### 1

#### Interpretation: All affirmative paradigm issues concerning theory and arguments concerning fairness or education that the negative could violate must be read first in the affirmative speech. To clarify, theory arguments must be read at the top of the affirmative case before all substantive arguments.

#### Violation:

#### Vote neg:

#### [1] Strat – theory preempts drastically change neg strat since they’re the highest layer of the debate. If the aff reads all their substance, then covers theory, the neg is disadvantaged since any substantive case neg work could be drastically reduced by the norms they purport. The neg needs to know what conditions they need to meet prior to setting a strat, outweighs – reversibility – you’ve spent a long time prepping this aff so you should know how long it takes to get through it, but I don’t know the conditions of engagement which severely skews neg strat.

#### [2] Norm setting – Negs are more likely to conform to their interps if they’re at the top of the aff since they establish a context under which we construct our case neg. Any arg for why we should respond to the spikes are a net benefit to my interp.

#### [3] Substantive education – Spikes on top makes it easier for the neg to plan a strategy that meets your paradigm to ensure better engagement since the discussion is shifted away from theory spike extensions to the crux of the topic.

#### Also you can’t use your spikes to take out my shell:

#### [1] No abuse – my shell doesn’t indict your ability to read spikes or these specific ones, just their placement.

#### [2] Meta-theory outweighs – similar to how theory precludes substance by establishing norms around it, meta theory should preclude their args.

#### Vote on fairness – abuse skews your evaluation of substance – precedes education since if there’s abuse, you can’t expect me to clash. Drop the debater – I can’t respond to a new aff in the 2NR since I don’t have a 3NR to defend my offense – link turns 1AR theory – proves the aff forced me to be abusive.

#### No RVIs: (A) The 1AR would just sit on the shell so I’ll always lose to the unchecked 2AR collapse—also means evaluate theory after the 2NR. (B) Chills legit theory which leads to a race to the bottom—outweighs deterrence since you could just beat a bad theory shell. Use competing interps—either there’s a bright line which collapses, or there isn’t which causes intervention.

### 2

#### Reject 1AR theory —

#### 1 – It screws over the 2NR since I have to split my speech time to cover two different flows – outweighs any neg abuse since the 2AR collapse will always win if I can’t consolidate offense especially since the 2AR just needs to win one standard and weigh.

#### 2 – One speech isn’t enough to develop clear clash – outweighs since resolvability is a gateway issue to other impacts.

#### 3 – Guts education – affs will always ditch substance and go for theory because it’s so strategic.

#### And, they’ll say infinite abuse but (a) spikes solve and (b) this particular instance isn’t that abusive.

#### Also, if you think it’s too harsh, then default to drop the arg.

### 3

#### Interpreation – The Aff must defend theory interpretations and arguments unconditionally as presented in the 1ac. In other words, the aff may not run cx checks.

#### Violation –

#### [1] Theory recourse – CX checks (a) causes sidestepping, encouraging you to have hidden abusive args since I either call you out on it in cx and you kick it or I concede it and you win, which makes debates innocuous and is empirically confirmed with Jake Steirn, (b) causes ambiguity – what constitutes a sufficient “check” is unclear. Even if we isolate the abusive practice in CX, the aff can still go for the arg and establish new parameters for checking, and (c) prep skew – even if you don’t kick the abuse, you get extra time to prep my interp since you know what I’ll indict. That gives you nearly double the time to prep and creates irreciprocal burdens. Theory recourse is key to any voter since it ensures I can check back abusive strategies.

#### [2] Value of CX – There’s a big difference between cross-examining a position and clarifying what the aff is. The point of CX is to do former. Your norm encourages debaters to not work at becoming good at questioning their opponents. Also no reason we need to use CX as clarification – you had 6 minutes to clarify what you defended. That’s key to education since CX and the ability to ask good questions is one of the most unique skills garnered in LD. Key to fairness because it allows aff to waste negative CX time and keeps the neg from gaining concessions.

