# 1nc

## 1st

#### Interpretation: debaters may not read substantive and theoretical justifications for their fw

#### Violation: you did

#### Standard

#### 1] Phil-ed: kills phil ed by forcing a theory debate in framework when we are supposed to be learning about and debating philosophy. That’s an indepedant voter because the only thing intrinsic to LD debate is discussion over philosophy and morality. Phil ed also controls the internal link to other voters because we need a concept of noramtivity to even care about fairness or education.

#### 2] Strat skew: TJFs force me to win on both theory and framework to win framework while you may only debate one, extending the other. Kills fairness since I have to engage on different layers with minimal time.

#### 3] Logic – theoretical justifications are bad bc regardless of whether or not the fw is philosophically coherent tjfs ensure we apply illogical args for debates which kills education because its bad to learn about untrue things and fairness because disregarding rules of logic make it so that we’re unable to come up with argumentation – independently logic outweighs because it’s a litmus test for what counts as an argument in the first place

#### Paradigm issues

#### Fairness voter, a] in reading any argument, you presuppose the judge is evaluating it fairly in the first place, b] debate is a competitive activity that requires fair evaluation

#### Drop the debater – 1. Deterrence – Prevents reading the abusive practice in the future since it’s not worth risking the loss which is k2 norm setting indefensible practices die out 2. TS – Otherwise you’ll read a bunch of abusive practices for the time trade off 3. Epistemic Skew – The round has already been skewed so it’s impossible to evaluate the rest of the flow

#### Competing interps – 1. Reasonability encourages a race to the margins of what counts as sufficiently fair which incentivizes as much abuse as possible 2. Norm setting – it encourages the most fair rule through debating competing models 3. Judge intervention – Reasonability begs the question of what the judge thinks is sufficient which takes the round out of the debaters hands.

#### No RVIs – 1. Baiting – incentivizes people to be abusive and script counter-interps to win on the RVI which increases the existence of bad norms 2. Logic – you shouldn’t win for proving you were fair

#### 1NC theory first – a] If I was abusive it was because the 1AC was b] We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea, c] 2AR answers to the 2NR counter-interp are always new, which means their interp is easier to win.

#### Neg abuse o/w aff abuse – we both have 13 minutes but you have persuasive advantages in the 2AR on top of infinite prep time.

#### No new 1ar paradigm issues - A] the 1NC has already occurred with current paradigm issues in mind so new 1ar paradigms moot any theoretical offense -- --- also means no new 1ar fwk justifications because the 1nc occurred without having them which also moots my offense AND its irreciprocal since I only have 1 speech to read a fw, B] introducing them in the aff allows for them to be more rigorously tested which o/w’s on time frame since we can set higher quality norms.

#### No cross-apps, overviews, or meta theory – make them win the CI cause they know they’re abusive and have to read takeouts to theory to win when called out, anything else recreates their abuse and assumes it was justified in the first place since they just try to commit more abuse to take out the shell

#### Reject 1ar, a], b], b]

## 2nd

#### interpretation: if the affirmative says the neg can only gain offense from one unconditional route to the ballot, then they may not limit what arguments I get to read as my uncondo route

#### violation: they read one uncondo and things like no neg meta theory

#### standard

#### 1] fairness– aff definitionally pigeonholds the nc strat into one thing which means they have inf prep time to craft and prep out perfect 1ars to everything and we have no recourse

## Case