# 1nc TOC Round 4

## Off

### 1

#### Interpretation: Debaters must not break new affs if the advocacy text is not disclosed at least 15 min before round

#### Violation: insert screenshot

Graphical user interface, application

Description automatically generated

Graphical user interface, text, application

Description automatically generated

#### Standards:

#### 1] Clash- Not disclosing incentivizes surprise tactics and poorly refined positions that rely on artificial and vague negative engagement to win debates. Their interpretation means that negatives are forced to rely on generics that don’t link or barely link instead of smart contextual strategies destroying nuanced argumentation.

#### 2] Resource Disparities – Their interpretation means only giant prep squads or schools with generations of prep like LHP could engage effectively since small school debaters don’t have prep that links to every possible aff from Rawls to Non-T to Wynter to a hyper specific policy aff.

#### Our model solves innovation by allowing you to break new affs, but we only ask that we disclose the plan text so that we can effectively overcome prep disparities. We literally only get 6 min to prep an entire aff that hwl had months to prepare, and those 6 min aren’t even for prepping they are literally for flowing.

#### Fairness –

#### Ed --

#### Paradigm Issues:

#### Use Competing Interps on New Affs Bad –

#### A. It’s a yes/no question on disclosing a new aff since you can’t disclose half a plantext “States ought to eliminate” means nothing.

#### B. Reasonability changes every round and forces the judge to intervene to determine what is reasonable.

#### No RVIs

#### A.Encourages debaters to read New Affs just to bait the shell and win on the RVI – kills substance

#### Discourages checking real abuse since debaters will think they will lose to the RVI

#### Drop the Debater

#### A.Our interp affects their entire 1AC since we couldn’t prepare for any argument – so drop the argument doesn’t make sense.

### 2

#### Interpretation—the aff may not defend a subset of appropriation.

#### Appropriation is a generic indefinite singular. Cohen 01

Ariel Cohen (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev), “On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars,” Journal of Semantics 18:3, 2001 <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/188590876.pdf>

\*IS generic = Indefinite Singulars

French, then, expresses the two types of reading differently. In English, on¶ the other hand, generic BPs are ambiguous between inductivist and normative¶ readings. But even in English there is one type of generic that can express only¶ one of these readings, and this is the IS generic. While BPs are ambiguous¶ between the inductivist and the rules and regulations readings, ISs are not. In¶ the supermarket scenario discussed above, only (44.b) is true:¶ (44) a. A banana sells for $.49/lb.¶ b. A banana sells for $1.00/lb.¶ The normative force of the generic IS has been noted before. Burton-Roberts¶ (1977) considers the following minimal pair:¶ (45) a. Gentlemen open doors for ladies.¶ b. A gentleman opens doors for ladies.¶ He notes that (45.b), but not (45.a), expresses what he calls “moral necessity.”7¶ Burton-Roberts observes that if Emile does not as a rule open doors for ladies, his mother could utter [(45.b)] and thereby successfully imply that Emile was not, or was¶ not being, a gentleman. Notice that, if she were to utter. . . [(45.a)] she¶ might achieve the same effect (that of getting Emile to open doors for¶ ladies) but would do so by different means. . . For [(45.a)] merely makes a¶ generalisation about gentlemen (p. 188).¶ Sentence (45.b), then, unlike (45.a), does not have a reading where it makes¶ a generalization about gentlemen; it is, rather, a statement about some social¶ norm. It is true just in case this norm is in effect, i.e. it is a member of a set of¶ socially accepted rules and regulations.¶ An IS that, in the null context, cannot be read generically, may receive a¶ generic reading in a context that makes it clear that a rule or a regulation is¶ referred to. For example, Greenberg (1998) notes that, out of the blue, (46.a)¶ and (46.b) do not have a generic reading:¶ (46) a. A Norwegian student whose name ends with ‘s’ or ‘j’ wears green¶ thick socks.¶ b. A tall, left-handed, brown haired neurologist in Hadassa hospital¶ earns more than $50,000 a year.¶ However, Greenberg points out that in the context of (47.a) and (47.b),¶ respectively, the generic readings of the IS subject are quite natural:¶ (47) a. You know, there are very interesting traditions in Norway, concerning the connection between name, profession, and clothing. For¶ example, a Norwegian student. . .¶ b. The new Hadassa manager has some very funny paying criteria. For¶ example, a left-handed. . .¶ Even IS sentences that were claimed above to lack a generic reading, such¶ as (3.b) and (4.b), may, in the appropriate context, receive such a reading:¶ (48) a. Sire, please don’t send her to the axe. Remember, a king is generous!¶ b. How dare you build me such a room? Don’t you know a room is¶ square?

