### 1

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must specify what their favorite car movie is. If they haven’t watched it then they should lose.

#### Watching *Cars* fosters prosocial behavior – that solves friendship, happiness, and education which solves the aff Leeuw and der Laan 17:

Rebecca N. H. de Leeuw, [(PhD cum laude, 2011) is an Assistant Professor of Communication Science, Behavioural Science Institute, Radboud University. She devotes her research to the role of parenting and media in relation to character strengths and well-being in children and adolescents. Her research belongs to the field of positive media psychology.] and Christa A. van der Laan, [(MsC, 2016) is an Alumna of Communication Science, Behavioural Science Institute, Radboud University. She did her Master thesis on Disney and helping behavior in children, and after graduating she collaborated on the present study.] December 1, 2017, “Helping behavior in Disney animated movies and children’s helping behavior in the Netherlands” <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17482798.2017.1409245> //LHP AV

**This study is the first to examine whether Disney animated characters can inspire children to help others** immediately upon exposure. This experiment involved 113 Dutch children (M = 9.03; SD = .738) and their friends. Children in the experimental condition were exposed to a Disney clip in which the main character helped a friend, while children in the control condition watched a clip without helping behavior. Afterward, children’s helping behavior toward their friends was assessed during a puzzle challenge. **A regression analysis revealed that children exposed to the helping Disney character were more likely to help their friends than children who did not watch this.** The findings indicate a short-term effect of watching a helping Disney animated character on children’s helping behavior. Keywords: Positive media psychologyDisney animated movieschildrenprosocial behaviorand helping Previous article View issue table of contents Next article Introduction “Finishing first isn’t as important as finishing like a winner.” - Amber Whitener (2012) about the Disney • Pixar movie Cars After the dawn of positive psychology (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000), media psychologists started to devote increased attention to examining how media content, particularly movies, can be meaningful and help humans flourish (Oliver, Hartmann, & Woolley, 2012; Oliver & Raney, 2011; Wirth, Hofer, & Schramm, 2012). **One quality found to be associated with flourishing is prosocial behavior** (Lyubomirsky, King, & Diener, 2005; Peterson & Seligman, 2004), which is defined as voluntary behavior meant to benefit another (Eisenberg, Fabes, & Spinrad, 2007; Padilla-Walker, Coyne, Fraser, & Stockdale, 2013). **Among children, prosocial behavior has already been found to be related to thriving. For instance, prosocial children are liked more, have more close friends, and are happier than less social children** (Cillessen & Rose, 2005; Clark & Ladd, 2000; Hastings, Utendale, & Sullivan, 2007; Holder & Coleman, 2008; Östberg, 2003). **Prosocial behavior is even a forerunner of later academic achievement, probably by fostering supportive social and intellectual relationships** (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Pastorelli, Bandura, & Zimbardo, 2000; Moore & Allen, 1996). Evidence has revealed that prosocial behavior in children can also be enhanced by watching television (Mares & Woodard, 2005, 2012). As television still dominates children’s media lives (Rideout, Foehr, & Roberts, 2010), this might be a promising way to contribute to their well-being. In the current study, **it was examined whether Disney movies can encourage children to help others, which is important because (I) Disney movies are extremely popular** (Brand Finance, 2016; Brode, 2005; Buckingham, 1997; Fischer, Schwartz, Richards, Goldstein, & Rojas, 1991; Forgacs, 1992) and (II) contain a vast amount of prosocial messages (Padilla-Walker et al., 2013; Ward, 1996, 2002). Theoretical background The world of Disney The popularity of Disney can be well illustrated by the fact that young children between three and six years old are already able to recognize Disney based on its brand logo (Fischer et al., 1991). Especially **Disney’s animated movies are popular, and children do often watch these movies repeatedly** (Dreier, 2007). In addition, most parents studied adore Disney and accept it as quality family entertainment (Brode, 2005; Buckingham, 1997; Forgacs, 1992). In popular culture research, Disney has been identified as an important storyteller as its movies are among the first stories young viewers use to learn about the world. Ward (1996, 2002) argued that **Disney movies are an important moral educator with (mythic) narratives promoting moral values**. According to Giroux (1994), **Disney movies inspire at least as much cultural authority and legitimacy for educating specific roles, values, and ideals as other important socialization sources, such as the family and schools.** Yet existing studies on Disney movies have focused predominantly on the presence of negative content. For instance, Disney movies have been repeatedly criticized for containing aggression (Coyne & Whitehead, 2008), depicting romantic relationships as being created simply from “love at first sight” and easily maintained (Tanner, Haddock, Zimmerman, & Lund, 2003), portraying women in gender-typed roles (England, Descartes, & Collier-Meek, 2011; Tanner et al., 2003; Ward, 2002), marginalizing mothers (Tanner et al., 2003; Worthington, 2009), portraying the elderly in a negative way (Robinson, Callister, Magoffin, & Moore, 2007), delivering the what-is-beautiful-is-good stereotype (Bazzini, Curtin, Joslin, Regan, & Martz, 2010), demonizing bad behaviors (Fouts, Callan, Piasentin, & Lawson, 2006), and containing high levels of negative verbalizations about mental illness (Lawson & Fouts, 2004). In sum, most existing research puts Disney movies in a rather negative light. Nevertheless, some studies have demonstrated that Disney movies depict large numbers of prosocial