### 1

#### A] Interpretation: The affirmative must, upon flipping for sides, tell the negative what specific affirmative position they will be reading, within five minutes of flipping for sides.

#### B] Violation: They didn’t tell us the Aff. – ss in doc

#### C] Net Benefits:

#### 1] Research – disclosure increases research and gets rid of anti-educational arguments because debaters are forced to prepare cases knowing that people will have answers AND people get the opportunity to research answers to disclosed cases. Not telling us the Aff makes focused research impossible because we won’t know where to focus pre round, and don’t have any incentive to go deep and do research if we know they can read any number of possible positions

#### 2] Clash – Disclosure is the best method for increasing clash in debates because it allows debaters to substantively engage positions rather than relying on sketchy tricks to avoid the discussion. It also allows for more specific clash because debaters can see specific arguments disclosed instead of trying to link generic arguments in.

#### 3] Reciprocity --- pairings just came out, and there isn’t much time to prep --- forcing us to split between a bunch of different positions while the Aff knows for sure which they’re reading makes it slanted in their favor by encouraging them to go deep while we can’t

#### 4] No Aff offense for disclosure bad --- they posted cites on the wiki for a TON of different Affs but just wouldn’t tell us which Aff they were reading --- the only offense was us not being able to anticipate or prep the Aff pre round because they forced us to split our time in too many directions

#### D] Voters –

#### Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking. No cross apps from case its likely that you are winning the aff since we couldn’t prepare for it. Fairness first – every argument assumes its evaluated fairly so its an indictment of case. Unfairness means judges can hack against your scholarship.

#### Drop the debater – a) they have a 7-6 rebuttal advantage and the 2ar to make args I can’t respond to, b) it deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

#### Use competing interps – a) reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter, b) collapses to competing interps – we justify 2 brightlines under an offense defense paradigm just like 2 interps.

#### 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

### 2

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all constructive positions on open source with highlighting on the 2020-2021 NDCA LD wiki after the round in which they read them, 30 minutes before the round.

#### Violation – they don’t – the lorax was disclosed as a blank doc. - ss

#### 1] Debate resource inequities—you’ll say people will steal cards, but that’s good—it’s the only way to truly level the playing field for students such as novices in under-privileged programs who can’t bypass paywalled articles.

Louden 10 – Allan D. Louden, professor of Communication at Wake Forest (“Navigating Opportunity: Policy Debate in the 21st Century” Wake Forest National Debate Conference. IDEA, 2010)

Groups interested in engaging in competitive National Debate Tournament (NDT)-Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA)-style policy debate are entering an exciting time in the debate community where **digital resources are making research and networking increasingly accessible**. Those developing programs should be encouraged to choose their own topics and resolutions, but they should also make use of the massive resources available by focusing on the official NDT-CEDA resolution. **New initiatives in the field of open-source debate make evidence sharing, such as the Open Caselist, a powerful tool for new programs to engage and compete against established teams**. It is no coincidence that **the winners of the NDT tend to be the schools with the largest coaching staffs, but the increased distribution and free sharing of evidence and resources have made smaller debate programs increasingly capable of competing against larger institutions**. We are now seeing the beginnings of **increased resource sharing**, with multiple initiatives focusing on regional evidence sharing for groups of developing debate programs. This **is one example of dramatic changes occurring in the community that are capable of opening the doors for new participation in debate**. Regardless of outside influence, such as an organized campaign by preexisting debate organizations to increase resource distribution, students are independently capable of establishing the foundations for a larger competitive program. The following suggestions are a nonlinear set of options available to students who wish to establish a struc-tured and coached debate program, and eventually developing the capability to maintain multiple professional teaching positions, such as those discussed earlier in the chapter.

#### 2] Evidence ethics – open source is the only way to verify pre-round that cards aren’t miscut or highlighted or bracketed unethically. That’s a voter – maintaining ethical ev practices is key to being good academics and we should be able to verify you didn’t cheat

### 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 get infinite pre-round prep since I should be able to compensate by choosing – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that a world is better than another before you adopt it.

#### Most educational since otherwise we wouldn’t use math or logic to approach topics. Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – T/F binary is descriptive and technical.

#### The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – 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. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I’ve met my burden.

### 4

#### Presumption and permissibility negates – a) statements are more often false than true since I can prove something false in infinite ways b) real world policies require positive justification before being adopted c) the aff has to prove an obligation which means lack of that obligation negates d) resolved in the resolution indicates they proactively did something, to negate that means that they aren’t resolved.

#### Skep is true and negates –

#### Every reason is equally as violent in its creation.

**Derrida,** Jacques Derrida, “Force of Law: The Mystical Foundation of Authority” //Massa But **justice,** however unpresentable it may be, doesn't wait.· It **is that which must not wait.** To be direct, simple and brief, let us say this: **a just decision is always required immediately, "right away." It cannot furnish itself with** infinite information and the **unlimited knowledge of conditions,** rules or hypothetical imperatives **that could justify it.** And **even if it did** have all that at its disposal, even if it did give itself the time, all the time and all the necessary facts about the matter, **the moment of decision,** as such, **always remains a finite moment of urgency** and precipitation, since it must not be the consequence or the effectof this theoretical or historical knowledge, of this reflection or this deliberation, **since it always marks the interruption of the** juridico- or ethico- or politico-**cognitive deliberation that precedes it,** that must precede it. The instant of decision is a madness, says Kierkegaard. This is particularly true of the instant of the just decision that must rend time and defy dialectics. It is a madness. **Even if time** and prudence,the patience of knowledge and the mastery of conditions **were** hypothetically **unlimited, the decision would be structurally finite,** however late it came, decision of urgency and precipitation, **acting in** the night of **non-knowledge and non-rule**

#### Affirming negates.

**Paraphrasing Mcnamara ‘06**, Paul, 2-7-2006, "Deontic Logic (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)," No Publication, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/logic-deontic/index.html#4.3> //Massa

#### Premise 1—If the aff is true, it ought to be the case that members of the WTO should reduce IP protections.

#### Premise 2—It ought to be the case that the WTO reduce IP protections if and only if the members have IP protections. This is because standard logic would necessitate transferring the obligation predicate onto its necessary condition.

