### 1

#### Interpretation: The aff must explicitly specify a comprehensive advocacy text in the 1AC where they clarify how their offense links back to the role of the ballot, is it post-fiat offense or pre-fiat offense and a clear explanation of the advocacy’s actor, action and object

#### Violation: They didn’t

#### Standards:

#### 1. Engagement – Knowing their advocacy is a prerequisite to making meaningful arguments, so its impossible to engage the aff. Our interp ensures that I read something relevant to your method, and knowing pre-fiat or post-fiat offense gives us a standard for what is relevant. This is true of kritikal affs since there is no norm on what “symbolic terrorism” is in the same way there is for what counts as a plan. Few impacts:

#### a) Education – When two ships pass in the night we don’t learn anything - This also guts novice inclusion because now they can never learn arguments in round.

#### b) Link turns the aff – Your impacts are premised on engaging with issues of oppression, but no one will take seriously a position that can’t be clashed with

#### c) Strategy Skew – You can recontextualize your advocacy to make up reasons why my links and offense don’t link in the 1AR

#### Framing: You can’t use the aff to exclude my shell. My shell simply constrains how you read your advocacy. My method is your advocacy with specification, so if I’m winning comparative offense, the shell outweighs even if method debates in general preclude theory.

### 2

#### Interpretation: Cards or evidence read by debaters on must start with the beginning sentence of a paragraph and end with the ending sentence of a paragraph. To clarify, debaters may not cut cards that start or end in the middle of a paragraph.

#### Violation: I’ve inserted the screenshot of what they’ve cut and the actual source

#### A screenshot of a computer Description automatically generated with medium confidenceGraphical user interface, text, application, email Description automatically generated

#### Prefer:

#### Evidence ethics- Full paragraphs must be cut properly and not conceal information, regardless of perceived relevancy. Cutting cards in the middle of a paragraph allows debaters to manipulate evidence and strategically leave out what contradicts with their arguments – putting rest of the uncut paragraph in the doc solves all your offense unless your intent was to cheat which is even worse. You justify debaters cutting “Under Kant, I can kill” from “If a murderer is chasing after me, under Kant, I can kill them.”

#### This is a reason to reject the team—miscutting evidence is academic misconduct that should disqualify any other argument they make in the debate from counting on the record—a brilliant plagiarized paper or speech would still get a zero—the debate community has agreed on what counts as misconduct-

#### Reject appeals to reasonability or intention—

#### 1. Cutting cards in the middle of paragraphs proves the aff is unreasonable and you should not believe any of their appeals

#### 2. Intent is irrelevant— we should be held accountable for the consequences of our actions. This about creating a better MODEL for debate, so you shouldn't accept excuses. ====

#### 3. They shouldn’t get excuses — they are a circuit debater who’s gone into far elims multiple times including Loyola – they also bid here

#### Reject the team—scratching the cards is an insufficient remedy

#### It makes reading unethically cut evidence a no cost option—if they’re caught, they can go for other things, if they’re not caught they get to win on no cost ev

#### 2. Reject the team for deterrence- letting them win despite this encourages the practice. Again this is a model of debate that you endorse, cutting cards in the middle of paragraphs is a terrible model of debate.====

#### 3. Remember, it literally does not matter if you or they personally believe that this was an accident or misunderstanding. It does NOT matter if you think this wasn’t super egregious. This is about precedent and norm-setting. Strake has plenty of resources, they’ve been debating on the circuit for awhile, they are familiar with these norms, there is no excuse.

### 3

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement –

#### A~ anything else moots 7 minutes of the NC – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that their theory of power is better than another before you adopt it.

#### B~ The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true so it's constitutive and jurisdictional. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I've met my burden.

#### C~ it’s the most logical since you don’t say vote for the player who shoots the most 3 points, the better player wins since debate is a game with rules given by how there’s a winner and loser. Answers collapse to truth testing since they require truth value i.e. truth testing is false requires proving that it is true that truth testing is false. Inclusion is a fallacy of origin because just because something is a prerequisite doesn’t make it more important

#### D~ Nothing leaves this round other than the result on the ballot which means even if there is a higher purpose, it doesn’t change anything, and you should just write whatever is important on the ballot and vote for me.

