# Yale Quarters 1N

## 1

**Interpretation: the affirmative may not claim the negative doesn’t get arguments**

**Violation:**

**The standard is infinite abuse -**

**Two impacts:**

**[A] Norm Setting - (- norming is an independent voter because its the terminal impact to theory i.e. theory tries to test norms**

**[B] Controls the Internal Link to clash/critical thinking -**

**Voters:**

**[1] Fairness is a voter**

**[a] Procedural Constraint - fairness controls the ability to gain respond to your args in the first place, if I had 1 second to respond to the 1ar I would lose due to fairness issues, also controls the internal link to education because we cant gain education if we’re precluded from good clash in the first place.**

**[b] Ballot Proximity - voting aff because their model is more educational doesn't gain you any actual educational value, however voting neg because they were unfair rectifies the abuse and has solvency**

**[c] Education concedes the validity of fairness - your arguments presume the judge will evaluate them fairly, responses trigger a double bind in which either the judge does not evaluate your argument fairly and they can hack and vote neg or they do but that proves fairness comes first**

**[2] Vote negative on substance - I couldn’t actually engage with the aff**

**[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**

## 2

#### the aff’s specific form of frivolous melancholy gives up usefulness of the world and creating change. all their BS theory arguments and tricks to go away from fighting capitalism – the 1AR extensions will prove. They enjoy the melancholic pleasures of being distanced and accommodated to the real world, and as a result remains stuck in parasitic oppression without change. Dean13

“Communist Desire”, Jodi Dean, , 2013, LHP AM

An emphasis on the drive dimension of melancholia, on Freud's attention to the way sadism in melancholia is 'turned round upon the subject's own self', leads to an interpretation of the general contours shaping the left that differs from Brown's**. Instead of a left attached to an unaclmowledged orthodoxy,** **we have one that has given way on the desire for communism, betrayed its historical commitment to the proletariat, and sublimated revolutionary energies into restorationist practices that strengthen the hold of capitalism**. **This left has replaced commitments to the emancipatory, egalitarian struggles of working people against capitalism - commitments that were never fully orthodox, but always ruptured, conflicted and contested - with incessant activity** (not unlike the manic Freud also associates with melancholia), and so **now satisfies itself with criticism and interpretation, small projects and local actions, particular issues and legislative victories, art, technology, procedures, and process**. It sublimates revolutionary desire to democratic drive, to the repetitious practices offered up as democracy (whether representative, deliberative or radical). **Having already conceded to the inevitably of capitalism, it noticeably abandons 'any striking power against the big bourgeoisie',** to return to Benjamin's language. For such a left, **enjoyment comes from its withdrawal from responsibility, its sublimation of goals and responsibilities into the branching, fragmented practices of micro-politics, self-care, and issue awareness**. Perpetually slighted, harmed and undone**, this left remains stuck in repetition, unable to break out of the circuits of drive in which it is caught** - unable because it enjoys. **Might this not explain why such a left confuses discipline with domination, why it forfeits collectivity in the name of an illusory, individualist freedom that continuously seeks to fragment and disrupt any assertion of a collective or a common?** The watchwords of critique within this structure of left desire are moralism, dogmatism, authoritarianism and utopianism - watchwords enacting a perpetual self-surveillance: has an argument, position or view inadvertently rukeo one of these errors? Even some of its militants reject party and state, division and decision, securing in advance an inefficacy sure to guarantee it the nuggets of satisfaction drive provides. **If this left is rightly described as melancholic, and I agree with Brown that it is, then its melancholia derives from the real existing compromises and betrayals inextricable from its history - its accommodations with reality, whether of nationalist war, capitalist encirclement, or so-called market demands.** Lacan teaches that, like Kant's categorical imperative, the super-ego refuses to accept reality as an explanation for failure. Impossible is no excuse - desire is always impossible to satisfy. A wide spectrum of the contemporary left has either accommodated itself, in one or another, to an inevitable capitalism or taken the practical failures of Marxism-Leninism to require the abandonment of antagonism, class, and revolutionary commitment to overturning capitalist arrangements of property and production. **Melancholic fantasy (the communist Master, authoritarian and obscene) as well as sublimated, melancholic practices (there was no alternative) shield this left, shield Ltd, from confrontation with guilt over such betrayal as they capture us in activities that feel productive, important, radical.**

#### They ignore the atmosphere of death and are able to get away with it because of the surrounding exhaustion. Politics demands a choice and a commitment—even if they win some nonsense extension, you can still make that choice. Listen to us, we can tell you what to do. This solves 100% of the inevitable aff appeals to skepticism. Dean 19

Dean, Jodi. *Comrade: An essay on political belonging*. Verso, 2019.

