**A: Interpretation-**If the aff reads a role of the ballot than it must be comprehensive with specifications for how the round ought to paly out under the role of the ballot in the AC. To clarify, the role of the ballot must specify: a) How we determine what a legitimate advocacy is under the role of the ballot *i.e. whether topicality constrains a debater’s advocacy* b) what area of the debate must be warranted c) If the debate should be determined solely by the flow or has pre-fiat implications d) what kind of theoretical objections can be made against the role of the ballot e) how you weigh competing advocacies under the role of the ballot.

**B: Violation-**He doesn’t specify any of that in his ROB

**C: Standards-**

1. Strat Skew: If they don’t clarify what a legitimate advocacy is under the role of the ballot then it is impossible for me to determine what I can read in the NC. They have infinite Pre-round prep so they are already ahead on the issue and probably have inifinite strats to delink me from the aff. They will just get up in the next speech and make no-link and preclusion arguments nullifying 7 minutes of NC speech time. Also it is impossible for me to determine what constitutes their role of ballot ie. I don’t know whether a generic consequenalist framework is sufficient to show that oppression is bad or if I need to include a Counter-Rob etc. If they just get up in the next speech and extend the framework as prefiat it a) functions as a shift in advocacy because they don’t contextualize the role of the ballot with real world impacts in the first speech b) functions as a side constraint to any implication I made in the last speech nullifying all my offence. It is impossible for me to create a viable strategy under his role of the ballot because debaters contextualize the role of the ballot to have different meanings, which means I can never know what kind of debate he is looking for under his role of the ballot. Thus there will be no in round clash. Without specifying what theoretical arguments can indict his role of the ballot, it nullifies a whole layer of NC strategy because he will just make semantic I meets and go for preclusion, making it impossible for me to win even if I engage the AC. He could also try to get out Also cx checks arguments do not solve a) it supercharges the abuse because he gets to shape my advocacy in cross ex instead of giving me his interpretation b) skews my cross ex time which should be spent giving myself more strategic outs **Also**, my interpretation re-contextualizes what a good role of the ballot looks like thus it functions as a constraint to his role of ballot. Even if they win that the role of the ballot comes before the shell or fairness in general, my interp turns the role of the ballot because it tells us what the ballot should look like even under their own substantive interpretation of the role of the ballot. In addition even if she is winning drop the argument this is an independatnt reason to drop the debater because dropping the ROB is kicking out of an advocacy furthering the abuse.

**Excluding fairness** from the role of the ballot fails since fairness is independently valuable – **two reasons**:

**First,** debate is a competitive game between two participants implying that neither debater should be advantaged by the rules. Fairness is a constitutive part of debate; it’s what makes debate a competitive activity and not merely a discussion forum, so it comes prior to people’s ability to evaluate external notions of what they ought to do.

**Second,** fairness is a constraint on deciding the winner: who debated better can’t be decided without equal starting points for both debaters. **Yi[[1]](#footnote-1) ’14:**

Great question! I think most people would agree that **in order to win a pre-fiat position, the** pre-fiat **debater must win that** a) **the position is pre-fiat and** b) **the position itself.** The b subpoint is especially important because very few judges would vote on a pre-fiat/ micropolitical position just based on the fact that it's read or it's real world implications- the debater would presumably have to win solvency or reasons why their advocacy would be better than the negatives. What this means is that **it doesn't matter how bad oppression is if the other debater** wins a link turn proving they **solve[s]** oppression **better.** But I think we can take the b subpoint one step further by asking what does it mean to “win” the position. I think **there are two ways to win a position: legitimately** (with the difference being **based on** the **skill discrepancies** of the debaters) **and illegitimately** (not by one debater being more skillful at debate, but **because one debater had a head start** over the other)**.** A good analogy would be that of a race between runner A and runner B. Runner B is the faster runner but runner A obtained an enormous head-start that runner B could not overcome. Runner A “won,” but few would call him the better runner. Thus, one way you could go about it is to argue that theory (specific to the position, not generic theory) **determin[ing] whether the pre-fiat layer is fair** for both debaters, that it **is key to determining whether the** winner of thepre-fiat **position [was] won via skill rather than exclusion.** For example, pretend a debater ran a pre-fiat position on oppression, but made it extremely difficult for the neg. to engage because their alt. used a form of utopian fiat, a reject alt., shifted based on the neg. advocacy, etc. The point is that the neg. would have a much harder time generating offense and engaging the position, not because they didn't want to, but because they were functionally excluded from the debate. And if the aff. debater “won” the K, it is reasonable to question whether they won via skill or via a “head-start.” Only by answering the theoretical layer can we answer this question. I'd like to conclude (sorry this is extremely long) by using an example that is extreme and probably won't occur but gets the point across. **Assume that the aff**. debater **reads a performance about elitism** in the community **and** as a part of their performance, they **smash[ed] their opponent's laptop** to symbolize their stand against elitism**.** Assume the neg. debater is fine with their laptop being smashed and the only qualm they have is a theoretical one, that **losing** access to **the**ir **laptop skews their strategy because they had prep on their laptop** against the K that they have now lost access to**.** If **the position preclud[ing] theory** that was SPECIFIC to the position, then if the aff. won their position, the neg. shell would have no weight. Obviously, this **is non-sensical because** if the aff. ended up ahead on the elitism position, **the aff**. didn't actually win the position, they **won because they hampered the neg**. **from engaging.** That, and I don't think any judge would genuinely buy the argument “what I did was ok because my position comes first!”

Including fairness also **solves the impacts in their role of the ballot better**, meaning it turns back their justifications

fairness ensures that discourse is legitimate and not just being used to gain an unfair advantage since **A)** It’s key to make sure people take positions seriously. **Adler[[2]](#footnote-2) ‘11:**

I think another justification for micropoliticians flipping Aff comes in proving the authenticity of their movement. **When a micropolitical debater [takes advantage of]** flip[ping] Neg (given the general Neg side **bias[es]**), **the appearance is that they are** still **playing a game** and **trying to** milk every **[gain] strategic benefit[s]** they can get**.** Especially given the delay of important discourse argued above, it seems the micropolitical debater is willing to trade actual discussion of their position for a statistically higher win percentage. While I do give some credence to the argument that winning positions generate more discourse than do losing ones—for example, more people know of Arfin’s advocacy than about McCready’s willingly losing (although that is complicated by Arfin running the position over more tournaments and having some rounds taped)—I do not think these arguments apply in this case. For example, I do not believe it is the **winning [alone doesn’t]** that **generate**s **discourse, but** the **winning with** seemingly **genuine** intentions and **actions. If** micropolitical **positions were** merely **strategic ploys, debaters would not engage in** the **critical analysis** of their own behavior **that allows the community to change**, because the advocacy has been presented as less serious; when the micropolitician flips Aff, it shows how serious they are and allows for more of the desired discourse**.** By **killing** **the perception that they are just trying to win ballots** and not actually trying to change debate, the micropolitician who [doesn’t take advantage of strategic skews] flips Aff can **inspire[s]** more **debaters to** examine their actions and to **actually consider the movement’s message.**

And **B)** If the round is unfairly biased against me, I lose the ability to participate and we can’t have meaningful discourse since debaters reap benefits from the suffering of others by gaining an edge in competition, encouraging them to maintain the status quo and not solving the issue so they can keep using their cause as a tool.
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