#### Their plan violates. Rules readings are always generalized – specific instances are not consistent. Cohen 01

Ariel Cohen (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev), “On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars,” Journal of Semantics 18:3, 2001 https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/188590876.pdf

In general, as, again, already noted by Aristotle, rules and definitions are not relativized to particular individuals; it is rarely the case that a specific individual¶ forms part of the description of a general rule.¶ Even DPs of the form a certain X or a particular X, which usually receive¶ a wide scope interpretation, cannot, in general, receive such an interpretation in the context of a rule or a definition. This holds of definitions in general, not¶ only of definitions with an IS subject. The following examples from the Cobuild¶ dictionary illustrate this point:¶ (74) a. A fanatic is a person who is very enthusiastic about a particular¶ activity, sport, or way of life.¶ b. Something that is record-breaking is better than the previous¶ record for a particular performance or achievement.¶ c. When a computer outputs something it sorts and produces information as the result of a particular program or operation.¶ d. If something sheers in a particular direction, it suddenly changes¶ direction, for example to avoid hitting something.

#### That outweighs—only our evidence speaks to how indefinite singulars are interpreted in the context of normative statements like the resolution—

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Precision –any deviation justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 2] Limits—specifying a type of appropriation offers huge explosion in the topic since space is, quite literally, infinite—but general interps solve since we can read DAs to anything.

#### CA Paradigm issues

### 3

#### Interp: Debaters must show-up to the tech-check

(NSDA, National Speech and Debate Association) Online Speech and Debate Competition Tips No Date <https://drive.google.com/uc?export=download&id=15gZxwk_e7FdlEAiRU0yrqOUQDbExZ-4h> DOA 9/18/21 Cho

Test your technology - It never hurts to test your technology more than once. In fact, problems can arise because of mistakes such as forgetting to plug in your computer the night before. Test everything; if there is an issue that occurs right before the round, it is best to have it resolved early. If you have backup technology, you may also want to test that. If your computer dies, but you know how to use your phone and you have printed a copy of your case, you may be able to keep going in a pinch.

#### Violation: they pulled up at 7:39 EST

#### Tab said they should be pulling up at 7:30 EST

#### 1] Tech issues – testing tech pre-round is key to functional debates like audio quality and sound settings. O/Ws A] Sequencing – controls the internal link to other standards B] Reversibility – you could get disqualified for being late.

#### 2] Prep Skew – I had to spend 15 minutes checking my tech while they could be prepping which irreparably skews the burdens in their favor. O/Ws on structural abuse since it’s the only verifiable impact.

#### 3] Delay – Late tech-checks and preventable tech issues delay RFDs and future pairings 2 impacts – (A) Scope – delaying the tournament skews flight 2 neg debaters, big prep-squads (B) Late rounds cause sleep-deficits which is bad for your health and skews your ability to effectively clash and engage.

#### 4] Disqualification – you could get disqualified which is a lexical pre-requisite to other standards.

### 4

#### Text – हिंदी में करो अफीम

#### The text does not mean only hindi is accepted, rather there should be a diversity in language usage that’s not just english

#### The normalization of normative English leads to an in-group/out-group that drive racial violence

**Rosa et al 17** Rosa, Jonathan, and Nelson Flores. "Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective." Language in society 46.5 (2017): 621-647. (Assistant Professor of Anthropology and Linguistics and Associate Professor in the Educational Linguistics Division)//Elmer

