### 1

#### Interpretation—The aff must disclose the role of the ballot, framework, or plan text before the round. To clarify, disclosure can occur on the wiki or over message.

#### Violation—they didn't

#### The standard is prep and clash – Two internal links-

#### a) Neg prep: The AC framework controls the direction of a round – even if its whole rez, my prep drastically differs based on a util aff, topical K aff, or a burden/tricks aff. 4 minutes of prep is not enough to put together a coherent 1nc or update generics—30 minutes is necessary to learn a little about the affirmative and piece together what 1nc positions work best against the affirmative and cut and research their applications to the affirmative. They get months to frontline one aff, while I come into the round guessing—o/w since their already structurally ahead,

#### b) Aff quality - disclosing the framework text allows preliminary research into the framework preventing frameworks from winning just because they are terribly confusing and not a philosophy that policymakers would actually use – if the affirmatives framework would be crushed with 20 minutes of research then it does not deserve to win. 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.

#### Fairness-

#### Education-

#### DTD-

#### Ci-

#### No rvis-

### 2

#### The role of the ballot is to determine the truth or falsity of the resolution.

#### 1. Logic: Debate is fundamentally a game with rules, which requires the better competitor to win. Every other ROB is just a reason why there are other ways to play the game but are not consistent enough with the purpose of the game to vote on, just like you don’t win a basketball game for shooting the most 3s.

#### 4. Inclusion: a) 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. b) Anything can function under truth testing insofar as it proves the resolution either true or false. Specific role of the ballots exclude all offense besides those that follow from their framework which shuts out people without the technical skill or resources to prep for it.

#### 6. Constitutivism: The ballot asks you to either vote aff or neg based on the given resolution a) Five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true which means its intrinsic to the nature of the activity b) the purpose of debate is the acquisition of knowledge in pursuit of truth – a resolutional focus is key to depth of exploration which o/w on specificity. It’s a jurisdictional issue since it questions whether the judge should go outside the scope of the game.

#### Prefer on neg definition choice – the aff should have defined ought in the 1ac because it was in the rez so it’s predictable contestation, by not doing so they have forfeited their right to read a new definition – kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement on a lack of your definition. Also, better since it focuses on real world instances rather than recycling old frameworks and evaluate after the 1N so we both have one speech which is key to reciprocity.

#### Negate:

#### [Negate –

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

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

#### 4] to[[5]](#footnote-5) is to “expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location)” but the rez doesn’t have a location

#### 5] reduce[[6]](#footnote-6) is to “(of a person) lose weight, typically by dieting” but IP doesn’t have a body to lose weight.

#### 6] for[[7]](#footnote-7) is “in place of” but medicines aren’t replacing IP.

#### 7] medicine[[8]](#footnote-8) 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.

#### [8] Inherency – either a) the aff is non-inherent and you vote neg on presumption or b) it is and it isn’t logically going to happen, and fairness is terminally unquantifiable.

#### [9] In order to say I want to fix x problem, you must say that you want x problem to exist, since it requires the problem exist to solve, which makes any moral attempt inherently immoral.

#### [10] To go anywhere, you must go halfway first, and then you must go half of the remaining distance ad infinitum – thus, motion is impossible because it necessitates traversing an infinite number of spaces in finite time and theory is paradoxical since it uses arguments to justify being unable to make arguments

#### [11] In order to find the answer to a question, you must ask if there is an answer, otherwise asking the question is pointless, but that requires asking whether or not there’s an answer to that question and so forth ad infinitum – this means the quest for knowledge fails and the acquisition of truth is impossible – negate since we can’t ensure resolutional truth value.

### Case

#### Reject 1ar theory:

#### A) Creates a 7-6 time skew

#### b)Causes infinite abuse against the neg, since I have no 3NR, you can just read a shell, and line by line all my responses in the 2AR, which means the aff always wins

#### C) Resolvability – all 2ar responses to 2nr counter interp are new which requires judge intervention to resolve

#### No aff infinite abuse: A) Spikes and 1ac theory solve

#### No 2ar weighing – infinitely unpredictable which I can’t respond to - make them do it in the 1ar
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