Some on the left are skeptical of such political belonging. **Seeing discipline only as constraint and not as a decision to build collective capacity, they substitute the fantasy that politics can be individual for the actuality of political struggle and movement. This substitution evades the fact that comradeship is a choice**—both for the one joining and for the party joined, as I explore below. It also ignores the liberating quality of discipline: When we have comrades, we are freed from the obligation to be and know and do everything on our own; there is a larger collective with a line, program, and set of tasks and goals. We are also freed from our impulses **(enjoined by communicative capitalism) to criticize and comment on the outrage of the moment.** **And we are freed from the cynicism that parades as maturity because of the practical optimism that faithful work engenders. Discipline provides the support that frees us to make mistakes, learn, and grow. When we err—and each of us will—our comrades will be there to catch us, dust us off, and set us right. We aren’t abandoned to go it alone.** **Disorganized leftists too often remain entranced by the illusion of everyday people spontaneously creating new forms of life that will usher in a glorious future.** This illusion fails to acknowledge the deprivationsand decapacitations that forty years of neoliberalism have inflicted. **If it were true** that austerity, debt, the collapse of institutional infrastructures, and capital flight **could enable the spontaneous emergence of egalitarian forms of life, we would not see the enormous economic inequalities, intensification of racialized violence, declines in life expectancy, slow death, undrinkable water, contaminated soil, militarized policing and surveillance, and desolate urban and suburban neighborhoods that are now commonplace**. **Exhaustion of resources includes the exhaustion of human resources. Lots of times people want to do something but they don’t know what to do or how to do it. They may be isolated in nonunionized workplaces, overburdened by multiple flextime positions, stretched thin caring for friends and family. Disciplined organization—the discipline of comrades committed to common struggle for an emancipatory egalitarian future—can help here. Sometimes we want and need someone to tell us what to do because we are too tired and overextended to figure it out for ourselves. Sometimes when we are given a task as a comrade, we feel like our small efforts have larger meaning and purpose, maybe even world-historical significance in the age-old fight of the people against oppression. Sometimes just knowing that we have comrades who share our commitments, our joys, and our efforts to learn from defeats makes political work possible where it was not before**. **Some leftists** agree with everything I’ve said thus far, yet they **add buts**. But won’t we end up disappointed and betrayed? **But won’t it all ultimately fail** (as it has so many times)? **But what about the harms comrades have inflicted on each other in the name of comradeship**? **But what about the persistence of sexism and racism**, bigotry and bias? **But what happens when we are no  longer on the same side**, when we cannot say “we” or acknowledge a side? **These questions press consideration of the end of comradeship**. Frankly speaking**, the critical tendency to reject an idea because of a slew of possible future failures is widespread in left milieus. An intellectual façade masks a failure of political will that would be unconvincing in any other context—don’t meet that person for coffee in case you fall in love and later have an expensive and hateful divorce; don’t speak at that meeting in case you lose your train of thought and end up sounding stupid; don’t take up sport or exercise because you might get injured and you’ll never be very good at it anyway; don’t live because you will inevitably die. Worries about the end foreclose possibilities of beginning. Yes, relationships end. Failures happen. But failure is nothing to fear—it’s something to learn from, a next step.** This chapter endeavors to learn from the end of comradeship. It considers four types of ending: expulsion, resignation, drift, and the end of the world. These four types are not always distinct. At times, one blends into the other. Yet they open up the ways that the loss of comradeship has differing causes and effects, results and outcomes. They remind us that **the fact of an end should not forestall beginning.**

#### The alternative is to become a comrade and practice discipline. Suppressing self-interest and personal desires for the sake of the movement is key to deconstructing capitalism. The role of the ballot is to deconstruct capitalism, it’s the only way to guarantee freedom.

Dean 19 Dean, Jodi. *Comrade: An essay on political belonging*. Verso, 2019.

