## 1

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all constructive positions on open source with highlighting on the 2020-21 NDCA LD wiki after the round in which they read them.

#### Violation – screenshots in the doc prove I do and they don’t

Graphical user interface, text, application

Description automatically generated

Graphical user interface, application

Description automatically generatedGraphical user interface, application

Description automatically generated

#### 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 – it equals the playing field.

Overing 18 – Bob Overing, LD Scholar (“Holiday Disclosure Post #6 – 10 Things Edition” JANUARY 12, 2018. http://www.premierdebate.com/disclosure-post-6/)

**Open source improves on usual disclosure practices** in the obvious way – **you can read their evidence for better prep**aration – and in a number of smaller ways too. **It solves the analytics problem** I discussed above, **so round-altering uncarded arguments are available** (though this doesn’t really apply to Harvard-Westlake), **and it gives access to evidence from paywalled articles**. **Every season I coach debaters who lack access to major databases; for schools without robust online library offerings or teams without college coaches, this matters a lot**.

#### 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] Depth of clash – it allows debaters to have nuanced researched objections to their opponents evidence before the round at a much faster rate, which leads to higher quality ev comparison – outweighs cause thinking on your feet is NUQ but the best quality responses come from full access to a case.

#### And, saying I can ask them does not solve –

#### [1] Stalling – they can take long and make prep irreciprocal because they prep the aff while we have less to prep the neg

#### [2] Norms – we shouldn’t have to ask you – if you’re racist, you should not be independent of me asking

#### [3] Defense – no reason why your norm is better – you can’t win in competing interps model

#### Disclosure has to be drop the debater and a voter- it is uniquely able to set norms and you can’t drop the argument. You shouldn’t get an RVI or OCI-a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices c] chilling effect-novices will never read theory because they know they’ll lose every time to super prepped out CI-ows on norming

#### Competing interpretations because disclosure is a question of models of debate and we should be able to defend our models – also, reasonability is arbitrary, has no brightline, and invites judge intervention since it’s up to them to determine their BS meter – also best for a race to the top where we can have better debates in the future which outweighs on scope. 1NC theory outweighs since the 1NC is reactive so if it’s abusive it’s because the 1AC was abusive – proves terminal defense to 1AR shells since it’s self inflicted.

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation. Outweighs because it’s the only intrinsic part of debate – all other rules can be debated over but rely on some conception of fairness to be justified.

## 2

#### Permissibility and presumption negate-a) 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 the aff will logically happen in the squo d) resolved in the resolution indicates they proactively did something, to negate that means that they aren’t resolved e) winning the nc proves since otherwise we’d be blindly deceived when skeptical f) permissibility can’t affirm since then anything would be ok which would justify racism – we should be safe and do nothing.

#### The neg burden is to prove that the aff won’t logically happen in the status quo, and the aff burden is to prove that it will.

Top of Form

Bottom of Form

#### Prefer:

#### 1] Text – outweighs on predictability:

#### A] Ought is “used to express logical consequence” as defined by Merriam-Webster

(<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought>) //Massa

#### B] Oxford Dictionary defines ought as “used to indicate something that is probable.”

<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought> //Massa

#### 2] Neg definition choice – the aff should have defined ought in the 1ac because it was in the rez so it’s predictable contestation, by not doing so they have forfeited their right to read a new definition – kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement on a lack of your definition. And, isn’t mutually exclusive with comparative worlds a) logic is a side constraint on desirability b) reinterprets to the more logical world rather than more desireable world.

#### 3] Debatability – debates centered around moral oughts are futile and can’t guide action – we can never know the intention of another agent.

**Hollingdale** Human, All Too Human.  Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche Translated by R. J Hollingdale.  Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. Recut SJCP//JG

Our experience of another person, for example, no matter how close he stand to us, can never be complete, so that we would have a logical right to a total evaluation of him; all evaluations are premature and are bound to be. Finally, the standard by which we measure, our own being, is not an unalterable magnitude, we are subject to moods and fluctuations, and yet we would have to know ourselves as a fixed standard to be able justly to assess the relation between ourself and anything else whatever.

#### Even our best guesses at intention are flawed; this makes any evaluation impossible.

**Taylor**. “Thine eyes hath not seen the virtue: A response to Kant’s theory of a priori morality.” 2010. <http://charactervertigo.com/thine-eyes-hath-not-seen-the-virtue-a-response-to-kants-theory-of-a-priori-morality>. Recut SJCP//JG

On With the intentionalist model, it becomes extremely difficult to judge our fellow human beings. In fact, it becomes impossible to make certain judgments about their moral rectitude because we cannot have access to their private states of willing. We look at someone like Hitler and say “Obviously evil”, but the intentionalist can raise all sorts of things like: “Well, yes, it looks bad, but it’s possible he was so insane that he truly thought that his actions were for the betterment of mankind…maybe he thought the Jews would be better off…maybe he etc., etc.” – you know, the intentionalist can make up categorical-imperatively-sound reasons for his actions, as far-fetched as they may be. Or, he was an angry, power-hungry bastard. Pick which seems more likely, but we can never know for certain, if we’re Kantians.

