## 1

#### Interpretation – Debaters may not read no neg analytics.

#### Violation – Their UV

#### 1] Standards –

#### a] Infinite Abuse – we can’t answer the aff

#### b] Clash – I can’t clash if I always lose, and I can’t offensively engage on the highest layer which destroys theoretical clash – strongest I/L to education because it’s the only form of unique education we get from debate.

#### C] Contradictions negate – A] your fault for setting them up B] they render truth impossible

#### 2] Paradigm issues –

#### Vote neg on substance – a] I was so skewed on substance so that I couldn’t win it b] I couldn’t engage in the aff in the first place

#### Fairness – its constitutive to debate as competitive activity that requires objective evaluation. Controls the I/L to education because you don’t learn from an already skewed round.

#### DTD – a] deters future abuse b] my strat has already been skewed so it’s the only way to rectify the abuse

#### Competing interps – a] reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation b] reasonability collapses since brightlines operate on an offense-defense paradigm

#### Norming outweighs – a] constitutivism – it’s the intrinsic purpose of theory magnitude – it’s the only out of round impact which link turns their arguments because they assume a good model of debate

#### No RVIs – a] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, b] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and c] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive.

#### No cross-apps, overviews, or aff meta theory – it’s how tricky debaters get away with abuse, force them to justify a CI.

#### Answering the spike doesn’t solve – it’s a matter of norming so possible in round responses doesn’t disprove the shell

#### NC theory first - 1] They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] We have more speeches to norm over it 3] It was introduced first so it comes lexically prior.

#### Neg abuse outweighs Aff abuse – 1] Infinite prep time before round to frontline 2] 2AR judge psychology 3] 1st and last speech 4] Infinite perms and uplayering in the 1AR.

#### Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is very aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to

#### DTA on 1AR shells - They can blow up blippy 20 second shells in the 2AR but I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention

#### Theory outweighs the ROB: 1] Procedural – determines the rules of the game which turns jurisdiction 2] turns – we couldn’t answer your argument

#### RVIs on 1AR theory – 1AR being able to spend 20 seconds on a shell and still win forces the 2N to allocate at least 2:30 on the shell which means RVIs check back time skew

## 2

#### I defend the status quo

#### Permissibility and presumption negate:

#### 1] Obligations- the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove something unjust, and permissibility would deny the existence of justice

#### 2] Falsity- Statements are more often false than true because proving one part of the statement false disproves the entire statement. Presuming all statements are true creates contradictions which would be ethically bankrupt.

#### 3] Affirmation theory- Affirming requires unconditionally maintaining an obligation

Affirm : maintain as true.

That’s Dictionary.com- “affirm” https://www.dictionary.com/browse/affirm

#### 4] Linguistics fail- Words have no intrinsic meaning but are constructed by signs and signifiers. For example, pencil refers to a specific image pops in your head that doesn’t replicate all pencils.

#### The resolution is false under prag:

#### 1] The Münchhausen trilemma negates. This card also answers all responses. There is no ethically justified framework

**Ideasinhat 18**, 11-16-2018, "Ideasinhat," <https://ideasinhat.com/2018/11/16/what-is-the-munchhausen-trilemma/> SJCP//JG Recut Jet

