### Disclosure

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose the affirmative thirty minutes before round.

#### Violation: screenshots
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#### Standards:

#### 1] Clash- Not disclosing incentivizes surprise tactics and poorly refined positions that rely on artificial and vague negative engagement to win debates. Negatives are forced to rely on generics instead of smart contextual strategies destroying nuanced argumentation.

#### 2] Reciprocity – They get an infinite amount of time to frontline their aff to write the most efficient and effective answers to anything we could say against it while we get only four minutes in round. This gives them a tremendous advantage that makes it impossible to win substance.

#### 3] Shiftiness- Not knowing about the affirmative coming into round incentivizes 1ar shiftiness . That means even if we read generics, they’d just find ways to recontextualize their advocacy in the 1ar. This is further exacerbated because they have several different ACs they’ve gone for on this topic, which means I don’t know which one to prepare for.

#### 4] Don’t buy their argument that they did – they just said that it’s the one on the wiki, but there are 4 different psycho affs on their wiki – I had no clue which one to look at.

#### Drop the debater on fairness because the round was unfairly skewed from the start and there’s not enough time to rectify the skew. AND dropping the argument is the same as DTD when the violation is their entire AC

#### No RVIs as they incentivize baiting and have a chilling effect on reading legitimate theory

### Spikes

**A. Interpretation: Spikes and tricks, including arguments that say the aff wins for just being read, may not be in the 1AC**

**B. Violation: “Answering the AC proves it true since you had to first embrace to lack to access rational argumentation.” – that’s the 3 and 4 point of their prefer additionally. And if they extend some random arg in a place I didn’t label as a violation, that’s another violation – that’s exactly the point. This is metatheory.**

**C. Standards**

**[1] Neg Strat Skew: 1AR nonsensical violations become no-risk issues for the aff, mooting my offense or beating me outright, so I lose or waste more time than violations – two impacts, [1] neg strat outweighs on a topic with infinite mechanisms and weird Kritiks, and [2], substance education since we don’t even have the ability to debate it.**

**[2] Participation – their short blippy framework args are hard to flow and are poorly structured and labeled, pushing out certain individuals, this is key to exclusion**

**Thompson 15,**

Marshall Thompson – Former Debater and Current Coach. http://vbriefly.com/2015/04/21/marshall-thoughts/

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. **ab**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.) Second, spikes add in a greater dimension of randomnessto the round. If they are seen then they are ‘caught’ then they don’t really help you win, if they are not they do. Against most debaters one can ‘reliably’ beat them or will ‘reliably’ lose to them. With cases with lots of spike however, one might generally beat them and then once just miss a spike and it is all over. If the round were to have happened at a different time then the spike might have been caught. This ‘luck’ dimension strikes me as at least giving reason to think it does not track with what we want when assessing who did the better debating.

**Accessibility is an independent voter that outweighs: a) all benefits to their interp for fairness or something are implicit benefits to debating’s process or content debate that must be accessed, b) this is a space constitutively designed to include different people by definition, so they void a fundamental structure of debate that comes before gateway issues, and c) most proximate obligation which outweighs on specificity –judge, you are an educator and most of all have to prevent dropping out. Exclusion comes first and also turns and outweighs anything the aff brings up because it’s a structural barrier that can’t be solved via other means like getting faster, and because the most unfair thing is to be structurally excluded from even being in the room.**

**[3] Integrity – the structure of their arguments encourages motivations that internal link turn their offense and wreck integrity,**

**Torson 13’**

Adam Torson Debate coach “Debate and the Virtue of Intellectual Integrity” Vbriefly March 25th 2013

Against Purposeful Obfuscation Too often in debate, strategy devolves into sophistry. Debaters utilize **a series of** tactics designed **only to muddy the water,** to obscure a fair evaluation of **the** merits of theirarguments **by** either **judges or opponents.** This includes the distortion of evidence, e.g. by reading cards out of context so as to make it seem that authors using terms differently actually intend the same meaning. It includes evasive or overly ambiguous explanations of arguments, designed to allow debaters to shift their positions in the rebuttals. **It** includes impossibly dense and blippyanalytical frameworks with contingent standards, layers of unreasonablespikes, theory bait, and other tricks **hidden throughout.** These tactics are inconsistent with an ethic of intellectual integrity.The rules that we set up to make the debate game intellectually rigorous are exploited to separate us altogether from a meaningful contest of ideas; the tail wags the dog. A student deploying these tactics hopes to win **not** because **he marshals** the **most compelling argument, but because his** opponent makes a superficial erroror his judge is too embarrassed to admit that he didn’t properly follow the argument. We hope that the practice of dialectic contestation will help us to challenge or confirm our beliefs on important personal and political questions. Strategies of purposeful obfuscation**, on the other hand,** turn arguments into **mere instruments of power –** ways of manipulating the circumstancesto contrive a favorable outcome. These strategies are disingenuous approaches to thinking through the topic because they are fundamentally unrelated to the residual quality of the arguments. That bad arguments could reliably beat good ones should strike us as a very strange outcome in any debate event worthy of the name.

