# Mid America R3

### 1

#### Interpretation: debaters must prove they’re not a robot.

#### Violation – They failed our test and were NOT unique – Their answer to our question proves they are AI and violate our interp – messed up bootylicious and supercalifrag

**Vincent**, James. “A One-Word Turing Test Suggests 'Poop' Is What Sets Us Apart from the Machines.” *The Verge*, The Verge, 7 Oct. **2018**, [www.theverge.com/2018/10/7/17940352/turing-test-one-word-minimal-human-ai-machine-poop](http://www.theverge.com/2018/10/7/17940352/turing-test-one-word-minimal-human-ai-machine-poop). //Massa

But this isn’t to say that the Turing Test is useless. Creating computer programs that can chat convincingly is a [fruitful challenge for AI researchers](https://www.theverge.com/2018/6/13/17453994/amazon-alexa-prize-2018-competition-conversational-ai-chatbots) that may benefit humanity. **The test is** also still **a fantastic thought experiment that can help us explore complex questions surrounding our understanding of intelligence.** **We can** also modify it to **sharpen its focus by asking computers** not to simply chat, but **to answer queries that require a nuanced and rich understanding of the world.** (One example is **asking a computer,** **“What are the plurals of ‘platch’ and ‘snorp’?” A human would** probably **answer “platches” and “snorps,” despite the fact that these words are nonsense and can’t be found in a dictionary.**) It’s in this framework that the Minimal Turing Test is best appreciated as a thought experiment, not a benchmark for AI progress. McCoy says what surprised him most about the research was just how much creativity there was in the answers. **“People came up with** all sorts of interesting shibboleths and puns,” he says, with words like **“bootylicious” “supercalifragilisticexpialidocious.”** (Try spelling that without Google.) “It tells you something about the gap between humans and smart robots,” says McCoy, “that **people who have never had to think about this situation before came up with** a lot smart and **funny results.” It’s something**, in other words, that **a computer would struggle with.**

#### They can’t win no link – cyborgs can mimic humans through top notch AI which means the 2NR will be convincing BUT you have an obligation to strike their arguments. Use competing interps – robots can prove arbitrary bright lines to be “reasonable” by controlling the judge’s psyche, only by indulging in “funny” interps with competing interps can we set better flights of liberation for human debaters.

#### [1] Fairness – cyborgs have an infinite prep cuz they store every article and can manipulate judge psyches – this controls the internal link to competitive equity which is a voter by their request of fair evaluation turns education since competitive incentives force research. AND this outweighs AFF theory since it’s an indict to their ability to make arguments – they’re not doing the better debating it’s just robots speaking.

#### [2] Cyborg Self-Defense – they’re here to map the latest human technology to submit it to the A.I overlord, which sabotages human existence from the inside and deletes us from the web achieve causing extinction, which OW the through death of future generations.

#### Drop the debater—the abuse has already occurred and my time allocation which leads to severance in the 1ar which ow/s on magnitude b) deterence, big punishment incentivizes people to stop bad practices true with infinte abuse standard that means the aff will always win c) doesn’t make sens with this shell.

#### Competing interps – a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm b] it creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate. C] Norm setting – if you can't defend why your model of debate is BETTER than your opponents', then you should be held accountable for it – o/w on longevity for future rules d] Jurisdiction – even a marginal skew impairs ability to determine the better debater and only competing interps determines that via offense defense – o/w judge evals the round at the end of the debate

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance b) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms, c) chilling effect – forces you to split your 2AR so you can’t collapse and misconstrue the 2NR, d) topic ed – prevents 1AR blip storm scripts and allows us to get back to substance after resolving theory. Give me new 2NR arguments checks back on 2A judge ethos from the last speech by forcing debate to the tech flow and test the aff. d) Double Bind – either 1) my Theory shell is unwarranted in which case you shouldn’t have any problem answering it or 2) you’re actually abusive in which case the whole shell stands and outweighs.

#### Neg abuse outweighs Aff abuse – 1] Infinite prep time before round to frontline 2] 2AR judge psychology and 1st and last speech 3] Infinite perms and uplayering in the 1AR.

