In the name of reciprocity, neg must concede aff defines nonresolutional words if aff concedes neg definitions of resolutional words. This checks back 6-3-2.5-7-3-2.5-4-2.5-6-2.5-3 time skew. Prefer my analysis because only I account for the most comprehensive cause of time skew, including CX and prep time. Thus, I define ‘whole’ to mean “The Democratic Republics of the Congo and North Korea ought to” and ‘rez’ to mean “require employers pay a living wage.”

Thus, I defend whole rez.

I contend life in either Congo or North Korea is already pretty shitty.

Subpoint A—any country with “Democratic Republic” in its name is clearly overcompensating for something.

Lapidos 09 writes:

http://www.slate.com/articles/news\_and\_politics/explainer/2009/04/the\_undemocratic\_peoples\_republic\_of\_korea.html

Why do the most totalitarian countries always have the most democratic-sounding names?

AND America confirms—We’re the bastion of freedom, and we’re the greatest. We don’t have either of the words “Democratic” or “republic” in our names. Wikipedia No Date:

The United States of America (USA), [is]commonly referred to as the United States (U.S.) or America, is a [federal republic](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Federal_republic)[[18]](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States#cite_note-18)[[19]](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States#cite_note-19) consisting of 50 [states](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/U.S._state) and a [federal district](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Washington%2C_D.C.). The [48 contiguous states](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Contiguous_United_States) and [Washington, D.C.](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Washington%2C_D.C.), are in central [North America](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North_America) between [Canada](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Canada) and [Mexico](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mexico). The state of [Alaska](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alaska) is located in the northwestern part of North America and the state of [Hawaii](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hawaii) is an [archipelago](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Archipelago) in the mid-[Pacific](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pacific_Ocean). The country also has five populated and numerous unpopulated [territories](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Territories_of_the_United_States) in the Pacific and the [Caribbean](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Caribbean). At 3.80 million square miles (9.85 million km2)[[20]](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States#cite_note-State_and_other_areas-20) and with over 320 million people, the United States is the world's [fourth-largest country by total area](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_and_dependencies_by_area) and [third most populous](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_and_dependencies_by_population). It is one of the world's most [ethnically diverse](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Race_and_ethnicity_in_the_United_States) and [multicultural](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multiculturalism) nations, the product of large-scale [immigration from many countries](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Immigration_to_the_United_States).[[21]](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States#cite_note-DD-21) The [geography](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Geography_of_the_United_States) and [climate of the United States](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Climate_of_the_United_States) are also extremely diverse, and the country is home to a wide variety of wildlife.[[22]](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States#cite_note-22)

AND core to freedom is America—here’s a picture of an eagle



Subpoint B—people don’t like it in the Congo and North Korea. The following joke empirically proves—

“Hey man who lives in either the Congo or North Korea, how do you like it?” “Can’t complain” /pause for laughter/ Get it? Like can’t complain because they live in brutal and backwards military regimes that will physically punish them if they do complain? But also “can’t complain” as in “I’m fine, I have no complaints” \*mime laughter\*

Prefer jokes because Zizek totally wrote a book where he told racist jokes and that was supposed to be some avant-garde philosophy, and though I have the book, I didn’t have time to cut it an hour before the round. But because you probably couldn’t tell the difference between two different Zizek cards anyway spread unclearly and cut densely, here’s a different Zizek card we can assume backs up my claim. Zizek 06

#### NOTE, JP:SPREAD THROUGH THIS AS FAST AND AS UNCLEAR AS POSSIBLE

For Zizek it is imperative that we cut through this Gord­ian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization/anonymization of the millions who are subju­gated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture — with all its pieties con­cerning ‘multiculturalist’ etiquette — Zizek is arguing for a politics that might be called ‘radically incorrect’ in the sense that it breaks with these types of positions and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today’s social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedevilled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political mor­bidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffe, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of im­plicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibi­tion conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek’s point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular we should not overlook Marx’s central insight that in order to create a uni­versal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose ‘universalism’ fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world’s population. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its out­comes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgement in a neutral marketplace. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diver­sity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and name­less (viz, the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’. And Zizek’s point is that this mystification is mag­nified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differ­ential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sus­tained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against this Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-par­ticular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Zizek’s universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or to reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a ‘glitch’ in an otherwise sound matrix.