Similar to Bucholtz & Hall's (2005) approach to identity and interaction, we are interested in how processes of raciolinguistic enregisterment emblematize particular linguistic features as authentic signs of racialized models of personhood. This is found not only in sociolinguistic accounts of the features that compose categories such as ‘African American English’ (Green 2002) or ‘Chicano English’ (Fought 2003), but also popular stereotypes and modes of linguistic appropriation such as ‘Mock Spanish’ (Hill 2008), ‘Mock Asian’ (Chun 2004), ‘Hollywood Injun English’ (Meek 2006), and ‘linguistic minstrelsy’ (Bucholtz & Lopez 2011). In each of these cases, minute features of language, including grammatical forms, prosodic patterns, and morphological particles, are emblematized as sets of signs that correspond to racial categories. Crucially, as Meek (2006) demonstrates, these forms need not correspond to empirically verifiable linguistic practices in order to undergo racial emblematization. Moreover, as Lo & Reyes (2009) point out, the imagination of groups such as Asian Americans as lacking a distinctive racialized variety of English analogous to African American English or Chicano English, must be interrogated based on the racial logics that organize stereotypes about and societal positions of different racial groups on the one hand, and perceptions of their language practices on the other. Specifically, Lo & Reyes argue that racial ideologies constructing Asian Americans as model minorities who approximate whiteness are linked to language ideologies constructing Asian Americans as lacking a racially distinctive variety of English. In related work, Chun (2016:81) shows how emblematized Mock Asian forms such as ‘ching-chong’ are located across ‘the important boundary between ‘Oriental talk’ and English’, which sustains Asian Americans alternately as model minorities and forever foreigners. Thus, we must carefully reconsider seemingly ‘distinctive’ and ‘nondistinctive’ language varieties alike, by analyzing the logics that position particular racial groups and linguistic forms in relation to one another. That is, no language variety is objectively distinctive or nondistinctive, but rather comes to be enregistered as such in particular historical, political, and economic circumstances.

#### The performance of the 1NC is a form of Code Switching that disrupts English-centered discourses

**Duan**, Carlina. " The Space Between: An analysis of code-switching within Asian American poetry as strategic poetic device"(English Honors) AND" Here I Go, Torching"(Creative Writing Honors). Diss. 2015. (BA in Honors English from the University of Michigan)//Elmer

In an interview with Women’s Review of Books literary magazine, Hong further discussed the strategic role of translation as a form of linguistic activism within her poetic work. When asked why she does not include translations from Korean to English within her own poetry, Hong said: “I wanted to open up these schisms, to emphasize that memory, the filtering of human experience into poetry, is often fractured and not transparent, especially experiences which have always been bisected and undercut by two languages.” She added, “I think I want to debunk the idea of easy translation—whether it be the idea of literal translation or, as I said before, the translating of one’s experience into poetry” (Hong 2002a, 15). Hong’s intentional decision to leave out English translations in her poetry creates a power dynamic between speaker and reader of the poem. Not only are “easy” translations dismantled and withheld from the reader, but, according to Hong, codeswitching — without translation — also more accurately reflects her personal experiences of cultural and linguistic movement. Hong points out that human experiences and the world of memory, especially for bilingual speakers, are “not transparent” — not captured neatly by one language, but rather, “bisected” by the complexities of belonging to two (or more) languages, implying a movement between multiple spaces. Scholars describe poetic code-switching in this way as a navigation of power. Literary scholar Benzi Zhang argues that code-switching makes apparent different levels of cultural knowledge for speaker and reader: “[T]he insertion of […] foreign words effectively renders Asian sensibilities into English and signifies different positions of cultural agency” (Zhang 131). Building upon this idea of cultural agency, I argue that Hong uses Korean to consciously expose themes of exoticism and racial stereotyping that readers themselves may be (consciously or unconsciously) participating in. As a result, Hong creates agency for her speaker through critiquing culturally appropriative behavior, in addition to an agency in knowledge; Hong’s speaker can access cultural understanding that her readers do not have. Yet, Hong does more than negotiate questions of audience access; she uses code-switching to reflect her speaker’s lived experiences of Korean-American identity, grappling with multiple languages and cultural codes. In “An Introduction to Chinese-American and Japanese American Literatures,” Jeffrey Chan et al. writes, “The minority experience does not yield itself to accurate or complete expression on the white man’s language” (qtd. Zhang 137). As Chang et al. suggest, code-switching embeds itself as a natural part of the “minority experience,” and is documented as such in Hong’s poems. Thus, the poems not only act as social critique of exoticization, but further inhabit the embodied experiences of Korean-American female identities living in the U.S. — which, as Hong reveals, are complicated experiences of rage, agency, celebration, and shifting power dynamics. Critics who have reviewed Hong’s work, such as Jan Clausen, have raised questions about the effect of Hong’s play with translation. Clausen, in a review titled “The poetics of estrangement,” published through the Women’s Review of Books, writes of Hong’s collection Translating Mo’um: “Hong deftly dismantles the romance of language as homeland, with results especially unnerving for the non-Korean-speaking reader” (Clausen 15). According to Clausen, Hong’s work with code-switching subverts traditional notions of the ‘native tongue’ as representative of “homeland,” dismantling what a reader may expect of a Korean American author: that she use Korean language to specifically discuss her ethnic culture as a hyphenated American. In other words, Hong’s code-switches function as intentional poetic protest against the reader’s expectations of the relationship between multilingual text and ethnic identity. As Clausen points out, such readings may anticipate that mother tongue is only introduced to speak about cultural difference or history, rather than used additionally as formal poetic device. In this chapter, I reveal Hong’s awareness of Korean language and code-switching as tools in identity-construction. Rather than allow others to shape her identity for her, she remains dominant in shaping her identity — and her agency — for herself.