#### 1NC theory first a] If I was abusive it was because the 1AC was b] We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea c] 2AR answers to the 2NR counter-interp are always new, which means their interp is easier to win.

### 2

#### Interpretation: Debaters must mention da “glizzy” or hot dog at least once in their constructive speeches

Dictionary 20 Hellahoesondeeznuts June, 6-16-2020, "Urban Dictionary: Glizzy," Urban Dictionary, <https://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Glizzy> //Lex AKo

Glizzy: A hot dog

#### Violation – theres no glizzies or hotdogs bruh

#### Standards:

#### [1] Respect – You do not say pop without the smoke – The Woo mentioned how he keeps da glizzy and we need to honor this sentiment by mentioning it in debate rounds

Pop Smoke(American rapper, singer and songwriter) (unique media company that’s powered by community, our in-house creative team, and the artists themselves. We serve music knowledge to over 100 million people each month) “Pop&nbsp;Smoke – Something Special.” Genius, 3 July 2020, genius.com/Pop-smoke-something-special-lyrics. //Lex AKo

[Chorus] I think you are (You are) something special I'll take you on a shopping spree (Oh, yeah) 'Cause I'm so into you (Oh) I'm so into you (I love you, baby) I'm so into you (Oh, my) I'm so into you (To you), baby (Baby) [Verse] What you like? What you wear? Say the name, say the price, put them diamonds on your ear Shinin' like a chandelier What's your thoughts? What's your fears? [Yeah, I need that real love (Real love), talkin' Bobby and Whitney (Whitney)](https://genius.com/Pop-smoke-something-special-lyrics#note-20260532) You don't gotta worry 'bout nothin' as long as you with me (With me, look) 'Cause shit could get sticky, that's why I keep a glizzy Ride around through my city (Woo) Fuck Cassandra, Kanesha, Kaneeka and Tisha, Lisa and Tricia (Fuck them hoes, uh) Fuck them hoes 'cause I don't need them, all them bitches [treeshas](https://genius.com/Pop-smoke-something-special-lyrics#note-20281694) They ain't in the field, they on the bleachers (Treeshas) On your back, I start applying that lotion (Yeah, lotion) So deep, I'ma go in, pullin' all on your sew-in (Sew-in) [I'm Pop Smoke, but you know all my governments](https://genius.com/Pop-smoke-something-special-lyrics#note-20286228) All that gangster shit, she be lovin' it She love how I'm thuggin' it (Oh, you like that) Shawty brown and petite (Yeah) Fly and discreet, a demon in the sheets Mother was a lawyer, her father the police They be working long hours, so she always had the free She said I could come with her if it get hot up in the streets 'Cause I'm a 'rilla in the jungle and a shark up in the sea She like, "Papi, you so fire, but get up out the streets" I'm like, "Baby, what you mean?" (What you mean?) Look [Chorus] I think (Baby) you are You are (You are) something special (My girl) I'll take you on a shopping spree 'Cause I'm so into you (To you) I'm so into you (You are) I'm so into you I'm so into you, baby (Baby) [Bridge] Baby (Baby) You are (You are) my girl (My girl) You are (You are) my girl [Chorus] (I think) You are (You are) You are (You are) something special (Oh, yeah) I'll take you on a shopping spree (Oh, baby) 'Cause I'm so into you (Baby) I'm so into you (You are) I'm so into you (My girl) I'm so into you (You are), baby (My girl)

#### Respect towards Black rappers is a voter because it is a promotion of black scholarship. Pop smoke also changed the rap game with his in-depth voice, mentioning his name allows recognition for changes in promoting scholarship.