#### E~ 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.

#### F~ 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

### 4

#### Text: Vote Neg to redact the 1AC - the CP does the aff but doesn't say it

#### Solves the Aff – disclosing militant strategies leads to militant crackdowns and the fracturing of undercommon collectivity

Text

Description automatically generated

#### The affirmative advocacy is the plasticization of blackness. They appropriate black suffering for the benefit of subjects within Civil Society. The impact is ontological slippage. Every and any non-black affirmation is anti-black and bad for our health.

Jackson, Zakiyyah Iman. "Losing manhood: Animality and plasticity in the (neo) slave narrative." Qui Parle: Critical Humanities and Social Sciences 25.1-2 (2016): 95-136. (Assistant professor of black feminist theory, literature, and criticism at George Mason University English Department)//Wake AD but re-cut by Elmer

In describing his presumably indispensible role in Mister’s birth, Paul D both identifies with and abjects the hen. Realizing that he had thus far been blind to crucial aspects of slavery’s gendered violence, his initial response was to displace those feelings onto Mister, as Mis- ter has become representative of a loss of the illusion of a proper gendered role. And it is this natality, this irreducible femininity, that Paul D resents, as Mister reminds him of **the plasticity of his manhood, or more precisely that such plasticity represents the impossibility for unqualified manhood to take hold**. Mister momentarily appeared before Paul D as “a blank,” yet with respect to Garner and the gendered symbolic arrangements of slavery more generally, Paul D begins to fear it is actually he who signifies as “a blank” or even that he fails to signify at all (be, 85). This unsettling encounter marks the beginning, not the completion, of Paul D’s meditation on the violent nature of Sweet Home’s ordered hierarchy in the renegotiated terms of an identity’s un/becoming. So if blackness, here, is a natal function rather than an identity or experience, then what/who are black people? The slash conjoining who and what is not there to o end but to open up the question as widely as needed, which Morrison invites us to do, in order to iden- tify whatever answer arises in the narrative. Paul D states, “Even if you cooked him [Mister] you’d be cooking a rooster named Mister. But wasn’t no way I’d ever be Paul D again, living or dead” (be, 86). Paul D is irrevocably changed by the violent terms of his enslave- ment, but into what? The statement about the cooking of Mister recalls the cooking of Sixo—a Sweet Home man burned to death by Schoolteacher. However, Paul D is establishing something more specific, a condition or quality that differentiates these two modes of roasting an other. The enslaved are not only **conscripted by hierarchical economies of commodification, property, and killing**, which would position Paul D and Mister as proxies, but also Paul D’s heart, mind, soul, and flesh are conscripted by and must contend with whatever the master effects. The blackened embodied mind is, therefore, rendered plastic by a demand that includes and exceeds the authorized **killing, consumption, and disposability of fleshly existence**. Paul D’s body, hobbled with a bit in his mouth, is subject to be transmogrified according to purported registers of “animality” and “humanity.” In this act of transmogrification—the changing of something into a different form or appearance (especially a fantastic or grotesque one)—the co- ordinates of the human body are changed into a different shape or form**—bizarre and fantastic**: human personality is made “wild” under the weight of blackness’s production as seemingly pure potentiality. “But wasn’t no way I’d ever be Paul D again, living or dead,” he says (be, 86). Here, Paul D is pointing to the way that the black body and mind are twisted and contorted in a manner indi erent to structures of form, their integrity and limits. So it is not only a body that is stolen but also the becoming of the slave: the slave’s future perfect state of being. The black(ened) can only be defined as plastic: impressionable, stretchable, and misshapen to the point that the mind does not survive—**it goes wild**. We **are well beyond alienation, exploitation, subjection, domestication, and even animalization; we can only describe such transmogrification as a form of engineering**. Slavery’s technologies were not the denial of humanity but the plasticization of humanity. After all, as Paul D learns, slavery is not “like paid labor”; economic labor might actually be incidental to enslavement (be, 165).“Beast of burden” is one of the many forms that Paul D is forced to take, but not the sole form; as Beloved depicts it, the slave’s body is always sub- jected to something else, to forms of domination that are in excess of forced labor. “The slave” is paradigmatically that which shall be appropriated by emerging **demands of the reigning order**, as needed, with no regard for the potential irreparable effects of ontological slippage. Arguably, plasticization is the fundamental violation of enslavement: not any one particular form of violence—animalization or objectification, for instance—but rather coerced formlessness as a mode of domination and the unheimlich existence that is its result.33

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)