Subpoint C—Come on, you guys already know this contention is true. But if neg still wants to be a contrarian nay sayer then make him pull a Dennis Rodman and go there.

So it can’t get any worse there, so might as well do the living wage.

Wow, I’ve already spend WAY too much time on substance, so THEORY UNDERVIEW As an overview to the underview, keep in mind these were all leaked from Scarsdale’s outround TOC affs, so even if you think these are ridiculous, horrible for debate, or just blatantly false, you just know they’re going to win anyway, so something something norm setting?

1. All neg interps are counterinterps. By reading the AC I implicitly take a stance on all positions (except for gay marriage and global warming, I mean I may want to run for office one day)
2. Substance is really essentially just theory. For example, I could just phrase my case as “A interpretation, if a country has the phrase “democratic republic” in its title, it’s probably shitty to live in.” or I could just say “it’s abusive the way the Congo and north Korea treat their citizens.
3. The neg may not read theory against AC theory since a) this moots AC offense because they can read theory on my theory arguments in the aff which ensures that I won’t be able to leverage any theory offense in the 1AR from the AC, giving them a huge time advantage, b) it leads to contradictions since the neg can just read theory against this arg, but this indicts those shells, so there’s no way to determine which comes first. Neg needs to beat back this spike before he can beat back the previous spikes because this determines the legitimacy of his being able to beat back the previous spikes.
4. Even if neg wins that he can read theory on theory, he DEFINITELY can’t read theory on theory which calls out the ability for theory on theory to be read because of time skew and infinite regress. Neg needs to beat back this spike before he can beat back the previous spike because this determines the legitimacy of his being able to beat back the previous spike.
5. Even if neg wins that he can read theory on theory on theory on theory which calls out theory being able to be read on theory on theory on theory, he DEFINITELY can’t read theory on theory on theory on theory on theory on theory which calls out the ability for theory on theory on theory on theory on theory on theory to be read because of time skew and infinite regress. Neg needs to beat back this spike before he can beat back the previous spike because this determines the legitimacy of his being able to beat back the previous spike.
6. If at some point what’s theory able to be read on or not is unclear, probably just means neg shouldn’t run theory/

# Framework—Irony Good

#### All kidding aside, let’s get serious, there was a method behind that madness. My AC mocks the charade we all play behind pretending what we talk about is significant. I really want to just talk about how a living wage means we don’t have to tip waiters, which means they won’t be as annoying, but then everyone complains about significance, expecting me to run some extinction scenario.

#### The role of your ballot is to vote for whomever best uses irony to deconstruct debate. My performance of the AC allows me to challenge the dominance of traditional politics.

Kulynych, Assistant Professor of Political Science @ Wintrop University, 1997 (Jessica Polity, vol. 30, #2 pg. 334-5)

If we interpret the “to show” here not as pointing out what is wrong with disciplinary society (which would leave Foucault subject to Fraser’s normative criticism), but rather as “showing,” or “showing up,” then we no longer need the introduction of normative notions, we are merely doing disciplinary society one better. Making a point is a function of discourse, the ability to align and arrange arguments that support a position. Yet, the performative protestor does not argue against the state, he mocks it. The protestor works at the margins of discourse, utilizing puns and jokes and caricature to “expose” the limits of what is being said. Thus, performative resistance, when considered as a critique, does not need to tell us what is wrong, rather it reveals the existence of subjection where we had not previously seen it. I am not suggesting that we can get a normative anchor out of the notion of performativity. To the contrary, I am suggesting performative resistance makes no such normative distinctions, or rather, that performativity is not about normative distinctions. We bring normativity to our performances as ethical principles that are themselves subject to resistance. By unearthing the contingency of the “self-evident,” performative resistance enables politics. Thus, the question is not should we resist (since resistance is always, already present), but rather what and how we should resist. This notion of performativity is also important for understanding the possibilities for innovation in Habermasian deliberative participation. Just as a protestor exposes the contingency of concepts like justive, a dialogue exposes the limits and contingency of rational argumentation. Once we are sensitive to the performative nature of speech, language and discourse, then we can see that deliberative politics cannot be confined to the rational statement of validity claims. Deliberation must be theatrical; it is in the performance of deliberation that that which cannot be argued for finds expression. Indeed it is precisely the non-rational aspects of deliberation that carry the potential for innovation. In his description of the poignant reminders of demonstration Chalounka recognizes that it is at the margins that the actual force of the demonstration resides, no matter what happens at the microphone. The oral histories of demonstrations (the next day over coffee) linger over the jokes and finny signs and slogans, the outrages and improprieties, more than the speeches and carefully coherent position papers. Andy convincing account of the politics of deliberation must take account of the creative potential that resides in the performance of debate.