**That creates systems that promotes drives to unfairness which outweighs their links on systemic magnitude and scope – it also is a voter – it’s key to portable skills which is impacted above and key to stop out of round oppression and exclusion which outweighs on magnitude**

**Torson 13’**

Torson 13 Adam Torson Debate coach “Debate and the Virtue of Intellectual Integrity” Vbriefly March 25th 2013  
Intellectual integrity denotes a commitment to the honest pursuit of truth through openness to evidence, ideas, and the criticisms of others. It prohibits the subordination of truth to expediency or personal gain and requires us to be on guard against self-deception and short-sightedness. It requires a balance between the courage of honest conviction and the humility to recognize that our conclusions must always be uncertain and provisional. Practiced with intellectual integrity, debate can be a powerful vehicle for personal growth. It encourages the self-reflection that helps students to cultivate a mature inner-life. Conscience is little more than an honest internal dialogue – the ability to critically reflect on one’s own thoughts and actions. Openness to opposing beliefs requires appreciating what the world looks like from someone else’s point of view, which in turn fosters humility, perspective, and tolerance. I think that many of us credit debate as a formative experience precisely because it taught us the virtue of intellectual integrity. Intellectual integrity is also indispensable in cultivating a sense of civic virtue. Our public life is plagued by sophistry and mindless line-toeing. Politics is treated like a spectator sport, and we engage only if we are enthralled by the spectacle. Intellectual integrity is a bulwark against citizenship devolving in this way. One with intellectual integrity is willing to be persuaded by reasoned argument rather than held hostage by ideology or tribalism. It requires suspicion of convention and to be more than a mere political dilettante or pseudo-intellectual. Above all, intellectual integrity bars credulous acquiescence to demagogues and mediocre apologists. By careful examination of the challenges we must face together, debate can foster a mature sense of connection to our many communities. We must recognize the burden of stewardship that comes with the opportunity to work with gifted young people. If what I’ve said rings true, then the debate community is obliged to embrace intellectual integrity as one of its core values. We aspire to be a community of thinkers and learners, and this goal is conveyed not simply by what we teach in the classroom but by the practices we deploy. I encourage the examination of those practices through the lens of intellectual integrity.

#### [4] their arg literally says that if we participate in the debate we lose. This means that they win no matter what – this creates a terrible norm for debate space which results in the round being decided by the coin toss or who gets what side in every round.

#### [5] They changed their method to account for what they expected me to read, meaning that their aff wasn’t even on the wiki to begin because it was crafted specifically against what they expected me to run, furthering the aff’s infinite prep and tailoring advantage.

1. **Voters**
2. **Exclusion is the first voter, because debate must be accessible to all, otherwise it systematically excludes disabled people and their views.**
3. **Fairness is the second voter because debate is a competitive activity and therefore needs to be fair as a precondition for engagement. If it’s not fair then people stop joining debate because there’s no use**
4. **Cross-apply paradigm issues – it’s still DTD because it skews the round from the start and debate as a competitive activity needs to be fair as a precondition**
5. **No cross applications from the aff, [1] this criticizes your args in the aff, so it frames the evaluation of those args. [2] the aff abuse makes it impossible for me to respond. Extending them confirms my abuse claim.**

### TT

#### 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.

#### They justify substantive skews since there will always be a more correct side of the issue but we compensate for flaws in the lit.

#### Most educational since otherwise we wouldn’t use math or logic to approach topics. 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.

#### 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. I denied the truth of the resolution because I don’t think it’s true which means I’ve met my burden.

#### The Merriam Webster Dictionary defines outer as “existing independent of mind” and space as “an extent set apart or available”. A private entity can’t take possession of an extent set apart that exists independent of the mind, so the res false.

#### And permissibility and presumption negate – more things are false than true, for every true statements, its converse must be false, which means at best it’s 50-50, but there are other statements which have multiple false statements for each true one.

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)