## 1

#### Interpretation: the affirmative debater must disclose the plan text, framework, and advantage area of the 1AC 30 minutes before the round. To clarify, disclosure can occur on the wiki or over message.

#### Violation: they didn’t, check doc for screenshot

#### Graphical user interface, text, application, email Description automatically generated

#### Vote neg for prep and clash – two internal links – a) neg prep – 4 minutes of prep is not enough to put together a coherent 1nc or update generics – 30 minutes is necessary to learn a little about the affirmative and piece together what 1nc positions apply and cut and research their applications to the affirmative b) aff quality – plan text disclosure discourages cheap shot affs. If the aff isn’t inherent or easily defeated by 20 minutes of research, it should lose – this will answer the 1ar’s claim about innovation – with 30 minutes of prep, there’s still an incentive to find a new strategic, well justified aff, but no incentive to cut a horrible, incoherent aff that the neg can’t check against the broader literature.

#### Voters:

#### Fairness: debate is a competitive activity that requires objective evaluation – side constraint to substantive debate.

#### Education: a) it’s the reason schools fund debate and b) it’s the only long-term impact.

#### Paradigm issues:

#### DTD to deter future abuse and rectify time skew from reading theory.

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you don’t win for being fair, and logic is a meta-constraint, b) good theory debaters will bait theory to win on the RVI, which causes abuse, c) chilling effect – makes debaters scared to call out real abuse because they’ll be out-teched on the RVI.

#### Competing interps – a) reasonability is arbitrary and requires judge intervention, b) collapses because brightlines concede an offense-defense paradigm.

## 2

#### 1. Logic: Debate is fundamentally a game with rules, which requires the better competitor to win. Every other ROB is just a reason why there are other ways to play the game but are not consistent enough with the purpose of the game to vote on, just like you don't win a basketball game for shooting the most 3s.

#### 2. Isomorphism: ROBs that aren't phrased as binaries maximize leeway for interpretation as to who is winning offense. Scalar framing mechanisms necessitate that the judge has to intervene to see who is closest at solving a problem. Truth testing solves since it's solely a question of if something is true or false, there isn't a closest estimate.

#### 3. Constitutivism: the ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic and five dictionaries  define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm  as to prove true b) the purpose of debate is the acquisition of knowledge in pursuit of truth – a resolutional focus is key to depth of exploration which o/w on specificity. It's a jurisdictional issue since it questions whether the judge should go outside the scope of the game.

#### 4. text: five dictionaries define negate as to deny the truth of[[1]](#footnote-1). Text comes first – a) Controls the internal link to predictability and prep which is key for clash and substantive education b) Key to jurisdiction since the judge can only endorse what is within their burden c) Even if another role of the ballot is better for debate, that is not a reason it ought to be the role of the ballot, just a reason we ought to discuss it.

## 3

#### Prefer on neg definition choice – the aff should have defined ought in the 1ac because it was in the rez so it’s predictable contestation, by not doing so they have forfeited their right to read a new definition – kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement on a lack of your definition. Also, better since it focuses on real world instances rather than recycling old frameworks and evaluate after the 1N so we both have one speech which is key to reciprocity.

#### Negate:

#### [Negate –

#### 1] Merriam Webster defines ‘member’ as: “a body part or organ[[2]](#footnote-2)”

#### but an organ can’t have obligations

#### 2] of[[3]](#footnote-3) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time

#### 3] the[[4]](#footnote-4) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but the WTO isn’t a disease

#### 4] to[[5]](#footnote-5) is to “expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location)” but the rez doesn’t have a location

#### 5] reduce[[6]](#footnote-6) is to “(of a person) lose weight, typically by dieting” but IP doesn’t have a body to lose weight.

#### 6] for[[7]](#footnote-7) is “in place of” but medicines aren’t replacing IP.

#### 7] medicine[[8]](#footnote-8) is “(especially among some North American Indian peoples) a spell, charm, or fetish believed to have healing, protective, or other power” but you can’t have IP for a spell.

#### [8] In order to say I want to fix x problem, you must say that you want x problem to exist, since it requires the problem exist to solve, which makes any moral attempt inherently immoral.

#### [9] To go anywhere, you must go halfway first, and then you must go half of the remaining distance ad infinitum – thus, motion is impossible because it necessitates traversing an infinite number of spaces in finite time and theory is paradoxical since it uses arguments to justify being unable to make arguments

#### [10] In order to find the answer to a question, you must ask if there is an answer, otherwise asking the question is pointless, but that requires asking whether or not there’s an answer to that question and so forth ad infinitum – this means the quest for knowledge fails and the acquisition of truth is impossible – negate since we can’t ensure resolutional truth value.

#### Permissibility and presumption negate

#### [1] ought implies an obligation but permissibility is a lack of one which means the neg met their burden of disproving an obligation

#### [2] there are infinite ways to prove a statement false which means it’s more likely to be false than true

#### [3] safety – It’s ethically safer to presume the squo since we know what the squo is, but we can’t know whether the aff will be good or not if ethics are incoherent

## Case

#### Reject 1AR Theory They have 7-6 time skew They have two speeches on theory and I have one which is def irreciporcal Its not inf abuse because I only have 7 mins If you don’t buy that, Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is crazy aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to– reasonability checks 2AR sandbagging by preventing crazy abusive 1NCs while still giving the 2N a chance. DTA on 1AR shells - They can blow up a blippy 20 second shell to 3 min of the 2AR while I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention and means 1AR theory is irresolvable so you shouldn’t stake the round on it. No new 1ar theory paradigm issues- A~ the 1NC has already occurred with current paradigm issues in mind so new 1ar paradigms moot any theoretical offense B~ introducing them in the aff allows for them to be more rigorously tested which o/w’s on time frame since we can set higher quality norms.
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