#### “Shmita” is a practice in Jewish law where once every seven years, lands are left fallow and debts are forgiven—this is to acknowledge the tumult and ridiculous of the past seven years and to start anew. Vote AFF to engage in an ironic debate Shmita through Guerrilla Communication. Empirically, distorting the message and medium of communication are more effective than pure criticism at challenging and changing norms.

Blissett, Member of Communications Guerilla, 2001 [Luther, KOMMUNICATION GUERRILLA, <http://critica.com/critica2/kommun.html>]

Guerrilla communication doesn’t focus on arguments and facts like most leaflets, brochures, slogans or baneners. In its own way, it inhabits a militant political position, it is direct action in the space of social communication. But other than many militant positions (stone meets shop window), it doesn’t aim to destroy the codes of power and signs of control. It prefers to counteract[s] the omnipotent prattling of power by distorting and disfiguring the meanings. Communication guerrillas do not intend to occupy, interrupt or destroy the dominant channels of communications, they focus on detourning and subverting the messages of transported. But what’s new about all this? Nothing, really—after all, there have been the Berlin Dadaists, the Italian Indiani Metropolitiani, the Situationists and many others. The practice of communication guerrilla can even be traced back to legendary characters like the Hapsburgian soldier Svejk and Till Eulenspiegel, the wise fool. Standing on the shoulders of earlier avantgardes, communication guerilla doesn’t claim the invention of a new politics or the foundation of a new movement. It is merely continuing an incessant exploration of the jungle of communication processes, of the intertwined and muddled pathes of senders, codes and recipients. Looking not just at what’s being said but focusing on how it is being said is the method of this exploration. The aim is a practical, material critique of the very structures of communication as a basis of power and rule. The bourgeois system takes its strength—beyond other things—from its ability to incorporate critique. Any democratic government needs an opposition. Every opinion needs to be balanced with another one, since the concept of representative democracy relies on the fiction of equal exchange. Criticism which doesn’t fundamentally shatter the legitimacy of the ruling system tends to become part of it. Communication guerrilla is an attempt to intervene without getting absorbed by the dominant discourse. We are experimenting with ways to get involved in situations and at the same time to refuse any constructive participation. Power relations have a tendency to appear as normal, even natural and certainly inevitable. They are deeply inscribed into the rules of everyday life. Communication guerrilla is one of the ways to create those short and shimmering moments of confusion and distortion, moments which tell us that everything could be completely different: a fragmented utopia as a seed of change. The symbolic order of western capitalistic societies is built around discourses of rationality and rational conduct. Guerrilla communication relies on the powerful possibility of expressing a fundamental critique through the non-verbal, paradoxical and mythical.

#### Irony is Superior to all other forms of discourse and performance because of its ability to challenge and overcome deeply entrenched discourses and hierarchies.

Hutchenson, Prof of English @ University of Toronto, 1995, (Linda, Irony’s Edge, p. 29-30)

The opposite to the “conservative” view—in other words, the theory that irony is really subversive and oppositional—also has a long (and parallel) history in which satire’s deployment of it plays an important part as well. And, similarly, the range of evaluations of its function and efficacy can be seen in statements that run the gamut from enthusiastic endorsement to vituperative condemnation. This is what makes irony’s transideological politics so difficult to sort out. The subversive functioning of irony is often connected to the view that is a self-critical, self-knowing, self-reflexive mode (White 1973:37; B. Bennett 1993) that has the potential to offer a challenge to the hierarchy of the very “sites” of discourse, such an ability to undermine and overturn, is said to have “politically transformative power” (Stallybrass and White 1986: 201). The concept of irony as “counter-discourse” (Terdiman 1985) has become a mainstay of oppositional theories that take on such hierarchies—be they based on race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality…and the list could continue. A “mode of combat,” irony becomes “a negative passion, to displace and annihilate, a dominant depiction of the world” (Terdiman 1985: 12), a passion that is seen to be especially crucial when the dominant, established discourses show great “absorbtive capacity” (ibid.: 13). In this view, irony’s intimacy with the dominant discourses it contexts—it uses their very language as its said—is its strength, for it allows ironic discourse both to buy time (to be permitted and even listened to, even if not understood) and also to “relativize the [dominant’s] authority and stablilty” (Terdiman 1985: 15), in part by appropriating its power (Chambers 1991: xvi).

