A. interpretation: debaters who read counterplans which PIC out of particular words in the resolution need to disclose the text of the counterplan at least 1 hour before the round on the NDCA wiki [if the counterplan is conditional/dispo]

B. violation:

C. standards:

1. research burden – there are an infinite number of words that could replace the words in the resolution – dignity wage, just wage, fair wage, raised minimum wage, so my interp is key to ensuring the aff can have a stable basis for researching and engaging the counterplan in the first place. Especially true in the context of PICs since they moot aff offense and require nuanced and discourse-specific answers. topic lit doesn’t solve because we’re discussing what words we should be allowed to use, so appealing to topic lit is vacuous since you are literally expanding the scope of normal topic search terms via the word PIC – also a reason why discourse is key to establish predictable basis for preparing for the CP. Key to fairness since judges vote on ballot accessing offense and education since my interp promotes more substantive clash on the CP.

A. interpretation: On the \_\_\_ if the aff defends a plan, the full text of the plan must be disclosed on the ndca wiki at least one hour before the round.

1. violation: he/she runs a plan but it isn’t disclosed
2. standard

1) limits – the plan case-list on this topic is endless \_\_\_\_\_ Disclosing text checks back since it ensures that I can have a reasonable basis for preparation, which is key to fairness and clash.

2) reciprocal prep advantage - under whole rez, we both know the resolution beforehand so we have equal basis for generating arguments. My interp still allows him/her to run a plan, but ensures that we both know the text beforehand. Even if the plan is predictable, disclosing ensures comparatively more clash since I know exactly what we’ll be debating. But, this doesn’t overcompensate and solves your fairness arguments a) the aff still knows it earlier than I do when constructing a position while the wiki is only checked right before a tournament and b) frontlines check back - my interp ensures more clash over the nuances of the plan text that the aff should be more prepared for. Reciprocal prep advantage is key to clash and fairness since it’s the basis for generating qualitatively supported arguments.

3) I must know the text of the aff advocacy beforehand in order to construct specific CP’s and DA’s that link. The hyper-specifics of plans and textual competition mean that knowing the text beforehand is key to – I can’t extemp good CP’s in-round since I won’t have specific solvency advocates or even be able to research the details of the plan - CP and DA ground is key to clash since it ensures that I can form positions that directly come into conflict with the aff advocacy. CP ground is also key to counterbalance the aff’s ability to select their plan advocacy - they get advantages from fiat so I should reciprocally also be able to select a specific advocacy.

And, usual disclosure bad args don’t apply - You don’t have to disclose the text if you’re not running a plan or even disclose the cards in the aff. I minimize exclusion by preventing big schools from generating an unfair prep advantage against small schools with hyper-specific plans. The wiki is a common point that both big and small schools alike can access. Exclusion also undermines fairness and education since it structurally excludes individuals from the activity.

1. Interpretation: If the aff clarifies this advocacy in the form of a text in the 1AC then the negative must have a text in the 1NC clarifying his advocacy [with a solvency advocate in the topic literature].
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Reciprocity- You have access to specific DA’s and turns to the 1AC because I’ve specified the scope of the aff advocacy but I’m denied that because you don’t have an advocacy text. Also have access to args about the flaws in my advocacy text but I don’t. Key to fairness to make sure both of us have reciprocal access the same args.
5. Stable Advocacy- my interp is key to prevent 2NR shifts because your advocacy has been written down in the form of a text that I can hold you to throughout the round. Otherwise, the 2NR has huge interpretive leeway in clarifying what he actually defends and gives him the opportunity to re-clarify his advocacy to get out of DA’s and turns. Key to fairness because absent this aff responses can be arbitrarily excluded.

A. CI: The neg can defend a counterplan unconditionally under the aff framework if it is won and the status quo unconditionally under their own if it is won.

Reasons to prefer:

1. neg ground – my interp is qualitatively important since the aff strategy puts me in a double bind of either reading a CP or having to engage the framework and concede the contention. Means the neg has only one out but that’s bad since a) specificity of aff plans means I’m just leveling the playing field – you should have to defend the desirability of the aff under the framework metric you chose and b) aff is infinitely more prepared to defend both their ethic and advocacy, means I’m behind either way.

2. real world – if you advocate for either an ethically bad or policy bad option we wouldn’t do it either way – forcing me to read weird offense or strange frameworks to get access to AC offense and a CP is not the way policymakers think. K2 education since it’s the only lasting civic benefit

to debate that applies to all voters and citizens. [and debating two options is real world – we want to find the best solution and don’t claim proposals are “unconditional” in a normal sense].

3. Gives the aff more flexibility and reset options – you’d be screwed if I went for 7 min of a CP that solves your offense better or 7 min of framework layering that precluded access to your offense in isolation – my strat gives you the possibility of collapse to either the NC or the aff case proper – you can pick your best turns and then go all-in for that if you win or kick case.

D.

Fairness/Education

**AT reciprocity - I have to win the framework and the contention while you just win one:**

- You can kick the AC framework, both of us just need to win our advocacy under whatever framework is true and i only have on advocacy under each framework.

- That would also be true if I just went for turns and a short philosophical NC.

**AT this is condo:**

- cannot go for both options, it’s just contingent on the framework the judge thinks is winning or gets conceded to. Means my interp is basically the same as dispo with the status quo and CP as the defaults – but I can’t kick anything since I’m bound to each under their respective framework.

- could kick the AC framework in the 1ar or go for the aff – allows me to test the desirability of the framework and contention; only need to win one advocacy either way there is no reciprocity violation.

**AT have to win fwk and then beat a CP:**

- non-unique – you would do this with any unconditional CP with a different ethic since you’d need to win your framework to even make the offense relevant when compared to the counterplan.

**AT qualitative skew – you pick the best world under your fwk and mine:**

- Completely non-unique – you already can pick the best framework for the aff advocacy that works together. I’m just doing the same.

- Not responsive to my interp – that’s an indict of counterplans and NCs with no turn ground, not the practice itself.

- Defending the status quo vis a vis the NC solves 100% of the abuse since that’s a shitty world to defend – everyone agrees shortage of organs and rampant effects like trafficking and autonomy loss from familial override are bad things – means I’m not cherry-picking.

- Doesn’t matter since in practice I would only get one world to defend since I can only go for either the CP or the status quo.

- Perm solves – you can claim to defend the best possible aff world through many perms in the 1ar to KO neg offense.

- Fiat of perfection occurs even if I read a short NC, CP under that framework that solved the aff, and then went to the AC. Your indict is not an indict of my practice, but of CPs in general but they’re key since […]

**AT forces a contradiction:**

- No you just signpost against each option depending on which framework you are assuming during that part of a rebuttal speech.

- No impact in this instance – I cant go for both of the options, so there’s not a problem with the aff technically contradicting itself.

**AT split time:**

- you don’t have to – can go for the NC.

- you would do this even if I went NC, AC.

1. Interpretation: if the neg defends an advocacy other than the status quo, then they must specify the conditions they’ll defend them under. To clarify, the NC must have an explicit text that states whether the counterplan is conditional, dispositional, or unconditionally. If it’s dispo, then they must spec the terms they’ll defend it under dispo.
2. Violation
3. Standards
4. Strat skew – if I forget to ask you in CX and spend time in the 1AR answering the CP, the 2NR can kick the CP and collapse to a new issue for the positive time tradeoff. Detracts from clash because you have no incentive to go for your positions and do interaction between my args if kicking it is more strategic. My interp is always net preferable because there is no possibility for me to not get the info about the status. Strat key to fairness- helps me form a coherent ballot story. Clash key to education – foundation of substantive debate.