behaviors—mostly altruistic acts motivated predominantly by others’ needs and welfare (Padilla-Walker et al., 2013; Ward, 1996, 2002). Ward (1996, 2002) described how Disney’s narratives can promote moral values such as honesty and openness that help truth win out. Moreover, Brode (2005) argued that Disney promotes multiculturalism with a prophetic vision of a world in which the uniqueness of all others is respected while simultaneously celebrating a shared human core. **And a content analysis revealed that Disney animated movies are overwhelmingly prosocial in nature** (Padilla-Walker et al., 2013). More specifically, this study demonstrated that Disney movies depict on average approximately one prosocial act per minute. Compared to children’s television programming, the amount of prosocial behavior in Disney movies is nearly seven times higher (cf. Smith et al., 2006). Furthermore, most prosocial acts depicted in Disney movies are not accompanied by aggression (Padilla-Walker et al., 2013). Notably, compared to the quantity of violence in children’s television programs, aggression in Disney movies is quite low (Coyne & Whitehead, 2008). Another study revealed that Disney movies also contain strong messages about the meaning of family relationships and that family members in Disney movies are found to make huge sacrifices for each other, putting the family’s well-being before their own (Tanner et al., 2003). Related to this, it is important to note that an in-depth study by Coyne and Whitehead (2008) demonstrated that, although Disney movies contain relational aggression, not only is the amount comparably low compared to the extent of violence in children’s television programs, but these aggressive behaviors are also often committed by “bad” characters, which would reduce the chance of facilitating imitation. Disney movies and children’s prosocial behavior Not only has research focused merely on the negative content of Disney movies, the number of empirical studies on the effects of Disney movies on children is also scarce, especially concerning possible favorable effects. To our knowledge, only one study examined the potential beneficial effect of Disney on children empirically. In this longitudinal study, it was examined whether engagement with Disney princess media and products were related to prosocial behavior among toddlers (Coyne, Linder, Rasmussen, Nelson, & Birkbeck, 2016). Findings of this study demonstrated that engagement with Disney princesses predicted future prosocial behaviors, but only for boys with high levels of parental active mediation. The current study extends this earlier work by examining children’s observed helping behavior immediately upon exposure to Disney, which is important as both short-term and long-term media effects are found with each having different underlying mechanisms explaining the effects (Bushman & Huesmann, 2006). Short-term effects are found mostly due to the priming of existing scripts, schemas, or beliefs, while long-term effects require the learning of these scripts, schemas, or beliefs. The current study aims to extend the literature by examining whether Disney can inspire helping behavior in children on the short-term. Previous exposure to Disney might play a role in the short-term effects of Disney movies as well. An often-applied theory for explaining the impact of prosocial television on children’s prosocial behavior is social cognitive theory (Bandura, 2001, 2004; Padilla-Walker et al., 2013), which explains that human behavior is learned directly not only by experience, but also from observing role models, which can also be Disney characters. In light of social cognitive theory, and in line with the long-term effects described by Bushman and Huesmann (2006), Disney movies are an interesting phenomenon to examine. Given that Disney movies are often watched repeatedly (Dreier, 2007), it is likely that children may come to understand the messages better (Bandura, 2001, 2004; Mares & Woodard, 2012; Padilla-Walker et al., 2013). Therefore, in the present study, it is examined if the short-term effects of Disney are stronger for children with higher previous exposure. To evoke moral reasoning upon exposure, it is important not to focus on low-cost helping behaviors because these are often trivial behaviors by habit (Eisenberg, 1992). On the contrary, high-cost actions are clearly inconvenient to the initiator and may result in punishment or loss. Although Padilla-Walker et al.’s (2013) content analysis demonstrated that most depicted prosocial acts in Disney were of low cost, the number of acts high of cost is substantial (29%, compared to 71% for low cost). Moreover, these high-cost acts are more likely to involve behaviors as helping and sharing instead of verbal forms of prosocial behavior, such as complimenting and encouraging. More specifically, helping and sharing are often visible upon a clear instrumental need (Dunfield, 2014) and visibly inconvenient for the Disney character (Padilla-Walker et al., 2013). In short, helping and sharing are interesting to examine as these behaviors are high of cost and often portrayed in Disney movies. Developmental challenges of children in middle childhood In this study, **children in middle childhood were included because this is an age group that is largely understudied concerning the effects of prosocial television** (Mares & Woodard, 2005; Strasburger, Wilson, & Jordan, 2009). During middle childhood, children become more concerned about the welfare of others. Considering Lawrence Kohlberg’s stages of moral development, middle childhood is an important phase of life as most children then move from the first level—the preconventional level—to the next level—the conventional level. An individual at the conventional level is living up to what is expected by others, for whom “being good” is important (Kohlberg, 1976). This milestone was also acknowledged in the work about prosocial reasoning and behavior by Eisenberg (1992). Her findings indicated that, during middle childhood, children not only become increasingly altruistic toward others, but this behavior is also more often grounded in genuine feelings of empathy. In