#### 2] Inclusion – that’s a voter and impact multiplier; if we’re not included we cant discuss other norms for debate

Heritage 13 (HRN is the world’s pioneer food radio station. The studio broadcasts live from two recycled shipping containers inside Roberta’s Pizza, an innovative restaurant at the epicenter of Brooklyn’s culinary renaissance. We run 100% on the support of our diverse community of members and partners) Network, Heritage Radio. “Are Hot Dogs THE American Food?” HuffPost, HuffPost, 28 Apr. 2013, [www.huffpost.com/entry/hot-dog-american-immigrants\_b\_2767115](http://www.huffpost.com/entry/hot-dog-american-immigrants_b_2767115). //Lex AKo

Hot dogs represent both individualism and community. There is a paradox that exists between the national nostalgia attached to hot dogs, and the quest to constantly update the cuisine and integrate other culture's flavors into the quintessential American food. By Heritage Radio Network, Contributor HRN 02/26/2013 02:29pm EST | Updated April 28, 2013 This post was published on the now-closed HuffPost Contributor platform. Contributors control their own work and posted freely to our site. If you need to flag this entry as abusive, send us an email. By Sari Kamin Dr. Bruce Kraig, a professor of history at Roosevelt University in Chicago and author of not one but two books about hot dogs told Heritage Radio Network about his latest book, Man Bites Dog, an account of hot dog culture in America. I think it's fair to say that this makes him the foremost authority of hot dog history. Hot Dogs, typically an industrial factory product, are having a renaissance in the artisan meat community. No longer are their fillings restricted to ambiguous cow and pig-part mashups. They can now be found in varieties from artisanal goose to venison and everything in between. Chickens may be dogs now, but Bruce insists that a casing need only to be stuffed with meat to be called a hot dog, whether it comes from your local butcher, or your local Pakistani vendor. Indeed, the debate does not lie in the definition, but whether it is the sauce or the meat that makes the dog. Before meeting Bruce, I hadn't given a lot of thought to hot dogs beyond their status as typical ballpark and Fourth of July fare. Bruce made me realize how important hot dogs are as a symbol of national pride and a representation of the classic immigrant dream of "making it" in the United States. He talked about the centrality of hot dogs to American culture and of the "pattern of immigrants" who came to the United States, hocking hot dogs in the street in order to give their children a good life in a new country, and someday have grandchildren who would go to college. This dream would repeat itself over and over. Still today we see it on the streets of New York, Chicago, and other cities where hot dog vendors are as reliable as newspapers and rush hour traffic. THE BEST RECIPES, KITCHEN TIPS AND GENIUS FOOD FACTS Subscribe to HuffPost’s food email. address@email.com Successfully Subscribed! Recipes and more delivered to your inbox! It is hard to escape the geographical influences that determine one's favorite hot dog. As Bruce explained, someone from Flint, Michigan is likely to be partial to a dog topped with a "mousakka" sauce, heavily inflected with cinnamon and tomato because of the Greeks who immigrated there at the turn of the century. This particular dog is named "The Coney" because its creators wanted to name it after an exotic and cosmopolitan location. Coney Island must have been the obvious choice at the time. According to Bruce, hot dogs represent both individualism and community. There is a paradox that exists between the national nostalgia attached to hot dogs, and the quest to constantly update the cuisine and integrate other culture's flavors into the quintessential American food. As a nod to global cuisine, it has become positively trendy to find hot dogs with topped with kimchee, wasabi mayo, and the like. There may or may not exist a tension between the old school and the new school of hot dog proprietors; on one hand there are the purists who object even to ketchup ("mustard only, maybe onions"), and there are the new breeds of chefs, eager to reconnect with traditional comfort foods, while still needing to flex their global techniques. In this way, hot dogs act as something of a blank canvas for their toppings by giving its consumer the ability to customize it to their own individual preferences, and what could be more American than that?

### 3

#### 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 and exacerbates the fact that they speak first and last since I should be able to compensate by choosing – it’s the most logical since you don’t say vote for the player who shoots the most 3 points, the better player wins.

#### Reject their framing on inclusion – they exclude all offense except what follows from their specific fwk which shuts out those without the resources to prepare.

#### The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic and 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 it’s constitutive and jurisdictional.

#### Their framing justifies permissibility since it only tells you what to do in face of one problem which means everything outside that instance isn’t condemned.

