# Sunvite R2 1N v Aadit

## 1

#### Interpretation: Debaters must follow their own disclosure interpretation that they disclose on their High School NDCA LD wiki page

#### Violation: They disclose the interp that the affirmative must disclose advantage areas and 30 minutes before the roudn – they don’t follow that – they didn’t sent me stuff barely before the round started and didn’t disclose advantage areas

Graphical user interface, application

Description automatically generatedGraphical user interface, text, application, Word

Description automatically generatedGraphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generatedGraphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generatedGraphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generated

#### Vote neg:

#### [1] Norming – if we are going to deliberate about what is the best disclosure practice, but you don’t follow your own, you destroy all possibilities of setting norms because no follows them – it just becomes a game – norming comes first it’s the terminal impact to theory and o/w on scope

#### [2] Academic Integrity – they are actively lying and being a hypocrite in a school based and funded space – academic integrity controls the internal link to all other voters because fairness only matters given that we only want to keep the game fair to precure some sort of benefits – it’s the worst form of unfairness by disadnvating people otusdie of the debate by making fake arguments. Also link turns education because eduaction is only attainable by being academically honest – for example if I plagarized a research paper I don’t learn due to dishonesty

#### [3] Reciprocity – the justify an reciprocal burden where they never have to follow their norms but everyone else has to

#### Fairness is a voter

#### b] fairness is a procedural constraint—if they had 10 minutes to say fairness bad and I only had 1 minute to defend it, they would win because it was structurally unfair to begin with.

#### Drop the debater (a) deter future abuse – empirically confirmed with aprioris and (b) norm setting c] dropping the arg is incoherent because it is dropping the aff advocacy so its functionally the same.

#### 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 disincentives 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 - logic comes first on theory since all args need to make sense in order to be evaluable.

#### Competing interpretations –

#### a] reasonability is arbitrary since it relies upon judge opinion which outweighs since it’s terminally unfair – it relies on something completely out of control and

#### b] reasonability collapses into competing interpretations since you need to justify why your brightline is better than competing ones

## 2

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must not defend a non-status quo policy option. To clarify, the affirmative may not fiat \_\_\_\_\_ (their advocacy)

#### Violation: They do (explain)

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Precision – the resolution doesn’t entail an actor nor does it an action – they are definitionally not topical or even a subset of the resolution – vote them down –

#### A] stasis point – the topic is the only reasonable focal point for debate – anything else destroys the possibility of debate because we will be two ships passing –

#### B] internal link turn – violating semantics justifies the aff talking about whatever with zero neg prep or prediction which is the most unfair and educational –

#### C] Jurisdiction – you can’t vote for them because the ballot and the tournament invitation say to vote for the better debater in the context of the resolution –

#### D] objectivity – only semantics are objective whereas pragmatics are subjective which means intervention

#### 2] Limits – they explode them – they are super Extra T and justify an infinite possible number of affirmatives and different actors – none of which are part of the resolution which means there is no prediction ground. Multiple Impacts – A] Stable Ground – they deck neg preparation ability and impose an infinitely reciprocal research burden on the negative to have to guess the infinite policy options and possible permutations and to cut specific disads to those - B] Predictability – no actor or action means its impossible to have a way to predict affs on this topic which decks quality engagement and education – C] Infinite Abuse – being non-topical justifies picking a trivially true aff which means they always win

#### 3] TVA – don’t defend an action and use ideal theory to explain why appropriation is bad - That’s better – it promotes in-depth philosophical clash over law that’s constitutive to LD

## 3

#### Skepticism is true and negates:

#### 1] Concept Skep – there are 2 forms of knowledge – deductive, knowledge from logical proofs, and empirical, knowledge from experience. However, all knowledge is grouped into two concepts – universals or particulars. The concept “I am Prateek” is particular because there is only one me, but “bears are white” is universal because it applies to all theoretical bears. Universal knowledge is epistemically inaccessible because you must prove a negative existential which requires omniscience to prove. For the concept, “bears are white” to be true, I must be certain there are no brown bears, as that would disprove my claim. That negates because it’s impossible to prove a universal concept like the resolution i.e., striking is good. At best, they prove this means particularism is true, which still means you negate because the aff isn’t particular.

#### 2] Rule Following – nothing inherent a rule mandates a specific interpretation to be followed. For example, nothing inherent in an arrow means that it has to point in one direction. Thus, the moral rule the aff sets is infinitely regressive and fails.

#### justifying voting neg.

#### 3] All moral actions are inherently immoral –

#### A] Justice Paradox – a just decision requires immediate action else on is complicit with the injustice they critique. However, the formulation the belief that x practice is unjust and y solution solves takes time, which means making claims about justice are contradictory.

#### 4] Is-Ought Gap – all moral statements are descriptive and cannot be truly moral as they explain descriptive facts about the world. For example, saying “x is illegal, thus one ought not do x” doesn’t justify why one ought not do x.

#### 5] Zeno’s Paradox – assume we are starting at any position A and want to get to position Z. In order to move from position A to Z we must cross halfway point position B, but in order to get to position B, we must cross the halfway point in between A and B, being C, and so on until infinity. Two impacts: a] movement is theoretically illogical thus the plan does nothing means you vote negative on presumption b] empirical conjectures result in external world skep – disproving logical premises with material examples justifies a disconnect between logic and the physical. Proving motion possible in the physical proves a rejection of the physical given the illogicality of the example, meaning we could be deceived and its not verifiable.

#### 6] Cartesian Skep – truth requires one to be absolutely certain about a statement or else the statement cannot be held true. For example, saying all apples are red requires certainty that no apples are blue or else the statement is an assumption. However, one cannot rule out the possibility of a deceptive demon who deceives all in their beliefs while simultaneously assuring ourselves that we are right. Thus, one can never prove that the external world exists because our knowledge of it may always be incorrect. This also proves solipsism is true as we can only be sure of our own mind and consciousness, but we can never verify that of the other.

## Case

### Framing

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

**1] Constitutive: The ballot asks you to either vote aff or neg based on the given resolution a) Five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true which means its intrinsic to the nature of the activity**

#### 2] Bindingness: a) all arguments pre-assume that they are true as judges don’t vote an arguments proven false b) in order to win that your ROB is superior to TT you must prove true the claim that your ROB is better than TT.

#### 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.

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)