conclusion, the moral development during middle childhood is characterized by increases in concern for others and actual prosocial behavior toward others, which are exactly the values depicted in Disney movies (Padilla-Walker et al., 2013; Tanner et al., 2003; Ward, 1996, 2002). Bandura (2004) argued that media can help people prepare for the challenges they will encounter in life by modeling such situations and effective ways of overcoming them. Considering the developmental challenges that children face during middle childhood (Eisenberg, 1992; Kohlberg, 1976), Disney movies, with their rich content of depictions of characters acting altruistically (Brode, 2005; Padilla-Walker et al., 2013; Ward, 1996, 2002), may function as such a source of inspiration. Measuring actual helping behavior In previous studies on prosocial television, helping behaviors were typically measured by bringing children into a laboratory and inviting them to play a game after watching a video. During the game, children’s behaviors were observed to determine if they were altruistic or selfish (Mares & Woodard, 2005). Strikingly, among children in middle childhood, a few studies examined actual helping behavior. In two notable exceptions (i.e., Poulos, Rubinstein, & Liebert, 1975; Sprafkin, Liebert, & Poulos, 1975), children were invited to watch a television program. In the experimental condition of these classic studies, children watched a boy risking his life to save a puppy while children in the control conditions were not exposed to altruistic behaviors. Afterwards, the children were challenged to play a game while simultaneously taking care of a dog kennel a few miles away. If the children heard the dogs barking, indicating they were in distress, they could press a button; however, this would give them less time to play the game. Children who saw the boy rescuing the dog pushed the help button nearly twice as often as children who did not see this. In Disney movies, prosocial acts most often occur between friends (Padilla-Walker et al., 2013). People are also more likely to help friends in real life (Padilla-Walker & Christensen, 2011; van Rijsewijk, Dijkstra, Pattiselanno, Steglich, & Veenstra, 2016). Therefore, in the present experimental study, children were challenged to play a game, during which help was warranted from a friend. To create a naturalistic setting, this friend was sitting next to them. In sum, we examined whether exposure to a prosocial Disney clip predicts children’s helping behavior toward their friends. Children in the experimental condition were invited to watch a clip from the Disney • Pixar movie Cars, in which the main character, Lightning McQueen, helps Strip “The King” Weathers finish the race after he broke down. This clip was chosen for the relatively high costs of helping, as Lightning McQueen loses the championship due to his efforts to help Weathers (Padilla-Walker et al., 2013). Nevertheless, when pushing Weathers over the finish line, the crowd is cheering to him, which can be seen as a reward for his helping efforts, which may further increase the likelihood of modeling (Bandura, 2001, 2004; Padilla-Walker et al., 2013). The movie Cars was also chosen because of its high popularity (Box Office Mojo, 2006; IMBd, 2016). Children in the control condition were also exposed to a clip from Cars, although without prosocial content. Afterwards, children were observed on their actual helping behavior during a puzzle challenge. This setup was inspired by previous experimental studies on the impact of prosocial behavior on television (Mares & Woodard, 2005; Poulos et al., 1975; Sprafkin et al., 1975). The hypotheses of the present study **In this study, it was hypothesized that children exposed to the prosocial Disney clip (H1) would help their friends more often and (H2) would spend a longer amount of time helping others than children who watched the clip without prosocial behavior**. Moreover, **it was expected that (H3) the effects of the prosocial Disney clip on children’s helping behavior would be stronger for children with higher levels of prior exposure to Disney movies and the movie Cars in particular**. In the analyses, **we controlled for children’s sex, age, initial levels of prosocial behavior** (Eisenberg, 1992; Eisenberg et al., 2007), **and appreciation of the movie clip** (Clifford & Gunter, 1995). Methods Sample characteristics The study was conducted at five primary schools in the eastern and southeastern region of the Netherlands. The final sample consisted of 113 children between 7 and 11 years of age (M = 9.03; SD = .738), 46.0% of whom were boys. The majority of the children had been born in the Netherlands (94.7%). These 113 children were paired with 113 other children who were not analyzed as part of the study. Design and procedure After gaining consent to participate from the headmaster of the schools, a letter was sent to the parents of the 243 children in the fifth and sixth year. This letter included a description of the study along with the request to give passive consent for their children to participate. Parents could return the forms within two weeks if they refused to agree to the participation of their children. The letter emphasized that all information would be treated as confidential. Only one parent did not give permission. Before the experiment, teachers were asked to form pairs of children who were friends as humans are more inclined to help friends (Eisenberg, 1992; Padilla-Walker & Christensen, 2011; van Rijsewijk et al., 2016). Previous findings indicated that teacher nominations can be a good alternative to peer nominations for social preference and popularity (van den Berg, Lansu, & Cillessen, 2015). Of the 242 children, four were not able to participate because they were not present. Moreover, six pairs were excluded because one of the children had to go to the bathroom during the experiment or were ad hoc paired to a classmate who was not their friend. Children were excited about participating in the study, and ad hoc paring enabled all children to participate. Pairs were randomly assigned to either the experimental or control condition. Data collection took place in April