# 1N v tommy yu minneapple

## 1

#### 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.

**[3] No RVI’s –**

**(a) creates a chilling effect – aff is dangerous on theory because they get to prep a long counterinterp in the 1ar and then get the 2ar to collapse, weigh, and contextualize - negs would always be disincentived from reading theory against good theory debaters which leads to infinite abuse so it outweighs time skew and**

**(b) they’re illogical - “I’m fair vote for me” doesn’t make any sense - you dont win for meeting ur burden of being fair - logic comes first on theory since all args need to make sense in order to be evaluable.**

**[4] Drop the debater - [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**

**O/W On specificity - we have made an infinite abuse claim not a marginal abuse argument**

**[5] Prefer Competing Interps -**

**[a] reasonability’s arbitrary & forces judge intervention especially with 2ar recontextualizations to always sound like the more reasonable debater**

**[b] norm setting - we find the best possible norms through robust theory debates**

**[c] reasonability collapses - you use offense/defense paradigm to evaluate brightlines,**

**[6] No Cross Apps or Metatheory on the combo shell - [a] even if my practice was abusive, yours was infinitely abusive, allowing them to use their aff to take our shell just proves the abuse [b] hold them to actually win they were fair, they will just default to outframe the combo shell**

### TT

#### The role of the ballot is to determine the truth or falsity of the resolution.

#### [1] Logic: Debate is fundamentally a game with rules, which requires the better competitor to win. Every other ROB is just a reason why there are other ways to play the game but are not consistent enough with the purpose of the game

### NC

#### Permissibility negates – ought implies an obligation but permissibility is a lack of one which means the neg met their burden of disproving an obligation.

#### Presumption negates – a] statements are more often false than true b] contradictions – would justify saying both p and not p if you knew nothing about p

#### Ethics is based in language –

#### 1] It creates out ability to think and makes us agents – life outside language is deterministic and without morality. Pettit 09,

Phillip Pettit. Made With Words, Hobbes on Language, Mind, and Politics. 2009. <http://www.jstor.com/stable/j.ctt7rp73.3> //LHPYA

This picture of the mental life with which nature furnishes human beings, according to Hobbes, has two striking features. The first is that every process that takes place within the mind, cognitive or appetitive, is entirely particularistic. People will see and remember, represent and desire, only concrete things and situations. They will have no capacity to hold by general claims about how things are, or by general policies or principles for the direction of action. They will be prisoners of the imagined particular. Presented with a triangle, they will register just the individual figure contemplated, not any general aspect of the triangle (DCr 6.11; L 4.9). They will see the triangle before them, but will not register it as a triangle, a closed figure, or a drawing; not having access to such classes, they will not have the capacity to register it as anything more general than this particular thing: they will not be able, however implicitly, to classify it. The second aspect of Hobbes’s picture is that all that happens in the natural mind does precisely that: it happens. The succession of conceptions in which mental life consists is a form of vital motion, not of animal or voluntary motion; “one conception followeth not another, according to our election, and the need we have of them, but as it chanceth us to hear or see such things as shall bring them to our mind” (EL 5.1). The process does not evolve under the prompting or guidance of the agent’s desire to have those conceptions assume a certain pattern—say, constitute correct and consistent representations—but only as a by-product of a desire to act in one or another concrete fashion. If the subject is well constructed, then the succession of conceptions will lead rationally to action; the action will satisfy the subject’s desires according to evidentially sensitive representations. But no matter how rational the process or result, this succession of conceptions will not be prompted or guided by the agent’s desires in the manner of an active, intentional performance. The natural agent, animal or human, may be rational, instantiating a certain model of homo rationalis. Yet no one in this natural state will exemplify homo ratiocinans. No one will display the sort of active reflection that we naturally ascribe to Auguste Rodin’s sculpture of the thinker, bent over in concentrated thought. But while the natural mind is particularistic and passive in Hobbes’s portrait, he had no doubt that is not how our minds are. We adult, articulate human beings have words and concepts, not just for particular things, but for classes and categories of things, and we use them to classify, cross-check, and pursue interconnections. More specifically, we do this actively or intentionally, asking ourselves questions about how the words and concepts go together, and seeking to determine the answers. We may do this publicly in speaking with one another, but we may also do it silently, as in reflecting and taking counsel with ourselves. In these two respects, then, we reveal a mind that is decidedly different from the natural mind that Hobbes finds in the animal kingdom. The Linguistic Way Beyond How do human beings escape the constraints of the natural mind? How do they achieve the capacity to represent and desire things under general aspects, and think about them in an active, voluntary way? Hobbes’s answer is the most startling and original claim that he makes in the whole of his philosophy. The claim is that language or speech is a historical invention, and that it is language that makes possible the general, active form of thinking that we human beings display; it enables us to classify as well as register particulars, and seek out the implications of those classifications in a voluntary or active manner. Language, in Hobbes’s story, provides the magic that enables us to jump the limitations of the natural, animal mind. The claim is most vividly expressed in Leviathan. Having reviewed the capacities of the natural mind that human beings share with animals, Hobbes directs us to other human capacities or faculties that “proceed all from the invention of words, and speech. For besides sense, and thoughts, and the train of thoughts, the mind of man has no other motion; though by the help of speech, and method, the same faculties may be improved to such a height, as to distinguish men from all other living creatures.”(L 3.11).

