling, but a thousand grains make a sound. But a thousand nothings cannot make something which means the physical world is paradoxical.

#### 6] Arrows Paradox- If we divide time into discrete 0-duration slices, no motion is happening in each of them, so taking them all as a whole, motion is impossible.

#### 7] Bonini’s Paradox- As a model of a complex system becomes more complete, it becomes less understandable; for it to be more understandable it must be less complete and therefore less accurate. Therefore no philosophical or political model can be useful.

#### **8] All analysis fails- substitution logic proves**

Wikipedia Summarizes[Wikipedia - “Paradox of analysis” <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paradox_of_analysis>] War Room Debate AI

A [conceptual analysis](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conceptual_analysis) is something like the definition of a word. However, unlike a standard dictionary definition (which may list examples or talk about related terms as well), a completely correct analysis of a concept in terms of others seems like it should have exactly the same meaning as the original concept. Thus, in order to be correct, the analysis should be able to be used in any context where the original concept is used, without changing the meaning of the discussion in context. Conceptual analyses of this sort are a major goal of [analytic philosophy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Analytic_philosophy).

However, if such an analysis is to be useful, it should be informative. That is, it should tell us something we don't already know (or at least, something one can imagine someone might not already know). But it seems that no conceptual analysis can both meet the requirement of correctness and of informativeness, on these understandings of the requirements.

To see why, consider a potential simple analysis:

(1) For all x (any given member of a class or set), x is a brother if and only if x is a male sibling

One can say that (1) is correct because the expression "brother" represents the same concept as the expression "male sibling," and (1) seems to be informative because the two expressions are not identical. And if (1) is truly correct, then "brother" and "male sibling" must be interchangeable:

(2) For all x, x is a brother if and only if x is a brother

Yet (2) is not informative, so either (1) is not informative, or the two expressions used in (1) are not interchangeable (because they change an informative analysis into an uninformative one) so (1) is not actually correct. In other words, if the analysis is correct and informative, then (1) and (2) must be essentially equal, but this is not true because (2) is not informative. Therefore, it seems an analysis cannot be both correct and informative at the same time.

#### 9] Linguistics fail- Words do not have intrinsic or inherent meaning but are rather constructed by a set of sign and signifiers. For example, if I say the word pencil, a specific image pops into your head that doesn’t necessarily imply all pencils.

## 5

#### Their scholarship is hateful and a reason to lose the round—their author endorsed pedophilia and actively advocated against the age of consent law.

Doezema 18, [Marie Doezema (Parisian Journalist). “France, Where Age of Consent Is Up for Debate.” The Atlantic, 10 March 2018. https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2018/03/frances-existential-crisis-over-sexual-harassment-laws/550700/ //WWDH]

After May 1968, French intellectuals would challenge the state’s authority to protect minors from sexual abuse. In one prominent example, on January 26, 1977, Le Monde, a French newspaper, published a petition signed by the era’s most prominent intellectuals—including Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, Gilles Deleuze, Roland Barthes, Philippe Sollers, André Glucksmann and Louis Aragon—in defense of three men on trial for engaging in sexual acts with minors. “French law recognizes in 13- and 14-year-olds a capacity for discernment that it can judge and punish,” the petition stated, “But it rejects such a capacity when the child's emotional and sexual life is concerned.” Furthermore, the signatories argued, children and adolescents have the right to a sexual life: “If a 13-year-old girl has the right to take the pill, what is it for?” It’s unclear what impact, if any, the petition had. The defendants were sentenced to five years in prison, but did not serve their full sentences.

#### Drop the debater—academic spaces have way too many sympathizers who ignore violence against children, and every act must be challenged in the most unflinching terms because anything else reinforces the epistemic bias in favor of rationalizing disgusting behavior.

Grant 18, [Alec Grant (Independent Scholar, retired from the Uiversity of Brighton where he was a Reader in Narrative Mental Health). “Sanitizing Academics and Damaged Lives” Mad In The UK, 12 April 2018. https://www.madintheuk.com/2018/12/sanitizing-academics-and-damaged-lives/ //WWDH]