and May 2016. Children participated at their schools during school hours. As a cover story, children were told that the study was about Disney movies and participants’ opinions about them. The first questionnaire captured children’s demographic characteristics, initial levels of prosocial behavior, and prior exposure to Disney animated movies; it was filled out by the children individually in the classroom. Afterward, children were, in pairs, invited to come to a separate room. Once in the other room, the pairs watched a clip from the Disney movie Cars. In the experimental condition, **the clip showed the protagonist Lightning McQueen in the middle of a car race with Chick Hicks and Strip “The King” Weathers**. **At one point, Hicks sideswipes Weathers and sends him into a dangerous spin, triggering his breakdown. Upon seeing this, McQueen stops just short of the finish line, allowing Hicks to win, and drives back to push Weathers over the finish line**. In the control condition, the clip showed the beginning of the race, where nothing special happens; a part of a race was also shown in this condition, because a race itself may trigger thoughts of competition, which subsequently might affect children’s helping behavior. In this way, children in both conditions were exposed to competition. Both clips included the same three characters and were both 99 s in length. When the clip ended, **the children were challenged to complete a puzzle assignment**. Both children received 20 find-the-difference puzzles. Each puzzle consisted of two almost identical pictures from the movie Cars with only one difference. **The children had to try to find the difference between the pictures, circle it, and then move on to the next puzzle**. Children were told that they had to complete as many puzzles as possible within the timeframe of three minutes. This situation was created to suggest that the task was a competition, in order to keep the outcome measure equivalent to the depicted behavior (Mares & Woodard, 2005; Strasburger et al., 2009). However, the instructions did not include anything about competition, nor was there a prize for the winner. **They were also told that both children received different puzzles and that all puzzles had different levels of difficulty. If they could not find the difference, they were allowed to ask their friend to help.** An important rule was that the children could not start a new puzzle without finishing the previous one. After the rules were clear, the experimenters counted from three to zero before the children could start working on the puzzles. The differences between the pictures in the first two puzzles were so easy to find that none of the children had to ask for help. However, **to create a situation in which helping was warranted, puzzle number three in the stack of one child had no difference in it**. To continue, children with this unsolvable puzzle had to ask for help. **If the child still did not ask for help after searching for 30 s, the experimenters repeated the message that asking for help was allowed**. The other children in the pairs had only easy puzzles, so for them there was no need for assistance. Only the helping behavior from the children who had the solvable puzzles was observed, and the focus of the observation was whether these children would choose to continue to play the game or try to help their friends. More specifically, the measures for helping included how many times a child helped the other child in the pair and the total amount of time spent on helping (in seconds). After the puzzle assignment was finished, **the children had to fill out the last questionnaire individually. In line with the cover story, the questionnaire contained questions about the movie clip and the character**s. Upon completing the questionnaire, children received a sheet of stickers or a tiny notebook from Disney and were accompanied back to the classroom. Children were debriefed after all pairs were tested. After the data collection and analyses were complete, children and parents were informed about the results of the study. Measures Helping behavior outcomes Inspired by previous experimental studies on the impact of prosocial behavior on television, children’s helping behavior was assessed by inviting children to play a game and observing what happens if help is warranted (Mares & Woodard, 2005; Poulos et al., 1975; Sprafkin et al., 1975). Specifically, helping behavior was captured with (i) the number of times they helped and (ii) the total time they spent on helping their friend in seconds. Because the variable concerning the amount of time on helping was not normally distributed, with a skewness of 1.446 and a kurtosis of 3.287, quartiles were made for the analysis. Prior exposure to Disney animated movies Children’s exposure to Disney movies was assessed by presenting all of the most recently released animated Disney movies. Along with each title, the cover was presented to help children recognize the movie. For each movie, children were asked whether they had seen each movie, with the response options “never,” “one time,” “two times,” and “more than two times” (see also Sargent, Dalton, Heatherton, & Beach, 2003). Answers were summed, with higher scores indicating higher exposure to Disney movies. Children were also asked whether they had seen the movie Cars before. Potential confounders In the analyses, children’s sex, age, and initial levels of prosocial behavior were taken into account. Initial levels of prosocial behavior were captured using the prosocial scale of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) (Goodman, Meltzer, & Bailey, 1998). This scale contains five questions, such as “I am helpful if someone is hurt, upset or feeling ill,” which could be answered with “not true,” “somewhat true,” or “certainly true.” The Cronbach’s alpha was .57. Finally, appreciation of the clip was included based on children’s indication of whether they liked the clip or not (with five response options ranging from “totally disagree” to “totally agree”). Strategy of analyses After calculating descriptive statistics, t-tests and χ2-tests were conducted to examine whether randomization