### T

#### Interpretation: The aff may only defend the resolution as a policy. To clarify, they must defend the “Resolved: A just government ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike.”

#### “Resolved” means enactment of a law.

**Words and Phrases 64** Words and Phrases Permanent Edition (Multi-volume set of judicial definitions). “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”.**Violation: they dont

#### Prefer my model of debate –

#### 1] Limits – absent the rez the aff could be anything which makes infinite affs. That destroys fairness – their abuse is supercharged by two things. A] they literally have infinite prep since the 2-month topic reset doesn’t apply and B] they can cherry pick their aff to be something trivially true like racism bad which I can’t substantively deny. C] They also create a moral hazard that leads to affs only about individual self-care so even if you think this aff is answerable, the ones they incentivize are not, so assume the worst possible affirmative when weighing our impacts.

#### 2] Clash – I don’t have prep specific to their non-T aff to generate in depth clash – they can leverage their specific knowledge of their aff to always frame out generics and use their extensive frontlines to crush any pre round prep I generated. That

#### A] destroys fairness because it’s impossible for me to engage with the aff

#### B] outweighs on education since arg interaction is the only specific way we learn in debate

#### C] turns their aff scholarship – the only way to create change through debate is by allowing clash or else the judge and everyone write off your substance and win as a non-T aff – allowing clash forces people to actually consider your claims and

#### D] is an independent voter that outweighs on constitutivism – clash is what differentiates between debate and speech which means that it’s a prerec to having a debate in the first place

#### Vote on fairness –

#### a] testing – you can’t evaluate their args because the round was skewed – if they have 10 minutes to win their aff or fairness bad and I have 1 for the opposite they will win

#### b] they concede its authority via speech times and tournament procedure

#### c] hacking – if they say it’s irrelevant then you can be unfair against them and vote for me

#### d] the ballot can never alter subjectivities but it can rectify unfairness

#### e] jurisdiction – the ballot says to vote for the better debater not the better cheater – that’s a metaconstraint

#### f] inclusion – nobody plays an unfair game – that’s lexically prior to their reading of the aff in debate

#### Competing interps over reasonability – a] to avoid judge intervention and b] framework is about the very structure of debate so they should be forced to defend theirs

#### Drop the debater – a] to deter future abuse and b] drop the arg on T is functionally the same

#### No RVI – a] logic – I’m fair vote for me makes no sense and outweighs because all args must be logical, b] baiting – rvis incentivize abuse to win on theory

#### TVA – disabled workers strike to disrupt production and progress

### Truth Testing

The role of the ballot is truth testing because

[a] Isomorphism: alternative Role of Ballots aren’t binary win/loss, and thus cannot function in debate

[b] Constitutivism: the ballot and tab software present decision as aff/neg, not who best achieves some good value. Also, “affirm” is “To state that (a proposition, or part of a proposition) is true; to give as an affirmative proposition,” and negate is “to deny the existence or truth of; to deny.”, which independently proves truth testing

[c] Coordination, tournaments provide focal points for debaters by announcing a topic, giving it salience. Absent that focal point, debate is impossible since the chance of our being prepared to debate the same thing is literally zero.