Put away your theory—taking one round or two away from the usual Kant-Korsgaard-Nagel bullshit won’t trigger extinction (only my advantage one does). Let’s have fun with irony, k?

# AT Irony Bad

## AT Irony ineffective

1. Empirically denied--Look to people like Stephen Colbert, Jonathan Swift, or really any stand-up comic, like George Carline. This empirically denies ineffectiveness.
2. TURN--A recent study found voters were more informed watching Colbert than Fox news
3. NUQ—current system isn’t effective either. People seriously hold that a $2 change in the minimum wage will cause the death of all humanity. We know it’s false, but we pretend like it’s true
4. The discursive value of the ironic deconstruction in the AC goes to remind the judge, competitors and the circuit of the ridiculousness. Debaters and judges love to share amusing stories, and this AC is one

## AT Labeling Irony not effective

1. Analytically denied—irony and self-awareness are two different, independent layers. The speech act of my AC is not affected by my labelling and explaining why it was necessary
2. Empirically denied—people like Colbert acknowledge that he just plays a character and his message isn’t weakened. A modest proposal by Swift had the first pages as satire then the rest explaining it.
3. TURN—If I didn’t label my AC as ironic, then I would have just seemed like an asshole for the entirety of the speech. Admittedly, I’m still an asshole now, just a different, more critical kind.
4. TURN—by labeling my AC as ironic, I gave the NC the change to operate within my ironic paradigm of ironic deoncstruction, which means the potential clash increases effectiveness. It’s your fault you didn’t want to engage me

## AT System doesn’t recognize Irony

1. TURN—it’s not the system I’m trying to change, but the way we the participants in the system see it. A perfect example of this is Stephen Colbert’s lampooning of George Bush during the Correspondent’s dinner. He loved it, but his real criticism worked for the constituents
2. This relies on Irony not being effective in the first place

## AT Be Ironic and Vote Neg

1. This isn’t ironic, this is dumb—there’s still a difference. My ironic deconstruction in the AC critically examines the trends in debate and flaws and foibles of debaters for a constructive end. Saying drop irony to be ironic is inane and counterproductive

## AT Wrong Forum

1. TURN--If I’m winning my role of the ballot, then it’s the perfect forum
2. TURN—there’s no better forum for investigatively fucking with debate than in a debate round. It wouldn’t make sense to do this at an Olive Garden, though to be fair, mostly why is because the servers would keep bothering me for tips. Which only reinforces why you need to affirm my plan text.
3. TURN—neg getting pissed off at my AC is a) what you’d expect from any legitimate kritik of the system as people don’t like change and do like to take the things they care for way too damn seriously AND b) shows the importance of the irony AC—I’m deconstructing why he’s getting pissed off in the first place
4. TURN—your mom’s the wrong forum

## AT No Weighing Mechanism

1. Not true, you can weigh by the significance of what we are lampooning, the probability of our cause being effected, the scope of people affected.

## AT People Don’t understand Irony

1. TURN—well, then how did you know to read that block… ironic, isn’t it?
2. TURN—people can misunderstand anything. For instance, JUDGE HE JUST CONCEDED YOU VOTE ON IRONY BY MAKING THAT ARGUMENT!!1!
3. No-abuse—you understood irony in this round. Call for the advocacy text—it’s unique to this round. I am not necessarily advocating irony to be used in every round, just as part of this Shmita
4. No abuse—I literally call out my AC as being ironic. Plus it’s called
5. No abuse—your authors are talking about people not understanding irony over text…but my performance was delivered with tone and signals that convey irony. It means anyone could understand.
6. TURN—by trying to construe some huge impact to the irony AC you are biting into the ROTB because the offense comes from my discursive speech act of insignificance

## AT Switch-side bad for irony

1. TURN—making you argue against irony means we can have a better understanding of irony in the first place
2. No Abuse—you didn’t have to argue against irony, you could have read an Ironic NC strat and won there
3. TURN—even if arguing against irony was bad, switch-side debate is particularly important because debate is one of the few places where debaters can learn the value of both sides of an issue without having to commit themselves to the “wrong” one. This is crucial to the development of debaters as open minded and critical thinkers.

