# 1NC v Chan :D

## 1

#### Interpretation: Aff debaters must tell the neg debater which aff they are reading before the round

Graphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generated

Violation: They don’t

1] Bait and switch

2] Prep and clash

#### Education is a voter since it is the only portable and durable skill that influences our subject formation. Fairness is a voter since a] debate is a game, competition equity matters proven by desire for wins, b] is worthless without rules and equal access.

#### Drop the debater – a] deters future abuse through a loss and b] set better norms for debate since you are less likely to repeat a practice you can lose for

#### Competing interps – [a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear model of debate, [b] it creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate through offense [c] offense defense paradigm is the best method for evaluation since you can compare benefits under both interps easier.

#### No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, if logic isn’t true then you should hack against them, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices

## 2

#### Interp: If debaters wikis arent working they have to contact their opponent and let them know Vio - Pre emotive A 1NC time skew B Back to substance debate

## 3

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all constructive positions on open source with highlighting on the 2021-22 NDCA LD wiki after the round in which they read them.

#### Violation – screenshots in the doc prove I do and they don’t

A screenshot of a computer

Description automatically generated with medium confidence

#### Debate resource inequities—you’ll say people will steal cards, but that’s good—it’s the only way to truly level the playing field for students such as novices in under-privileged programs.

#### 2] Evidence ethics – open source is the only way to verify pre-round that cards aren’t miscut or highlighted or bracketed unethically. That’s a voter – maintaining ethical ev practices is key to being good academics and we should be able to verify you didn’t cheat

#### 3] Depth of clash – it allows debaters to have nuanced researched objections to their opponents evidence before the round at a much faster rate, which leads to higher quality ev comparison – outweighs cause thinking on your feet is NUQ but the best quality responses come from full access to a case.

## 4

#### Interp: If the affirmative defends anything other than “Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.” then they must provide a counter-solvency advocate for their specific advocacy in the 1AC. (To clarify, you must have an author that states we should not do your aff, insofar as the aff is not a whole res phil aff)

#### Violation

#### Prefer

#### 1. Limits – there are infinite things you could defend outside the exact text of the resolution which pushes you to the limits of contestable arguments, even if your interp of the topic is better, the only way to verify if it’s substantively fair is proof of counter-arguments. Nobody knows your aff better than you, so if you can’t find an answer, I can’t be expected to. Our interp narrows out trivially true advocacies since counter-solvency advocates ensure equal division of ground for both sides.

#### 2. Research – Forces the aff to go to the other side of the library and contest their own view points, as well as encouraging in depth-research about their own position. Having one also encourages more in-depth answers since I can find responses. Key to education since we definitionally learn more about positions when we contest our own.

## Case

#### Presumption - there is no relationship between voting aff and their advocacy or solvency – ontology means its cruel optimistic to think voting aff does anything.

#### 1] They have zero solvency – merely mentioning disfluency isn’t a coherent warrant to disrupting affective structures

#### A] They aren’t radical - they still follow debate trends like spreading, cutting cards in highlighted formats, etc, which means they play the game just as much so you can vote neg but recognize the aff is a goo idea

#### B] Competitive incentives distort it - They read kant in other rounds and tricks on the neg prove that their scholarship and advocacy won’t be taken seriously or spill up

#### C] They read disclosure and then don’t disclose to disabled debaters which proves they aren’t accessible or aligned

#### 2] it is agency denying to say you don't get to deserve this space. Disabled debaters who see it as home away from physical/social location and denying people that space is inherently violent

#### 3] Even if you're right about how debate works - reactionary pushback from Larpers mean that losing ballots on T go home they just read heg good instead of framework

#### A] Losing rounds doesn’t have to do with truth-value

#### B] They still hire coaches and try to improve – like how we are both coached by massa

#### 4] Being unfair doesn’t destroy debate – it just sustains the hiearchry – ask yourself whether disabled debaters could ever engage with this aff which turns their offense

#### They are going to go for this argument that being unfair is solvency for them but if we win that theory was a prior question it proves engagement was impossible