## 1

#### Interpretation—the aff must disclose the plan text, framework, and advantage area 30 minutes before the round. To clarify, disclosure can occur on the wiki or over message.

#### Violation – they didn’t – they responded 8 minutes before round with minimal info – screenshots in the doc.

A screenshot of a computer

Description automatically generated

A screenshot of a computer

Description automatically generated

Graphical user interface, text, email

Description automatically generated

#### Standards:

#### 1] Neg prep—4 minutes of prep isn’t enough to put together a coherent 1nc or update generics—30 minutes is necessary to learn about the affirmative, piece together what 1nc positions apply, and research their applications to the affirmative.

#### 2] 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.

#### 3] Level playing field – I’m from a small school with 2 entries and no coaching – we have limited prep and disclosure is key to pre-round adaptation. Big schools can collect flows, and craft prep-outs while we’re left in the dark.

#### 4] Strategy – disclosure helps novices understand the context in which positions are read by good debaters and help with brainstorming potential args– helps compensate for lack of prep among small schools.

#### 5] Engagement – Having an idea of what the aff is going to go for means I can read an NC contextual to the round and incentivizes clash.

#### Voters:

#### Fairness – key to objective evaluation and a safe space for all. Debaters wouldn’t compete if the activity wasn’t fair – outweighs educations since debate participation controls the internal link to topic education.

#### Alienation – the neg is uniquely alienating to small-school debaters who will struggle to bid without disclosure which kills equity in the debate space.

#### Drop the debater – a] deter future abuse, b] set better norms for debate and c] we indict the entire advocacy – dta makes no sense.

#### Competing interps – [a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm, [b] it creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate.

#### No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices.

#### No 1ar theory –

#### 1] Time skew – Forces me to answer the shell, which distracts from substance – substantive clash is k2 education and 1ar theory distracts from it.

#### 2] Judge intervention – I only have 1 speech to answer it and no 3NR which means that the judge has to intervene and decide if my answers were good enough after taking into account to 2ars lies.

#### 3] Reciprocity – I only have once chance to respond after it is introduced while they have two chances

#### 4] Persuasive spin in the 2ar appeals to judges more ows on judge psychology bc they will always win that debate

## 2

#### A. Interpretation: The aff must specify a comprehensive role of the ballot and clarify how the round will play out under that role of the ballot in the form of a text in the 1AC. To clarify, the aff must:

#### 1. Clarify how we determine what a legitimate advocacy is and how offense links back to the role of the ballot, such as whether topicality constrains the aff advocacy or not.

#### 2. Every plank of the ROB must be warranted, just like the standard text for a normative ethical theory, and what area of debate must be warranted i.e. which assumptions we should accept and which we shouldn’t.

#### 3. Clarify what theoretical objections do and do not link to the aff, and whether or not the aff comes before theory.

#### 4. Describe how to weigh and compare between competing advocacies i.e. whether the role of the ballot is solely determined by the flow or another method of engagement.

#### B. Violation:

#### C. Standards:

#### 1. Engagement – If I don’t know how the role of the ballot functions, its impossible for me to engage the aff, since knowing what counts as offense for me is a prerequisite to being able to make meaningful arguments that clash with yours. Knowing what a legitimate advocacy is ensures that I read something that is relevant to your method, and knowing how to weigh gives us an explicit standard for what is relevant, preventing superficial clash where we each make vacuous preclusion claims. This is uniquely true of role of the ballots since there is no communal norm on what “preformative engagement” is in the same way there is for what counts as util offense. Few impacts:

#### a) Education – when two ships pass in the night we don’t learn anything, education is derived from analyzing and comparing each other’s arguments, so this theory argument is specifically legitimate. Not being able to crystallize on one issue is the definition of bad education. CHOKSHI:

Niraj Chokshi is a former staff editor at TheAtlantic.com, where he wrote about technology. He is currently freelancing How Do We Stop the Internet From Making Us Stupid? JUN 8 2010 <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2010/06/how-do-we-stop-the-internet-from-making-us-stupid/57796/>

