## 1 – Theory Strat

#### Interpretation: If there are offensive theory arguments in the AC, then they must explicitly outline in the text of the AC a strategy that the 1N could employ that doesn’t violate any theory constraints in the aff. To clarify, you can still read your spikes, you just need to also specify a strat.

#### Violation:

#### Standards:

#### Substantive Education: They need to specify in the text of the aff what type of strategies would be permissible because otherwise it is inevitable that I will slip up and that the round will turn into a theory debate. This denies any sort of substantive education since there are always more constraints on what sort of substantive education is good under the aff underview. It also makes the quality of the theory debate worse because the arguments are developed very unclearly in the underview, rather they can either read just a few arguments that are well developed or they read the arguments in the 1AR.

#### They can’t specify the arguments in CX because

#### a) there is no reason I should waste time on clarifying your advocacy

#### b) I need all the prep time to make a strategy

#### c) it’s inefficient to try and question them through each strategy that doesn’t work takes too long

#### d) they need to specify before I begin forming a strategy because they need to clarify what ground is entailed by the shells because absent that its impossible to tell what the combination looks like.

#### Key to education because in order to know the truth of the claim we need to be able to contest it.

#### B. Strat Skew: If they don’t specify what sort of strategy wouldn’t violate any of the shells then they can defend contradictory spikes that makes it impossible for the neg to win because there is always a violation. This outweighs any aff arguments for why the 1AR is hard because contradictory spikes are functionally NIBs, since you have to respond to the spikes but you don’t win if you do. This should also serve as the litmus test to whether or not the combination of spikes should be something that is fair in this round. If the strategy that they said wouldn’t violate any spikes is absurd and offers the neg no ground then you should err voting neg off of the independent unfairness of their specific combination of spikes. This is outweighs on fairness because it is a matter of comparing 0 possible neg ground to a slightly harder time in the 1AR.

#### And, paragraph theory is uniquely hard to flow- it’s all short, blippy arguments that are not well structured, uniquely disadvantaging disabled individuals, which excludes them from the activity. THOMPSON:

Marshall Thompson – Former Debater and Current Coach. http://vbriefly.com/2015/04/21/marshall-thoughts/

First, I think that evaluating who is the better debater via who dropped spikes excludes lots of specific individuals, especially those with learning disabilities. I have both moderate dyslexia and extreme dysgraphia.  Despite debating for four years with a lot of success I was never able to deal with spikes. I could not ‘mind-sweep’ because my flow was not clear enough to find the arguments I needed, and I was simply too slow a reader to be able to reread through the relevant parts of a case during prep-time. **ab**I was very lucky, my junior year (which was the first year I really competed on the national circuit) spikes were remarkably uncommon. Looking back it was in many ways the low-point for spike. They started to be used some my senior year but not anything like the extent they are used today. I am entirely confident, however, in saying that if spikes had had anywhere near the sameprevalence when I started doing ‘circuit’ debate as they do now, I—with the specific ways that dyslexia/dysgraphia has affected me—would never have bothered to try to debate national circuit LD (I don’t intend to imply this is the same for anyone who has dyslexia or dysgraphia, the particular ways that learning disabilities manifest is often difficult to track). Now, the mere fact that I would have been prevented from succeeding in the activity and possibly from being able to enjoyably compete is not an argument. I never would have been able to succeed at calligraphy, but I would hardly claim we should therefore not make the calligraphy club about handwriting. Instead, what I am suggesting is that the values that debate cares about and should be assessing are not questions of handwriting or notation. We expect notation instrumentally to avoid intervention, but it is not one of the ends of debate in itself. Thus, if there is a viable principle upon which we can decrease this strategic dimension of spikes but maintain non-intervention I think we should do so. I was ‘good’ at philosophy, ‘good’ at argument generation, ‘good’ at research, ‘good’ at casing, ‘great’ at framework comparison etc. It seems to me that as long as I can flow well enough to easily follow a non-tricky aff it was proper that my learning disabilities not be an obstacle to my success. (One other thing to note, while I was a ‘framework debater’ who could never have been good at spikes because of my learning disability I have never met a ‘tricky debater’ who could not have succeeded in debate without tricks simply in virtue of their intelligence and technical proficiency; that is perhaps another reason to favor my account.) Second, spikes add in a greater dimension of randomnessto the round. If they are seen then they are ‘caught’ then they don’t really help you win, if they are not they do. Against most debaters one can ‘reliably’ beat them or will ‘reliably’ lose to them. With cases with lots of spike however, one might generally beat them and then once just miss a spike and it is all over. If the round were to have happened at a different time then the spike might have been caught. This ‘luck’ dimension strikes me as at least giving reason to think it does not track with what we want when assessing who did the better debating.

#### Accessibility is an independent voter that outweighs: if people can’t participate in debate then what happens inside of rounds isn’t relevant. Also turns the aff because proves the aff isn’t open to everyone and procedural deliberation are uniquely hurting people.

