### Non-Disclosure is a Voting Issue

#### Interpretation: Affirmatives must promptly disclose any aff that has been broken by their team.

#### There’s a whole bunch of violations. First, I contacted them immediately after pairings came out. They left me on read for two thirds of the total pre-round prep time while I spent that entire time prepping the aff actually disclosed on their wiki.

#### Second, twelve minutes before the start time, they told me it’s new. The aff is not new. Not only has it been broken by their team before, they’ve been reading this consistently for multiple topics.

#### Only eight minutes before start time did they finally indicate what the aff is, which is less than 20% of the total pre-round prep allotted by the Blake tournament.

#### This is an egregious violation of standard community practice and the compound nature of the violations suggests a clear pattern of intentional evasiveness that you should not write off as an accidental oversight.

#### Non-disclosure is a voting issue. None of their claims can be adequately tested without the ability to engage. This is doubly true for non-topical affs where the neg’s pre-round topic prep will not apply. It turns any in-round impact of their aff because they subvert meaningful discourse on the matter. It also means they shouldn’t get to cross-apply the case because those truth claims have not been tested and should be presumed false.

#### Drop the debater. The abuse has already occurred and I spent 30 minutes prepping the wrong aff that I can never get back. Sorry doesn’t sweeten my tea.
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## TFW

#### The aff *must* defend the consequences of implementing a topical plan.

#### The role of the ballot is to determine the efficacy of a topical proposal relative to the status quo or a competing option

#### Your aff might allude to the topic but it isn’t topical

#### First is fairness – debates about scholarship in a vacuum are myopic and breed reactionary generics – they allow the aff to cement their infinite prep advantage, because all the aff has to do is find evidence supporting an ideological orientation towards the world – this crushes clash because all of our prepared negative strategies are based on praxis, and by not defending a clear actor and mechanism we lose 90% of negative ground, and the aff still retains traditional competition standards like perms to make being neg impossible - Fairness is an intrinsic good and key to the mechanisms of debate

#### Second is ground: defending a personal survival strategy forces the 1nc to negate your identity – that forces me to make terrible neg arguments that deny a personal strategy for you – the ballot becomes a referendum on identity rather than a contestable thesis point which is messed up

#### Third is a TVA: you can read a version off the aff that discusses how compulsory voting solves for the harms of the aff – if they argue that doesn’t solve or has issues that proves my fairness claim all their deficits to a TVA are neg arguments allowing for ground and clash

#### Switch side debate solves your offense – read it as a kritik on the negative

#### Fourth is Topic education

#### These skills are tremendously valuable for movement building and challenging injustice but require engagement with a well-prepared opponent

Talisse 5 – Professor of Philosophy @ Vandy (Robert, Philosophy & Social Criticism, “Deliberativist responses to activist challenges,” 31(4) p. 429-431)

The argument thus far might appear to turn exclusively upon different conceptions of what reasonableness entails. The deliberativist view I have sketched holds that reasonableness involves some degree of what we may call epistemic modesty. On this view, the reasonable citizen seeks to have her beliefs reﬂect the best available reasons, and so she enters into public discourse as a way of testing her views against the objections and questions of those who disagree; hence she implicitly holds that her present view is open to reasonable critique and that others who hold opposing views may be able to offer justiﬁcations for their views that are at least as strong as her reasons for her own. Thus any mode of politics that presumes that discourse is extraneous to questions of justice and justiﬁcation is unreasonable. The activist sees no reason to accept this. Reasonableness for the activist consists in the ability to act on reasons that upon due reﬂection seem adequate to underwrite action; discussion with those who disagree need not be involved. According to the activist, there are certain cases in which he does in fact know the truth about what justice requires and in which there is no room for reasoned objection. Under such conditions, the deliberativist’s demand for discussion can only obstruct justice; it is therefore irrational. It may seem that we have reached an impasse. However, there is a further line of criticism that the activist must face. To the activist’s view that at least in certain situations he may reasonably decline to engage with persons he disagrees with (107), the deliberative democrat can raise the phenomenon that Cass Sunstein has called ‘group polarization’ (Sunstein, 2003; 2001a: ch. 3; 2001b: ch. 1). To explain: consider that political activists cannot eschew deliberation altogether; they often engage in rallies, demonstrations, teach-ins, workshops, and other activities in which they are called to make public the case for their views. Activists also must engage in deliberation among themselves when deciding strategy. Political movements must be organized, hence those involved must decide upon targets, methods, and tactics; they must also decide upon the content of their pamphlets and the precise messages they most wish to convey to the press. Often the audience in both of these deliberative contexts will be a self-selected and sympathetic group of like-minded activists. Group polarization is a well-documented phenomenon that has ‘been found all over the world and in many diverse tasks’; it means that ‘members of a deliberating group predictably move towards a more extreme point in the direction indicated by the members’ predeliberation tendencies’ (Sunstein, 2003: 81–2). Importantly, in groups that ‘engage in repeated discussions’ over time, the polarization is even more pronounced (2003: 86 Hence discussion in a small but devoted activist enclave that meets regularly to strategize and protest ‘should produce a situation in which individuals hold positions more extreme than those of any individual member before the series of deliberations began’ (ibid.) 17 The fact of group polarization is relevant to our discussion because the activist has proposed that he may reasonably decline to engage in discussion with those with whom he disagrees in cases in which the requirements of justice are so clear that he can be conﬁdent that he has the truth. Group polarization suggests that deliberatively confronting those with whom we disagree is essential even when we have the truth. For even if we have the truth, if we do not engage opposing views, but instead deliberate only with those with whom we agree, our view will shift progressively to a more extreme point, and thus we lose the truth. In order to avoid polarization, deliberation must take place within heterogeneous ‘argument pools’ (Sunstein, 2003: 93). This of course does not mean that there should be no groups devoted to the achievement of some common political goal; it rather suggests that engagement with those with whom one disagrees is essential to the proper pursuit of justice. Insofar as the activist denies this, he is unreasonable.