When it comes to focus, turning on the spotlight may not matter as much as our ability to dim the ambient light. Nicholas Carr argued on Saturday in The Wall Street Journal that the Internet is making us dumber and on Monday The New York Times had a front-page feature on the mental price we pay for our multi-tasked lifestyles. If we are indeed losing our ability to think deeply, the key to fighting back may lie in a subtlety: focus may be more about our ability to filter out distractions than our ability to home in on the issue at hand. Carr posed his idea that technology is making us stupid in a 2008 Atlantic cover story and his forthcoming book "The Shallows" is a longer rumination on the theory. According to professors and research cited in The Times piece "the idea that information overload causes distraction was supported by more and more research." And those distractions, according to research Carr cites, are forcing us to change the way we think. Deep thought is losing ground to superficiality. So, if our multitasking lifestyle causes distraction, and distraction leads to superficial thinking, how do we fight back? Carr offers some advice:

#### b) Resolvability – if there is no engagement determining which arguments come first is impossible so the judge can’t resolve the round. This comes first- judge needs to be able to resolve who is winning under your role of the ballot, so even if that precludes theory in general, resolving the round is a gateway issue.

#### c) Having clearly defined parameters and guidelines on the role of the ballot debate is a prerequisite to debate itself. SHIVELY:

Shively, Michael [Prof Politics at Texas A&M]. “Partisan Politics and Political Theory” (p.181-2)

The ambiguists must say "no" to—they must reject and limit—some ideas and actions. In what follows, we will also find that they must say "yes" to some things. In particular, they must say "yes" to the idea of rational persuasion. This means, first, that they must recognize the role of agreement in political contest, or the basic accord that is necessary to discord. The mistake that the ambiguists make here is a common one. The mistake is in thinking that agreement marks the end of contest—that consensus kills debate. But this is true only if the agreement is perfect—if there is nothing at all left to question or contest. In most cases, however, our agreements are highly imperfect. We agree on some matters but not on others, on generalities but not on specifics, on principles but not on their applications, and so on. And this kind of limited agreement is the starting condition of contest and debate. As John Courtney Murray writes: We hold certain truths; therefore we can argue about them. It seems to have been one of the corruptions intelligence by positivism to assume that argument ends when agreement is reached. In a basic sense, the reverse is true. There can be no argument except on the premise, and within a context, of agreement. In other words, we cannot argue about something if we are not communicating: if we cannot agree on the topic and terms of argument or if we have utterly different ideas about what counts as evidence or good argument. At the very least, we must agree about what it is that is being debated before we can debate it. For instance, one cannot have an argument about euthanasia with someone who thinks euthanasia is a musical group. One cannot successfully stage a sit-in if one's target audience simply thinks everyone is resting or if those doing the sitting have no complaints. Nor can one demonstrate resistance to a policy if no one knows that it is a policy. In other words, contest is meaningless if there is a lack of agreement or communication about what is being contested. Resisters, demonstrators, and debaters must have some shared ideas about the subject and/or the terms of their disagreements. The participants and the target of a sit-in must share an understanding of the complaint at hand. And a demonstrator's audience must know what is being resisted. In short, the contesting of an idea presumes some agreement about what that idea is and how one might go about intelligibly contesting it. In other words, contestation rests on some basic agreement or harmony.

#### 2. Strategy Skew – You make formulating a strategy impossible since I don’t know what links to your evaluative mechanism. My interp means we know what a legitimate neg advocacy is, otherwise you can make up reasons mine doesn’t link to the role of the ballot in the next speech, and by specing a weighing mechanism I can know to make the most relevant arguments so you can’t arbitrarily preclude them in the next speech. If I go for a policy action and then you say the AC is about speech acts then I lose any ability to engage in that new framing in the 2nr since I didn’t know how it functioned in the 1NC. Links to substantive engagement because I don’t know how to effectively engage in your position.

#### Further, warranting every plank prevents the aff from arbitrarily excluding certain offense with unwarranted planks, taking away advocacies crucial to my strategy. Finally, knowing how the aff functions with regard to theory prevents a double bind where I’m screwed strategically since if I read theory you’ll just claim the aff comes first and if I don’t you can collapse to 1ar theory. Strategy skew is key to fairness since it’s the way we access the ballot.

#### Framing: You can’t use your ROB to exclude my shell. My shell allows you to read your role of the ballot, it just functionally constrains how you can do that. Additionally, as long as I win comparative offense to my interp it precludes on a methodological level -my method is your ROTB with specification, your is just the ROTB, so if the former is better it’s a reason to vote for me even if method debates in general preclude theory. Also, if they go for K first that proves the abuse of my shell since they should have specified in the AC.

