# 1NC v. Kelvin Saint Mark’s Round 5

## 1

### 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

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.

## 2

### Theory

#### Interp: Debaters may not read that aff theory is drop the debater, no RVIs, Competing Interps and Aff Fairness issues come before NC arguments.

#### Violation – Their UV

#### 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 fairness comes first, it also means it comes as the highest layer because I cant weigh between other shells because the aff has the highest fairness adv. So this means that as long as they read a shell I violate in the 1ar I will lose. Independently controls the IL to clash because I can’t clash if I always lose – strongest IL 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 IL to education because you don’t learn from an already skewed round.

#### c] Neg theory is DTD - 1ARs control the direction of the debate because it determines what the 2NR has to go for – DTD allows us some leeway in the round by having some control in the direction

#### d] Competing interps – Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation – it also 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 – Going all in on theory kills substance education which outweighs on timeframe

#### g] No cross-apps, overviews, or meta theory – its how tricky debaters get away with abuse, force them to justify their abuse.

## 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

#### 11] Their evidence concedes its topic specific – Westlake reads green

#### **Shah 19** Sachin “A STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF SIDE-BIAS ON THE 2019 JANUARY-FEBRUARY LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE TOPIC” NSD, 15 February 2019. <http://nsdupdate.com/2019/a-statistical-analysis-of-side-bias-on-the-2019-january-february-lincoln-douglas-debate-topic/> SJCP//JG

To further quantify the side-bias, the proportion of negative wins when the affirmative was favored (p1) can be compared with the proportion of affirmative wins when the negative is favored (p2). Ideally the difference between the proportions would be 0; however, p1 = 34.84% while p2 = 28.77, a staggering 6.07% difference. Now the question is whether this difference is statistically significant. In order to determine the answer, a two-proportion z-test was used. The null hypothesis is p1 – p2 = 0 , because that means both sides are able to overcome the debating level skew equally. The alternative hypothesis is then p1 – p2 > 0, meaning the negative is able to overcome the skew more than the affirmative is able, demonstrating a side-bias. This two-proportion z-test rejected the null hypothesis in favor of the alternative (p-value < 0.0001). There is sufficient evidence that the negative is able to overcome the skew more often than the affirmative can. This implies there is a less than 0.01% chance that there is no side-bias because it demonstrates the higher proportion of negative wins when the affirmative is favored is significant. In short, the negative has a greater ability to win difficult rounds than the affirmative does, which indicates there exists a skew in the negative’s favor. This analysis is statistically rigorous and relevant in several aspects: (A) The p-value is less than the alpha. (B) The data is on the current January-February topic, meaning it’s relevant to rounds these months [2]. (C) The data represents a diversity of debating and judging styles across the country. (D) This analysis accounts for disparities in debating skill level. (E) Type I error was reduced by choosing a small alpha level. The combination of these points validates this analysis. As a final note, it is also interesting to look at the trend over multiple topics. In the rounds from 93 TOC bid distributing tournaments (2017 – 2019 YTD), the negative won 52.99% of ballots (p-value < 0.0001) and 54.63% of upset rounds (p-value < 0.0001). This suggests the bias might be structural, and not topic specific, as this data spans six different topics. Therefore, this analysis confirms that affirming is in fact harder again on the 2019 January-February topic [3]. So don’t lose the flip!

### 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

### 1NC – AT: Framework

#### Util collapses to emotivism – Util merely says pain and pleasure are what derives morality, but those are emotive states that individuals process and express in different ways, which means only an expression of desires can allow for the fulfillment of those principles.

#### That negates – Every emotive judgement is indexed to a particular individual, no emotive sentiments can ever be fully universal. This means that the resolution negates since there is no emotion that can be applied to a universal claim that x is y. And, The aff cannot prove the resolution true since statements like the aff are not truth apt but expressions.

#### Util collapses to particularism – judgements are contextual to every situation since util can’t categorically condemn any action, as anything may increase pleasure in a particular instance. Jonathan **Dancy**, British philosopher, who has written on ethics and epistemology. He is currently Professor of Philosophy at University of Texas at Austin and Research Professor at the University of Reading. He taught previously for many years at the University of Keele. Ethics without principles, **2004** ///AHS PB

There is a question whether we are simply to abandon the less speciﬁc versions of our principles, as Scanlon seems to suggest, or whether they can remain in play in some way. Richard Holton (2002) offers a picture which is broadly similar to Scanlon's but which allows the superseded principles to remain on the scene.17 Holton is pursuing the idea that there is no one set of principles that entails, and hence justiﬁes, each true moral claim. But he takes this to be compatible with holding that each true moral claim is entailed by some true principle (together with appropriate non-moral truths). The thought is that we can ﬁnd a way of adding new principles to the old ones, principles that are in some way built on the old ones, but do not amend or replace them. We have, as it were, a nested set of principles of different layers. There is the principle ‘do not kill’, and there is the principle ‘do not kill except in self-defence’. Where Scanlon would say that the latter principle replaces the former, Holton says that both remain sound, but that the question which one we are to use depends on the circumstances, in the following way. We can perfectly well apply the simple principle ‘do not kill’, in cases where there is no further relevant feature to be borne in mind (such as that one needs to defend oneself). So a moral argument could run like this: 1. It is wrong to kill. 2. This would be a killing. 3. There are no further relevant features. 4. So: it would be wrong to do this. If, however, self-defence is at issue, the third premise is false, and we need a different argument, thus: 1. It is permitted to kill in self-defence. 2. This would be a self-defending killing. 3. There are no further relevant features. 4. So: it is permissible to do this.

#### That Negates – The aff is a universal obligation that says nukes are bad in every circumstance, but that’s impossible under particularism.