Muir 1993 (Star A. , Professor of Communications @ George Mason University,PHILOSOPHY AND RHETORIC, "A Defense of the Ethics of Contemporary Debate," v26, n4, p.290)

The role of switch-side debate is especially important in the oral defense of arguments that foster tolerance without accruing the moral complications of acting on such beliefs. The forum is therefore unique in providing debaters with attitudes of tolerance without committing them to active moral irresponsibility. As Freeley notes, debaters are indeed exposed to a multivalued world, both within and between the sides of a given topic. Yet this exposure hardly commits them to such “mistaken” values. In this view, the divorce of the game from the “real world” [this] can be seen as a means of gaining perspective without obligating students to validate their hypothetical value structure through immoral actions. Values clarification, Stewart is correct in pointing out, does not mean that no values are developed. Two very important values—tolerance and fairness—inhere to a significant degree in the ethics of switch-side debate. A second point about the charge of relativism is that tolerance is related to the development of reasoned moral viewpoints. The willingness to recognize the existence of other views, and to grant alternative positions a degree of credibility, is a value fostered by switch-side debate: Alternately debating both sides of the same question . . . inculcates a deep-seated attitude of tolerance toward differing points of view. To be forced to debate only one side leads to an ego-identificaion with that side. , . . The other side in contrast is seen only as something to be discredited. Arguing as persuasively as one can for completely opposing views is one way of giving recognition to the idea that a strong case can generally be made for the views of earnest and intelligent men, however such views may clash with one’s own. . . .Promoting this kind of tolerance is perhaps one of the greatest benefits debating both sides has to offer. The activity should encourage debating both sides of a topic, rea- sons Thompson, because debaters are "more likely to realize that propositions are bilateral. It is those who fail to recognize this fact who become intolerant, dogmatic, and bigoted.""\* While Theo- dore Roosevelt can hardly be said to be advocating bigotry, his efforts to turn out advocates convinced of their rightness is not a position imbued with tolerance. At a societal level, the value of tolerance is more conducive to a fair and open assessment of competing ideas.

This turns all their internal links to real world advocacy, without first adopting both sides of the issue in a harmless forum such as debate, debaters go onto the real world without the ability to critically access and defend their position. In other words, debate is the metaphysical playground where children learn to make mistakes so that they don't make those same mistakes when the stakes are higher.

1. TURN--<Opponent> I really valued your opinion, and thought you’d engage in the struggle with me

## AT Why This Round

1. I don’t need to justify why this round—just demonstrate debate’s significance absurdity
2. C/A Hutchenson—this round is uniquely key because irony gains its discursive and oppositional power by acting in the dominant space being criticized. This round is an example of just that
3. Out-of-round not as effective because nobody cares out of round. It’s not mocking anything sacred, and not the purpose of satire. Swift didn’t present “A Modest Proposal” to Pakastani people

## AT Mocking Serious Issues Bad

1. TURN—it’s worse to recognize that serious issues are bad and just not speak of them. That’s what allows them to continue
2. TURN--I’m just the bearer of bad news—don’t shoot the messenger. Satire’s role is to galvanize anger at a misdirected source so we can refocus it on the issues that matter
3. No abuse—I’m not even trivializing poverty—I’m just charading the significance we pretend to have in debate. I literally say that
4. Okay maybe I’m trivializing extinction. But hey, Bostrom means that’s a good thing. HAIL BOSTROM <salute>

## AT People Like Debate, Not Irony

1. No impact—who gives a shit?
2. TURN—they need to lighten up… or realize that I’m not mocking them, but the system
3. TURN—you really don’t get the point of this role of the ballot, do you? You’re still clearly trying to make some significant conclusion

## AT You’re just trying to win

1. WHAT THE HELL! How do you know my advocacy!!? You are being presumptuous and rude—I advise you check yourself good sir/ma’am! You don’t know what’s going on in my head. In fact, I swear, I was thinking about puppies.
2. TURN—even if I am doing this just to win… you just made that argument to try to win!
3. No abuse--Even if I am trying to win, that doesn’t nullify the critical advantages of my AC

## AT Cooptation

1. TURN—if those I’m criticizing latched onto my plan without evne a trace of irony, it’d expose and shed light on the ridiculousness
2. Non-unique—many people in the status quo already really advocate the plan
3. TURN—I’m the one coopting them! My re-approriation of their voices in a mocking manner is the offense!