#### D. Voter:

#### Vote on fairness because debate’s a game that needs rules, and education because that’s why schools fund it. Use competing interps because reasonability is arbitrary which causes intervention which is definition-ally unfair.

## 3

#### Interp: debaters must use comic sans as their font in their speech docs.

#### Violation – the doc is in \_\_\_

#### Prefer -

#### Inclusion – comic sans is easiest to read for people with dyslexia.

**Hudgins 17** “Hating Comic Sans Is Ableist” Lauren Hudgins Feb 23, 2017 <https://medium.com/the-establishment/hating-comic-sans-is-ableist-bc4a4de87093> OHS-AT

The irregular shapes of the letters in Comic Sans allow her to focus on the individual parts of words. While many fonts use repeated shapes to create different letters, such as a “p” rotated to made a “q,” Comic Sans uses few repeated shapes, creating distinct letters (although it does have a mirrored “b” and “d”). Comic Sans is one of a few typefaces recommended by influential organizations like the British Dyslexia Association and the Dyslexia Association of Ireland. Using Comic Sans has made it possible for Jessica to complete a rigorous program in marine zoology at Bangor University in Wales.

#### To pre-empt the 1AR - the ability to change the font doesn’t solve – it’s ableist to expect them to do something for your aesthetic preference.

**Hudgins 17** “Hating Comic Sans Is Ableist” Lauren Hudgins Feb 23, 2017 <https://medium.com/the-establishment/hating-comic-sans-is-ableist-bc4a4de87093> OHS-AT

In addition, she cannot proofread in a font that’s difficult for her to read. “You cannot fix formatting errors you cannot see!” To her, asking her to change to a font she cannot adequately use “is the epitome of ableism.” Sometimes she can ask someone in her cohort to help her spot errors, but it’s a lot to ask. “I can and have had people in my class look over my work, but you need to understand that we’re not collaborators, they’re my peers. This is an encroachment on their time.”

Asking her to change her font is asking her to take a task that is already very difficult for someone with dyslexia and demanding that she take extra steps to please the aesthetic preferences of someone for whom reading is easy.

#### Inclusion’s an independent voter – you have to be in debate to gain from it and it’s a gateway issue because it ensures everyone benefits from the activity since it’s how people get scholarships, make friends, and improve critical thinking skills.

## Framing

#### The standard is saving lives:

#### Death outweighs

#### 1] Death is the worst form of evil since it destroys the subject itself.

Paterson 3 – Department of Philosophy, Providence College, Rhode Island (Craig, “A Life Not Worth Living?”, Studies in Christian Ethics.

Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is death per se that is really the objective evil for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alter- native of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather, death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightening strikes.80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unintentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, death itself can be credibly thought of as a ‘primitive evil’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life.81  In conclusion, concerning willed human actions, it is justifiable to state that any intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner. To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human possibility.82

#### 2] Trillions of people in future generations means the future holds a lot of value – outweighs their offense under any framework.

## Case

#### Squo solves – the WTO is focused on ensuring fair, accessible trading conditions internationally – that ensures pharmaceutical accessibility.

Ott 21’ Haley Ott, “New World Trade Organization chief on reviving U.S. ties and addressing the COVID crisis,” CBS News interview. Published March 12, 2021. Accessed 8/10/2021; Omar E. https://www.cbsnews.com/news/world-trade-organization-wto-ngozi-okonjo-iweala-us-ties-covid-vaccine-economies-trade/.

