### 1

#### Interpretation: The aff must explicitly specify a comprehensive role of the space in the form of a text in the 1AC where they clarify how offense links back to the role of the ballot, such as whether post-fiat offense or pre-fiat offense matters and what constitutes that offense with implications on how to weigh

#### Violation: they don’t

#### Standards:

#### 1. Engagement – Knowing what counts as offense is a prerequisite to making arguments, so its impossible to engage the aff. Our interp ensures that I read something relevant to your method, and knowing how to weigh gives us a standard. Especially true since there is no norm on what “performative engagement” like there is for util offense

#### 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) 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 ROTB to make up reasons why my offense doesn’t link in the 1AR

#### Framing: You can’t use your ROB to exclude my shell. My shell simply constrains how you read your ROTB. My method is your ROTB with specification, so if I’m winning comparative offense, the shell outweighs even if method debates in general preclude theory. If they go for the Aff first that proves the abuse of my shell since they should have specified in the AC.

### 2

#### Interpretation: If debaters claim their cites aren’t working, they must disclose entry titles as a summary of their position. To clarify – instead of saying “The Impossible Bomb,” this can be either the author of your position, the description of the plan text, framework text, or “Lay” or “Stock.”

#### Violation: Graphical user interface, application Description automatically generatedGraphical user interface, text, application, email Description automatically generatedscreenshots in the doc – also if they contest that the you should use the ctrl f test – nowhere in the aff except the title does it say “Impossible Bomb” which means it definitively violates. They also read a lay aff and disclosed it as the structural bomb aff which is incoherent.

#### Standards:

#### 1] Pre-round prep- Prep becomes atrocious when you make people sift through 20 word docs to figure out which links you’re reading and which impacts to prep. Discourages hidden arguments which also hurts disabled people and links into inclusion.

#### 2] Inclusion- key for inclusion since disadvantaged people have computers more prone to lag and even 3 or 4 can crash the program for them—Inclusion is an independent voter because it allows for people to participate and outweighs - accessibility is a multiplier for their impacts. Disclosing a summary as the title of your position solves—people can quickly get a summary and go to open source if they need more information

### 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

#### Negate because either the aff is true meaning its bad for us to clash w/ it because it turns us into Fake News people OR it’s not meaning it’s a lie that you can’t vote on for ethics

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

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

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

#### 4] medicine[[6]](#footnote-6) 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.

#### **1] We’re in a hologram**

Stromberg 15[Joseph Stromberg- “Some physicists believe we're living in a giant hologram — and it's not that far-fetched” <https://www.vox.com/2015/6/29/8847863/holographic-principle-universe-theory-physics> Vox. June 29th 2015] War Room Debate AI

Some physicists actually believe that the universe we live in might be a hologram. The idea isn't that the universe is some sort of fake simulation out of The Matrix, but rather that even though we appear to live in a three-dimensional universe, it might only have two dimensions. It's called the holographic principle. The thinking goes like this: Some distant two-dimensional surface contains all the data needed to fully describe our world — and much like in a hologram, this data is projected to appear in three dimensions. Like the characters on a TV screen, we live on a flat surface that happens to look like it has depth. It might sound absurd. But when physicists assume it's true in their calculations, all sorts of big physics problems — such as the nature of black holes and the reconciling of gravity and quantum mechanics — become much simpler to solve. In short, the laws of physics seem to make more sense when written in two dimensions than in three. "It's not considered some wild speculation among most theoretical physicists," says Leonard Susskind, the Stanford physicist who first formally defined the idea decades ago. "It's become a working, everyday tool to solve problems in physics." But there's an important distinction to be made here. There's no direct evidence that our universe actually is a two-dimensional hologram. These calculations aren't the same as a mathematical proof. Rather, they're intriguing suggestions that our universe could be a hologram. And as of yet, not all physicists believe we have a good way of testing the idea experimentally.

#### 5] Grain Paradox- One grain falling makes no sound, but a thousand grains make a sound. A thousand nothings cannot make something which means the physical world is paradoxical.

