

Disclosure – Nueva CS

1NCs

1NC Paragraph

Failure to disclose cites and full text of all broken case positions on the NDCA wiki is a voting issue – we asked them to disclose yesterday and they haven't – we have screenshots that prove.

1 – Research – disclosure increases research and gets rid of anti-educational arguments because debaters are forced to prepare cases knowing that people will have answers AND people get the opportunity to research answers to disclosed cases.

Nails 13 - (Jacob [I am a policy debater at Georgia State University. I debated LD for 4 years for Starr's Mill High School (GA) and graduated in 2012.] "A Defense of Disclosure (Including Third-Party Disclosure)" <http://nsdupdate.com/2013/a-defense-of-disclosure-including-third-party-disclosure-by-jacob-nails/>) GHS GB

I fall squarely on the side of disclosure. I find that the largest advantage of widespread disclosure is the educational value it provides. First, **disclosure streamlines research.** Rather than every team and every lone wolf researching completely in the dark, **the wiki provides a public body of knowledge that everyone can contribute to and build off of.** Students can look through the different studies on the topic and choose the best ones on an informed basis without the prohibitively large burden of personally surveying all of the literature. The best arguments are identified and replicated, which is a natural result of an open marketplace of ideas. Quality of evidence increases across the board. In theory, the increased quality of information [this] could trade off with quantity. If debaters could just look to the wiki for evidence, it might remove the competitive incentive to do one's own research. Empirically, however, the opposite has been true. In fact, a second advantage of **disclosure** is that it **motivates research.** **Debaters cannot expect to make it a whole topic with the same AC** – that is, unless they are continually updating and frontlining it. Likewise, **debaters with access to their opponents' cases can do more targeted and specific research.** Students can go to a new level of depth, researching not just the pros and cons of the topic but the specific authors, arguments, and advocacies employed by other debaters. The incentive to cut author-specific indicents is low if there's little guarantee that the author will ever be cited in a round but high if one knows that specific schools are using that author in rounds. In this way, disclosure increases incentive to research by altering a student's cost-benefit analysis so that the time spent researching is more valuable, i.e. more likely to produce useful evidence because it is more directed. In any case, if publicly accessible evidence jeopardized research, backfiles and briefs would have done LD in a long time ago. Lastly, and to my mind most significantly, **disclosure weeds out anti-educational arguments.** I have in mind the sort of theory spikes and underdeveloped analytics whose strategic value comes only from the fact that the time to think of and enunciate responses to them takes longer than the time spent making the arguments themselves. If [theory spikes] these arguments were made on a level playing field where each side had equal time to craft answers, they would seldom win rounds, which is a testimony to the real world applicability (or lack thereof) of such strategies. A model in which arguments have to withstand close scrutiny to win rounds creates incentive to find the best arguments on the topic rather than the shadiest. Having transitioned from LD to policy where disclosure is more universal, I can say that **debates are more substantive, developed, and responsive when both sides know what they're getting into prior to the round**. The educational benefits of disclosure alone aren't likely to convince the fairness-outweighs-education crowd, but I've learned over the course of many theory debates that most of that crowd has a very warped and confusing conception of fairness. Debaters who produce better research are more deserving of a win. **Debaters who make smart arguments and defend them should win** out over debaters who hide behind obfuscation. That so many rounds these days are resolved on frivolous theory and dropped, single-sentence blips suggests that wins are not going to the "better debaters" in any meaningful sense of the term. The structure of LD in the status quo doesn't incentivize better debating.

The impact is education – research is key to our ability to a) actually learn about the topic and become engaged in the real world and b) process large amounts of information, which is a necessary portable skill in the digital age.

2 – Clash – Two internal links.

a) Engagement – disclosure allows substantive engagement through prepping out specific arguments rather than relying on sketchy tricks to avoid the discussion.

b) Specificity – debaters can see specific arguments disclosed instead of trying to respond to nuanced warranting with generic arguments.

Two impacts.

a) Fairness – clash means arguments are better tested and the best argument wins which is the metric for a good debater

b) Education – clash is the only kind of education unique to debate and forces us to actually defend our positions, which we need to actually promote social change to fix screwed up things in the real world.

3 – Argument quality – Two internal links.

a) Foreknowledge – A world without disclosure rewards debaters for running arguments not because they are good, but because their opponents won't know how to respond. Disclosure forces debaters to commit to quality; under my interpretation, debaters would have to write cases knowing that their opponents will have the opportunity for thoughtful preparation.

b) Cross-pollination — Debaters can use and modify the best ideas from each other's wikis, ultimately leading to development of the best version of the argument.