## Case

#### No weaponization – requires an absurd level of precision

**Oberg 98** (Jim Oberg, is an American space journalist and historian, regarded as an expert on the Russian and Chinese space programs. “PLANETARY DEFENSE, ASTEROID DEFLECTION & THE FUTURE OF HUMAN INTERVENTION IN THE EARTH'S BIOSPHERE”, http://defendgaia.org/bobk/oberg.html)

For example, Dr. Carl Sagan and some of his colleagues suggested that it was statistically more dangerous to build an asteroid defense system than simply to wait for the impacts. Their argument was based on the thesis that a system-in-being could under some circumstances be abused by "a madman" to deliberately divert otherwise-harmless objects toward an Earth impact. Although admittedly unlikely, this manmade danger was deemed MORE likely than the original natural threat of asteroid impact.

But this view is erroneous. The concern fails to account for operational issues in navigation, targeting, guidance and control, issues which real-world spaceflight operators deal with on a daily basis. By assuming that a space rendezvous -- bringing two objects into contact -- is merely an inverse process of avoidance -- guaranteeing that two objects do NOT come into contact, this concern is unrealistic.

The "avoidance" maneuver is already in the repertory of spaceflight operators today, in low Earth orbit. If the predicted path of a piece of space debris comes "close enough" (defined in the dimensions of the avoidance zone around the shuttle), the shuttle makes a small orbital adjustment to take it (and the zone centered on it) away from the predicted path of the candidate impactor.

Rendezvous is also routine in low Earth orbit, but it is a far different process than merely reversing the avoidance maneuver. As the active vehicle nears the target it receives more and more precise relative position data (navigation), which it converts into desired course corrections (targeting), which converts into required rocket burns (guidance), and which it then performs -- to the required level of precision -- using onboard rockets (control).

As the range and time-to-contact drops, so does the size of the uncertainty zone around the target, where the chaser is aiming. At the same time, the effect of rocket maneuvers on miss distance also drops rapidly -- they have less time to propagate and grow. Unless the approach is flown very precisely, the predicted miss distance can easily drift outside the "uncertainty zone" to such a great distance that the active vehicle's rockets simply cannot bring the aim point back onto the target fast enough. In other words, there is not enough "control authority" in the system. And the active vehicle flies past the target. The rendezvous fails.

For the proposed asteroid-deflection schemes of the next several decades at least, their control accuracy is far too poor to perform a "rendezvous", a deliberate collision, with Earth. Such systems would be fully effective in diverting dangerous asteroids, but would be physically unable to do the opposite, bring them into contact with Earth. As a threat for misuse, they would panic only those who don't understand real space operations.