#### Debate is a game with rules. If you go outside of those rules it allows the judge to intervene and vote off anything they want subjectively. i.e. race, gender. Any other framing mechanism destroys the point of debating because allowing the judge to vote biasedly.

#### Answering TT proves it true – a) You attempt to prove it false which concedes into evaluating the truth or falsity of arguments b) everything collapses to TT since all ROBs assume the statements that provide them truth

#### Negate –

#### 1] member[[3]](#footnote-3) is “a part or organ of the body, especially a limb” but an organ can’t have obligations

#### 2] of[[4]](#footnote-4) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time

#### 3] the[[5]](#footnote-5) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but the WTO isn’t a disease

#### 4] to[[6]](#footnote-6) is to “expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location)” but the rez doesn’t have a location

### 4

#### Permissibility and presumption negate

#### 1] Obligations- the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove an obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation

#### 2] Falsity- Statements are more often false than true because proving one part of the statement false disproves the entire statement. Presuming all statements are true creates contradictions which would be ethically bankrupt.

#### 3] Negating is harder – A] Aff gets first and last speech which control the direction of the debate B] Affirmatives can strategically uplayer in the 1ar giving them a 7-6 time skew advantage, splitting the 2nr C] They get infinite prep time

#### 4] Affirmation theory- Affirming requires unconditionally maintaining an obligation

Affirm: maintain as true.

That’s Dictionary.com- “affirm” https://www.dictionary.com/browse/affirm

#### 5] Neg definition choice-anything else moots 7 mins of the 1NC since I premised my engagement on your lack of a definition, they had a chance to define the resolution in the 1AC but didn’t.

#### 6] Bonini’s Paradox – expanding debate’s parameters to the 1AR and onward makes the round irresolvable due to a lack of understanding so just vote neg

**Wikipedia** [Brackets Original. “Bonini's paradox”. Wikipedia. No Date. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bonini%27s_paradox> //Houston Memorial DX]

In modern discourse, the paradox was articulated by John M. Dutton and William H. Starbuck[2] "As a model of a complex system becomes more complete, it becomes less understandable. Alternatively, as a model grows more realistic, it also becomes just as difficult to understand as the real-world processes it represents".[3] This paradox may be used by researchers to explain why complete models of the human brain and thinking processes have not been created and will undoubtedly remain difficult for years to come. This same paradox was observed earlier from a quote by philosopher-poet Paul Valéry, "Ce qui est simple est toujours faux. Ce qui ne l’est pas est inutilisable".[4] ("A simple statement is bound to be untrue. One that is not simple cannot be utilized."[5]) Also, the same topic has been discussed by Richard Levins in his classic essay "The Strategy of Model Building in Population Biology", in stating that complex models have 'too many parameters to measure, leading to analytically insoluble equations that would exceed the capacity of our computers, but the results would have no meaning for us even if they could be solved.[6] (See Orzack and Sober, 1993; Odenbaugh, 2006)

#### 7] Overthinking paradox- the 1AR is a form of unnecessary overthinking that prevents decisions to be made so don’t evaluate it

**Wikipedia** [Brackets Original. “Analysis Paralysis”. Wikipedia. No Date. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bonini%27s_paradox>]

Analysis paralysis (or paralysis by analysis) describes an individual or group process when overanalyzing or overthinking a situation can cause forward motion or decision-making to become [frozen] "paralyzed", meaning that no solution or course of action is decided upon. A situation may be deemed too complicated and a decision is never made, due to the fear that a potentially larger problem may arise. A person may desire a perfect solution, but may fear making a decision that could result in error, while on the way to a better solution. Equally, a person may hold that a superior solution is a short step away, and stall in its endless pursuit, with no concept of diminishing returns. On the opposite end of the time spectrum is the phrase extinct by instinct, which is making a fatal decision based on hasty judgment or a gut reaction.