The impact is education -- it's key to our ability to actually understand the best arguments in the topic literature.

4 – Inclusion – Two internal links.

a) Intel – otherwise schools with big programs who bring more students and judges and are better connected will scout more rounds and have more flows; disclosure equalizes that intel disparity.

b) Research – disclosure forces big, wealthy programs to put their prep on the wiki – that means everyone has access to the best, paywalled evidence, and also keeps smaller programs up-to-date on the meta.

5 – Evidence ethics – disclosure allows debaters to check each other's evidence before the round instead of needing to use prep to do so, meaning it's easier to find misconstrued evidence – misconstruing evidence is academic dishonesty and prevents actual engagement with the literature.

The implication is that they should lose – the ballot should be used to set a precedent in favor of a positive model of debate – wins and losses determine the direction of activity so teams losing for bad practices incentivizes them and other teams to disclose in the future. Theory is an a priori question – it's about whether their arguments should be included in the round in the first place.

Competing Interpretations – two reasons.

1 – No Difference – debaters or judges assert an arbitrary standard to determine the bright line to reasonability, or we debate over what the bright line is, which collapses into competing interpretations.

2 – Hacking – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters exploit a judge's tolerance for questionable argumentation.

We'll preempt a couple arguments –

They'll say people will just steal prep –

1 – we only need you to disclose the text of the card, not the highlighting or the paraphrase – people still have to do work to parse the card, decide it's strategic, highlight it, etc.

2 – impact turn – in the squo big schools with lots of intel can steal cards anyway off of flows they get, so it's just a question of whether smaller schools can access that game.

3 – briefs and round recordings mean there's no uniqueness to the education impact – if people want free ev they can get it in either world.

They'll say it hurts small schools who can't prep out as many arguments –

1 – no uniqueness – big schools have access to basically whatever flows they want anyway with more judges and more connections – it's a question of whether small schools get access to that game.

2 – no uniqueness again – there's already an incentive to do as much prep as possible – disclosure lets prep be more targeted instead of having to prep answers to every card ever written by anyone on the internet which reduces the research burden necessary to compete.

They'll say there's no critical thinking in a world of prepouts –

1 – no uniqueness again – debate is already a game about prepouts – that was above.

2 – the core critical thinking in-round comes from picking back-half strats – people are mostly reading blocks in rebuttal anyway – not making people disclose blocks still preserves that.

3 – link turn – you have longer to think critically about answers to arguments in a world of disclosure – 2 minutes of prep isn't enough to do in depth critical analysis.

They'll say theory is bad in pf – it's necessary to ensure a better activity – out-of-round discussion doesn't solve because a) debate is a game so people will only change their action in response to pressure and b) it's less accessible because it's gated based on things like who's at camp – no one has ever changed a significant norm of debate because of reddit, sorry Allen.

They'll say we're in bad faith –

1 – we texted them a day before the tournament – we had no strategic incentive to do so and it gave them a ton of time to prep answers.

2 – we've been disclosing for two years and this is only fifth round reading theory – it definitely isn't strategic of to be the only team giving away our prep in exchange for four ballots, especially when those are flow ballots who we're statistically likely to pick up anyway.

3 – we've made a genuine effort to engage in this discourse at camp, on r/debate, and in CX – spending our time outside of round on those discussions probably proves we care.

1NC Long

A. Interpretation: Debaters must, on a page on the NDCA wiki with their name and the school they attend, disclose the taglines, full citations, and the full text of the card of any pieces of evidence which they have read in their case in a previous round before the coinflip.

B. Violation: They have not posted cites: we can provide screen shots if necessary. We'll preempt the we meet – they don't have a page now, but they can contact paperless debate to get one – the wiki's been out since October; that's what we did.

C. Net Benefits:

1 – Research – disclosure increases research and gets rid of anti-educational arguments because debaters are forced to prepare cases knowing that people will have answers AND people get the opportunity to research answers to disclosed cases.

Nails 13 - (Jacob [I am a policy debater at Georgia State University. I debated LD for 4 years for Starr's Mill High School (GA) and graduated in 2012.] "A Defense of Disclosure (Including Third-Party Disclosure)" <http://nsdupdate.com/2013/a-defense-of-disclosure-including-third-party-disclosure-by-jacob-nails/>) GHS GB

