## 1 – Theory

#### Interpretation: debaters must include the URL in citations for their evidence.

#### Violation: they didn’t – examples include their Gryz 02 and Foot cards.

#### Standards:

#### [1] NSDA rules – the unified manual says to include the URL.

NSDA 21 National Speech and Debate Association, “High School Unified Manual,” 1 September 2021, National Speech and Debate Association, accessed 11 September 2021, pg. 30, <https://www.speechanddebate.org/wp-content/uploads/High-School-Unified-Manual-2021-2022.pdf> ~ST~

Written source citation. To the extent provided by the original source, a written source citation must include:

1. Full name of primary author and/or editor

2. Publication date

3. Source

4. Title of article

5. Date accessed for digital evidence

6. Full URL, if applicable

7. Author qualifications

8. Page number(s)

#### That’s a voter – if we can choose what rules to break, I can make speeches however long I want, which is a side constraint to substance. Also proves the shell is reasonable and predictable because it’s a common standard.

#### [2] Ev ethics – no way to check whether their quote exists– they can just make up whatever “evidence” they want. Pasting into a search engine doesn’t solve – a) many texts have weird formatting that prevents it from functioning, and b) difficult to find correct version without a paywall. That’s a voter – a) debate’s meaningless if we have no argument credibility, b) uncredible ev means we don’t know if their claims are true, and c) debate should prepare for the real world, in which small ev ethics violations are punished severely.

#### Also links to inclusion – small schoolers use wiki cards, so bad citations negatively impact their research. That’s a voter because inclusion is a prereq to debate.

#### DTD – a) in real life, you get a 0 on the whole assignment – best to teach good norms now, and b) deters future abuse because they won’t reviolate if they lose.

#### C/A CI

#### No RVIs – a) you don’t win for being fair or academically honest, b) people will bait be abusive to win on the RVI, c) people will be scared to call out real abuse for fear of being out-teched on the RVI, and d) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong, which forces me to argue for bad norms.

## 2 – Theory

#### Interpretation: The Aff must defend theory interpretations and arguments unconditionally as presented in the 1ac. In other words, the aff may not run cx checks.

#### Violation:

#### 1. Theory recourse – CX checks (a) causes sidestepping, encouraging you to have hidden abusive args since I either call you out on it in cx and you kick it or I concede it and you win, which makes debates innocuous and is empirically confirmed with Jake Steirn, (b) causes ambiguity – what constitutes a sufficient “check” is unclear. Even if we isolate the abusive practice in CX, the aff can still go for the arg and establish new parameters for checking, and (c) prep skew – even if you don’t kick the abuse, you get extra time to prep my interp since you know what I’ll indict. That gives you nearly double the time to prep and creates irreciprocal burdens. Theory recourse is key to any voter since it ensures I can check back abusive strategies.

#### 2. Strat Skew – This skews my strategy because a) I have to waste valuable cross-x time clarifying abusive argument of asking questions that set up a coherent strategy in the NC, b) I am not allowed to run theory if I think of a potentially abusive thing in the AC during my speech. This also link turns all other theory arguments since theoretical benefits are predicated on the ability to run theory in the first place.

## 3 - ROTB

#### 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.

#### [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 and presumption negate:

#### [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.

#### [LBL]

## 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.**

#### 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.

#### Takes out justice – 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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