#### 6] Arrows Paradox- If time is divided into 0-duration slices, no motion is happening in each of them, so taking them all as a whole, motion is impossible.

### 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

#### 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

### 5

#### CP: Vote neg to endorse the aff without their spelling of “women” and replace it with “womin.”

**WCCC 03** <https://www.msu.edu/~womyn/alternative.html> Woman, Womyn, Wimyn, Womin, and Wimmin: Why the alternatives spellings? Womyn Creating Consciousness Collectively - Alternative Spellings WC3 is a Registered Student Organization at Michigan State University. This organization began as an idea in the Fall of 2001 and with the dedication of four womyn, became a reality in the Spring of 2003 by feminist and activists.  
By taking the “men” and “man” out of the words “woman” and “women” we womin are symbolically saying that we do not need men to be “complete. We, as womyn, are not a sub-category of men. We are not included in many of the history books, studies and statistics that are done in male dominated societies, thus they do not apply to us, for in these items we do not exist. In these societies men are the “norm” and women the “particular,” a mere sub-category of the “norm,” of men. The re-spelling of the word “woman” is a statement that womin we refused to be defined by men. We are womyn and only we have the right to define our relationships with ourselves, society, with other womyn and men. These re-spellings work as a symbolic act of looking at and defining womin ourselves as we really are, not how men and society view them us, but through our own female views of ourselves, as self-defined womyn.

#### Language is a necessary starting point of deconstruction of biases.

**Sani ‘13** [Shehu Sani – Nigerian senator, an author, playwright and a human rights activist. He is President of the Civil Rights Congress of Nigeria - (CRCN). and the Chairman of Hand-in-Hand, Africa. He was a leading figure in the struggle for the restoration of democracy in Nigeria] “Hatred for Black People” November 2013.] MT – Recut

The important point here is that language plays a role in the state's definition and policing of "the epistemological limits of what society can be." Language is not simply a cultural epiphenomenon of more fundamental economic processes. It functions as a "measure of population" setting both the outer limits of society—that is, the question of who legitimately belongs to the national community—and its inner limits or demarcations. The reality is that language is a strong force in society that segregates groups according to specific cultures, sexes, races, classes, etc. The underlying issue that allows language to build up such barriers is the subconscious fight to possess the English language. Language segregates members of society, either forcing them out or accepting them into the larger, accepted group. Languages force people out of the majority, while at the same time segregating them into smaller and smaller groups within their minority. People at each level of society associate and claim a certain type of language that defines their identity. Everyone is trying to define and prove themselves through their use of language, either consciously or subconsciously.

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)
3. https://www.google.com/search?q=of+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=of+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i61l3.1473j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. https://www.google.com/search?q=the+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=the+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i64j69i61j69i60l2.1976j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. https://www.google.com/search?q=reduce+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&sxsrf=AOaemvI3lZsbmnXg5WHeL4m6rYGn8Vf6Aw%3A1630610232638&ei=OCMxYbCaJpO0tQb6wpGoCA&oq=reduce+definition&gs\_lcp=Cgdnd3Mtd2l6EAMyCQgjECcQRhD5ATIECAAQQzIECAAQQzIFCAAQgAQyBQgAEIAEMgUIABCABDIFCAAQgAQyBQgAEIAEMgUIABCABDIFCAAQgAQ6BwgAEEcQsAM6BwgAELADEEM6BwgjEOoCECc6BAgjECc6BQgAEJECOhEILhCABBCxAxCDARDHARDRAzoKCAAQsQMQgwEQQzoHCAAQsQMQQzoICAAQgAQQsQM6CAgAELEDEIMBOgoIABCABBCHAhAUSgQIQRgAUMLMBFjS3QRgnt8EaAJwAngDgAG2A4gB-heSAQozLjExLjEuMi4xmAEAoAEBsAEKyAEKwAEB&sclient=gws-wiz&ved=0ahUKEwiwlru9gOHyAhUTWs0KHXphBIUQ4dUDCA8&uact=5 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. https://www.google.com/search?q=medicine+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=medicine+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59.2986j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)