## 1

#### Interpretation—the aff must disclose the plan text, framework, and advantage area 15 minutes before the round. To clarify, disclosure can occur on the wiki or over message.

#### Violation – Aff conceded it was new during tech check

Graphical user interface, text, application, email

Description automatically generated

#### Standards:

#### 1] Neg prep—4 minutes of prep isn’t enough to put together a coherent 1nc or update generics—15 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 15 minutes of research, it should lose—this will answer the 1ar’s claim about innovation—with 15 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. Drop the debater deter future abuse – empirically confirmed with aprioris. RVIs are bad because (a) chills theory on decent theory debaters causing net more abusive practices and (b) they’re illogical - “I’m fair vote for me” doesn’t make any sense - logic frames their args since all args need to make sense to be evaluable.

## 3

#### Interpretation – if the aff reads a preemptive 1AC theory shell, they must specify what a violation would look like in the 1AC.

#### Violation – you read AFC but didn’t say what a violation looks like. Meeting the shell could look like saying “any role of the ballot or framework violates”

#### Vote neg

#### [1] Absent specification you can shift a violation into the 1NC ie. I could read truth testing or a fairness voter and concede the shell thinking the shell only applies to ethical frameworks but the 1AR can shift into the violation which kills fairness.

#### [2] Contestation – the warrants for the counterinterp to AFC change based on what violates. If truth testing violates it would have a different abuse story than if only contesting the ethical framework violates. Absent spec that kills norming – norming is an independent voter because it’s the terminal impact of theory. This is also a reason why you should err negative and give new 2NR responses on the counterinterp because they skewed my counterinterp

## AT: Lacan

#### Top Level

#### [1] Non falsifiable – alienation through language and drives cannot be proven or disproven. Non-falsifiable theories are bad and justify violence – i.e. the Salem Witch Trials created violence and mass death because there was no way to disprove that those accused were witches. Also true of literally any structure of marginalization – sexism, racist, etc.

#### [2] Lacan is paternalistic – even if their theory is true, letting others dictate and control your desires is paternalistic, which is an epistemic indict. Psychoanalysis requires someone to be analyzed by someone doing the analyzing, which leads to paternalist interpretations of desire that justify oppression.

#### [3] Language is indeterminate – we cant track differences and developments over time, i.e. different communications between different people and in different langauges proves that we can carve out pockets of meaning and not all language is alienating. Proves that the K is wrong – we can use language to authentically articulate the Real, at least in some instances.

#### [4] Cruel optimism is cruel – it leads to the abandonment of advocacy skills and research about important material actions. This aff can be good in debate – i.e. winning means that more people will read this aff which will build awareness. This motivates action in the real world – a precondition to change is awareness, proves the aff is good.

#### [1] Even if language has a lack, and I cant fully articulate a relationship/desire there is no reason why that is uniquely good thing to be articulate and rather it should stay personal

#### [2] If we understand our entire life through language there is no way we could have a desire that escapes languages capacity to fulfill it in the first place.

#### [3] Just because something is impossible doesn’t meant we should not strive, humans genuinely try to live a better life for themselves but not a perfect one. Its not like we know the lack and then believe the fantasy but we genuinely believe in our own optimism

#### [4] This justifies that we all just die and we could never even recognize that we have a lack in the first place which puts you alt in a double bind either life is valuable and its fulfilling to live life to your best ability or you cant even do your alt because you justified your own death.

**[5] Lack can be fulfilled, initial arbitrary sounds associated to objects/concepts are necessary to understand the world. And when your environment affects you as a person and shapes you desire you can then use your pre-made associations to fully describe your desire and then create a solution.**