#### DTD

**[a] Epistemic Skew - I was structurally precluded from engaging in substance given the time spent reading the shell and the abuse itself, means you can’t truly evaluate substance because they are always ahead**

**[b] Deters Future Abuse - empirically confirmed with things like A Prioris**

**[c] Norm Setting - anything else allows debaters to get away with abusive practices which means theory will never work at setting norms**

#### No RVIs –

A] logic

B] baiting

C] 1ar

#### Competing Interps –

## 2 – Presumption Permiss

#### Permissibility Negates –

#### 1] Semantics – Ought is defined as expressing obligation which means absent a proactive obligation you vote neg since there’s a trichotomy between prohibition, obligation, and permissibility and proving one disproves the other two.

#### 2] Safety – It’s ethically safer to presume the squo since we know what the squo is but we can’t know whether the aff will be good or not if ethics are incoherent.

#### 3] Logic – Propositions require positive justification before being accepted, otherwise one would be forced to accept the validity of logically contradictory propositions regarding subjects one knows nothing about, i.e if one knew nothing about P one would have to presume that both the "P" and "~P" are true.

#### 4] Shiftiness – Permissibility ground encourages the aff to load up with triggers and the 1ar controls the direction of the round which means they can moot all my offense, I need permissibility in the 2n to compensate.

#### Presume neg- A. We assume statements to be false until proven true. That is why we don’t believe in alternate realities or conspiracy theories. The lack of a reason something is false does not me it is assumed to be true. B. Statements are more often false then true. If I say this pen is red, I can only prove it true in one way by demonstrating that it is indeed red, where I can prove it false in an infinite amount of ways.

## 3 – Disclosure

#### Interp: if a debater reads a disclosure argument against another debater, they cannot violate that disclosure argument

#### Violation – you read a new aff and on your wiki there’s new affs bad
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Normsetting

## Case

### Overview

**Overview:**

**[1] I get new 2nr responses to spikes - [a] I don’t know the implications until the 1ar, all of these blippy args will just be re implicated and extrapolated [b] not granting new 2nr responses incentivizes affs filling the AC with blippy reasons to auto affirm, making it inevitable I miss something and lose  [c] k2 fairness & education bc otherwise they auto win off a single extension**

**[2] Time skew is false - we both have 13 minutes to debate, and you get to leverage your aff in the 1ar which solves allocation**

**[3] Negating is harder - [a] Infinite Prep - affs get infinite pre tournament prep to extensively frontline all possible responses negs can have, also solves their arguments because they can just have it prepped out [b] Terms and Conditions - the aff gets to set the possibilities for the debate, i.e. all arguments the 1nc makes will be based on what the aff is which means that they get control over how the round goes - this impact turns reactivity because they know what our strat will be**

**[4] Reject arguments that change when the judge evaluates the round - it makes debate one sided which is definitionally unfair**

**[5] Reject arguments that use the same warrant to justify multiple conclusions e.g. their time skew means x y z - none of these actually have a warrant as to why the implication is true rather just an assertion - all args need a clear claim warrant & impact**

**[6] I get RVIs to each spike - they are all tiny no risk arguments that create a MASSIVE time skew -- I have to respond to all of them or else I lose, this is unique to their UV and not my shell because none of the arguments are complete and are all blippy and easy to miss**

**[7] Reject arguments that create logical contradictions or paradoxes - they make the round irresolvable - don't let them go for these as independent reasons to affirm, at best they all trigger presumption because the converse is simultaneously true**

#### Principle of explosion – a] it negates because it means statements are also false b] there is no paradox that has been demonstrated to trigger it c] the implication is that their conception of truth is meaningless and vacuous – if everything is true, nothing has meaning, so use the pragmatic truth of the kritik

#### Multiple worlds – a] this supercharges the link to the K – focusing on other worlds when we have problems that politics needs to solve on this one is a distraction from real political struggle b] only about quantum things which have no macro level impact

#### Dogmatism paradox – a] be dogmatic to the NC because the aff is a bunch of nonsense u know is false b] debate presupposes objective evaluation not assuming things

#### Simplicity – that’s another link – the idea that we don’t care to do anything because we’re lazy is the same logic that has squashed leftist resistance. Voting neg is simpler because it’s a shorter word. Yes eval responses – anything else begs the question of the arg itself

#### Quantum superposition is 1 sentence card with no warrant and not about ethics but reality. Again, micro not macro so no impact

#### No trivial entity – the premises assume the conclusion that a trivial entity exists – read this evidence. I’m the trivial entity if there is one, so listen to me.

#### Condo logic – false antecedents mean true statements not true consequents which is what all their args presuppose. Worst case, replace aff with neg and I win.

#### Truth value – the aff has it because everything does – this has no warrant. If it doesn’t, then vote neg because they didn’t say anything.

#### Fake news – debate doesn’t presuppose truth beforehand – we debate over it.

#### Decision-making – we appeal to logic or pragmatism which solves. Infinite regress flows neg because we can’t justify the aff.

#### Liar’s paradox – this proves truth values exist – I can say “there are some true things” and be consistent. The pragmatism stuff above also answers this.

#### Overthinking paradox – the idea that my ideas aren’t worth thinking about is a voting issue – degrades my agency and self-confidence which pushes minorities out who already have a hard time. Don’t overthink – this arg is bad intuitively.

#### Bonini’s paradox – your worldview is too complex so negate. My theory does have historical explanatory power which was the entire K – this is an oversweeping assertion.