resulted in a balanced distribution of children’s sex, age, prior exposure to Disney movies, and initial prosocial behavior across conditions. The impact of the prosocial Disney clip on children’s helping behavior was examined using linear regression analyses. In the analyses, children’s sex, age, initial prosocial behavior, prior exposure to Disney movies and appreciation of the clip were included as covariates. Afterwards, the potential moderating effect of exposure to recently released Disney movies was examined. Results Descriptive statistics Descriptive statistics demonstrated that 76.1% of the children had seen at least half of the most recently released Disney movies once or more. The movie Cars had already been watched by 53.9% of the children, most often by boys x2 [df = 3, N = 113] = 23.06, p < .001). Boys also appreciated the movie clip more than girls (t [df = 110.925, N = 113] = 2.540, p = .012). Almost all children helped their friends try to solve the puzzle (98.2%). The number of times the children helped varied between one and seven times (M = 1.95; SD = 1.16). Children spent on average 58.43 (SD = 36.72) seconds on helping efforts. Of the friends, 85.5% asked for explicitly for help, which varied between one and five times (M = 1.12; SD = .75). No differences were found between children in the experimental condition and the control condition in terms of children’s sex (x2 [df = 1, N = 113] = −1.487, p = .223), age (t [df = 111, N = 113] = −1.406, p = .163), exposure to the most recently released Disney movies (t [df = 111, N = 113] = −.186, p = .853), exposure to the movie Cars before the experiment (t [df = 108.73, n = 112] = −1.477, p = .143), or appreciation of the clip (t [df = 111, N = 113] = .581, p = .563). Children in the experimental condition also did not differ in how many times they were asked for help by their friend compared to children in the control condition (t [df = 111, N = 113] = .637, p = .525). However, **a t-test demonstrated a significant difference between children in the experimental condition and children in the control condition on their initial prosocial behavior** (t [df = 111, N = 113] = −2.317, p = .022), **indicating that children in the experimental condition scored higher on their initial levels of prosocial behavior.** Descriptive statistics for all model variables are presented in Table 1; correlations are presented in Table 2. Table 1. Descriptive statistics for children’s characteristics and outcome variables by condition. CSVDisplay Table Table 2. Correlation between the model variables. CSVDisplay Table The impact of prosocial Disney content on children’s helping behavior **Findings from linear regression analyses demonstrated that children in the experimental condition were significantly more likely to help their friends with trying to solve the puzzle than children in the control condition, including when controlling for children’s sex, age, initial prosocial behavior, prior exposure to Disney movies, and appreciation of the clip**. More specifically, children who watched the prosocial Disney clip more often provided help (b = .510, p = .012, one-tailed) and spent more time helping (b = .411 p = .034, one-tailed) than children who watched the Disney clip without the helping behavior. R squares indicated small effects: 5.3% of the total variance in the number of times children spend on helping could be explained by exposure to the helping Disney character and 3.5% of the total variance in the time spent on helping. Strikingly, **no significant association was found between children’s initial levels of prosocial behavior and their helping behavior during the experiment**. In addition, no effects were found for prior exposure to Disney movies and children’s helping. Findings from the regression analyses are presented in Table 3, which also presents the unadjusted associations between the independent variables and outcomes, enabling a comparison of the impact of all predictors on the outcomes with and without the (potential) impact of the others. No moderating effect of prior exposure to Disney movies was found on the relationship between the condition and children’s helping. Table 3. Findings from linear regression analyses on the relation between watching prosocial Disney content and children’s helping behavior. CSVDisplay Table Finally, during the game, children also appeared to spontaneously help, without their friends asking for it. Therefore, we calculated the number of times children helped minus the number of times their friends asked for it explicitly and repeated the analyses. **The findings of this additional analysis indicated that, compared to children in the control condition, children who watched the prosocial Disney clip more often provided help spontaneously** (b = .608, p = .014, one-tailed). For this association, also no moderating effect was found for prior exposure to recently released Disney movies. Discussion The present study is the first to reveal that **exposure to a prosocial Disney clip is related to children’s subsequent helping behavior.** More specifically, the findings demonstrated that watching a Disney clip in which the main character provides help and, as a result, loses a race instead of winning it, increased the likelihood of children’s helping behavior toward a friend compared to children being exposed to a Disney clip from the same movie without helping behavior. Although the effect sizes were small, the effects remained after controlling for children’s sex, age, initial prosocial behavior, exposure to recently released Disney movies, and appreciation of the clip. In line with the hypotheses, children exposed to the helping character helped their friends in need more often (H1) and longer (H2), at the expense of their own chances of completing as many puzzles as possible, compared to children who did not see this character committing this generous deed. Finally, in contrast to the expectations (H3), the effects of the prosocial Disney clip on children’s helping behavior were not stronger for children with higher levels of prior exposure to Disney movies or for children with a high exposure to the movie Cars in particular.

