#### Interpretation: Debaters must not read cards. For clarification, cards are any quotes copied and read directly from an author that may be selectively cut or not.

#### Violation: They read the \_\_\_\_\_ card.

#### Standards:

#### 1] Small Schools – cards force debaters to do tons of research. The debater that does more prep always wins. Analytic arguments don’t need prep, and are on equal ground. Small schools are not prepped over due to the large prep bias of cards. Key to inclusion which is an independent voter and outweighs. Excluding small schools means excluding viewpoints, so we don’t know if any arguments we make are correct.

#### 2] Critical Thinking – People read arguments that have been made by others rather than creating their own. Key to education and outweighs because we need to be able to think of our arguments rather than quote. Key to good debate.

#### 3] Strat skew – Aff has more time to read cards. Aff has 6 minutes plus 4 minutes, and the neg only has 7 minutes read cards. Key to fairness. Aff always has more authors and evidence. Aff always wins. Only way to solve is no cards. There is equal time as then 2NR can respond to 1AR arguments with analytic arguments.

#### 4] Prep Skew – Literature always has more cards on one side. There is better cards on one side creating a structural skew. Analytics solve because there is no more cards on one side to make it easier. This is key to fairness because if one side has more prep then they will always win.

#### Topic lit – People still research to make good analytic arguments, they just don’t quote, but also allows for the creation of new arguments without a deficit.

#### Voters:

#### Fairness – fairness is a voter because if debate weren’t fair, people would quit and debate couldn’t exist. Debate is based on fairness and the judge has to make a decision that is fair to both sides.

#### Education – schools fund debate for education and education is a portable impact.

#### Competing interps: A) We compete for a better model of debate which leads to better norms. B) Reasonability allows debaters to be extremely abusive up to a bright line which also necessitates judge intervention.

#### Drop the debater: This is the only way to effectively deter future abuse. Losing for being abusive discourages further abuse k2 norms setting.

#### No RVIs: A) They shouldn’t win just by proving they’re fair. That’s a burden they have coming into the round. B) Prevents good theory debaters from baiting theory. Good theory debaters will read abusive arguments to initiate theory which leads to horrible norms. C) Chilling effect – Debaters will be deterred to read theory if good debaters are always winning on the RVI. Means we can never check abuse.