# 1NC

## 1st

interp – all neg interps are counter inteprs and no neg rvis on 1ac+1ar theory

violation

inf abuse –

#### 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

#### Also a reason to vote neg on substance since I couldn’t engage

#### DTD, a] deternece, b] epistemic skew

#### No RVI – a] baiting, good theory debaters bait with abusive positions and always win on the RVI, b] logic – you shouldn’t win for proving you were fair, logic ow since it is a meta constraint on all arguments we make

#### Competing interpretations over reasonability: A) reasonability is arbitrary – it invites arbitrary judge intervention since someone has to decide what’s reasonable, B) competing interps is key to setting norms for debate – that’s good since we stop future abuse.

#### 1nc theory first

theory shells about 1ac paradigm issues come first

#### 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

## 2nd

interpretation – debtaers must not read 1ar theory dtd and eval theory after the 1ar and 1ar theory highest layer

# Case

ROB is comparative worlds

A] collapses

Presumption permissibility negates

#### [1] Semantics – Ought is defined as expressing obligation which means absent a proactive obligation you vote neg since there’s a trichotomy between prohibition, obligation, and permissibility and proving one disproves the other two. Semantics outweighs – A. it’s key to predictability since we prep based on the wording of the res B. It’s constitutive to the rules of debate since the judge is obligated to vote on the resolutional text.

#### [2] Logic – Propositions require positive justification before being accepted, otherwise one would be forced to accept the validity of logically contradictory propositions regarding subjects one knows nothing about, i.e. if one knew nothing about P one would have to presume that both “P” and “~P” are true

#### No 1AR Theory or Independent Voters – a] Resolvability: Either you auto accept all responses to 2NR standards and they auto win since I can't respond, or you intervene to give 2AR credence and xapp their resolvability weighing, b] infinite abuse, c] no aff infinite abuse

Offense

Turn – deliberation requires ability to appropriate