## 1NC

### 1NC---OFF

Interpretation debaters may not say that they get 1ar theory that its dtd competing interps, and the neg doesn’t get analytics

Violation is it’s in the underview

Standard is infinite abuse – the aff just reads 1ar theory every round and we auto lose since its dtd and we cant respond to the shell since we would have to use analytics to make a counter interp – that destroys fairness since the 1ar always have an uncontestable route to the ballot also destroys clash since they will just go for 1ar theory every single round regardless of their being actual abuse and skirt education and in depth clash

#### No RVIs – a) logic – don’t winfor being fair -- logic o/w’s it’s a litmus test for arguments b) norming – can’t kick if wrong and have to go for shell – o/w’s it’s the intrinsic goal of theory debates, c) Encourages baiting which is worse b/c you can j beat back friv shells. d) chilling effect – forces you to split your 2AR so you can’t collapse and misconstrue the 2NR, 3) topic ed – forces 2n’s on theory – o/w’s on timeframe, only have 2 months

#### Competing Interps – 1] Reasonability = race to the bottom = more abusive 2] Collapses to CI – debate about a reasonable brightline

#### Drop the Debater—a) Deters future abuse b) 1NC was skewed b/c had to read theory c) abuse already occured

#### Combo shells first- indict your theory norms, metatheory

Can’t weigh case

#### 1NC theory first - 1] Abuse was self-inflicted- They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] Norming- We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea since the shell was read earlier. Norming outweighs A] Constutivism- It’s the constitutive purpose of theory debating B] Sequencing- it’s a pre-requisite to actualizing any other voter like fairness or education 3] It was introduced first so it comes lexically prior 4] All the reasons why 1AR theory is skewed towards the aff should be evaluated as a reason why 1NC theory comes first

#### Neg abuse outweighs Aff abuse – 1] Infinite prep time before round to frontline 2] 2AR judge psychology and 1st and last speech 3] Infinite perms and uplayering in the 1AR.

#### Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is very aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to– reasonability checks 2AR sandbagging by preventing really abusive 1NCs while still giving the 2N a chance.

### 1NC---OFF

#### Interp: The affirmative debaters must tell the negative debater what changes are in the aff

#### Violation: screenshots

Graphical user interface, text, application, email

Description automatically generated

#### Standards

#### A~ Pre round prep- Hiding changes mean that pre round neg prep was skewed—4 minutes of prep is not enough to put together a coherent 1nc or update our answers to the aff

#### B~ academic integrity – disclosing changes is key to ensure that new evidence isn't miscut and we have an idea of what analytics will look like

### 1NC---OFF

#### Interp: The affirmative debater may not claim that each subject’s ethicality arises from their own relations indexed to themselves. To clarify, indexicals is bad.

#### Violation – CX conceded its an implication from the rule following paradox

#### Negate:

#### [1] infinite abuse – there are infinite potential indexes that could affirm including descriptive standards that are impossible to turn and allowing them to win if they affirm under any index makes it impossible to negate – they can introduce a new descriptive index in the 1ar and auto-win which means it’s impossible to beat them. strongest internal link to fairness since one side wins every round.

#### [2] accessibility – indexicals justifies horrible things, i.e. if the resolution was “slavery ought to be reinstated,” under a certain index, that would affirm such as “consistency with reinstating slavery,” which means they can justify literally any reprehensible action and can’t condemn things like racism or genocide since there are indexes that would affirm that. That’s an independent voter since they make debate unsafe and accessibility is a prior question to being able to debate. It’s also false – a] generation an obligation requires an absolute obligation that justifies following it b] we can have indexes that negate which nonuniques their offense since you need to prove it 100% true.

# Case

#### Presumption and permissibility negates – a) more often false than true since I can prove something false in infinite ways b) real world policies require positive justification before being adopted – there’s alwahys an institutional DA to going through Congress c) Unjust[[1]](#footnote-1) is “contrary to conscience or morality or law” so they need to prove the negative obligation, not just the lack of one.

#### d) resolved[[2]](#footnote-2) indicates “firmly determined” which means they proactively did something, to negate that means that they aren’t resolved e) permissibility can’t affirm since then anything would be ok which would justify racism – we should be safe and do nothing. f) to negate[[3]](#footnote-3) means to deny the truth of which means if the aff is false you vote neg Negating is harder – A] Aff gets first and last speech which control the direction of the debate B] Affirmatives can strategically uplayer in the 1ar giving them a 7-6 time skew advantage, splitting the 2nr

1. https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/unjust [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. https://www.google.com/search?q=resolved+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=resolved+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57.2078j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)