## 1

#### Interp: Debaters must, on the page with their name and the school they attend, disclose all taglines, full citations, and the first and last three words of each evidence on the NDCA 2021-2022 wiki at least an hour before the round if they’ve read that case before.

**Violation: My opponent hasn’t posted any cites for Palm Classic – I HAVE SCREENSHOTS**

A picture containing text, indoor, white

Description automatically generated

#### Standards:

1] Accessibility – Disclosure allows open-access for cites and small schools can recut evidence others come up with – voting issue to mitigate structural skews which precludes the ability to have a fair debate.

**2] Clash** – Disclosure allows debaters to substantively engage positions rather than relying on sketchy tricks to avoid the discussion – also allows depth since debaters see specific arguments instead of trying to link generics – forces us to defend our positions and voting issue for advocacy skills to engage real change

#### 1 - Drop the debater since dropping the arg is the entire case that wasn’t disclosed – voting for me sets a precedent and deters harmful positions – also no way to rectify abuse since forcing disclosure now won’t fix educational deficits in this round

**2 – Comes before 1AR theory – A – if we had to be abusive its because it was impossible to engage their aff, B – Neg abuse outweighs aff abuse because we control the depth of the debate if we can’t engage depth is impossible**

**3 – Use competing interps on T – a) T is a yes/no question, you can’t be half topical or mostly topical b) reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation. Reasonable limits invite unpredictable intervention, impossible to prep**

**4 – No RVI’s, 1] theory is a gateway issue so it’s illogical to vote them up for being fiar. They also chill theory since people just bait it and get good at defending abusive stuff, especially bad topicality which destroys neg’s ability to check abuse 2] strat skew, allows aff to collapse to theory for 3 minutes in the 2AR, which ) means they get strategic collapse/weighing, and b) I can’t formulate a 2NR strat because I don’t know whether they’ll go for theory heavily in 2AR**

#### T outweighs case – in-round engagement is structured by pre-round abuse – anything else nullifies topicality and insulates their arguments from testing, so presume them false.

#### Drop the debater on T – the entire aff is abusive; at worst, our engagement with every part of it was skewed – anything else greenlights 1AR restart. Literally a one man school, don’t play trix debate

## Case

#### The Role of the Ballot is to vote for whoever does the better debating – any alternative framework must explain why we switch sides, why there has to be a winner and a loser, and why there are structural rules. The frame for evaluating offense is that debate is a game and we’re all here to win – that means procedural questions come first.

#### Vote neg for clash – abdicating government actions sanctions picking any interpretation for debate – incentivizes retreat from controversy and forces the neg to first characterize the aff and then debate it which eliminates the benefit of preround research. A common point of engagement ensures effective clash, which is a linear impact – negation is the necessary condition for distinguishing debate from discussion, but negation exists on a sliding scale. The topic of discussion is up to the affirmative, but depth and nuanced engagement is determined by negative ground. Any impact intrinsic to debate, not just discussion, comes from negation because it starts the process of critical thinking, reflexivity, and argument refinement.