Academics who sympathize with paedophilia constitute its intellectual public relations arm. Their role is to make child-adult sex presentable, more acceptable to the public, fit for polite society, sugar-coated, glossed with a scholarly veneer, sanitized. Snapshots of sanitizing academic activity from the last 40 years show how this seeps into and contaminates public policy, education and practice in insidious ways. This is done via the workings of power, privilege, perverse cronyism, and, as Pilgrim (2018) argues, as a result of widespread moral stupor and denial. It’s astonishing that this happens in the face of the psychological and development features of complex post-trauma which are often a consequence of child sexual abuse. By pathologizing adult survivors, often with the ‘Borderline Personality Disorder’ (BPD) tag, mainstream psychiatric business-as-usual plays out its role in suppressing the truth about the consequences of paedophilia among adult survivors. Pilgrim (2018) reminds us that care and mutuality are core ethical features of all sexual practices. As someone who was for many years associated with cognitive therapy, I’m interested in ‘cognitive, or thought distortions’, which are used by people in rationalising their behaviour in self-serving ways. We know from Pilgrim and many other writers, researchers and practitioners about the rationalisations of perpetrators of child sexual abuse and exploitation. They include: Children are not victims but willing participants; They want it; They enjoy it; It’s about friendship; It’s about love; It helps children develop and mature. According to Pilgrim (2018), the ‘heyday’ period of academic versions of such rationalisations was the 1970s. 1977 was the year of an unsuccessful lobby by French intellectuals to defend intergenerational sex. Included among these were the otherwise well-respected philosophers Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, Jaques Derrida, Roland Barthes and Michel Foucault. These figures were at the forefront of the use of academic authority to lobby governments to liberalise and decriminalise adult-child sexual contact. In 1978, Foucault took part in a France-Culture broadcast with two other gay theorists, Hocquengham and Danet, to discuss the legal aspects of sex between adults and children. They wanted a repeal of the law preventing this because they took the view that in a liberal (they really meant libertarian) society, sexual preferences generally should not be the business of the law. Foucault, Hocquengham and Danet made the following assertions: that children can, and have the capacity to, consent to such relations without being coerced into doing so; that abuse and post-abuse trauma isn’t real; that the law is part of an oppressive and repressive heteronormative social control discourse which unfairly targets sexual minorities; that children don’t constitute a vulnerable population; that children can and are capable of making the first move in seducing adults (they introduced here the category of ‘the seducing child’); that the laws against sexual relations between children and adults actually function to protect children from their own desires, making them an oppressed and repressed group; that – in the language of the sociologist Stanley Cohen – international public horror about sexual relations between adults and children is a form of moral panic which feeds into constructing the ‘paedophile’ as a folk devil, in turn provoking public vigilantism; that sex between adults and children is actually a trivial matter when compared with ‘real crimes’ such as the murder of old ladies; that many members of the judiciary and other authority figures and groups don’t actually believe paedophilia to be a crime; and that consent should be a private contractual matter between the adult and the child. Fast forward to 1981. The Paedophile Information Exchange (PIE) has been active for seven years. This was a pro-paedophile activist group, founded in the UK in 1974 and officially disbanded in 1984. The group, an international organisation of people who traded in obscene material, campaigned for the abolition of the age of consent. Dr Brian Taylor, the research director and member of PIE, and sociology lecturer at the University of Sussex produced the controversial book Perspectives on Paedophilia, which had the aim of enlightening social workers and youth workers about the benefits of paedophilia. Taylor, who identified as gay, advocated ‘guilt-free pederasty’ (sexual relations between two males, one of whom is a minor). He argued that people generally are hostile to paedophilia only because they don’t understand it, and If they did wouldn’t be so against it. So it was simply a matter of clearing up prejudice and ignorance.

## 6

#### Hijack – Deleuze justifies emotivism:

#### 1. Affect terminates in the normative conclusion of the NC since the aff just makes an ontological claim about the world but that materializes itself in terms of expressions of those desire in every aspect, including linguistic constructs like the resolutional statement.

#### 2. The reason communal attachments increase affect is for the purpose of joy – your card literally says it which proves expression of emotions is the reason your framework matters.

#### 3. Affect material manifests itself through emotions, which means the only way we can account for affect is through those expressions and exchange of emotive responses.

#### That negates –

#### 1. Every emotive judgement is indexed to a particular individual, no emotive sentiments can ever be fully universal. This means that the resolution negates since there is no emotion that can be applied to a universal claim that x is y. And, The aff cannot prove the resolution true since statements like the aff are not truth apt but expressions.

#### 2. Even if not, desires are predicated on pursuing an individual course of action. Ought statements do not make sense and are counter-intuitive because individuals have an overwhelming emotion against decisions out of their control.

#### Cain, Cain, George. "Needs, Desires, Fears, and Freedom." The Downtown Review. Vol. 1. Iss. 1 (2015). Available at: http://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/tdr/vol1/iss1/7  Now, thus far we have discussed how humans are connected by common needs, desires, and fears. What people want most of all is the ability to have control of their persons, their lives, and their circumstances in order to satisfy their needs, fulfill their desires, and eliminate their fears if possible. In order to have such control, people need the freedom to do so. This freedom is commonly known as autonomy. Although what constitutes true autonomy is entirely subjective and varies from person to person, the most general definition of the term is the freedom of the individual to do whatever he wants to do without any hindrances.

## 7

#### NC theory first - 1] They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] We have more speeches to norm over it 3] It was introduced first so it comes lexically prior.

#### Neg abuse outweighs Aff abuse – 1] Infinite prep time before round to frontline 2] 2AR judge psychology 3] 1st and last speech 4] Infinite perms and uplayering in the 1AR.

#### Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is very aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to

#### DTA on 1AR shells - They can blow up blippy 20 second shells in the 2AR but I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention

#### RVIs on 1AR theory – 1AR being able to spend 20 seconds on a shell and still win forces the 2N to allocate at least 2:30 on the shell which means RVIs check back time skew

#### No new 1ar theory paradigm issues- A] New 1ar paradigms moot any 1NC theoretical offense B] introducing them in the aff allows for them to be more rigorously tested

## Case

### Underview

#### A] We do this for a reason which means u negate on skep

#### B] If I told you the earth was flat you wouldn’t believe me

#### C] this means you need offense to prove a statement

#### D] same analysis concludes neg c/a args

#### E] No – policymakers actually need reasons to do things

#### F] No reason this is the case – affirm means to say its true.

### Framework

#### Emotivism takes the first piece of evidence out because we indicate an alaysis of the subject

#### Emotivism accounts for instability because we allow for progressive evaluation of emotive states

#### 1] Turn – affect is only liberating if you “feel” not one who evokes feeling. If minoritarianism is valuable, you must abandon affect; it excludes black people from their survival strategy which is a disad to their framing.

Hemmings 05, [Hemmings, Clare. 2005. “Invoking Affect: Cultural Theory and the Ontological Turn.” Cultural Studies 19 (5): 548–67.]

I want to continue by suggesting that **only for certain subjects can affect be** thought of as attaching **in an open way; others are so** over-**associated with affect that they** themselves **are the object of affective transfer.** In this vein, Jennifer Biddle (1997, p. 231) insists that **in** matters of **sexuality it is the woman who carries** the **shame of gendered impropriety**, and marks its limits: ‘It is, after all, the prostitute who is shameless, but the gentleman, let us not forget, who is discreet’. Such transferred **affective attachments** do not only pertain to gender and sexuality, but also **suffuse critical accounts of the process of affective racialization**. I am thinking here of Franz Fanon and Audre Lorde’s often cited descriptions of other people’s affective response to their blackness. Fanon remembers: My body was given to me sprawled out, distorted, recoloured, clad in mourning in that white winter day. The Negro is an animal, the Negro is bad, the Negro is mean, the Negro is ugly; look, a nigger, it’s cold, the nigger is shivering, the nigger is shivering because he is cold, the little boy is trembling because he is afraid of the nigger, the nigger is shivering with cold, that cold that goes through your bones, the handsome little boy is trembling because he thinks that the nigger is quivering with rage, the little white boy throws himself into his mother’s arms: Mama, the nigger’s going to eat me up. (1952, p. 80) While **the white boy’s fear, learned** **within a racist** familial and social **order**, can **attach to an unknown black object, Fanon’s body is precisely not his own, but** is ‘sprawled out’ and **‘distorted’,** **presented** to him **via the white boy’s affective response**. Lorde similarly recalls her realization that it is her body that is disgusting to a white woman sitting next to her on the bus: When I look up the woman is still staring at me, her nose holes and eyes huge. And suddenly I realise that there is nothing crawling up the seat between us; it is me she doesn’t want her coat to touch. The fur brushes past my face as she stands with a shudder and holds on to a strap in the speeding train . . . Something’s going on here I do not understand, but I will never forget it. Her eyes. The flared nostrils. The hate. In discussing the same passage, Sara Ahmed argues that affect thus places bodies in spatial relation along racially defined lines (2000, p. 85 /6). In both of these examples, it is **the black body** **that carries the weight o**f, and is suffused with, **racial** **affect, as it is the female body that carries the burden of the affects** that **maintain sexual** **difference** in Biddle’s example above. Biddle, Fanon and Lorde’s narratives testify to the argument that some **bodies are captured** and held **by** affect’s structured precision. Not only, then, is **affect itself not random, nor** is the **ability to choose to imagine** affect **otherwise**. My concerns about the centring of the critic in **affective discourse** come full circle. In the first instance, the need for a new theory of the ontological **requires displacing marginal theory** and histories from a chronology of cultural theory. Furthermore, the cultural critic has to evidence their desire to move away from that imagined chronology by choosing choice. Yet, as I have suggested, the autonomy of the critic to make such a choice is dependent upon their being the subject rather than object of affective displacement. The failure of some critics to ‘choose choice’ paradoxically becomes evidence of their concomitant failure to relinquish an imagined history that they may already have been erased from.

#### We are though – cross apply emotive states

#### Robinson doesn’t apply – we don’;t read extinction

#### Structures reform – for example when u become 21 you are allowed to drink, our systems are built to account for flux.

### Offense

#### 1] It’s a competitive double bind – either it’s competitive cause you call for the ballot or you read a perm in which case you actually don’t call for the ballot and you vote neg anyway.

#### 2] Performative consistency – The aff says to be a good person is to give joy and knowledge to their peers, if the aff is true, you should give me the ballot and explain the rest of your aff for the rest of the round since you would be providing joy to me and knowledge to us without a selfish drive for the ballot.

#### 3] C’mon Comrade – If you are actually a comrade you will give me the ballot for the sake of forming a relationship and dedicate the rest of the round to building a coalition against capitalism or whatever other problems the aff articulates. I am offering to sacrifice my speech time if you sacrifice the ballot for your cause, show some solidarity.

1. <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-1)
2. *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-2)