The Münchhausen trilemma is a problem in the branch of philosophy known as epistemology; the Münchhausen trilemma, also known as Agrippa’s trilemma, reveals that any theory of knowledge cannot be certain and that all beliefs are unjustified. In other words, justified beliefs, which are beliefs founded on reason and logic, cannot be obtained, as the Münchhausen trilemma demonstrates the impossibility of justified premises. There have been numerous attempts to establish [justified beliefs](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-009-9493-5_1), but none have been satisfactory thus far. And so, the Münchhausen trilemma thought experiment is still a problem for any theory of knowledge The Münchhausen trilemma leads us to unjustified beliefs and deprives us of certainty in knowledge because it stops us from forming a theory of knowledge via fallacious reasoning: e.g., When we rid our philosophy from arbitrary assumptions, unjustified premises, or circular reasoning, as the trilemma so dictates, we likewise have to obviate all notions of justified belief and certainty because all known origin points for any theory of knowledge involve some form of the above mentioned fallacies. To see how the Münchhausen trilemma demonstrates that any theory of knowledge cannot be proven, consider the various responses, written below, that one can give when their worldview is questioned. To give an example of the Münchhausen trilemma, we will use [realism](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/realism/) as the theory of knowledge to be skeptical towards. Briefly, a realist believes the contents of perception are mind-independent and exist objectively outside the person; they believe we have a one-to-one correspondence between our minds and reality. Thus, the realist has justified beliefs, since he or she sees a real world. Their theories of knowledge are objectively the case. CIRCULAR REASONING When we ask the realist, who believes they see reality objectively so, how they have derived that belief, they can respond with an [appeal to sense perception](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/perception-problem/). They construct their theory of knowledge on the grounds of perception. An appeal to sense perception simply means that the realist relies on their senses to know things; for example, “I know there is a book on my desk, because I can see it“. So, the realist can say, “I know the apple is red because I can verify that claim up against my senses; that is, I can see that the apple is plainly red”. The Problem Of Perception However, as the Münchhausen trilemma so encourages us to do, when we ask the realist how they can rely on their sense-perceptions for their theory of knowledge, trouble arises; unjustified beliefs begin to emerge. Since we have a first-person perspective onto the world, which means we live within experience, we cannot step outside our own point of view. That means, we cannot verify whether our sensory experiences are accurate or not; we cannot know if sensory experience corresponds to a real world environment or not. And that is a problem for anyone who wants epistemic justification from sense perception. Relying on sense perceptions for a theory of knowledge, the realist has to argue, “apples are red if I perceive them to be red, and I perceive the apple to be red; therefore, apples are red”. This is circular reasoning, as it appeals to sense perception to verify something found in sense perception

#### 2] the[[1]](#footnote-1) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but appropriation isn’t a disease

#### 3] of[[2]](#footnote-2) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time

#### 4] private[[3]](#footnote-3) describes “belonging to or for the use of one particular person or group of people only” and an entity[[4]](#footnote-4) is “independent, separate, or self-contained existence”

#### No new 1ar definitions: I premised my strat off a lack of 1ac definitions and reading them in the 1ac solves since the words in the resolution are expected to be defined

#### No new 1ar permissibility presumption affirms arguments: you already read them in the aff so reading new ones gives you a 2-1 skew

#### Not speccing the advocacy is a voting issue – justifies new 1ar plan text to delink out of my arguments and defending the “resolution” can entail any type of appropriation

## 3

#### Interpretation: On the 2021-2022 NDCA LD Wiki, the affirmative debater must disclose all theory interpretations that have been read in the 1AR and 1AC in one cite box or open-source document. Here’s an example:

Graphical user interface, text, application, email

Description automatically generated

#### Violation: they don’t

#### Standards:

#### 1] Norming – It’s impossible to go through 30 round reports before round and find which norms not to violate – only the interp allows for the negative to be fair and respect norms

#### 2] Prep skew – you can see what a fair affirmative is since I have disclosed all my neg theory interps but it’s impossible for the negative to be fair because we don’t know what you want us to meet. That outweighs aff theory because we could’ve been fair but you chose not to let us

#### Disclosure outweighs – magnitude – affects the entire round including prep

## Case

### 1NC – AT: Underview

#### 1] Their strategy of quick, blippy, hidden arguments exclude people with learning disabilities – underlining implications solves their abuse

Thompson 15 Terrence Lonam April 21, 2015 “Miscellaneous Thoughts from the Disorganized Mind of Marshall Thompson” http://nsdupdate.com/2015/04/21/miscellaneous-thoughts-from-the-disorganized-mind-of-marshall-thompson/

