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# \*\*VOTERS\*\*

## DEEP LEARNING

#### Deep learning re-organizes values by rigorously comparing them, leading to practical problem solving skills that transcend any individual situation. Portable knowledge outweighs. LOMBARDO:

Tom Lombardo [Professor Emeritus, Director of Center for Future Consciousness] – Ethical Character Development and Personal and Academic Excellence. 2011. Center for Future Consciousness. Accessed through the Wisdom Page. “Deep learning involves… associated with wisdom (Bransford, Brown, and Cocking, 2000; Lombardo, 2006c).”

Deep learning involves getting the big picture—a synthesized and comprehensive understanding of a domain of study, rather than simple surface learning of a set of disconnected facts. Whereas surface learning never penetrates to the core ideas of a learner, deep learning penetrates and affects the learner’s fundamental values and beliefs. Deep learning involves [through] conceptual re-organization; in surface learning nothing of importance in the learner’s mind changes. Deep learning is carried into the future and affect[ing]s decisions and problem solving; deep learning transfers from the original learning situation to new situations. Surface learning is the opposite—it doesn’t transfer. Deep learning empowers the individual. Deep learning is achieved through thinking about the subject matter; surface learning involves rote memorization. In fact, deep learning means that a person can think about the new ideas learned and can think with these ideas—[so] the new knowledge becomes operational; it is active and useable knowledge. Surface learning is inert, floating on the surface of the mind, and a person’s thinking processes and problem solving do not incorporate the new knowledge. Hence, deep learning creates practical knowledge—knowledge that can be used—whereas surface learning is the accumulation of trivia. Deep learning also connects with self-awareness, reflection, and meta-cognition: when individuals engage in deep learning, they think about their own thinking processes and beliefs. Surface learning occurs without self-reflection. Finally, deep learning is usually associated with an intrinsic motivation to learn and the associated emotional affect is positive. Surface learning is extrinsically motivated (e.g., to pass a test) and the associated emotional affect is frequently negative, involving anxiety, fear, and stress. Deep learning is an active and exhilarating process; surface learning is more passive and often felt as mere drudgery. All these qualities of deep learning apply to the type of knowledge associated with wisdom (Bransford, Brown, and Cocking, 2000; Lombardo, 2006c).

The evaluation of these arguments is the same as the evaluation of any other theory voter. I am just contextualizing what type of education is most valuable.

**[Thus, fairness is not the most important.]**

## EDUCATION [GENERIC]

1. The only lasting benefit from debate is education. It is the reason why many people join the event, so assuring it isn’t destroyed is key.
2. Schools are funded by educational programs, so it is only logical that the event stays educational.
3. Education is inherently important to debate because it gives debaters skills that can be utilized outside of rounds. Strait and Wallace explain,

L. Paul **Strait** (George Mason University) **and** Brett **Wallace** (George Washington University). “The Scope of Negative Fiat and the Logic of Decision Making.” WFU Debater’s Research Guide. **2007**.

**Education is the most important thing any debater will receive from the activity. Regardless of rounds won or lost, knowledge gained from** years of **researching and arguing about different issues will give individuals a great deal** of information. **Debate also educates students about how to properly construct arguments, how to speak in public, how to analyze arguments and quickly think of substantive responses, all of which are tools that can be applied in any aspect of life outside of debate.** The more debaters who think they can win rounds by avoiding the topic, the less educational value received in each round and in the activity as a whole.

Education is more important than Fairness because: ***[SEE FULL FILE]***

# \*\*THEORY FRAMEWORK\*\*

## DROP THE DEBATER [GAME THEORY]

#### Game theory models show that punishment creates a fairer game overall, especially when replicated.

H. Brandt, C. Hauert, and K. Sigmund. "Punishment and Reputation in Spatial Public Goods Games." *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London - Biological Sciences*. 2003. 270 (1099-1104).

