# 1NC Longhorn Classic Trips

## 1

### Theory

#### Interpretation – Debaters may not read that aff theory is drop the debater, no RVIs, Competing Interps and Aff theory first.

#### Violation – Their UV – 5 point

#### 1] Standards –

#### a] Infinite Abuse - They can read a theory shell that’s DTD/no RVI/CI that means their standard automatically comes before any 1NC standard since aff theory comes first, it also means it comes as the highest layer because I can’t weigh between other shells because the aff has the highest theory layer. So, if they read a shell that I violate in the 1AR I will lose because they have the highest layer, and I can’t get offense on that layer. Winning a CI on the 1AR shell doesn’t disprove our abuse story – any risk of offense on the highest layer under competing interps and a 3-minute 2AR on a shell makes it impossible to negate.

#### 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.

#### 2] Paradigm issues –

#### a] 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

#### b] 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.

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

#### d] 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

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

#### f] 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.

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

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

## 2

### Theory

#### Interp: Debaters must disclose affirmative advocacy texts and advantage areas thirty minutes before round if they haven’t read the aff before.

#### Violation: screenshots

Graphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

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.

#### 2] Shiftiness- Not knowing enough about the affirmative coming into round incentivizes 1ar shiftiness about what the aff is and what their framework/advocacy entails.

## Case

### 1NC – AT: Underview

#### 1] Their strategy of quick, blippy, hidden arguments exclude people with learning disabilities

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.)

#### Vote them down – inclusion is a tangible out-of-round impact distinct from the procedural aspects of debate – it’s key to minority participation.

#### 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] Spikes that weren’t disclosed are a voting issue- prevents us from rigorously testing your norm and incentivizes surprise tactics

#### 4] Under views are a voting issue—one small theory analytic can take out huge chunks of the 1nc which kills substantive clash

#### 5] 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

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

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

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

#### 9] No time skew- we both have 13 mins. The aff can read theory in the 1ac to check abuse

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

### 1NC – Theory Hedge

#### 1] NC theory first – 1] Abuse was self-inflicted- They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] Norming- We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea 3] It was introduced first, so it comes lexically prior.

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

#### 3] 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– reasonability checks 2AR sandbagging by preventing really abusive 1NCs while still giving the 2N a chance.

#### 4] DTA on 1AR shells – They can blow up blippy 20 second shells in the 2AR while I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention and means 1AR theory is irresolvable so you shouldn’t stake the round on it.

#### 5] 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 – outweighs on quantifiability

#### 6] No new 1AR theory paradigm issues – A] the 1NC has already occurred with current paradigm issues in mind so new 1ar paradigms moot any theoretical offense B] introducing them in the aff allows for them to be more rigorously tested which o/w’s on time frame since we can set higher quality norms.

#### 7] Reject infinite abuse claims – a] spikes solve—there are only so many theoretical issues anyway, b] infinite abuse doesn't exist since there are a finite number of rounds, c] if I win, I can't engage in 1AR theory then you could never check infinite abuse since we can't use your shells to determine what's abusive d] Functional limits solves – I only have 7 minutes so I can’t be infinitely abusive