First, I think that evaluating who is the better debater via who dropped spikes excludes lots of specific individuals, especially those with learning disabilities. I have both moderate dyslexia and extreme dysgraphia. Despite debating for four years with a lot of success I was never able to deal with spikes. I could not ‘mind-sweep’ because my flow was not clear enough to find the arguments I needed, and I was simply too slow a reader to be able to reread through the relevant parts of a case during prep-time. I was very lucky, my junior year (which was the first year I really competed on the national circuit) spikes were remarkably uncommon. Looking back it was in many ways the low-point for spike. They started to be used some my senior year but not anything like the extent they are used today. I am entirely confident, however, in saying that if spikes had had anywhere near the same prevalence when I started doing ‘circuit’ debate as they do now, I—with the specific ways that dyslexia/dysgraphia has affected me—would never have bothered to try to debate national circuit LD (I don’t intend to imply this is the same for anyone who has dyslexia or dysgraphia, the particular ways that learning disabilities manifest is often difficult to track). Now, the mere fact that I would have been prevented from succeeding in the activity and possibly from being able to enjoyably compete is not an argument. I never would have been able to succeed at calligraphy, but I would hardly claim we should therefore not make the calligraphy club about handwriting. Instead, what I am suggesting is that the values that debate cares about and should be assessing are not questions of handwriting or notation. We expect notation instrumentally to avoid intervention, but it is not one of the ends of debate in itself. Thus, if there is a viable principle upon which we can decrease this strategic dimension of spikes but maintain non-intervention I think we should do so. I was ‘good’ at philosophy, ‘good’ at argument generation, ‘good’ at research, ‘good’ at casing, ‘great’ at framework comparison etc. It seems to me that as long as I can flow well enough to easily follow a non-tricky aff it was proper that my learning disabilities not be an obstacle to my success. (One other thing to note, while I was a ‘framework debater’ who could never have been good at spikes because of my learning disability I have never met a ‘tricky debater’ who could not have succeeded in debate without tricks simply in virtue of their intelligence and technical proficiency; that is perhaps another reason to favor my account.)

#### 2] Spikes that aren’t on top are a voting issue- it means I have to wait for the 1ac to finish to formulate a strategy since I don’t know what your going to read which moots 6 min of prep

#### 3] Under views are a voting issue—one small theory analytic can take out huge chunks of the 1nc which kills substantive clash. Disclosing 15 minutes before the round doesn’t check – question of norming and that’s still not adequate prep.

#### 4] New 2NR Responses- A] none of the spikes have a clear implication in the 1ac B] It’s key to robustly contest their norm. C] Stops them from hiding tricks in random parts of the aff

#### 5] Negating is harder so auto reject aff fairness claims- they have a 2ar judge psychology advantage and have infinite prep before round

#### 6] RVI’s on each spike- otherwise they can read the most absurd paradigm issues for 6 min and are never held accountable

#### 7] The role of the negative is to contradict the aff – weighing means that u don’t prefer one side

#### 8] No time skew- we both have 13 mins. The aff can read theory in the 1ac to check abuse. Spikes check abuse. You can do drills and spread faster which outweighs on portability. Kills norming because you can cross-app these to any shell

#### 9] No invincible 2NR – the 2ar has judge persuasion and the last word

#### 10] Spikes with a phil aff is a voting issue – skirts engagement with your theory of power which kills engagement

### Offense:

#### 1] Public sector appropriation thumps – none of their evidence is specific enough to justify private sector key

#### 2] The intrinsic nature of capitalism has changed – growth is no longer coupled with consumption which solves inequality

Zitelmann 21 – studied history and political sciences, graduating with a doctorate “summa cum laude” in 1986. His dissertation was published in both German and English: Hitler. The Policies of Seduction. Rainer Zitelmann began his career lecturing history at the Freie Universität Berlin from 1987 to 1992. He then became chief editor at one of the leading and most prestigious publishing houses in Germany, Ullstein-Propyläen. He followed this with the role of section editor at the major German daily newspaper “Die Welt”, which he held until 2000. (Rainer, "Consumption Presumption: Are Human Beings Destroying the World?," National Interest, 2-12-2021, https://nationalinterest.org/feature/consumption-presumption-are-human-beings-destroying-world-178114, Accessed 3-8-2021, LASA-SC) Recut Jet

