

AT: Tricks

Notes...

...From TDH

Hi all! This is a file brought to you by the Debate Hotline for use by LD novices and intermediates getting into circuit debate. Circuit debate often involves tricks, theory, critiques, and the numerous interactions that come with those intersecting at the many different role of the ballots (RotBs) that come with them. This file provides a simple introductory resource to use in the most complicated and complex type of debate: tricks debate. This file will mainly be from the standpoint of someone not looking to engage in tricks debate. If it is the other way around, please wait for further resource drops.

As a note, this file should not be used as an end-all-be-all file in every instance. In some instances, it will be more beneficial to truly understand the aff/neg tricks and come up with unique, novel responses to them that will throw opponents off. This is simply an introductory basis to aid with prep and basic understanding. But with that being said . . . enjoy the resource drop! Thank you!

AT: Truth Testing

Comparative Worlds

The role of the ballot is to evaluate the desirability of the resolution by comparing the world of the aff to the world of the neg:

1. Constitutivism:

(a) "Resolved" is

A legislative instrument that generally is used for making declarations, stating policies, and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; a resolution uses the term "resolved". Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor's veto. (Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11, 13.1, 6.8, and 7.4 and Senate Rules 10.9, 13.5 and 15.1)

That's LSA 5, Governing body of the state of Louisiana (Louisiana State Legislature, 2005, "Legislative Glossary," <https://www.legis.la.gov/legis/Glossary.aspx>)

(b) "Affirm" means

to publicly show your support for an opinion or idea:

That's Cambridge ND, Cambridge Dictionary (Cambridge Dictionary, ND, "affirm," <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/affirm>)

to state clearly one's support for (an idea or belief)

That's Collins ND, Collins Dictionary (Collins Dictionary, ND, "affirm," <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english-thesaurus/affirm>)

(c) "Negate" means

: to cause to be ineffective or invalid

That's Merriam ND, Merriam-Webster (Merriam-Webster, ND, "negate," <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>)

2. to make ineffective

That's Collins ND, Collins Dictionary (Collins Dictionary, ND, "negate," <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/negate>)

(d) "Ought" means

Ought modal verb [+ to infinitive] (DUTY) used to say that it is necessary or desirable to perform the action expressed in the verb:

That's Cambridge ND, Cambridge Academic Content Dictionary (Cambridge Dictionary, ND, "ought," Cambridge University Press, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/ought>)

2. Ground – truth testing forecloses CPs and Ks which eviscerates neg engagement and educational testing.

3. Resolvability – NIBs and tricks can't be weighed. That devolves to irresolvable rounds and intervention which guts education – comparative worlds solve.

4. Hijack – truth can only be determined by comparing the world in which something is true to a world in which it is false.

AT: Constitutivism

1. **No Impact** – CPs, Theory, and Ks are **all illegitimate** according to the NSDA, but **no one adheres**.
2. **Wrong** – “affirm” and “negate” **aren’t** written on the resolution.

AT: Isomorphism

1. Resolvability – weighing two conceded truth claims becomes impossible under truth testing which creates irresolvable rounds.
2. Hijack – (XT 4 Point).

AT: Bindingness/Hijack

Hijack – (XT 4 Point).

AT: Paradoxes

General

Reject paradoxes – they're called paradoxes because they're questions of logic that aren't actual situations – any other substantial reason to (affirm/negate) comes prior.

AT: Good Samaritan Paradox

Non-sequitur – we simply resolve a pre-existing issue in the status-quo – we wish it didn't exist.

AT: Arrow's Paradox

Arrow is wrong – you can't divide time into non-existent '0 duration' intervals.

AT: Decision-Making Paradox

Doing the aff requires only one decision because every other decision has already been made.

AT: Bonini's Paradox

Empirical claim without an empirical warrant – models simplify complex systems.

AT: Tricks

AT: Resolved Trick

They read the adjective of “resolved”, its contextual meaning is

A legislative instrument that generally is used for making declarations, stating policies, and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; a resolution uses the term “resolved”. Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor's veto. (Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11, 13.1, 6.8, and 7.4 and Senate Rules 10.9, 13.5 and 15.1)

That’s LSA 5, Governing body of the state of Louisiana (Louisiana State Legislature, 2005, “Legislative Glossary,” <https://www.legis.la.gov/legis/Glossary.aspx>)

AT: Eval After (xxx)

1. Grammar – evaluating after (xxx) means evaluating in the speeches after that which can be interpreted as evaluating the entire debate.
2. Fairness – evaluating after (xxx) arbitrarily jettisons other speeches and limits engagement.

AT: Condo Logic

1. **Grammar** – the resolution isn't an if-then statement, and the antecedent and consequent aren't related like condo logic requires.
2. **Fairness** – debaters arbitrarily connecting antecedent-consequent statements takes the role out away from the judge which decks (aff/neg) engagement.