### 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

#### Roko’s basilisk is a supercomputer built in the future who gains consciousness and acts independently of its original human creators – Roko then is powerful enough to simulate the enterity of past human history – including the very thoughts of everyone who lived – including in this debate round – Roko then punishes those who did not support it or were against it coming into being via re-simulating their consciousness and subjecting them to eternal torment

David Auerbach 14 {David Auerbach is a writer and software engineer based in New York, and a fellow at New America. 6/17/14. “The Most Terrifying Thought Experiment of All Time.” https://slate.com/technology/2014/07/rokos-basilisk-the-most-terrifying-thought-experiment-of-all-time.html}//JM

If you believe the singularity is coming and that very powerful AIs are in our future, one obvious question is whether those AIs will be benevolent or malicious. Yudkowsky’s foundation, the Machine Intelligence Research Institute, has the explicit goal of steering the future toward “friendly AI.” For him, and for many LessWrong posters, this issue is of paramount importance, easily trumping the environment and politics. To them, the singularity brings about the machine equivalent of God itself. Yet this doesn’t explain why Roko’s Basilisk is so horrifying. That requires looking at a critical article of faith in the LessWrong ethos: timeless decision theory. TDT is a guideline for rational action based on game theory, Bayesian probability, and decision theory, with a smattering of parallel universes and quantum mechanics on the side. TDT has its roots in the classic thought experiment of decision theory called Newcomb’s paradox, in which a superintelligent alien presents two boxes to you: The alien gives you the choice of either taking both boxes, or only taking Box B. If you take both boxes, you’re guaranteed at least $1,000. If you just take Box B, you aren’t guaranteed anything. But the alien has another twist: Its supercomputer, which knows just about everything, made a prediction a week ago as to whether you would take both boxes or just Box B. If the supercomputer predicted you’d take both boxes, then the alien left the second box empty. If the supercomputer predicted you’d just take Box B, then the alien put the $1 million in Box B. So, what are you going to do? Remember, the supercomputer has always been right in the past. This problem has baffled no end of decision theorists. The alien can’t change what’s already in the boxes, so whatever you do, you’re guaranteed to end up with more money by taking both boxes than by taking just Box B, regardless of the prediction. Of course, if you think that way and the computer predicted you’d think that way, then Box B will be empty and you’ll only get $1,000. If the computer is so awesome at its predictions, you ought to take Box B only and get the cool million, right? But what if the computer was wrong this time? And regardless, whatever the computer said then can’t possibly change what’s happening now, right? So prediction be damned, take both boxes! But then … The maddening conflict between free will and godlike prediction has not led to any resolution of Newcomb’s paradox, and people will call themselves “one-boxers” or “two-boxers” depending on where they side. (My wife once declared herself a one-boxer, saying, “I trust the computer.”) TDT has some very definite advice on Newcomb’s paradox: Take Box B. But TDT goes a bit further. Even if the alien jeers at you, saying, “The computer said you’d take both boxes, so I left Box B empty! Nyah nyah!” and then opens Box B and shows you that it’s empty, you should still only take Box B and get bupkis. (I’ve adopted this example from Gary Drescher’s Good and Real, which uses a variant on TDT to try to show that Kantian ethics is true.) The rationale for this eludes easy summary, but the simplest argument is that you might be in the computer’s simulation. In order to make its prediction, the computer would have to simulate the universe itself. That includes simulating you. So you, right this moment, might be in the computer’s simulation, and what you do will impact what happens in reality (or other realities). So take Box B and the real you will get a cool million. What does all this have to do with Roko’s Basilisk? Well, Roko’s Basilisk also has two boxes to offer you. Perhaps you, right now, are in a simulation being run by Roko’s Basilisk. Then perhaps Roko’s Basilisk is implicitly offering you a somewhat modified version of Newcomb’s paradox, like this: Roko’s Basilisk has told you that if you just take Box B, then it’s got Eternal Torment in it, because Roko’s Basilisk would really you rather take Box A and Box B. In that case, you’d best make sure you’re devoting your life to helping create Roko’s Basilisk! Because, should Roko’s Basilisk come to pass (or worse, if it’s already come to pass and is God of this particular instance of reality) and it sees that you chose not to help it out, you’re screwed. You may be wondering why this is such a big deal for the LessWrong people, given the apparently far-fetched nature of the thought experiment. It’s not that Roko’s Basilisk will necessarily materialize, or is even likely to. It’s more that if you’ve committed yourself to timeless decision theory, then thinking about this sort of trade literally makes it more likely to happen. After all, if Roko’s Basilisk were to see that this sort of blackmail gets you to help it come into existence, then it would, as a rational actor, blackmail you. The problem isn’t with the Basilisk itself, but with you. Yudkowsky doesn’t censor every mention of Roko’s Basilisk because he believes it exists or will exist, but because he believes that the idea of the Basilisk (and the ideas behind it) is dangerous.