Some people claim that we need to cut our consumption or there will be no hope for the planet. Such claims are based on the thesis that continued growth increases the rate at which the earth’s finite resources are consumed and, moreover, leads to irreversible climate change. And such warnings are by no means new. In 1970, for instance, the Club of Rome attracted a great deal of attention with the publication of The Limits to Growth. A Report for the Club of Rome’s Project on the Predicament of Mankind, which has to date sold more than thirty million copies in thirty languages. The book warned people to change their ways and had a clear message: the world’s raw materials, and in particular, oil would soon be used up. In twenty years, the scientists predicted, we would have used the very last drop of oil. Of course, the Club of Rome’s models for the depletion of oil—and almost all other major raw materials—were wrong. According to the scenarios presented in The Limits to Growth, we should now be living on a planet that has been devoid of natural gas, copper, lead, aluminum and tungsten for decades. And we were supposed to have run out of silver in 1985. Despite the bleak forecasts, as of January 2020, the United States Geological Survey estimated silver reserves worldwide at 560,000 tons. Employing an extensive array of data, the American scientist Andrew McAfee proves in his book More from Less that economic growth is no longer coupled to the consumption of raw materials. Data for the United States, for example, show that of seventy-two resources, from aluminum to zinc, only six are not yet post-peak. Nevertheless, despite the fact that the U.S. economy has grown strongly in recent years, consumption of many commodities is actually decreasing. Back in 2015, the American environmental scientist Jesse Ausubel wrote an essay, “The Return of Nature: How Technology Liberates the Environment,” showing that Americans are consuming fewer and fewer raw materials per capita. Total consumption of steel, copper, fertilizer, wood and paper, which had previously always risen in line with economic growth, had plateaued and was now in constant decline. Such across-the-board reductions in natural resource consumption are only possible because of much-maligned capitalism: companies are constantly developing more efficient production methods and reducing the amount of raw materials they consume. Of course, they are not doing this primarily to protect the environment but to cut costs. What's more, a constant stream of innovations has promoted the trend of miniaturization or dematerialization. Just think of your smartphone. How many devices has your smartphone replaced and how many raw materials did they use to consume? Nowadays, many people no longer have a fax machine or street atlas because they have everything they need on their smartphone. Some even use their phones instead of a wristwatch. You used to need four separate microphones in your telephone, cassette recorder, Dictaphone and video camera, today you just need one—in your smartphone. The finite nature of the world’s natural resources is one argument against growth, climate change is another. Let’s take China as an example: China currently emits more CO2 than any other country in the world and is building a number of new nuclear power plants in order to achieve carbon neutrality by 2060. With the new build program well underway, China’s first new-generation nuclear power plant recently went into operation. In the very near future, China intends to start exporting power plants. The latest generation of nuclear power plants is much safer than earlier models—and can play a pivotal role in the fight against climate change. In the United States, Joe Biden is already evaluating the advantages of small modular reactor (SMR) nuclear power plants. As the name suggests, SMRs are smaller than traditional nuclear fission reactors and offer a maximum capacity of three hundred megawatts. In the United Kingdom, for example, a consortium led by Rolls-Royce has announced plans to build up to sixteen SMR power plants. So far, two reactors of this type are in operation, both onboard the floating nuclear power plant “Akademik Lomonosov, which supplies heat and electricity to the Siberian city of Pevec and its one hundred thousand inhabitants. Anticapitalists blame capitalism for resource consumption and climate change. But political decisions—such as Germany’s decision to phase out nuclear energy—frequently have a negative impact on climate change. Telling people to cut their consumption must seem like pure mockery to the hundreds of millions of people around the world who are still living in extreme poverty. What they need is more capitalism and economic growth. Just like in China, where the number of people living in extreme poverty has fallen from 88 percent in 1981 to less than 1 percent today. Andrew McAfee’s book has an optimistic message about how we don't have to turn back the clocks and cut our consumption: capitalism and technological progress are allowing us to steward the world’s resources, rather than stripping them bare.

#### Outweighs Stockwell – their evidence is a consequentialist account of what happens as a result of cosmic elitism i.e. inequality is not intrinsically tied to elitism

#### 3] Space is infinite – answers their appropriation args cuz they assume space is finite to exclude others

#### 4] Appropriation is a precondition for experimentation – legal research leads to better funding
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