#### 2] It’s inescapable – even if moral theorization could occur absent language it can only be communicated within it when getting others to act on it to create goodness

#### And language causes infinite violence –

#### 1] Language gives rise to comparison which results in endless competition and violence. Pettit 2,

Phillip Pettit. Made With Words, Hobbes on Language, Mind, and Politics. 2009. <http://www.jstor.com/stable/j.ctt7rp73.3> //LHPYA

Lacking the capacity to think in a classificatory way, other animals are insensitive to the ways in which they differ from or resemble their fellows, and so they live in the private as well as the present. But human beings can transcend the boundary of private concern as they can transcend the boundary of concern for the present. And transcend it they certainly will. It will be important for their welfare that they know how they compare with others and that they achieve a high relative standing.5 According to the Hobbesian picture, people’s concern with returns to themselves—their own pleasure, or their avoidance of pain—will naturally lead them to want access to the resources or powers whereby such returns can be produced. If they are to satisfy their wants, they will need the “natural” resources represented by “the faculties of body and mind” as well as “instrumental” resources such as “riches, place of authority, friendship or favour, and good fortune” (EL 8.4). Bent on the pursuit of their own self-interest, then, they will seek the means of conducting that pursuit; moved by the love of self, they will look for a way of consummating that love. In this they will be no different from other animals, though they may be more adept at spotting the means whereby their ends can be realized. But there is one aspect of the resources sought by human beings and other animals that only becomes clear on reflection and reasoning. This is that in a competitive world where the objects of desire are scarce, what will really matter to any creature is not the absolute level of its resources but their level relative to the resources of others. Where there is competition for resources, or competition in the use of resources, the important thing for each will be not the absolute quantity of resources commanded but the extent to which those resources enable the creature to outdo its competitors; “what all have equally is nothing” (DH 11.6). Letting the word power serve for resource, Hobbes finds a nicely turned way of putting the point. “And because the power of one man resisteth and hindereth the effects of the power of another: power simply is no more, but the excess of the power of one above that of another. For equal powers opposed, destroy one another”. These observations are true in some measure of all animals, but given their longer time horizons, it is particularly true of human beings. And it is only human beings, of course, who can become aware of the observations, since only they will be able to compare themselves with others for the resources they each command, and only they will be able to see that the important thing for each will be to have more resources than others—greater power. Under the pressure of this perceived need, the human being becomes a creature “whose joy consisteth in comparing himself with other men”

#### 2] Language is structurally negative and doesn’t refer to reality – if I say a saw an oak tree you know I didn’t see a car or person but you can’t visualize what I did see – since our rationality is based in language truth is created by individuals rather than extrinsically found but that creates infinite violence over meaning creation.

#### Thus, morality requires an authority to enforce a universal moral theory and resolve conflict. Only an absolute sovereign can do this. Parrish 2:

Derrida`s Economy of Violence in Hobbes` Social Contract, Richard Parrish

“All of the foregoing pints to the conclusion that in the commonwealth the sovereign’sfirst and most fundamental **job is to be the ultimate definer.**Several other commentators have also reached this conclusion. By way of elaborating upon the importance of the moderation of individuality in Hobbes’ theory of government, Richard Flathman claims that **peace “is possible only if** the **ambiguity and disagreement** that pervade general thinking and acting **are eliminated** by the stipulations of a sovereign.” Pursuant to debunking the perennial misinterpretation of Hobbes’ mention of people as wolves, Paul Johnson argues that“one of the primary functions of **the sovereign is to provide** the necessary **unity of meaning** and reference **for the**‘ primary **terms in which [people]** men try to **conduct their** social **lives.” “The** whole **[purpose]** raison d’entre of sovereign helmsmanship lies squarely in the chronic**[is to] defus[e]**ing of **interpretive clashes,”without which humans would**“fly off in all directions” and **fall** inevitably **into the violence of the natural condition.”**

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the will of the sovereign. Prefer it for motivation – morality lacks authority over agents. Even if the aff defines the good it gives no way to obligate agents to actually be good. That hijacks the aff since defining good and denying the ability to enforce it the sovereign creates is contradictory.

#### I negate: A just government ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike

#### That negates –

#### 1] The aff creates post-fiat obligations for the state – this is incoherent because it implies an authority higher than the state to constrain the sovereign. Only sovereign entities can create moral obligations, so the state can’t have an obligation to act

#### 2] The aff gives employees, specifically public sector ones, the right to strike against the state which is definitionally a violation of the sovereign’s will

### 4

## Case

### UV

#### 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

#### [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

### Responses

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.

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.