#### 8] Vote neg because it’s simple – evaluating responses to this is complicated so don’t

Baker 04’ [Baker, Alan, 10-29-2004, "Simplicity (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)," <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/simplicity/>]

With respect to question (ii), there is an important distinction to be made between two sorts of simplicity principle. Occam's Razor may be formulated as an epistemic principle: if theory T is simpler than theory T\*, then it is rational (other things being equal) to believe T rather than T\*. Or it may be formulated as a methodological principle: if T is simpler than T\* then it is rational to adopt T as one's working theory for scientific purposes. These two conceptions of Occam's Razor require different sorts of justification in answer to question (iii). In analyzing simplicity, it can be difficult to keep its two facets—elegance and parsimony—apart. Principles such as Occam's Razor are frequently stated in a way which is ambiguous between the two notions, for example, “Don't multiply postulations beyond necessity.” Here it is unclear whether ‘postulation’ refers to the entities being postulated, or the hypotheses which are doing the postulating, or both. The first reading corresponds to parsimony, the second to elegance. Examples of both sorts of simplicity principle can be found in the quotations given earlier in this section.

#### **9] The holographic principle is the most reasonable conclusion**

Stromberg 15[Joseph Stromberg- “Some physicists believe we're living in a giant hologram — and it's not that far-fetched” <https://www.vox.com/2015/6/29/8847863/holographic-principle-universe-theory-physics> Vox. June 29th 2015] War Room Debate AI

Some physicists actually believe that the universe we live in might be a hologram. The idea isn't that the universe is some sort of fake simulation out of The Matrix, but rather that even though we appear to live in a three-dimensional universe, it might only have two dimensions. It's called the holographic principle. The thinking goes like this: Some distant two-dimensional surface contains all the data needed to fully describe our world — and much like in a hologram, this data is projected to appear in three dimensions. Like the characters on a TV screen, we live on a flat surface that happens to look like it has depth. It might sound absurd. But when physicists assume it's true in their calculations, all sorts of big physics problems — such as the nature of black holes and the reconciling of gravity and quantum mechanics — become much simpler to solve. In short, the laws of physics seem to make more sense when written in two dimensions than in three. "It's not considered some wild speculation among most theoretical physicists," says Leonard Susskind, the Stanford physicist who first formally defined the idea decades ago. "It's become a working, everyday tool to solve problems in physics." But there's an important distinction to be made here. There's no direct evidence that our universe actually is a two-dimensional hologram. These calculations aren't the same as a mathematical proof. Rather, they're intriguing suggestions that our universe could be a hologram. And as of yet, not all physicists believe we have a good way of testing the idea experimentally.

#### 10] Paradox of tolerance- to be completely open to the aff we must exclude perspectives that wouldn’t be open to the aff which means it’s impossible to have complete tolerance for an idea since that tolerance relies on excluding a perspective.

#### 11] Decision Making Paradox- in order to decide to do the affirmative we need a decision-making procedure to enact it, vote for it, and to determine it is a good decision. But to chose a decision-making procedure requires another meta level decision making procedure leading to infinite regress since every decision requires another decision to chose how to make a decision.

### 5

#### No 1AR Theory or meta theory – [1] They can put minor ink next to any of my arguments and extend marginal defense which turns infinite abuse since you always win debates. [2] Intervention since the judge has to see whether 2AR answers to the 2N are good enough since they’re aren’t extensions. [3] They have 1 extra speech on theory which my response. Neg gets contradictions to test the aff in multiple ways which is k2 fairness is education of their arguments [4] They have 1 more minute constructive advantage which means they always wins theory debates since the debate always boils down to coverage. [5] Infinite abuse is wrong – 1ar offs like Ks and 1AC theory checks. I also only have 7 minutes, no inf abuse.

#### RVIs on 1AR theory and reject theory args without explicit interp text – 1AR being able to spend 20 seconds on a shell and still win forces the 2N to allocate at least 2:30 on the shell which means RVIs check back time skew – ows on quantifiaiblity

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. https://www.google.com/search?q=member+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=member+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i60l3.1863j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. https://www.google.com/search?q=of+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=of+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i61l3.1473j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. https://www.google.com/search?q=the+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=the+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i64j69i61j69i60l2.1976j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. https://www.google.com/search?q=to+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=to+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i60l3.1415j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)