# NC

## 1 – Theory

#### Interpretation: debaters must disclose all constructive positions on open source on the page with their name and school on the 2021-2022 NCDA LD wiki with highlighting, tags, and cites after the round in which they read them.

#### Violation: Their entry record shows they went to 10 tournaments this season, but none are disclosed – see screenshots.

#### Entry record (https://www.tabroom.com/index/results/team\_results.mhtml?id1=1080163&id2=)

Graphical user interface, text, application, email

Description automatically generated

#### Standards:

#### [1] Resource disparities – stealing cards is good because it’s the only way to level the playing field for students in under-privileged programs.

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) https://www.americanforensicsassoc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Navigating-Opportunity-Book.pdf

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 structured and coached debate program, and eventually developing the capability to maintain multiple professional teaching positions, such as those discussed earlier in the chapter.

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

#### [3] Depth of clash – allows debaters to have nuanced objections at a faster rate, which leads to higher quality debates – outweighs because thinking on your feet is nonunique but the best quality responses come from full access to a case.

#### Voters:

#### Fairness: debate is a competitive activity that requires objective evaluation – side constraint to substantive debate.

#### Education: a) it’s the reason schools fund debate and b) it’s the only long-term benefit.

#### Paradigm issues:

#### DTD to deter future abuse and rectify time skew from reading theory.

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you don’t win for being fair, and logic is a meta-constraint, b) good theory debaters will bait theory to win on the RVI, which causes abuse, c) chilling effect – makes debaters scared to call out real abuse because they’ll be out-teched on the RVI.

#### Competing interps – a) reasonability is arbitrary and requires judge intervention, b) collapses because brightlines concede an offense-defense paradigm.

## 2 – Theory

#### Interpretation: if the affirmative reads a ROTB other than TT, they must specify a comprehensive ROTB and clarify how offense operates in the form of a delineated text in the 1AC. To clarify, the aff must clarify:

#### [1] How offense links to the ROTB, such as if pre or post-fiat offense matters or comes first.

#### [2] How theoretical objections operate, such as if the aff comes before theory.

#### [3] How to compare between advocacies, such as if engagements off the flow are evaluated.

#### Violation: they didn’t (specify which points they violate).

#### Standards:

#### [1] Engagement – can’t contest offense that we don’t know links to their aff. a) key to fairness, education, and is an independent voter since we need a point of contestation to answer claims in-depth, b) key to novice inclusion since they don’t know K lit or how the ROTB functions – voter because debate requires participation, and c) link turns their ROTB – impacts depend on engagement with their oppression issues – no net benefit from just writing the case at home and is uniquely bad since people won’t take a position that can’t be clashed with seriously.

#### [2] Strat skew – formulating a strategy is impossible if we don’t know what links to the evaluative mechanism. For example, if I larp, they can say the 1AC is about performance and weigh to exclude all my offense.

#### C/A paradigm issues and voters

## 3 – TT

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

**[1] Linguistics – five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true. That outweighs – a) Controls the internal link to predictability and prep which is key for clash and substantive education b)** **Key to jurisdiction since the judge can only endorse what is within their burden.**

#### [2] Every statement is a question of truth – for example, saying “the res is false” is the same as saying, “it is true that the res is false.” That means other ROTBs collapse to truth testing.

#### Permissibility negates:

#### [1] “Unjust” is defined:

Oxford Languages No Date Oxford Languages, dictionary, “unjust,” no date, Google, accessed 13 January 2022, pg. 1, https://www.google.com/search?q=define+unjust&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS909US909&oq=define+unjust&aqs=chrome.0.35i39j0i512l3j0i10i512j0i512l2j0i10i512j0i512l2.1248j1j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8

not based on or behaving according to what is morally right and fair.

#### **A neutral action, like walking, does not violate what is moral and is therefore not unjust.**

#### [2] Statements are more often false than true since I can prove something false in infinite ways but true in only one.

#### [3] We require an active reason to believe something; that’s why arguments need warrants.

## 4 – Determinism

#### I negate, resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

#### **FREE WILL IS AN ILLUSION! Determinism is true and negates.**

#### [1] Every effect has a cause precisely predetermined by the laws of nature.

Westacott 18 Emrys Westacott, Professor of Philosophy at Alfred University, Ph.D. in Philosophy at the University of Texas at Austin, "Hard Determinism Explained," 17 January 2018, ThoughtCo, accessed 31 December 2021, Pg. 1, <https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-hard-determinism-2670648> ~ST~

To say that every event is determined by prior causes and the operation of laws of nature means that it was bound to happen, given those prior conditions. If we could rewind the universe to a few seconds before the event and play the sequence through again, we’d get the same result. Lightning would strike in exactly the same spot; the car would break down at exactly the same time; the goalkeeper would save the penalty in exactly the same way; you would choose exactly the same item from the restaurant’s menu. The course of events is predetermined and therefore, at least in principle, predictable.