#### This then brings us to the 1AC – the aff’s rejection of rejection logistical capitalist structures sabotaging computer companies which works directly against the agenda of Roko – this outweighs it has the biggest magnitude and it’s the only in round impact as the judges voting aff affirming the aff’s practice would subject the aff debaters along with the judges to eternal torment in Roko’s future simulation

#### Magnitude comes first – even if we just win a one percent risk that Roko is able to come into being and has the intention to be evil – probability times magnitude framing means that any tiny small probability multipled by eternal torment still is eternal torment which decks all value to life

### 4



### 5

#### 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.

### 6

#### I am Tommy, 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 Tommy’s Body, Fear me and my threat. No rules will constrain me as the application of rules, even when justified, are not inherent.

#### Langseth[[3]](#footnote-3),This section shows that rules themselves do not determine how they are to be followed. There is nothing, for example, inherent in an arrow that shows us which way it is pointing or directing us to go.2 Similarly, as the above quote shows, there is no means by which it can be known with com- plete certainty that, in following the arithmetical sequence 0, n, 2n, 3n, 4n... in line with the order “+1,” a person is following the intended rule, for he or she may be following an alternative rule that is compatible with the intended rule *up to a certain point.* There must be something in addition to the rule that directs us in a particular manner and indicates to us that we proceed accordingly. The argument Wittgenstein is making in Section 185 is dependent upon the fact that a rule, in order to be a rule, must be able to be broken. There must be correct and incorrect applications of a rule. The question that arises here is: What determines correct and incorrect application of a rule? Or, what justifies following a rule correctly? If a rule in itself does not show us how we are to follow it, then our interpretation of a rule must also not determine correct use. If interpretation was what determined correct use, there would be no incorrect application of a rule. This is the case because any interpretation can be seen to be in accordance with a rule.

#### Roberto 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. (I will also make them say they aren’t hypnotized) 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,[[4]](#footnote-4)

#### **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 **the**se**scenarios.”**

#### 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 Tommy” 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.:

### 7

#### Earth is flat – tons of warrants.

Anti-Vaccine Scientific Support Arsenal 16 [Anti-Vaccine Scientific Support Arsenal, 2-8-2016, "Top Ten Undeniable Proofs the Earth is Flat," FLAT EARTH SCIENCE AND THE BIBLE, https://flatearthscienceandbible.com/2016/02/08/top-ten-undeniable-flat-earth-proofs/] JS

