General I meet response. (Affirmative T)

We meet the topicality requirement put forth by the resolution. Through the relevant and pertinent definitions put forth by the 1AC, we have met the burden of topicality, making our interpretation of the round that by which the topicality standard should be measured.

Counter Interpretation (this is where you tell the judge what their argument was and why yours is better).

Standards:
Predictable Limits: As we are in fact developing ocean areas through non-military means, the affirmative case is within predictable limits and highly arguable by the negative team.

Ground: Because we have set forth a case with a great deal of arguable ground, it is clear that the negative team has put forth a competing interpretation in order to create a time skew and limit our debate.

Bright Line: There is a clear division between topical and non-topical cases. We have put forth a 1AC that works within the framework of the resolution.

Education: Because we have put forth a reasonably topical case, debating the merits of what is and is not topical limits education. By forcing the Negative team to debate the merits of the case, education becomes the precipitating factor in the round.

Reasonability: The affirmative has met a reasonable interpretation of the resolution and as such it is unwarranted to reject the affirmative case outright. Remember that because T is an apriori issue, it must be clear without any doubt that our case is untopical, which the NEG cannot do under a reasonable understanding of the resolution.