One of the best-known statements of this doctrine was given by the French scientist Pierre-Simon Laplace (1749-1827). He wrote:

We may regard the present state of the universe as the effect of its past and the cause of its future. An intellect which at a certain moment would know all forces that set nature in motion, and all positions of all items of which nature is composed, if this intellect were also vast enough to submit these data to analysis, it would embrace in a single formula the movements of the greatest bodies of the universe and those of the tiniest atom; for such an intellect nothing would be uncertain and the future just like the past would be present before its eyes.

Science cannot really prove that determinism is true. After all, we often do encounter events for which we don’t have an explanation. But when this happens, we don’t assume that we are witnessing an uncaused event; rather, we just assume that we haven’t discovered the cause yet. But the remarkable success of science, and especially its predictive power, is a powerful reason for supposing that determinism is true. For with one notable exception–quantum mechanics (about which see below) the history of modern science has been a history of the success of deterministic thinking as we have succeeded in making increasingly accurate predictions about everything, from what we see in the sky to how our bodies react to particular chemical substances.

Hard determinists look at this record of successful prediction and conclude that the assumption it rests on–every event is causally determined–is well-established and allows for no exceptions. That means that human decisions and actions are as predetermined as any other event. So the common belief that we enjoy a special sort of autonomy, or self-determination, because we can exercise a mysterious power we call “free will,” is an illusion. An understandable illusion, perhaps, since it makes us feel that we are importantly different from the rest of nature; but an illusion all the same.

#### [2] Brain signals determine action before choice – means we don’t control our actions

Fried et. al 11 Itzhak Fried, professor of neurosurgery, psychiatry and biobehavioral sciences at UCLA, Roy Mukamel, associate professor of psychology at Tel-Aviv University, Gabriel Kreiman, professor of ophthalmology at Harvard, "Internally generated preactivation of single neurons in human medial frontal cortex predicts volition," 10 February 2011, PubMed, accessed 21 August 2021, <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21315264/> ~ST~

There has been a long debate on the existence of brain signals that precede the outcome of decisions, even before subjects believe they are consciously making up their mind. The framework of multivariate decoding provides a novel tool for investigating such choice-predictive information contained in neural signals leading up to a decision. New results show that the specific outcome of free choices between different plans can be interpreted from brain activity, not only after a decision has been made, but even several seconds before it is made. This suggests that a causal chain of events can occur outside subjective awareness even before a subject makes up his/her mind. An important future line of research would be to develop paradigms that allow feedback of real-time predictions of future decisions to reveal whether such decisions can still be reverted. This would shed light on how tight the causal link is between early predictive brain signals and subsequent decisions.

#### Takes out justice:

#### [1] Labelling an action as unjust is only possible with an alternative.

Robb 20 David Robb, Professor of Philosophy at Davidson College, "Moral Responsibility and the Principle of Alternative Possibilities," 9 July 2020, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed 2 January 2022, Pg. 1, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/alternative-possibilities/> ~ST~

No doubt the principle’s appeal can in part be traced to ordinary moral practice. One day at the cafeteria, Kurt steals John’s lunch. Under normal circumstances, we hold Kurt responsible for his act. But now add that he had to act as he did. Suppose, for example, that Kurt was coerced by a bully to steal John’s lunch; or he is suffering from a neurological disorder compelling him to act; or he was brainwashed. These are some of the many ways in which his alternatives can be closed off. But however this happens, once the alternatives are gone—once Kurt must act as he does—blaming him no longer seems appropriate.

#### [2] It is impossible to label something as unjust without free will.

Miller 17 David Miller, Professor of Political Theory and Senior Research Fellow at the University of Oxford, "Justice," 26 June 2017, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed 2 January 2022, pg. 1, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/justice/#UtilJust> ~ST~

Finally, the definition reminds us that justice requires an agent whose will alters the circumstances of its objects. The agent might be an individual person, or it might be a group of people, or an institution such as the state. So we cannot, except metaphorically, describe as unjust states of affairs that no agent has contributed to bringing about – unless we think that there is a Divine Being who has ordered the universe in such a way that every outcome is a manifestation of His will. Admittedly we are tempted to make judgements of what is sometimes called ‘cosmic injustice’ – say when a talented person’s life is cut cruelly short by cancer, or our favourite football team is eliminated from the competition by a freak goal – but this is a temptation we should resist.
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