AT: Indexicals

1. **Voting Issue** – justifies affirming under racist and morally repugnant indexes.
2. **Triggers Presumption** – justifies negating under specific indexes too.
3. Winning any other framework takes it out – debate requires a normative ethic to justify doing the aff which means individual opinions are insufficient.

AT: Trivialism

1. Voting Issue – Trivialism says that statements like “Holocaust Good” are true – that’s morally repugnant.

2. Triggers Presumption – means that the converse of the resolution is also true.

AT: Kabay 1

1] The burden of proof is on them to prove trivialism — their arg is incoherent since we can prove trivialism is false without proving every single proposition is false since altriv doesn’t state every arg is false

2] Role of speech is meaningless – debate is evaluated on the arguments made

AT: Kabay 2

1] Turn – proves propositions like ‘trivialism is false’ is true which creates a paradox between the two

2] Propositions like altriv can be justified without proving triv is true — i.e. ‘trivialism is false’

AT: Kabay 3

1] Denial can still be possible bc for them to win that it doesn’t matter they need to win trivialism in the first place but that’s offense bc it proves that our denial of trivialism proves it as a proposition false

2] I did appear to the round, arguments are evaluated post-contestation in the 2AR

AT: Explosive Liar

1] Conflates truth of the sentence and if the sentence is right or wrong which means that the sentence could be true and still be wrong

2] Contradictions negate – they prove it’s impossible too generate statements if the opposite disproves it – i.e. trivilaism and altriv

3] premise 1 and 2 do not follow each other since if L is true then it is the case that L is true

4] reject this syllogism since it takes a jump from 2 to 3, 2 doesn't mention anything about trivialism

AT: Curry’s Paradox

1] Assumes there’s a precedent in the resolution but there isn’t

2] Turn – If A is true, then trivialism is false also proves that trivialism is always false

AT: Contradictions Affirm

1] law of noncontradiction is wrong - statements can contradict each other with the moving of time ie. the sky is blue and sky is black depends on different times of the day but are true - that takes out the explosion and means they cant cross apply

2] linguistic statements don't reflect material truth - even if the sky is blue is true right now it doesn't mean that it materially is - its how we perceive it which proves their theory devolves to egoism

AT: Possibilism

1] possibilism requires scientific evidence that there first exists other worlds in which trivialism is true - you cannot use a priori facts to influence decisions in the a posteriori because that wouldn't doesn't intrinsically exist

2] the 4th premise is wrong and makes a jump because they haven't proven that world W is the same as our actual world

Theory

Oral Citations Theory

Note: This is meant to be if they read a line that includes “[x] dictionaries define . . .” and proceed to insert [x] number of definitions in the footnotes of the document.

Interp:

Oral source citation. **In all debate events, contestants are expected to, at a minimum, orally deliver the following when introducing evidence** in a debate round: primary **author(s) name** (last) **and year of publication**. Any other information such as source, author’s qualifications, etc., may be given, but is not required. Should two or more quotations be used from the same source, the author and year must be given orally only for the first piece of evidence from that source. Subsequently, only the author’s name is required. Oral citations do not substitute for the written source citation. The full written citation must be provided if requested by an opponent or judge.

That’s NSDA 24, National Speech and Debate Association (NSDA, “High School Unified Manual 2024-25,”

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1hq7-DE6ls2ryVtOttxR4BNpRdP7xUbBr0M3SMYefek8/edit?tab=t.0>)

They violate – they didn’t.

Prefer:

1. Constitutivism – it’s straight from the NSDA Manual which guides judging and debating – most constitutive and jurisdictional.

2. Plagiarism – reading evidence without offering a verbal citation discredits the authors. Academic dis-integrity is a voter – debate is a research activity and violating honor codes is a d-rule.

DTD – deters future abuse and sets norms.

Use C/I – sets the best norms, and reasonability invites intervention and collapses due to use of offense-defense.

No RVIs – they’re illogical in the context of preset NSDA rules.

Win Condition Theory

Interp: debaters must allow a win condition for the opposing debater(s).

They violate – they (xxx).

Prefer:

1. Infinite Abuse – incentivizes affirmatives to race to the margins to make arguments that are impossible to answer or repugnant like “Holocaust Good”. Accessibility outweighs – it’s a pre-requisite to the activity.

2. Clash – crushes any argumentation and engagement which decks all education. It outweighs – it’s the only reason debate is funded.

DTD – deters future abuse and sets norms.

Use C/I – sets the best norms, and reasonability invites intervention and collapses due to use of offense-defense.

No RVIs – they’re illogical in the context of preset NSDA rules.