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## Presume aff:

**1. Presume aff because of the double extension and 7:4:6:3 rebuttal time skew, 7% judge neg side bias based on an analysis done from 32,181 rounds[[1]](#footnote-1), and competitor neg side bias. The fact that I can overcome these skews and be at a standstill at the end of the 2AR means that I did the better debating.** **Time is necessary to make arguments, which means that it holds the internal link to other presumption arguments. It is also key to fairness because it constraints the amount of arguments we can make.**

**2. The neg has the ability to adapt to the aff while I forced to pick an interp on the topic. Flex allows the neg to frame their strategy to the aff, giving an advantage as they can create an ideal strat for any aff I run.**

This has three implications:

a. Theory is an RVI for the aff because I’m forced to pick an interp on the topic.

b. If the neg runs topicality just reevaluate my offense under their interp because I was forced to pick a strat.

c. It takes out the neg argument that says, “the aff can frame and close the round” since it explains why forcing me to pick an interp is detrimental to me.

### Frontlines

#### A2: Even Speaking Time

**1. My argument deals with rebuttal time skew. Speaking time in rebuttals is key as the rebuttals are the time when we develop and interact arguments. Framing in the 1AC isn’t important if the round comes down to impacts off the 1NC.**

**2. Making strategic decisions does not compensate for the time skew – this links even harder into fairness, as this means that I have to do more strategic work than you simply based on the sides we have.**

#### A2: “Negate means to Deny”

**1. This argument is literally nonresponsive to my presumption arguments. The ballot’s role is to determine who the better debater is. My argument is that because I’ve overcome structural skews and the round is still a tie, I did the better debating.**

**2. This argument is true “absent a reason to affirm”, but presumption functions a reason to affirm, meaning that the existence of my argument disproves yours.**

**3. [DON’T READ WITH SKEP TRIGGER] Just because something is not true does not mean that it is false. We can just be uncertain about the truth of a statement. For example, me being unable to prove that a parallel universe exists doesn’t automatically render that statement false – we are merely uncertain about it. This indicates that presumption is the best way to resolve the debate.**

#### A2: “More Likely False”

**1. Turn – your argument that there are more ways that a statement can be false just proves that it is easier to negate the resolution than affirm it. When there is no offense, this has two implications:**

**a. I did the better debating overcoming this skew, meaning that you should vote affirmative**

**b. You did the worse debating by letting the round come to a tie despite having so many different ways by which to negate, so you should not vote negative.**

#### A2: Definitions First

**Prefer theoretical reasons for presumption because:**

**1. Theory frames the role of the ballot and establishes constraints on what issues should be an issue in the round, which makes it a pre-requisite.**

**2. In the event of a tie, substance is no longer an issue because there is no offense or implications to weigh.**

**3. Grammatical truths are irrelevant because in the event of a tie, nothing is either disproven or proven.**

**4. The ballot tells you to vote for whomever did the better debating, which isn’t dictated by a grammatical truth. In the event of a tie, it means I’ve did the better debating.**

#### A2: Burden of Proof

**1. Ok, come on son. The burden of proof in LD debate for arguments is bidirectional. You have the burden of proof to prove your arguments true as well.**

**Luong, [**BURDEN OF PROOF AND PRESUMPTION IN LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE: A CALL FOR REFORM, Minh A. Luong, <https://debate.uvm.edu/NFL/rostrumlib/ldbofpluong1095.pdf>, SK]

**Argumentative burden of proof**. This burden of proof standard **is the most commonly recognized** of the two types. Simply put, **the burden of proof on an argument level places the responsibility on an advocate to prove her or his specific arguments in a debate round.** So **while the affirmative has the obligation to prove the truth of the resolution, both debaters have the burden of proof to support their individual arguments.** Thus **when evaluating particular arguments in an L-D debate, the burden of proof is bi-directional, or in other words, each debater should assume responsibility for sound argumentation.** RidgeSK

**This non-uniques his/her argument.**

#### A2: Grammar is first

**1. Grammar is nonsensical as a standard for the presumption debate – your definition of “negate” makes it impossible for affirming to be grammatically consistent which destroys my ground further**

**2. There is absolutely no bright-line for what constitutes a grammatically correct interpretation. The first definition of affirm on google is “assert strongly and publicly”, so if the judge believes that my asserting the resolution was done strongly then you affirm. Two implications:**

**a. grammar just incites more judge intervention as the judge must decide what is grammatically correct, making the debate irresolvable.**

**b. Infinite Regress: there are always more grammatically correct interpretations of every word that is within a definition meaning that we will never be able to arrive at one cogent definition.**

**This takes out the internal link to predictability in my opponent’s justifications, as there are too many interpretations and definitions for any one of them to be predictable.**

**3. Preclusion is not a reason as to why increasing grammatical interpretations links into fairness or education. Four reasons:**

**a. Just because grammar is a pre-requisite does not mean it is intrinsically valuable. This is the fallacy of origin.**

**b. Grammar is an all or nothing issue. If we have grammatically correct arguments, then we can have fairness or education. If not, then we cannot. This does not prove that increasing grammar will increase fairness/education, or vice versa.**

**c. No bright line, again, for what constitutes a sufficiently grammatical interpretation so that we can communicate enough to comprehend fairness or education.**

**d. No warrant as to why grammar is the basis of expression of language – individuals communicate with improper grammar all the time, and still manage to get ideas across. Empirically proven – people still understood Bush.**