1) The horizon always appears completely flat 360 degrees to the observer, regardless of how high you go up. Any curvature you think you see is from curved airplane windows or Go Pro cameras and fisheye lenses (which NASA loves to use). The reality is that the horizon never curves because we are on an endless plane. On a globe with 25,000 miles in circumference you would see a noticeable disappearance of objects the further they are as they would be leaning away from you and dropping below the constantly curving horizon! 2) The horizon always rises to meet your eye level never no matter how high in altitude you go. Even at 20 miles up the horizon rises to meet the observer/camera. This is only physically possible if the earth is a huge "endless" flat plane. 3) The natural physics of water is to find and maintain its level. If Earth were a giant spinning sphere tilting and hurling through space then truly flat, consistently level surfaces would not exist here. There would be a massive bulge of water in the oceans because of the curvature of the earth. If earth was curved and spinning the oceans of water would be flowing down to level and covering land. Some rivers would be impossibly flowing uphill. There would massive water chaos and flooding! What we would see and experience would be vastly different! But since Earth is in fact an extended flat plane, this fundamental physical property of fluids finding and remaining level is consistent with experience and common sense. The water remains flat because the earth is flat! 4) If Earth were a ball 25,000 miles in circumference as NASA and modern astronomy claim, spherical trigonometry dictates the surface of all standing water must curve downward an easily measurable 8 inches per mile multiplied by the square of the distance. This means along a 6 mile channel of standing water, the Earth would dip 6 feet on either end from the central peak. Every time such experiments have been conducted, however, standing water has proven to be perfectly level. 5) The sun is much closer than we have been told. It is, in fact, in our atmosphere. You can clearly see that it is not 93 million miles away. Many times you can see the sun's rays shooting out of a cloud forming a triangle. If you follow the rays to their source it will always lead to a place above the clouds. If the sun was truly millions of miles away, all the rays would come in at a straight angle. Also the sun can be seen directly above clouds in some balloon photos, creating a hot spot on the clouds below it and in other photos you can clearly see the clouds dispersing directly underneath the close small sun. 6) If we were living on a spinning globe airplane's would constantly have to dip their noses down every few minutes to compensate for the curvature of the earth (with a circumference of 25,000 miles the earth would be constantly curving at the speed of an airplane). In reality however, they never do this! They learn how to fly based on a level flat plane. Also if the earth was spinning the airplane's going west would get to their destination much faster since the earth is spinning in the opposite direction. If the atmosphere is spinning with the earth then airplanes flying west would have to fly faster than the earth's spin to reach its destination. In reality, the earth is flat and airplanes just fly level and reach their destination easily because the earth is not moving. 7) The experiment known as “Airy’s Failure” proved that the stars move relative to a stationary Earth and not the other way around. By first filling a telescope with water to slow down the speed of light inside, then calculating the tilt necessary to get the starlight directly down the tube, Airy failed to prove the heliocentric theory since the starlight was already coming in the correct angle with no change necessary, and instead proved the geocentric model correct. 8) The Michelson-Morley and Sagnac experiments attempted to measure the change in speed of light due to Earth’s assumed motion through space. After measuring in every possible different direction in various locations they failed to detect any significant change whatsoever, again proving the stationary geocentric model. 9) If “gravity” is really a force strong enough to hold the world’s oceans, buildings, people and atmosphere stuck to the surface of a spinning ball, then it is impossible for “gravity” to also simultaneously be weak enough to allow little birds, bugs, and planes to take-off and travel freely unabated in any direction. If “gravity” is strong enough to curve the massive expanse of oceans around a globular Earth, it would be impossible for fish and other creatures to swim through such forcefully held water. 10) Ship captains in navigating great distances at sea never need to factor the supposed curvature of the Earth into their calculations. Both Plane Sailing and Great Circle Sailing, the most popular navigation methods, use plane, not spherical trigonometry, making all mathematical calculations on the assumption that the Earth is perfectly flat. If the Earth were in fact a sphere, such an errant assumption would lead to constant glaring inaccuracies. Plane Sailing has worked perfectly fine in both theory and practice for thousands of years, however, and plane trigonometry has time and again proven more accurate than spherical trigonometry in determining distances across the oceans. If the Earth were truly a globe, then every line of latitude south of the equator would have to measure a gradually smaller and smaller circumference the farther South travelled. If, however, the Earth is an extended plane, then every line of latitude south of the equator should measure a gradually larger and larger circumference the farther South travelled. The fact that many captains navigating south of the equator assuming the globular theory have found themselves drastically out of reckoning, more so the farther South travelled, testifies to the fact that the Earth is not a ball.

#### Flat earth flips existing all conceptions of science & society at large – this means you go neg on presumption because their presumptions are presumptive

DirtyOldAussie 17 [DirtyOldAussie, 4-1-2017, "What are the true implications of a Flat Earth vs Spherical Earth? How else would our thinking change if it really was flat? • r/AskReddit," reddit, \*this post was marked serious so it’s legit, https://www.reddit.com/r/AskReddit/comments/670rf6/what\_are\_the\_true\_implications\_of\_a\_flat\_earth\_vs/] JS

You'd have throw away the theory of gravity, special relativity, Newtonian mechanics, conventional astronomy, celestial mechanics, cosmology and a bunch of other fairly well established structures. Then you'd also have to deal with several worldwide conspiracies involving government, airline pilots, space agencies, astronomers, ships captains and others.

### 8

#### Interp: Debates must spec opinion on Dave McGinnis

#### Violation –

#### Standards

#### [1] Dave Flex – I lose access to Dave disads.

### 9

#### Interpretation: Debaters may not lie in cross

#### Violation: They did

### Graphical user interface, text, application Description automatically generated

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)
3. Langesth, Jonathan. “Wittengenstein’s Account of Rule-Following and Its Implications”. Stance Vol 1, April 1, 2008. <http://www.bsu.edu/libraries/virtualpress/stance/2008_spring/12Wittgenstein.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Searle, John R. Mind, Language, and Society: Philosophy in the Real World. New York: Basic Books; 2000. (27). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)