# Junior Year Theory File – OHS-AT

## Disclosure

### Disclose Tags

#### Interp: Debates must disclose each full tag line for cards disclosed on the NDCA wiki.

#### Prefer -

#### Strat skew: I have no idea what the implications of your card are and how they function in your case. First and last three isn’t enough for me to understand what a card means. There can be a section of a card with multiple warrants but absent your tagline, I have no idea which of them you’re going to read. Also necessary to learn the thesis of your position – otherwise I enter the round in the dark.

### Disclose Round Reports

#### Interp: For each position broken on the NDCA wiki, debaters must include a corresponding round report that summarizes what positions were read and gone for in each speech.

#### Violation – you don’t – here’s a screenshot.

#### Prefer -

#### 1] Level the playing field – big schools can go around and scout and collect flows but independents are left in the dark so round reports are key for us to prep- they give you an idea of overall what layers debaters like going for so you can best prepare your strategy when you hit them. Accessibility first and independent voter – it’s an impact multiplier

#### 2] Strategy ed for novices - round reports help novices understand the context in which positions are read by good debaters and help with brainstorming potential 1NCs vs affs – helps compensate for kids who can’t afford coaches to prepout affs

#### 3] Pre-round prep – 2NRs gives especially give an idea of what type of debater someone is – they could have a bunch of Ks disclosed but always kick them and go for theory each 2NR – otherwise I enter every 1AR blind whereas you have an idea of what you want to go for from the start.

#### Independent voter for accessibility – not everyone can afford a coach

### Disclose if Paywalls

#### Interp: For every broken position that has evidence with paywalls, debaters must either

**a] open source disclose all taglines, citations, and evidence read**

**or**

**b] disclose tags, complete citations, and the full text from each piece of evidence**

**All disclosure must be occur on the NDCA wiki under the correct side and their own name. To clarify, there needs to be some way to see the full text of your evidence if it has paywalls.**

#### Violation – [see file]

#### Prefer-

#### 1] Accessibility: paywalls on sites like HeinOnline and JSTOR make it so only certain debaters can access the articles and read in advance – my interp means that all debaters can understand the crux of your evidence that first three last three doesn’t allow. Anything else stacks the deck against kids that can’t afford to databases that cost hundreds of dollars since they enter the round at a structural disadvantage, not knowing what your position says. Especially true here – your taglines are intentionally confusing! Independent voter – encourages confused novices dropping out - your method is only valuable if it is accessible.

#### 2] Evidence ethics – seeing full text is the only way to verify before round that cards aren’t miscut or powertagged. That’s a voter – people get expelled from school all the time for tiny academic ethics violations, best to teach good norms now.

### Disclose T/Theory

#### Interp: Debaters must disclose all broken T and theory interpretations on the NDCA wiki.

#### Violation: you don’t – here’s a sceenshot in the doc

#### Prefer-

#### 1] Norming: if I see the past interps you’ve read I have a strategic incentive to avoid the theory debate since it opens up another avenue for you to win – o/ws a] specificity - it’s the purpose of theory b] scope – allows for debates to be maximally fair and educational

#### 2] Substantive education: avoiding the theory debate ensures maximum substantive education so not every round devolves into theory – o/ws a] portability – we don’t use theory when we’re older but we learn about the world debating substance b] timeframe – we only have 2 months to debate the topic.

### Disclose Plan Flaw

#### Interp: Debaters must disclose all broken plan flaws on the NDCA wiki.

#### Violation: you don’t – here’s a sceenshot in the doc

#### Prefer –

#### Norm setting – encourages better plan writing by allowing affs to adjust based off of what’s on the wiki – two imapcts a] real world education: teaches grammar and legal precision which helps in writing and English b] predictability – plan flaw can be anything from punctuation to whether or not you have to include resolved – otherwise aff loses every round cuz of bidirectional must/may not capitalize after colon.

### Have Contact Info

#### Interpretation: Debaters, on their corresponding NDCA LD wiki page, must disclose their contact information. To clarify, this can be an email address, Facebook, number, etc.

#### Violation: I do and you don’t – here are screenshots

#### The standard is pre-round prep – contact info is necessary to ask for what aff is being read, the full text of an article, past 2NRs, etc – otherwise I have no idea how to construct a 1NC/best construct my 1AC – destroys critical engagement and gives you a huge advantage

## FW

### Plans+Util Bad

### Straight Ref Bad

## CPs

### UQ CPs Bad – Shell

#### Interp: the negative may not read a counterplan that garners uniqueness for a disad.

#### Prefer –

#### Aff ground – a] they arbitrarily inflate disad ground by blowing up tiny changes – you could fiat the US going almost bankrupt and then say the plan’s 10-dollar price tag causes global collapse b] unpredictable since it’s not a relevant consequence of the plan c] kills core and logical aff answers to DAs like uniqueness presses and no link

### UQ CPs Bad – Paragraph

#### Uniqueness counterplans are a voting issue – they arbitrarily inflate neg DA ground by blowing up tiny changes, moot core aff answers like uniqueness presses, and are unpredictable since it’s not a relevant consequence of the plan

## Theory

### Check Spec

### Answer My Request to Disclose Spec

#### Interp: the affirmative must specify the actor of the aff advocacy if asked prior to the round.

#### **Prep skew – otherwise I lose 30 minutes of prep round prep since I have no idea what links to your aff – terror only applies to the federal government that affect circuit courts, court legitimacy only links to SCOTUS, shutdown only links to Congress, etc – especially key on this topic since we know the phil ground is really bad and there are a limited amount of DAs that are all contingent on the actor.**

## Evidence Ethics

### Brackets

#### Interp: Debaters may not insert brackets containing their own language into evidence unless it is to remove gendered language.

#### Violation -

#### Prefer -

#### 1] Academic Ethics – you can change the entire meaning of what their author says – ie you can bracket in the word “not” to turn a claim into something that is the exact opposite of what the author intended to say. Independent voter - fairness and education don’t matter outside of debate but academic integrity has actual consequences and frowned upon in the real world.

#### 2] Cognitive Bias – you can manipulate judge’s perception of your position by having them think that a credible expert is saying something that they didn’t – since it’s carded by a professional, judges are psychologically influenced to buy your args. Key to fairness – allows you to have unbeatable ev.

## Plan Flaw

### Must Read Alternative Text

#### Interp: If the neg reads a plan flaw criticizing the aff’s plan text, they must include an alternative plan text that they claim is legally/semantically correct.

#### Prefer-

#### 1] Aff strat – I have no idea how to modify my plan text next time since I don’t know what the correct wording is – means I always lose to plan flaw since it’s not clear what’s okay and what’s not

#### 2] Legal/grammar ed – my interp means we both learn how to correctly structure our sentences – that o/ws - grammatical correctness impacts test and essay scores so it’s uniquely portable

## Speech Doc

### Flash Analytics

### Font Size

#### Interp: The text of all cards on both debaters’ speech docs must be the same font size.

#### Violation:

#### Prefer -

#### 1] Evidence Ethics – Shrinking font decreases readability while emphasizing what you want, making miscutting easier to get away with. Even if no miscutting occurred it’s still dishonest to hide your evidence – you wouldn’t try to hide parts of quote you cite in a research paper. Evidence ethics is an independent voter: teaching debaters that being academically dishonest is ok encourages it in real life in which it’s heavily frowned upon. Academic honesty k2 education since you don’t learn anything by just making things up.

#### 2] Reciprocity – all my font is the same size so you don’t have to waste time changing it but I do in order to read it – reciprocity keep to fairness but definition.