# 1NC

## 1

#### The interpretation is the affirmative must only get offense off the desirability of the resolution.

#### They violate, CX checks.

#### 1]- Limits—a bounded topic serves as a predictable stasis point for debate that guarantees thematic coherence—absent defined limits, debate’s competitive incentives create a race to the margins that distorts topic research and kills education.

#### 2]- Topic education, we only have two months per topic debating non-T affs incentivizes debaters to dump the topic and forces me to spend time prepping those affs instead.

#### 3]- Clash, A) ground skew, aff absent limits aff can just pick topics with no neg ground like racism bad, B) Predictability I can’t prep ATs to an infinite number of possible aff cases. C) less engagement means we don’t get education about case

#### Paradigm issues:

#### 1]- Education, its important b/c a) it’s why debate gets funded and b) it’s the only takeaway.

#### 2]- Fairness, a) it’s an intrinsic good, b) all args concede because they assume the judge evaluates them fairly, c) debate is a game, if it’s unfair no one will play

#### 3]- Jurisdiction, judges can’t vote for anything beyond the purview of the resolution a) Judges don’t vote on args outside the round, b) judges don’t flow CX, c) the judges job at this tournament is to evaluate different arguments about the resolution, judges don’t get to decide what is topical, the tournament does, d) anything else allows judges to inject anti-black, anti-women, anti-queer bias which turns case.

#### 4]- Drop the debater, a) it deters further abuse and makes debate better for everyone and substance is skewed since I had to spend time on theory b) They didn’t affirm the resolution which means the debate cannot start

#### 5]-No RVI’s, you don’t win for being fair. Also, debaters will bait out theory to win on RVI’s which means infinite justified abuse

#### 6]- Competing interpretations, a) reasonability is bad b/c it requires judge intervention and b) arguing ab the norms is the only way to get the best norms possible

#### 7] Reading the aff topically is k2 testing the aff, that creates better performances and educates us which turns the aff because we know what performances are true or not

#### 8] TVA: read a topical aff in the form of "the failed ASL movement that the PRL instantly stopped" and read 1AR theory objecting to standard communicative models of debate - solves your issues with the form of debate while still preserving our conditions with the content

#### No cross apps from substance, a) testing, if they cross, it is impossible to win, even if they are unfair, b) logic, they are using unfairness to prove that they are fair, which is contradictory, c) a priori, T must be evaluated in a vacuum – otherwise it is not a fair testing of whether they are fair.

#### Any argument they’re winning supercharges the violation and is not a reason to vote for them since they’re winning it because I couldn’t engage.

## 2

#### Interp---Debaters must disclose which aff they are reading 30 minutes prior to the round if they have read that aff previously.

#### Violation: they didn’t disclose until 8 minutes before

Graphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generated Graphical user interface, application

Description automatically generated

#### 1] Evidence Ethics - Disclosure deters mis-cutting, power-tagging, abuse of brackets and ellipses, cutting out of context and plagiarism. Independent voter on theory since my interp is key key to being good academics

#### 2] Prep skew—the aff has infinite prep time, we have 4 minutes, 30 minutes of disclosure is k2 fairness

#### Fairness is a voter---judge’s constitutive role is to evaluate the better debater---that’s impossible if the round is skewed. Drop the debater a] key to deter abusive practices e.g. ellipses and b] round has been irreparably skewed. Use competing interps---a] reasonability’s arbitrary and forces judge intervention b] normsetting---we find the best possible norms c] reasonability collapses---you use offense/defense paradigm to evaluate brightlines. No RVIs---a] illogical---you shouldn’t win for defending the topic b] baiting—they’ll bait theory and prep it out—justifies infinite abuse. Evaluate the debate after the NC since each speech is reciprocal since we both get one, it’s just a question of if I get one more minute to counteract the aff’s ability to set the terms for the round. Responding to this argument assumes the debate hasn't been evaluated yet which requires an AC response.

# Case

## Case

#### 1] Vote neg on presumption –

#### a] no impact to the ballot – they’ve informed us on issues with debate which should be enough to solve – their invested in the material structures of competition that their cards criticize which is also a perf con and an offensive reason to vote neg

#### b] debate cant change subjectivities: we’re fundamentally the same person before and after debate rounds, bad people were bad before debate – the burden of proof is ON THEM for making broad structural claims about the impact of debate on subjectivities

#### c] even if debate can change subjectivities, the vast majority of debaters will never have their hands on any sort of power – means even if the competitive structures of debate make us worse people we don’t do anything because of that

#### d] no solvency on ANY 1AC impact, they’re ridiculously unspecific – control f the word debate in the doc –they cant solve the broader societal structures that they claim impact disability

#### At the worst – these are all justifications for why fairness or skills outweighs everything – they can’t solve their impacts, but you can solve the quality and enjoyment debaters take from debate rounds by giving them equal chances to win

#### 2] Affirming the topic does not require “fiat” or “futurism” – phil debaters prove

#### 3] “fiat” has nothing to do with futurism – it’s simply stating that we should debate about the resolution itself not it’s likelihood