# Yale Round 3

## 1

**Interp: The affirmative must only defend the hypothetical enactment of the resolution “Resolved: The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines”**

**Resolved means a policy**

**Words and Phrases 64** Words and Phrases Permanent Edition. “Resolved”. 1964.

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

**Vote neg for limits: their model has no resolutional bound and creates the possibility for literally an infinite number of 1ACs. Not debating the topic allows someone to specialize in one area of the library for 4 years giving them a huge edge over people who switch research focus ever 2 months. Cutting negs to every possible aff wrecks small schools, which has a disparate impact on under-resourced and minority debaters. Counter-interpretations are arbitrary, unpredictable, and don’t solve the world of neg prep because there’s no grounding in the resolution**

**Fairness outweighs –**

**[1] it’s an intrinsic good – debate is a game that requires rules to evaluate it--it ensures a structure to make their aff heard and to deny fairness’s value is a performative contradiction since you obviously cared about other rules such as speech times. If fairness didn’t matter, you should just hack against them and evaluate their arguments unfairly, making responses circular**

**[2] Link turns their education offense – getting to the third and fourth level of tactical engagement is only possible with refined and well-researched positions connected to the resolutional mechanism. Repeated debates over core issues incentivize innovative argument production and improved advocacy based on feedback and nuanced responses from opponents.**

**[3] Probability – The role of individual debate rounds on broader subject formation is white noise – can you remember what happened in Yale round 3? – individual rounds don’t affect our subjectivity, so fairness is the only impact your ballot can resolve. You should presume all their truth claims false because they have not been properly tested**

**Terminal defense to their model –**

**[1] TVA solves - \_\_. Disads to the TVA prove it true since it proves there is neg ground**

**[2] SSD solves - read it when you negate for the same content education**

**[3] Discuss your aff out of round when people are willing to listen and not make dumb arguments for the W**

**Drop the debater - severance kills 1NC strat construction—1AR restart favors aff since it’s 7-6 time skew and they get 2 speeches to my one. Competing interps - a) reasonability’s arbitrary & forces judge intervention especially with 2ar recontextualizations to always sound like the more reasonable debater b) norm setting - we find the best possible norms c) reasonability collapses - you use offense/defense paradigm to evaluate brightlines. This means Even if their aff is answerable, the ones they incentivize are not which means you presume the worst possible affs because people inevitably want to be as abusive as possible for the win and they create a model of self care**

**No rvi’s or impact turns -**

**[1] they’d purposefully be abusive to bait us into reading bad arguments and can drill it a lot chilling us from checking abuse**

**[2] You shouldn’t win for being T - if you win T is a bad thing then its at most just a reason we should drop it to let us learn from our mistakes**

**[3] Only reason we read T is because we were pigeonholed and had nothing else to read**

**[4] T just says the aff is a bad idea like any other argument, under their logic every argument for why the aff is a bad idea would also be an independent voter**

**[5] We don’t force you to do anything - we just propose a norm that can be subject to change**

**No 1ar theory or independent voters: you get 2ar ethos to blow up a 20 second shell we overcover and responses to my counter interp will be new causing intervention.**

## 2

**Interp: Debaters must disclose tournaments on the 2021-2022 NDCA LD wiki under the actual name of the tournament on tabroom for every round at said tournament.**

**Violation: The names are “Grapevine Classic” and “Yale University Invitational 2021” on tab**

<https://www.tabroom.com/index/tourn/index.mhtml?tourn_id=20620>

<https://www.tabroom.com/index/tourn/index.mhtml?tourn_id=20393>

****

**The standard is inclusion - they make debate inaccessible to novices or small schools who compete on the circuit but don’t have access to resources or have knowledge of debate lingo to know the shorthand nicknames for tournaments. Two internal links to accessibility - 1) lets debaters see if you won or lost on tab going for specific strategies or hitting specific strategies, letting debaters adapt around that and b) lets debaters see what speaks judges gave to help them see how good you were at going for x argument. Independently links into reciprocity since if I disclosed one way and you didnt’ you had the advantage in this round. Outweighs - none of their standards matter if debaters can’t access them and means reasonability is uniquely wrong since even a 1% risk of exclusion is bad, you obviously don’t say some level of exclusion is justif****ied**