I fall squarely on the side of disclosure. I find that the largest advantage of widespread disclosure is the educational value it provides. First, **disclosure streamlines research.** Rather than every team and every lone wolf researching completely in the dark, **the wiki provides a public body of knowledge that everyone can contribute to and build off of.** Students can look through the different studies on the topic and choose the best ones on an informed basis without the prohibitively large burden of personally surveying all of the literature. The best arguments are identified and replicated, which is a natural result of an open marketplace of ideas. Quality of evidence increases across the board. In theory, the increased quality of information [this] could trade off with quantity. If debaters could just look to the wiki for evidence, it might remove the competitive incentive to do one's own research. Empirically, however, the opposite has been true. In fact, a second advantage of **disclosure** is that it **motivates research.** **Debaters cannot expect to make it a whole topic with the same AC** – that is, unless they are continually updating and frontlining it. Likewise, **debaters with access to their opponents' cases can do more targeted and specific research.** Students can go to a new level of depth, researching not just the pros and cons of the topic but the specific authors, arguments, and advocacies employed by other debaters. The incentive to cut author-specific indicents is low if there's little guarantee that the author will ever be cited in a round but high if one knows that specific schools are using that author in rounds. In this way, disclosure increases incentive to research by altering a student's cost-benefit analysis so that the time spent researching is more valuable, i.e. more likely to produce useful evidence because it is more directed. In any case, if publicly accessible evidence jeopardized research, backfiles and briefs would have done LD in a long time ago. Lastly, and to my mind most significantly, **disclosure weeds out anti-educational arguments.** I have in mind the sort of theory spikes and underdeveloped analytics whose strategic value comes only from the fact that the time to think of and enunciate responses to them takes longer than the time spent making the arguments themselves. If [theory spikes] these arguments were made on a level playing field where each side had equal time to craft answers, they would seldom win rounds, which is a testimony to the real world applicability (or lack thereof) of such strategies. A model in which arguments have to withstand close scrutiny to win rounds creates incentive to find the best arguments on the topic rather than the shadiest. Having transitioned from LD to policy where disclosure is more universal, I can say that **debates are more substantive, developed, and responsive when both sides know what they're getting into prior to the round.** The educational benefits of disclosure alone aren't likely to convince the fairness-outweighs-education crowd, but I've learned over the course of many theory debates that most of that crowd has a very warped and confusing conception of fairness. Debaters who produce better research are more deserving of a win. **Debaters who make smart arguments and defend them** from criticism **should win** out over debaters who hide behind obfuscation. That so many rounds these days are resolved on frivolous theory and dropped, single-sentence blips suggests that wins are not going to the "better debaters" in any meaningful sense of the term. The structure of LD in the status quo doesn't incentivize better debating.

Research skills impacts to education because it's key to our ability to a) actually learn about the topic and become engaged in the real world and b) process large amounts of information, which is a necessary portable skill in the digital age.

2 – Clash – Two internal links.

a) Engagement – disclosure allows substantive engagement through prepping out specific arguments rather than relying on sketchy tricks to avoid the discussion.

b) Specificity – debaters can see specific arguments disclosed instead of trying to respond to nuanced warranting with generic arguments.

Clash is key to fairness because it means arguments are better tested and the best argument wins which is the metric for a good debater and to education because a) it's the only kind of education unique to debate and b) it forces us to defend positions, which we need to actually promote social change to fix screwed up things in the real world.

3 – Argument quality – Two internal links.

a) Foreknowledge – A world without disclosure rewards debaters for running arguments not because they are good, but because their opponents won't know how to respond. Disclosure forces debaters to commit to quality; under my interpretation, debaters would have to write cases knowing that their opponents will have the opportunity for thoughtful preparation.

b) Cross-pollination — Debaters can use and modify the best ideas from each other's wikis, ultimately leading to development of the best version of the argument.

Argument quality impacts to education because it's key to our ability to actually understand the best arguments in the topic literature.

4 – Inclusion – Two internal links.

a) Intel – otherwise schools with big programs who bring more students and judges and are better connected will scout more rounds and have more flows; disclosure equalizes that intel disparity.

b) Research – disclosure forces big, wealthy programs to put their prep on the wiki – that means everyone has access to the best, paywalled evidence, and also keeps smaller programs up-to-date on the meta.

5 – Evidence ethics – disclosure allows debaters to check each other's evidence before the round instead of needing to use prep to do so, meaning it's easier to find misconstrued evidence.

D. Voters:

1 – Education – it's the reason schools find debate and the only portable skill of debate.

2 – Fairness – debate is a competition and fairness indicts your ability to determine the winner.

3 – Inclusion – it prevents teams from accessing any benefit of debate in the first place.

4 – Evidence ethics – misconstruing evidence is academic dishonesty and prevents actual engagement with the literature.

Drop the debater – two reasons.

1 – No Difference – It's the same as dropping the argument since the argument is the entire case that wasn't disclosed.