#### Thus, premise 3—if the aff is true, it ought to be the case that the members of the WTO has IP protections. This logically follows from “if P is Q and P is Q only if N, then N.”

#### External world skep is true.

**Neta**, Ram. “External World Skepticism.” The Problem of The External World, **2014**, philosophy.unc.edu/files/2014/06/The-Problem-of-the-External-World.pdf. //Massa

You take yourself to know that you have hands. But notice that, **if you do have hands, then you are not merely a brain floating in a vat of nutrient fluid and being electrochemically stimulated to have the sensory experiences** that you have now: such a brain does not have hands, but you do. So if you know that you do have hands, then you must also be in a position to know that you are not such a brain. **But how could you know that you are not such a brain? If you were such a brain, everything would seem exactly as it does now**; **you would** (by hypothesis) **have all the same sensory experiences that you’re having right now.** Since your **empirical knowledge of the world** around you **must somehow be based upon your sensory experiences, how could these experiences**—the very same experiences that you would have if you were a brain in a vat—**furnish you with knowledge that you’re not such a brain? And if you don’t know that you’re not such a brain, then you cannot know that you have hands.**

#### And, any account of morality is regressive since it predicates one universal rule on the existence of another moral rule. Since every human chain of reasoning must be finite according to our finite nature, such a reasoning process must terminate in a rule for which no reason can be given.

### Underview

## Framing

### Hijack 1

**Affect theory collapses to skep –**

**[1] Absolute fluidity means you can act upon any desire which means you can never condemn a moral action which negates.**

**[2] It is metaphysically impossible for a subject to contain themselves to a good norm if it is a good thing because the subject is always changing, which means no good action can be binding to agents which negates since the aff can’t be enforced.**

**[3] Auto negates since if the external world is always shifting due to affect and its fluid nature, its impossible to have coherent obligations anquered in it.**

### Hijack 2

**The aff collapses to emotivism – a) affect terminates in the normative conclusion of the expression of desire since the aff just makes an ontological claim about the world but that materializes itself in terms of expressions of those desire in every aspect, including linguistic constructs like the resolutional statement b) normative potential of the subject to express their affect which means emotivism is the only way to generate obligations from your framework.**

**That negates –**

**Every emotive judgement is indexed to a particular individual, no emotive sentiments can ever be fully universal. This means that the resolution negates since there is no emotion that can be applied to a universal claim that x is y.**

On Deleuze :

1] Just because you change through time doesn’t mean you are a fundemnatl,ly different person. IE I am still aadit, even if I don’t like soccer anymore, im still the same person.

2] Not normative: just because the subject is fluid doesn’t mean we have an obligation to promote fluitiy

On active affect:

1] No objective brightline for active vs passive affect

2] Concedes affect can have static properties

On Schaefer 13:

1] Just proves there is a world outside of language, but that doesn’t mean our understanding of reality is false

2] Good is good enough—we know a pen is even if there is no direct correlation

3] presuppose sthe world is fluid but we deny that

4] No impact since the NC isn’t normative

#### If time

#### FRAMING ISSUE: Constantly changing desires and actions do not change our ONTOLOGICAL NATURE—there’s no internal link between the flux of desires and the flux of agency

#### 4] Turn: If two thoughts belong to the same mind, then there is a train of thought available to that mind in which they could both figure. That presupposes that there's a singular agent that encapsulates different things. The phrase “I think” necessitates unity of self-consciousness, so even if my interactions in the world themselves are not static, the ways in which I process them are.

#### 5] Even if there are such things as desires that implicate a shiftiness of the subject, the ability to conceptualize those desires is static. This is the same reason why there is nothing that shifts a racist person from their desires.

#### 6] Although some instances desire would alter the subject, this does not affect their AGENCY as a whole. Certain negative or positive experiences contextualize how an agent pursues and formulates their desires.

#### 7] Fluidity alone can’t generate static obligations since they’re temporally bound; you need static norms that are always good for a subject’s agency to do so. If you can’t generate an obligation you can’t generate a prescription of what obligation you should take.

#### 8] Infinite Regress – constantly upholding fluidity is itself is in itself a static norm which means the syllogism is paradoxical.

#### 9] Inclusion voter – constant fluidity rids the state of laws against rape, pedophilia etc. which means all violence is permissible. Inclusion is an independent voter because you cannot debate if you cannot participate.

#### 10] Not Normative – Deleuze makes a descriptive claim that fluidity is always good but, gives no action guiding constraints in moral dilemmas proves every action is permissible under Deleuze since it doesn’t shape how we act.

#### 11] Perf Con – you follow static norms such as following speech times and answering questions during CX. that is a voting issue and outweighs since you knew your method and still chose to violate it.

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)