London — Dr. Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala has taken the reins as the new Director-General of the World Trade Organization at what critics are calling a crisis moment for the global body. The organization brings countries around the world together to fairly manage trade, but it's facing a rise in nationalism and protectionism, structural issues that have made it difficult to settle disputes among members, vital negotiations about sustainability that have gone unresolved for years, and an international pandemic emergency. Okonjo-Iweala, a former finance minister from Nigeria who worked for decades at the World Bank, is the first African and the first woman to hold the position of Director-General — a role that will see her, among many other things, help to facilitate agreements among the WTO's 164 member states. CBS News' Haley Ott spoke to her about the major issues facing the organization, and the world, today. The interview has been edited for length and clarity. Haley Ott: For many Americans, the first time they heard of the World Trade Organization was when former President Trump threatened to leave it. Why is the WTO important, and in a time of increasing nationalism, how do you keep it relevant? Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala: Well, thank you, Haley. The WTO is important because its rules underpin the multilateral trading system, meaning it provides **a forum** where **every country can** come and **discuss and negotiate trade** agreements, and also **a place for dispute settlement**. You know, in the old days, we used to have trade wars. Now we have a place where countries can come and settle disputes they have among them. President Biden has rescinded America's threat to leave the WTO, but he hasn't completely abandoned President Trump's approach to trade. He's said that his policy would prioritize Americans and American workers. Does that worry you? Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala: Not at all. And actually, I want to commend the United States because it never actually left the WTO. It had problems with it, but the U.S. paid its share of the budget and still remained a member. And I'm so glad that President Biden has stated that he wants to revive multilateralism and support of the WTO is one of the ways to do that. China is a member of the World Trade Organization, and it's been accused of using WTO structures to unfairly benefit itself to the detriment of some other members, including the United States. What do you say to critics who say that the WTO has been unable to ensure fair global trade in regards to China? Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala: Well, the WTO **was created to ensure a level playing field** among all trading nations, transparency, balance, so that the private sector can feel that when they are participating, it's fair. Now, WTO members have issues that they want to settle with each other. I think that we will work hard at the secretariat to support them so that these issues can be dealt with. **We** do **have** some **rules about making sure** that **unfair subsidies are not given**? We have to look and see, are those rules still fit for purpose in this modern age, with things evolving? Do we need to make new rules to deal with that? One of the main subjects facing the World Trade Organization today is fish, how much certain countries should be able to fish in order to keep global stocks secure. Negotiations have been going on for years, and you've stated that it's one of your goals to come up with an agreement by the end of this year. What do you say to those who say this issue of fish is a real test for the WTO on its ability to deliver on an issue that really matters to people around the world and that, if it's not able to, it as an organization may not be fit for purpose? Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala: I agree. It's as simple as that. You know, **it's unacceptable to have negotiations** on an issue going on **for 20 years**, and I've said 20 years is enough. **We need to get it done** because this is about sustainability of our oceans. It's contributing to the sustainable development goals that every country agreed on, including the United States. We have to look at over capacity subsidies in fishing that are leading to overfishing and illegal fishing so that our fish stocks will be renewed and sustainable, our oceans will be sustainable for our fish. You've said that trade and the WTO can help the world address the coronavirus pandemic, which has decimated economies globally. How can trade help deal with the pandemic? Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala: It's unconscionable that there are countries in the world, **over 130**, **who have not** even **started vaccinating** any of their people. It's in the self-interest of the whole world to have everyone vaccinated. So we can help work with manufacturers to see what more sites they can **bring it in developing countries** and emerging markets **to increase supply**. The WTO can also look at trade. How can trade help with the recovery? Are there areas where we can liberalize trade more among our members so that we can trade? And that will lift up some countries to contribute to the recovery. Some countries have suggested waiving some intellectual property rights to make new technologies accessible for manufacture around the world. Would you support that policy? Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala: Let me say this, Haley. People need to understand what is behind this demand. Because poor countries watched during the HIV-AIDS crisis, they could not get hold of drugs. They were too expensive. Ten thousand dollars. Unaffordable. And people died. It was 10 years before they were able to get access to produce these drugs, generics, to save lives. That memory hurts. The second issue is the fact that the H1N1 pandemic or epidemic that occurred in 2008/9, rich countries bought up all the vaccines and poor countries had no access. So that lies behind this desire to have the intellectual property waiver, **for all to have access**. Now, that debate is going on. It will be decided among members. But we need to know why it's important and we need to come to some sustainable agreement. But for now, I've advocated what I've called a third way, which is **we need to boost manufacturing** right away so that we can have increased supplies. So **it's not one or the other**. I've always said, we can walk and chew gum. Finally, it's Women's History Month. You are the first woman to be the head of the World Trade Organization and the first African person. What does that mean to you and what obstacles still need to be addressed? Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala: Well, it means a lot to me. I love being the first female and the first African, but I always tell people that's not the most important fact. The fact is that the WTO is facing many challenges and it needs the most competent person to help it come out of those challenges and find solutions. So that's the important thing. And, well, you know, I'm humbled that people have selected not only the first African and the first female, but someone they believe has the competence to try and deliver.