Just as there are four theses on the comrade, so does the comrade have four primary characteristics: discipline, joy, enthusiasm, and courage. If, as I argue in *The Communist Horizon*, **communism is a collective desire for collectivity, then comradely discipline functions as its law and language. Discipline—meetings, reports, work, demonstrations, campaigns, “unity of action,” carrying out the line—provides the language through which previously inchoate and individual longing becomes collective will**. **Discipline also provides the impediment that maintains desire: organizing requires planning and postponement. The comrade here is not the same as the militant who might celebrate and pursue the heroic and individualistic propaganda of the deed.** As we have already seen with Brecht, the young comrade’s impatience botched the whole operation and so his comrades had to kill him. Comradeship is a disciplining relation: **Expectations, and the responsibility to meet them, constrain individual action and generate collective capacity. Comrades learn to push immediate self-interest and the desire for personal comfort or advancement aside for the sake of the party, the movement, and the struggle. Discipline negates and creates. It induces the subordination of personal interest for the sake of producing a new force, a force strong enough to endure the long years of revolutionary struggle and prevail.** In the words of one of the Communists Gornick interviewed in *The Romance of American Communism:* “To be involved with people in a political enterprise, to feel that particular comradeship, to watch people becoming in such an atmosphere, that is to feel the world being made anew.”[70](javascript:void(0)) Lenin famously and frequently spoke of the need for discipline in the revolutionary party—rigorous discipline, proletarian discipline, iron discipline, socialist discipline, comradely discipline, and so on. **Party discipline generally referred to the expectations of unity in action, free discussion, and criticism.**[**71**](javascript:void(0)) **Proletarian, or labor, discipline differed insofar as it pointed to the new organization of labor under socialism, the voluntary organization of class-conscious workers. Rather than being subjected to the will of the bosses, the forces of the market, or the tyranny of the wage, the “conscious and voluntary initiative of the workers” yields new gains in productivity, more advanced techniques of production.**[**72**](javascript:void(0)) **The working class demonstrates through proletarian discipline that capitalists and landlords are superfluous. We don’t need them. We can—and will—do it ourselves.** In each kind of discipline, what matters is that discipline is freely accepted. For Lenin, discipline itself is revolutionary, more revolutionary than the defeat of the bourgeoisie: “for it is a victory over our own conservatism, indiscipline, petty-bourgeois egoism, a victory over the habits left as a heritage to the worker and peasant by accursed capitalism.”[73](javascript:void(0)) **Through comradely discipline, we make one another stronger. Our commitment to working together toward our common goal works back on us, enabling us to surmount and maybe even abolish those individualist attributes produced by capitalism. We can make mistakes, learn, and change. By recognizing our own inadequacies, we come to understand the need to be generous and understanding toward the shortcomings of others. We develop an appreciation for strengths and talents that we had been unable to see. We become a new kind of collectivity**. One doesn’t have to be a Bolshevik to recognize the necessity of revolutionary discipline. In *Homage to Catalonia*, Orwell says that “‘revolutionary’ discipline depends on political consciousness—on an understanding of *why* order must be obeyed.”[74](javascript:void(0)) The explanation for a given task, which generates a shared understanding of the task’s importance, is one of the ways that equality replaces hierarchy. If we are on the same side, if we share the same goals, we have to coordinate our actions to realize them. As comrades, we take on tasks voluntarily; we discipline ourselves because that’s what political action requires. Accompanying comradely discipline is joy, the second characteristic of the comrade. In a pamphlet on Communist *subbotniks*—that is, Saturdays of voluntary labor undertaken during the Civil War—Lenin quotes an article that appeared in *Pravda* celebrating the enthusiastic voluntary work done on the Moscow-Kazan railway: When the workers, clerks and head office employees without even an oath or argument, caught hold of the forty-pood wheel tire of a passenger locomotive and, like industrious ants, rolled it into place, one’s heart was filled with fervent joy at the sight of this collective effort, and one’s conviction was strengthened that the victory of the working class was unshakable … When the work was finished those present witnessed an unprecedented scene: a hundred Communists, weary, but with the light of joy in their eyes, greeted their success with the solemn strains of the Internationale.[75](javascript:void(0)) The joy of discipline is internal and external, felt by comrades and experienced by those who witness how discipline changes the world. **Through the intense collectivity that discipline enables, comrades can do the impossible; they are liberated from prior expectations and constraints. Joy accompanies the sense of collective invincibility. *Together we made it happen—and we did it for purposes larger than ourselves***. A CPUSA section organizer describes the power that accrues when people join together as the thrill of seeing one become through the other, the idea through the structure, the structure through the action. And the whole of it discipline, each by its own properties, own function, and together, by the grand design that only a disciplined existence could form.[76](javascript:void(0)) **Joy in comradeship testifies to the freedom that discipline affords.**

## Case

**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**

### LBL

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.

### 