### 4

#### Their philosophy requires rationality that constructs a “perfect subject” – this “perfect subject” is inaccessible to everyone, which rectifies ableism

Ryan 11 "[Group 2] Cognitive Disability, Misfortune, and Justice (Deontology-Ryan) « Introduction to Ethics," No Publication, <http://parenethical.com/phil140win11/2011/01/17/group-3-cognitive-disability-misfortune-and-justice-deontology-ryan/> MM

In Kant's deontological ethics, one has a duty to treat humanity not as a means, but as an end. However, Kant's criterion for being part of humanity and moral agency is not biological. In order to be considered fully human, and a moral agent, one must be autonomous and rational. If one lacks rationality and autonomy they cannot escape the chain of causality to act freely from moral principles, and hence are not moral agent's. Kant's moral program fails to account for those who are cognitively impaired because they lack autonomy and rationality. Since Kant's requirement for moral agency is so cut-and-dry and leaves no room for ambiguity, there is no clear moral distinction made between the cognitively impaired and other non-human animals. In the case of Kant, there could be no universal moral law from the categorical imperative that would apply to the cognitively impaired and not non-human animals as well. McMahan reaches the same conclusion as Kant, namely that, there is no meaningful moral distinction to be made between the cognitively impaired and other non-human animals. McMahan takes it to be the case that certain psychological attributes and capacities constitute a minimum for us to value a person as a moral agent. The cognitively impaired fall below the threshold for moral agency because they do not have certain psychological attributes and capacities that McMahan takes to be constitutive of moral agency. Therefore, as morality dictates we be impartial, we cannot give favor to the cognitively impaired over animals with similar psychological endowments. According to McMahan we have no non-arbitrary basis to do so. While McMahan agrees that many accept that we have reasons to give priority to those most proximal to us (which would give the family of someone cognitively impaired reason to favor them over a similarly endowed non-human animal) it does not give a reason for society as a whole to give this preference. Kant and McMahan are similar, in that their standards for moral agency exclude the cognitively impaired (rationality/autonomy and psychological capacities respectively). In Kant's morality, those who are rational and autonomous are to be treated as ends in themselves.

#### They read morally repugnant args – Thus the alt is to drop them – ableism permeates all form of violence and is a representation of human inferiority and oppression

Siebers 9: Siebers, Tobin ~Professor of Literary and Cultural Criticism @ University of Michigan~, "The Aesthetics of Human Disqualification". October 2009. / MM

*Oppression* is the systematic victimization of one group by another. It is a form of intergroup violence. That oppression involves “groups,” and not “individuals,” means that it concerns identities, and this means, furthermore, that oppression always focuses on how the body appears, both on how it appears as a public and physical presence and on its specific and various appearances. Oppression is justified most often by the attribution of natural inferiority—what some call “in-built” or “biological” inferiority. Natural inferiority is always somatic, focusing on the mental and physical features of the group, and it figures as disability. The prototype of biological inferiority is disability. The representation of inferiority always comes back to the appearance of the body and the way the body makes other bodies feel. This is why the study of oppression requires an understanding of aesthetics—not only because oppression uses aesthetic judgments for its violence but also because the signposts of how oppression works are visible in the history of art, where aesthetic judgments about the creation and appreciation of bodies are openly discussed. One additional thought must be noted before I treat some analytic examples from the historical record. First, despite my statement that disability now serves as the master trope of human disqualification, it is not a matter of reducing other minority identities to disability identity. Rather, it is a matter of understanding the work done by disability in oppressive systems. In disability oppression, the physical and mental properties of the body are socially constructed as disqualifying defects, but this specific type of social construction happens to be integral at the present moment to the symbolic requirements of oppression in general. In every oppressive system of our day, I want to claim, the oppressed identity is represented in some way as disabled, and although it is hard to understand, the same process obtains when disability is the oppressed identity. “Racism” disqualifies on the basis of race, providing justification for the inferiority of certain skin colors, bloodlines, and physical features. “Sexism” disqualifies on the basis of sex/gender as a direct representation of mental and physical inferiority. “Classism” disqualifies on the basis of family lineage and socioeconomic power as proof of inferior genealogical status. “Ableism” disqualifies on the basis of mental and physical differences, first selecting and then stigmatizing them as disabilities. The oppressive system occults in each case the fact that the disqualified identity is socially constructed, a mere convention, representing signs of incompetence, weakness, or inferiority as undeniable facts of nature. As racism, sexism, and classism fall away slowly as justifications for human inferiority—and the critiques of these prejudices prove powerful examples of how to fight oppression—the prejudice against disability remains in full force, providing seemingly credible reasons for the belief in human inferiority and the oppressive systems built upon it. This usage will continue, I expect, until we reach a historical moment when we know as much about the social construction of disability as we now know about the social construction of race, class, gender, and sexuality. Disability represents at this moment in time the final frontier of justifiable human inferiority.