The previous scenarios assumed players operating under full anonymity. However, in more realistic scenarios relating to higher organisms and in particular to humans, players may accumulate information about their environment and specifically about potential future interaction partners. Similar to the conditioning of the punishment activity, each **player[s]** maythen **condition** his **cooperative effort on the punishing behaviour of his fellows** in other interactions. In particular, **[A] cooperator** who knows he is **matched with** two **non-punishers could** be tempted totake advantage of the situation by temporarily **switch**ing **to defection without having to fear punishment. In that sense, all players carry some sort of reputation reflecting their strategic character.** Through observations of third-party interactions and gossip, a player’s reputation may become known to others. Therefore, we assume that, with a probability *m*, a cooperator learns about the punishing behaviour of its co-players and at the same time succumbs to the temptation when faced with two non-punishers. In well-mixed populations with random encounters, reputation can promote and stabilize the social strategy G1 (Sigmund *et al.* 2001; Hauert *et al.* 2003). A complementary case occurs if, with a probability *n*, **defectors who learn that they** are up against **[will be] punishe[d]**rs are sufficiently intimidated and **cooperate.** We shall not consider this effect here, because it turns out to be less important. For *m >* 0, interactions between G1 and G4 are no longer neutral. Indeed, G4 performs worse because any G1 or G4 player matched with two G4 players will occasionally defect and this lowers the overall score of G4 players. Reputation preserves the bistability introduced by punishment and further increases the range of *r* feasible for cooperation by slightly lowering the threshold to *rc* < 1.25 (see figure 3). As before, the paradoxical G2 strategy quickly vanishes and, for *r* in the vicinity of *rc*, the time evolution sensitively depends on the initial configuration, i.e. on the presence of a sufficiently large G1 cluster. Actually, the value of *rc* is essentially determined by the performance of G1 against G3 . Reputation strengthens the position of G1 because these players now occasionally refrain from cooperation when matched with two G3s. In contrast to these minor changes near *rc*, significant changes are observed for higher *r*. **Reputation clearly [ensures]** promotes the social strategy G1 and reduces the mild players to a small minority, so **that invading defectors are reliably punished** and quickly eliminated.

#### **Prefer this argument for four reasons: *[SEE FULL FILE]***

## RVI GOOD [GENERAL]

**Short version:** If I win offensive reasons for why I’m winning theory I should win the round - not because I’m following the rules but rather that a) I’m advancing the best interpretation for debate and b) I was forced to waste my time engaging the theory debate instead of defending my offense. Theory cannot be a no risk issue for debaters or they would simply run it to waste their opponent’s time and always have a structural advantage in that they could not lose on it. The structure of competing interpretations necessarily demands that theory be a time suck, even if they didn’t intend it.

**Shell:**

**A. Interpretation:** If debaters run theory and I meet the interpretation or gain offense on theory then I should win the round.

**B. I meet.**

**C. Standards.**

***[SEE FULL FILE]***

# \*\*POLICY ARGUMENTS\*\*

50 STATE COUNTERPLAN GOOD

**A. Counter-interpretation:** If the affirmative debater fiats that the USFG do the resolutional action, the negative debater may fiat that the 50 states do the resolutional action as opposed to the USFG

B. I meet.

C. Standards:

1. Real world applicability:

The current political tides are shifting towards state rights. It is more realistic to consider policy implementation through the lens of individual state implementation rather than federal implementation. The United Press International illustrates this with the example of the Supreme Court,

UPI - 2011, Supreme Court Sets New Federalism Boundary, June 16 <http://www.upi.com/Top_News/US/2011/06/16/Supreme-Court-sets-new-federalism-boundary/UPI-45321308241642/?spt=hs&or=tn>

**The U.S. Supreme Court Thursday ruled unanimously a defendant can use state sovereignty to challenge a federal conviction when it involves her own rights**. When Carol Anne Bond, of the Philadelphia area, found out her close friend was pregnant by Bond's boyfriend, she began harassing the woman, court records say. The other woman suffered a minor burn when Bond put caustic substances on objects the woman was likely to touch. Bond was indicted under a federal law that bans "knowing possession or use, for non-peaceful purposes, of a chemical that 'can cause death, temporary incapacitation or permanent harm to humans'" -- part of a federal act implementing a chemical weapons treaty ratified by the United States." A federal judge refused Bond's motion to dismiss the federal charges on the grounds that the statute exceeded Congress' constitutional authority. Bond entered a "conditional" guilty plea, reserving the right to appeal.A federal appeals court in Philadelphia rejected Bond's 10th Amendment claim, saying she had no standing. But the **Supreme Court, in a unanimous opinion written by Justice Anthony Kennedy, said [the defendant]** Bond "**ha[d]**s **standing to challenge the federal statute on grounds that the measure interferes with the powers reserved to states**. ... (A lawyer appointed to defend the law, once the administration withdrew) contends that for Bond **to argue the national government has interfered with state sovereignty in violation of the 10th Amendment is to assert only a state's legal rights and interests. But in arguing that the government has acted in excess of the authority that federalism defines, Bond seeks to vindicate her own constitutional interests."**

Real world applicability is key to civic education because it ensures we contextualize our policy making to how we can realistically participate in politics and express our voices. This is also key to education derived from critical thinking because learning about politics forces us to consider the best ways to pursue the passage of plans.

