## 1

#### A. Interpretation: : The aff must explicitly specify a comprehensive role of the ballot in the form of a text in the 1AC where they clarify how offense links back to the role of the ballot, such as whether post-fiat offense or pre-fiat offense matters and what constitutes that offense, and how theory operate under their ROB.

#### Multiple ways the AC violates: aff mentions a vague ROB in the form of an impossible standard for the neg with no link to offence

#### C. Standards:

#### 1. Engagement – If I don’t know how the role of the ballot functions, its impossible for me to engage the aff, since knowing what counts as offense for me is a prerequisite to being able to make meaningful arguments that clash with yours. Knowing what a legitimate advocacy is ensures that I read something that is relevant to your method, and knowing how to weigh gives us a standard for what is relevant, This is true of role of the ballots since there is no norm on what “performative engagement”. Few impacts:

#### a) Education – when two ships pass in the night we don’t learn anything, education is derived from analyzing and comparing each other’s arguments, so this theory argument is specifically legitimate.

#### b) Link turns your role of the ballot – your impacts are premised on actually having a debate and engaging with issues of semiocapitalism. Almost impossible to engage roles of the ballot are uniquely bad since no one will take seriously a position that can’t be clashed with, so you harm any progress your position can create.

#### 2. Strat Skew- I cant formulate a Coherent strategy since I don’t know what counts as offense under your ROTB, ruins fairness since you know what counts as offense and I don’t so I will always lose.

#### Framing: You can’t use your ROB to exclude my shell. My shell allows you to read your role of the ballot, it just functionally constrains how you can do that. Additionally, as long as I win comparative offense to my interp it precludes on a methodological level -my method is your ROTB with specification, yours is just the ROTB, so if the former is better it’s a reason to vote for me even if method debates in general preclude theory. Also, if they go for the Aff first that proves the abuse of my shell since they should have specified in the AC.

#### 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. RVI’s cause a chilling effect that discourages legit theory, you had a burden to be fair and educational in the first place

## 2

#### CP Text: Vote negative to inject the affirmative advocacy with a radical loss.

Genosko 16 - Gary Genosko, University of Ontario, Lo Sguardo, 8/29/16 “How to Lose to a Chess Playing Computer According to Jean Baudrillard” [http://www.losguardo.net/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/2017-23-Genosko.pdf] Accessed 9/14/20 SAO

Readers of Baudrillard know that he thought about competition in sport and games in terms of failure and frailty. In For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign, exchange value and symbolic ambivalence are mutually exclusive domains; in the latter, desire is not satisfied through phantasmic completion, and this entails that desire may ride failure to an ignominious counter-victory. Baudrillard found in the failure to react positively to an inducement like winning a race – captured in that bizarre American football phrase appropriated as a handle by Ronald Reagan, «Win One for the Gipper!» – the principle of a radical counter-economy of needs. Losers come in all shades. But radical losers stand apart from the crowd in the virulence of their capacity to radiate loss that they throw down as a challenge. There are those who are irresistibly drawn to blowing it, and others who can taste failure and steal it from the jaws of victory. From the Beatles to Beck, the figure of the loser has fascinated lyricists and theorists alike as not merely sympathetic but as a foundation for a deliberate weakness in the face of overwhelming odds and the false pretenses of victory. Here I revisit Jean Baudrillard’s speculations about computer chess programs, specifically IBM’s Deep and Deeper Blue, and how best to play against them. Drawing on Baudrillard’s theory of loss in sports as an act of contempt for the fruits of victory, institutional accommodation, and the cheap inducements of prestige and glory, I examine how chess masters like Garry Kasparov have met the challenge of the brute force programs – some of which were congealed models of his own play – with appeals to a kind of unforced play and even ‘non-thought’. Considering the malevolent and fictional computer system HAL, as well as Deep Blue and subsequent programs, right up to IBM’s Jeopardy-playing computer ‘Watson’, this paper looks at ways to defeat programming power by critically regaining the counter-technical and (dys)functional skills of the loser.

## 3

**Interpretation – The affirmative must defend that the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust**

**Violation – they don’t**

**Resolved is policy. Louisiana House 05, [Louisiana State Legislature – Legislative Glossary. 3-8- 2005, https://www.legis.la.gov/legis/Glossary.aspx#Reading%20of%20a%20bill]**

**Resolution 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 theconstitutionally required enacting clause; **a resolution uses the term resolved**. Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor&#39;s veto. (Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11, 13.1, 6.8, and 7.4 andSenate Rules 10.9, 13.5 and 15.1)

**Appropriation is “the action of taking something for one's own use, typically without the owner's permission”**

#### Outer space is “the physical universe beyond the earth’s atmosphere” Standards –

**[1] predictable limits and ground—allowing the aff to pick any ground for the debate makes neg engagement impossibly by skirting a predictable starting point, allowing for infinite affs and invalidating prep. Caselists are concessionary, unpredictable, beaten by perms, and don’t justify their** model. The affirmative gives up the skills that come from clash which are key for real world change, they would rather force a negative concession for a ballot.

**[2] Small schools disad: under-resourced are most effected by a massive, unpredictable caselist which worsens structural disparities. Inclusion and accessibility matter– you can't debate if you can't participate which is a prerequisite to accessing their benefits and ensures everyone gains from the activity.**

#### [3] Third, Tactics — their interpretation centers debate on telos without tactics – the left has too many ideas and not enough methods to achieve them – their failure to invest in movement-building cedes the political to a neoliberal will which cements depoliticization and racial violence.

## 4

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

* Theory comes first
* Functions as post fiat offense
* Offense is anything that proves the rez true or flase.

**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.**

## Case

**Productivity is key to improve living standards and accessing luxury**

**Boundless Economics 16** (Boundless economics, “The Importance of Productivity,” <https://www.boundless.com/economics/textbooks/boundless-economics-textbook/economic-growth-20/productivity-98/the-importance-of-productivity-368-12465/> ///ghs-sc)

\*\*\*edited for clarity

Productivity is essentially the efficiency in which a[n] company or economy can transform resources into goods, potentially creating more from less. Increased productivity means greater output from the same amount of input. This is a value-added process that can **effectively raise living standards** through decreasing the required monetary investment in everyday necessities (and luxuries), making consumers wealthier (in a relative sense) and businesses more profitable. From a broader perspective, increased productivity increases the power of an economy through driving economic growth and satisfying more human needs with the same resources. Increased gross domestic product (GDP) and overall economic outputs will drive economic growth, improving the economy and the participants within the economy. As a result, economies will benefit from a deeper pool of tax revenue to draw on in generating necessary social services such as health care, education, welfare, public transportation and funding for critical research. The benefits of increasing productivity are extremely far-reaching, benefiting participants within the system alongside the system itself. Productivity Beneficiaries To expand upon this, there are three useful perspectives in which to frame the value in improving productivity within a system from an economic standpoint: Consumers/Workers: At the most micro level we have improvements in the standard of living for everyday consumers and workers as a result of increased productivity. The more efficiency captured within a system, the lower the required inputs (labor, land and capital) will be required to generate goods. This can potentially reduce price points and minimize the necessary working hours for the participants within an economy while retaining high levels of consumption. Businesses: Businesses that can derive higher productivity from a system also benefit from creating more outputs with the same or fewer inputs. Simply put, higher efficiency equates to better margins through lower costs. This allows for better compensation for employees, more working capital and an improved competitive capacity. Governments: Higher economic growth will also generate larger tax payments for governments. This allows governments to invest more towards infrastructure and social services (as noted above).

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)