#### 4] Neg framework choice – a) aff speaks first and last which means they control the direction of the round b) infinite pre-round prep means they’re prepared for any debate – prep controls quality of arguments c) they get one more speech to contextualize arguments in different ways.

#### Now negate:

#### 1) Inherency – either a) the aff is non-inherent and you vote neg on presumption or b) it is and it isn’t going to happen. It isn’t going to happen – proven by how it’s a proposal they fiat and they have harms

#### 2) A just government can never be just if the passing of the resolution makes them just meaning there is no such thing as a just government to begin with and you negate on presumption because the res is impossible.

3) Strike means to hit forcibly and deliberately with one's hand or a weapon or other implement.(oxford dictionaries) which is nonuniversalizable under Kant because it’s a contradiction in conception

**4) There needs to be a space between things to distinguish them as multiple since otherwise there’s no distinction, but that space is a thing itself because otherwise it would have to be a part of the other objects which means it would be the same. This means objects need space to differentiate but space is an object which means that plurality is impossible since adding a space to distinguish between things just adds an object which means there’s no additional distinction as its self-identical. Assuming plurality, you can infinitely divide things to make new objects like dividing a rectangle into two and so on, but if dividing can go on infinitely, it means the parts that make it up are infinitely small and therefore nonexistent. Nonexistent parts can’t add to quantity, so nothing exists so there’s no plurality, but even if they’re finitely small, an infinite amount of those is infinitely big, and multiple infinitely big things are impossible since they extend into each other. This means Monism is true since its thesis is you cant divide objects into others since it’s the same. That negates: a) ought statements require conduct between agents – even if one has a duty for them self, it assumes a difference between the self and the mind; otherwise it’s not a duty since its just self-imposed and b) plurality impossible means change is impossible as it goes from one state from existing to not existing, but monism proves that one thing exists which can’t not exist since it’s everything.**

## 3

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that a world is better than another before you adopt it.

#### Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – T/F binary is descriptive and technical.

#### a priori’s 1st – even worlds framing requires ethics that begin from a priori principles like reason or pleasure so we control the internal link to functional debates and pragmatic truth.

#### Most inclusive because other ROBs open the door for personal lives of debaters to factor into decisions and compare who is more oppressed which causes violence in a space where some people go to escape.

#### 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 – controls the internal link to fairness since it’s the basis of things like predictability and prep and jurisdiction is a meta constraint on anything else since the judge voting aff if they affirm better and neg the contrary proves that it’s an independent voter and otherwise they could just hack against or for you which means hack against them if they contest it and it also controls the internal link to fairness since that’s definitionally unfair. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I’ve met my burden.

## Case

#### Uses others as a mere means to an end

Fourie 17 Johan Fourie 11-30-2017 "Ethicality of Labor-Strike Demonstrates by Social Workers" <https://www.otherpapers.com/essay/Ethicality-of-Labor-Strike-Demonstrates-by-Social-Workers/62694.html> (Johan Fourie is professor of Economics and History at Stellenbosch University.) JG

A further formula of the Categorical Imperative is "so, act as to treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of any other context, never solely as a means to an end but always as an end within itself' (Parrott, 2006, p. 51). By this Kant meant people should be valued and respected as an individual and not used for the benefit of others. Participating in a labor-strike demonstration/action is **a direct violation of this** categorical perspective as it would not be ethically permissible because the severe dependence and well-being of clients, the effective functioning of the employer organization, and society **is used to duly and unduly influence the bargaining process for better working conditions**. In participating in the labor strike demonstration, the humanity, and well-being of clients and society **is not seen as crucial** **and as an 'end'**, but rather used to demonstrate the undeniable need for the skills and expertise of social workers. Furthermore, through withholding services, social worker professionals demonstrate that the well-being and welfare of society have lost its inherent importance/value. Though the value of overall well-being is taught throughout the social work training process and is enshrined in the professional ethical codes.

#### Violates the commitment to not cause harm

Fourie 17 Johan Fourie 11-30-2017 "Ethicality of Labor-Strike Demonstrates by Social Workers" <https://www.otherpapers.com/essay/Ethicality-of-Labor-Strike-Demonstrates-by-Social-Workers/62694.html> (Johan Fourie is professor of Economics and History at Stellenbosch University.) JG

In addition to the above, engaging in a labor strike demonstration is a gross violation of the **prima facie duty of the social worker**, nonmaleficence: **to not cause harm**, and display a commitment to the well-being of the client, organization as well as society. As Social Workers withdraw their labor, services are ceased, and automatic disruption occurs which can inflict serious harm on clients, organizational functioning as well as society. According to Mehta and Swell (2014), examples of the harm caused to clients and organizational functioning include severe and fatal delays in executing or developing timeous interventions **for at-risk clients,** miscommunication, and no service delivery. Moreover, by withdrawing their labor in a strike demonstration, ethical principles such as beneficence and social justice are also not adhered to as no acts of kindness, empathy is shown, and the most vulnerable members of society **will be impacted the most**.

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)