2. Turn ground:

Multi-state fiat increases aff turn ground by providing the aff with fifty unique places to turn. Each state would implement the policy individually so there would be greater opportunities to generate offense. Federal government fiat is uniform and does not provide these opportunities. This is key to fairness because my interpretation provides the aff with a huge opportunity to counter-act the aff time disadvantage and gain new sources of offense to win. Turn ground is also key to education because debating about all of the different problems with state implementation of policies forces us to consider how we can participate in state politics and if state implementation vs. federal implementation is preferable.

# \*\*TRUTH-TESTING POSITIONS\*\*

## NIBS BAD

A. Interpretation: Both debaters may only derive offense that proves the truth or falsity of resolution from a sufficient standard that they advocate or their opponents’ standard. A standard is defined as an ethical theory that can speak to the truth and falsity of all normative statements without the use of an external decision calculus. This means no necessary but insufficient burdens.

B. Violation:

C. Standards:

1. Resolvability: Multiple NIBs make the debate irresolvable. If each debater wins one, you can’t compare the two and they are both a priori reasons to vote, so there is no link to a decision calculus. Truth is not a decision calculus unless discussed within a framework, since statements can’t be “a priori” true or false in a vacuum. Resolvability is the strongest impact back to fairness because without it, there IS no way to make a decision.
2. Reciprocity: His arguments aren’t quantitatively reciprocal because I have to win each one decisively before the case debate even matters and they aren’t qualitatively reciprocal since I can’t turn them, for the converse of the statement that the resolution is nonsensical is that it is logical, which isn’t sufficient for me to win. Each NIB gives him a 3 to 1 advantage since he can win the case, win the NIB, or win both. Reciprocity maintains equal avenues to access the ballot.
3. *[A2 Skep]* Ground: To beat his arg, I need 100% defense since there’s no way to turn “morality doesn’t exist” in a way that would a priori affirm. He’ll always have a risk of offense since all I can do is play defense, he’ll ALWAYS win.

### A2 You can run NIBs too

1. Aff undermining an assumption of negating doesn’t mean you affirm, so NIBs on the neg are nonsensical.
2. Neg would run theory if I had a prioris or NIBs in the AC, so telling me I could have been retroactively unfair doesn’t make any sense.
3. Aff can’t anticipate a prioris since they don’t link to the aff standard, whereas neg can react to them if they’re in the AC, so the abuse is more severe in the neg world.

### A2 Theory is also a NIB

1. *[Explain how the interp is specific to substantive offense and why that solves]*
2. Arguing for RVIs on theory solves whereas nothing solves against substantive NIBs since I can’t change the rules of logic to make it no longer insufficient.
3. It’s not my fault. Theory is self-inflicted since they’re the ones being abusive.
4. Theory is evaluated prior to substance, so it doesn’t have to function in the same way.
5. Theory is reciprocal since both sides have the burden to be fair.

### A2 NIBs are real world

*[The first answer answers non-normative NIBs like skep]*

1. The only NIBs that are real world are normative NIBs like deontological and constitutional constraints. However, these are not unfair because they’re turn-able insofar as they are normative [you can link turn them or impact turn them]. You can’t turn skep into an offensive reason to vote for you. Non-normative NIBs like the existence of morality are unfair because of this AND are not real world because we don't presuppose any metaphysical reality to morality [or justice, or numbers, etc.] in the real world.
2. In the real world, those concerns are still out-weighable. For example, we can say that we have to violate a constitutional right to prevent nuclear war. The way his/her NIB is being articulated isn’t real world because he/she phrases it as not weighable.

## SKEPTICISM BAD [FAIRNESS – GENERAL]

**A. Interpretation:** Both debaters must concede that some actions are objectively normatively preferable to others except in cases of presumption.

**OR**

**A. Interpretation:** If the aff concedes that some actions are objectively normatively preferable to others except in cases of presumption, the neg must concede the same.

**OR**

**A. Interpretation:** Debaters may not run skepticism if the implication is that nothing is morally preferable to anything else.

**B. Violation:**

**C. Standards:**

1. Strategy skew:

1. Aff offense doesn’t interact because it’s a generic indict independent of specific arguments I make that functions externally to the framework, forcing a 1AR restart. Thus, neg has a 13/7 advantage and it’s a no risk issue so I can’t even strategically use what little time I have left. Skep is also functionally a pic out of the resolution’s evaluative term, which kills my strat because there are \_ words in the resolution that I have to defend whereas I can’t pic out of his advocacy, giving him a \_ to 1 advantage. Just getting rid of the argument exacerbates the abuse by incentivizing the neg to sit down on substance when I’ve already lost time. Other impacts don’t matter if I can’t engage in arguments in the first place because my arguments would be less developed simply as a function of a lack of time.

***[SEE FULL FILE]***