2 – Norm-setting – Voting for us sets a precedent in favor of a positive model of debate—wins and losses determine the direction of activity.

Competing Interpretations – two reasons.

1 – No Difference – debaters or judges assert an arbitrary standard to determine the bright line to reasonability, or we debate over what the bright line is, which collapses into competing interpretations.

2 – Hacking – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters exploit a judge's tolerance for questionable argumentation.

No RVIs – two reasons.

1 – Baiting – RVIs incentivize debaters to coerce theory with abusive practices and big prepouts, killing substantive clash on other flows.

2 – Counterbalancing – Any abuse on T cuts both ways, loss of substance on the aff is checked by the lack of offense and time skew on the neg.

1NC Short

A. Interpretation: Debaters who are aware of the existence of the NDCA wiki must, on a page on the NDCA wiki with their name and the school they attend, disclose the taglines, full citations, and the full text of the card of any pieces of evidence which they have read in their case in a previous round at least one hour before the round.

B. Violation: They have not posted cites: we can provide screen shots if necessary.

C. Net Benefits:

1 – Argument quality – Two internal links.

a) Foreknowledge – A world without disclosure rewards debaters for running arguments not because they are good, but because their opponents won't know how to respond. Disclosure forces debaters to commit to quality; under my interpretation, debaters would have to write cases knowing that their opponents will have the opportunity for thoughtful preparation.

b) Cross-pollination — Debaters can use and modify the best ideas from each other's wikis, ultimately leading to development of the best version of the argument.

Argument quality is a voter because debate is a unique space in which we need to have in-depth education about important issues.

2 – Inclusion – Two internal links.

a) Intel – otherwise schools with big programs who bring more students and judges and are better connected will scout more rounds and have more flows; disclosure equalizes that intel disparity.

b) Research – disclosure forces big, wealthy programs to put their prep on the wiki – that means everyone has access to the best, paywalled evidence, and also keeps smaller programs up-to-date on the meta.

Inclusion is a voter because it's a prerequisite to accessing any benefit of debate.

3 – Evidence ethics – disclosure allows debaters to check each other's evidence before the round instead of needing to use prep to do so, meaning it's easier to find misconstrued evidence. Evidence ethics is a voter because misconstruing evidence is academic dishonesty and prevents actual engagement with the literature.

Drop the debater – two reasons.

1 – No Difference – It's the same as dropping the argument since the argument is the entire case that wasn't disclosed.

2 – Norm-setting – Voting for us sets a precedent in favor of a positive model of debate—wins and losses determine the direction of activity.

1NC – Preempts

We'll preempt a couple arguments –

They'll say people will just steal prep –

1 – we only need you to disclose the text of the card, not the highlighting or the paraphrase – people still have to do work to parse the card, decide it's strategic, highlight it, etc.

2 – impact turn – in the squo big schools with lots of intel can steal cards anyway off of flows they get, so it's just a question of whether smaller schools can access that game.

3 – briefs and round recordings mean there's no uniqueness to the education impact – if people want free ev they can get it in either world.

They'll say it hurts small schools who can't prep out as many arguments –

1 – no uniqueness – big schools have access to basically whatever flows they want anyway with more judges and more connections – it's a question of whether small schools get access to that game.

2 – no uniqueness again – there's already an incentive to do as much prep as possible – disclosure lets prep be more targeted instead of having to prep answers to every card ever written by anyone on the internet which reduces the research burden necessary to compete.

They'll say there's no critical thinking in a world of prepouts –

1 – no uniqueness again – debate is already a game about prepouts – that was above.

2 – the core critical thinking in-round comes from picking back-half strats – people are mostly reading blocks in rebuttal anyway – not making people disclose blocks still preserves that.

3 – link turn – you have longer to think critically about answers to arguments in a world of disclosure – 2 minutes of prep isn't enough to do in depth critical analysis.

They'll say theory is bad in pf – it's necessary to ensure a better activity – out-of-round discussion doesn't solve because a) debate is a game so people will only change their action in response to pressure and b) it's less accessible because it's gated based on things like who's at camp – no one has ever changed a significant norm of debate because of reddit, sorry Allen.

They'll say we're in bad faith –

1 – we texted them a day before the tournament – we had no strategic incentive to do so and it gave them a ton of time to prep answers.

2 – we've been disclosing for two years and this is only fifth round reading theory – it definitely isn't strategic of to be the only team giving away our prep in exchange for four ballots, especially when those are flow ballots who we're statistically likely to pick up anyway.

3 – we've made a genuine effort to engage in this discourse at camp, on r/debate, and in CX – spending our time outside of round on those discussions probably proves we care.