## 1

#### Interp - all arguments related to affirming or negating [the plan] made must be consistent with a comparative worlds paradigm

#### Violation: they read truth-testing

#### Standards:

#### [1] Ground and strat skew – their interp imposes an absolute proof on us – gives them functionally infinite ground through skeptical arguments and logical tautologies – comparative worlds is a 1:1 burden structure that makes debate better and reciprocal.

#### [2] Advocacy skills – their interp leads to defensive offense, where risks of skepticism are weaponized to avoid progress – debaters become sophists instead of advocates– biggest impact since it provides debate intrinsic value – it harms topic ed and clash.

#### [3] Comparative worlds is a form of truth testing – it decides whether the statement is true based on which world is better – we’ve isolated fairness disadvantages to other forms of truth testing which answers their offense.

#### Impact is reject all the presumption and permisibilty triggers

#### Fairness/Edu/DTD -

## 2

#### Interpretation: Debaters must have a plan text delineated in the 1AC

A] shiftiness

## 3

#### Interpretaion: can’t say skep comes before theory

A] kills theory educatio and norming

B] theory edu o/ws phi

## 4

Skep negates

1] 2ar persuasion

2] no obligation means presume neg

3] permissibilty

## Case