## 1

#### A: Debaters must have only one potential standard that, at any point in the round, can function as a mechanism for providing offense. To clarify, They may not claim that a specific impact transcends their standard and is the biggest impact back to “any standard”.

#### B-Violation: They read a value criterion of consequentialism and then assert that extinction impacts come first under all ethical theories.

#### C- Standards

#### 1. Resolvability:

#### 2. Ground:

#### 3. Clash:

#### D. Voter: Fairness first and it’s a voter

#### 1] Fairness is constitutive process of debate since debate is a game with a winner and loser, speech times, etc. - Constitutive Rules means any DA to our interpretation are inevitable and terminally non-unique 2] Self Defeating- All the 1ar's arguments assume that the judge will evaluate them fairly which concedes it's authority- actively hack against them

#### Education is a voter because it is the only long term benefit we get out of debate and it is the reason why schools fund debate in the first place. Drop the debater to solve for in round abuse, deter future abusive practices, and because substance is skewed as I have been forced to spend time on theory.

#### Use competing interps because it is the only method that allows us to quantify and weigh the abuse and because reasonability requires intervention by asking the judge to determine the threshold for abuse.

## 2

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolutional statement is true or false:

**1. Inclusion: a) other ROBs open the door for personal lives of debaters to factor into decisions and compare who is more oppressed which causes violence in a space where some people go to escape. b) Anything can function under truth testing insofar as it proves the resolution either true or false. Specific role of the ballots exclude all offense besides those that follow from their framework which shuts out people without the technical skill or resources to prep for it.**

**2. Constitutivism: The ballot asks you to either vote aff or neg based on the given resolution a) Five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true which means its intrinsic to the nature of the activity b) the purpose of debate is the acquisition of knowledge in pursuit of truth. It’s a jurisdictional issue since it questions whether the judge should go outside the scope of the game.**

**All Independent Voters must be addressed individually. You can’t just deny them on face, they all have individual reasons why they negate.**

1. **I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I have met my burden.**
2. **Resolution is non- sensical.**

**Prefer Semantics, the resolution must be evaluated if it logically makes sense prior.**

1. **“States” is defined as “the particular condition that someone or something is in at a specific time” (Oxford) but something/someone in a particular condition at a specific time can never make any action.**
2. **“To” is defined as “indicate movement” (Merriam Webster) but that means the resolution is incoherent because the word ought cannot move to the word be – they’re both abstract concepts.**
3. **“Math: reciprocity necessitates aff arguments only matter within reciprocal times. And the reciprocal of 4 minutes is 1/4 of a minute.**

## 3

#### Justifying util is an independent voter –

#### 1. Util justifies atrocities since it justifies allowing us to harm some for the benefit of others – even if they spew some pain quantifiability argument that doesn’t solve since there are still instances some get great benefit from others harm.

#### 2. Util can’t justify intrinsic wrongness – We can’t know whether our action was good until we’ve evaluated the states of affairs they’ve produced since it’s based on the outcome of the action. Probability doesn’t solve because that just allows for moral error and freezes action while attempting to calculate the perfect decision.

#### 3. Util justifies death good – the absence of pleasure is not bad since there is no life to calculate its lossed value and experience its absence but the lack of pain is actively good even if that good cannot be enjoyed by anyone because it would still have net value.

#### Two Impacts:

#### [2] They read morally repugnant arguments. Thus the alternative is to drop the debater, to ensure that debate remains a space safe for all – the judge has a proximal obligation to ensure inaccessible practices don’t proliferate. Accessibility is a voting issue since all aff arguments presuppose that people feel safe in this space to respond to them.

## 4

Interpretation: Debaters must have all their cards highlighted in yellow/green, anything else harms colorblind debaters.

Violation: All their cards are highlighted in blue< I am a colorblind debater

Standards-

1. Time skew- you have a doc to read every word I said off of, and I cant read off your doc, I have to spend more time in CX and Prep creating a time screw ruinign fairness.
2. I cant engage with arguments I cant read- lack of engagement ruins education.

CA voters

1. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Dictionary.com – maintain as true, Merriam Webster – to say that something is true, Vocabulary.com – to affirm something is to confirm that it is true, Oxford dictionaries – accept the validity of, Thefreedictionary – assert to be true* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)