**Thus, even if grammar is good, my opponent gains no offense on the presumption debate.**

#### A2: NFL Rules

**1. This is a misinterpretation of the NFL rules – Terminal Defense on your argument**

Pellicciotta, [PRESUMPTION AND BURDEN OF PROOF, RJ Pellicciotta, SK]

**There is a misconception that the rules of L/D prohibit the use of standards of presumption or burden of proof.** I argue that such a statement is a misinterpretation of the guidelines currently in place. **Those guidelines state that there is no prescribed presumption or burden of proof.** I believe **it would be erroneous however to surmise from this that such concepts are not allowed in value argumentation.** **Presumption and burden of proof are acceptable standards in a Lincoln Douglas Debate round when established by one of the debaters.** The rules concerning such standards simply prevent these ideas from being automatically connected to one side or the other. In other words, the affirmative does not have the burden of proof simply by virtue of being the affirmative and the negative does not have presumption simply by virtue of being the negative. **The instructions on the NFL ballot clearly illustrate this**: “**The burdens** on the affirmative and negative positions are not prescribed as they may be in debates on propositions of policy; therefore decision rules **are fair issues to be argued in the round**. ”SK

**2. Turn: Your argument says that in LD judges shouldn’t automatically presume to one side. The 53.7% neg side bias from this year clearly proves that judges most often presume neg, so we should vote aff to correct this**

**3. Turn: Your arguments deal with how the structure of LD debate (how the affirmative speaks first and defends a proposition and the negative must only negate it) gives you presumption ground. However, this actually violates NFL rules as they say that you shouldn’t automatically presume before the round.**

#### A2: Bad for Topical Education.

**1. Your argument makes no sense. The reason that we are debating presumption is because the topical arguments have been proven to be irresolvable. As such, even if topical education is good, the existence of presumption proves that it can’t exist in this round – my argument outweighs on in round specificity.**

**2. We need presumption for real world education. This debate is good for real world decision making when we are faced with uncertainty.**

Zarefsky, [David Zarefsky, "Criteria for Evaluating Non-Policy Argument," Advanced Debate, 3rd ed., 1987, p. 392. SK]

I think **our theories of argument would be given greater validity and wider utility by grappling with issues such as the nature of presumption and burden of proof**, the responsibilities of the advocates, the role of the judge, and the nature of "good reasons" in the context of non-policy propositions. And **I think our students would be far better prepared to understand and to apply the argumentative perspective to the wider range of setting in which human beings must make choices under conditions of uncertainty.** SK

## Presume neg:

**To negate means, “to deny the truth of,” which implies that absent a reason to affirm the resolution, you negate.**

**Prefer definitional arguments because:**

**a. Grammar is the basis of the expression of language and thus argumentation, which makes it a pre-requisite.**

**b. There is a reason why the burden of the proof is on the aff – things are always more likely false than true because there are an infinite number of ways to deny something.**

**c. Definitions hold the internal link to predictability because understanding our language is based in definitions. Predictability outweighs on fairness because it forms the basis of prep, i.e., I determine a neg strat based on definitions.**

### Frontlines

#### A2: Time Skew

**1. Both debaters have the same amount of time to make arguments. While their link argument is different than this, their internal link to fairness states that “time constraints the arguments we make”; however, both debaters have the exact same time.**

**2. Making strategic decisions as a debater compensates for a lack of time and is more effective than presumption because it actually generates offense.**

**3. The aff’s time-tradeoff in rebuttals is due to the fact that they get a 6 minute constructive to frame the round in the most strategic way for the 1AR, which means they have an advantage.**

**4. Turn- Forces strategic thinking. You have to make smart args and maximize time allocation, which enhances critical thinking and information processing skills.**

**5. Turn- time skews force debaters to talk fast, which improves education.**

Mike Korcok:

**The best evidence available indicates that speedy speaking makes you smarter. To a cognitive psychologist this claim would not be surprising nor would it necessarily even be considered controversial: speedy speaking is a pedagogically sound practice: speaking faster improves cognitive ability. Speech rate determines working memory capacity and working memory capacity is a critical component of cognitive ability.**

**6. You get what you deserve. Arguing time skews bad just wastes time that could be used to deal with actual arguments.**

**7. Infinitely regressive – even if I give you presumption you still have (x) interp that uses time skew as a justification – no matter what happens the time will always be skewed.**

#### A2: Side Bias

1. No judge side bias – this may just mean that the better debaters may have been negating.

## General Presumption

### A2: Presumption Bad

The presumption debate is good

1. Good for real world decision making when we are faced with uncertainty.

Zarefsky, [David Zarefsky, "Criteria for Evaluating Non-Policy Argument," Advanced Debate, 3rd ed., 1987, p. 392. SK]

I think **our theories of argument would be given greater validity and wider utility by grappling with issues such as the nature of presumption and burden of proof**, the responsibilities of the advocates, the role of the judge, and the nature of "good reasons" in the context of non-policy propositions. And **I think our students would be far better prepared to understand and to apply the argumentative perspective to the wider range of setting in which human beings must make choices under conditions of uncertainty.** SK

#### A2: You chose this side (Aff)

**1. Even if I chose to flip aff, the abuse still exists – im just trying to create better norms for debate**

**2. The fact that I chose to affirm isn’t a reason to negate, at best it functions as terminal defense on the presumption debate, which still makes the round irresolvable. My opponent needs reasons as to why presumption flows neg, or affirm on risk of offense.**

1. <http://fantasydebate.com/ld-national-statistics/> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)