## AT Ironic NCs

1. You’re only copying my ironic stance! That’s not cool! It’s like when you hear Louis CK say a hilarious joke and then Dane Cook goes and steals it but it’s just not as funny because a) it doesn’t have the same presentational value b) it doesn’t have its originality or surprise novelty and c) Dane Cook is a doucher for stealing jokes!!
2. TURN—AC is better for irony than the negative, four points
	1. Absurdity doesn’t equal irony. Kulyncyh from the role of the ballot clearly shows that irony is actually disempowering unless it recognizes and hints at the irony of the situation—the plan did, the neg didn’t
	2. The NC had no discursive markers to show their audience they were being ironic or satirical…when irony becomes obscure it risks literal interpreatations
	3. They have no underview to explain the significance of their irony…plan did, Neg didn’t!
	4. They don’t have an actual extinction scenario people have read. Advantage one was literally from someone’s wiki…plan always outweighs because I have actual examples from people I criticize
3. TURN—all the NC does is steal focus away from the intent of the performance of the AC. Vote aff because my message was clearer
4. Perm—Ironically do the plan and CP
5. Perm—textual competition is an absurd check of competition for irony debates. Little a is that text doesn’t correspond with the advocacy when you say the opposite. Little b is that their intent is consistent with my intent because \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, so it’s not mutually exclusive

## AT Theory

Overview—1. His failure to present an alternate role of the ballot is damning, cross apply my role of the ballot of using irony to deconstruct debate, that’s Klynych—this means there’s always a risk of offense for me, where he has none. 2. His arguments boil down to this round not being key, but he’s conceding the warrant in Hutchenson—this round is key because irony has a unique ability to overcome entrenches modalities and politics without being absorbed by the dominant discourses. The impact is K before theory because only I have solvency for the conceded harms of the squo

### AT Topic Ed

1. Non-unique—we can get topic ed just by researching, reading a book, or taking classes in college. Even if he wins that we need in-round discussion, there’s no reason that we need this round too
2. TURN—C/A Hutchenson, that means this round has reason not to be topical but use irony
3. No abuse and TURN—my performance just encourages us for a round to be insignificant—means I still have a topical advocacy of paying waiters more so they don’t have to work for tips—I may have different warrants behind it, but ultimately it’s topical. This is better for topic ed because we get more interesting and underexplored regions of the lit we wouldn’t otherwise cover—means my world coopts his and is comparatively better
4. No abuse—extend my advocacy that you vote aff for an ironic debate shmita—even if he wins it’s bad to do irony every round, it’s not competitive with my advocacy because I say we should do it for this round, regardless of other rounds
5. Outweighed—at best neg’s winning a marginal link to topic ed, but he’s conceded full strength of link of the warrants on my K. Means even if theory before K in a vacuum, I control a larger impact still

## AT Ks

1. Their Net Benefit to the K is coopted—Kulynch and Blisset straight turns their K because straight forward Ks don’t solve but only get incorporated within the dominant political machine
2. Irony solves for any K--it allows us to question the status quo and solve. Especially relevant because my AC criticizes the notion of our self-holding significance in the first place

Burbules 01[ Nicholas C. Burbules. University of Illinois at UrbanaChampaign. “Postmodern Doubt and Philosophy of Education.” June, 01]

Education involves engagement, among persons and between persons and the matters to be explored. Yet for this engagement to avoid dependency, there must also be a critical distance. Playing with the tropes of irony, tragedy, and parody are among the ways that we can avoid taking ourselves as teachers too seriously. We can adopt certain stances without fully endorsing them. We can question our authority, and invite others to question it, even within contexts that arrogate authority to us whether we wish it or not. 20 At a deeper level, we can adopt methods of inquiry and interrogation but also turn these methods upon themselves, exploring their usefulness andthe limits of their usefulness. Such a stance allows for both a respect and appreciation for perspectives and approaches that broaden our understandings, but also a wary suspicion of the tendency for teachers, texts, and methods to become hypostasized, entrenched.