## 1

#### Interpretation: All AC spikes or preemptive theoretical framing issues/ROB must be read at the top of the affirmative’s case

#### Violation: They were at the bottom

#### The standard is strat skew – I can’t formulate my NC strategy until after the spikes are read because you could have several framing issues like 1AR theory paradigm, AFC, Theory incoherent, no neg fiat, or PICs bad. That moots 6 minutes of time I could be using to formulate an NC that best meets the spikes and engages with the aff. Strat skew is key to reciprocal fairness since you get to form your 1AR strat during my NC. Key to education since it leads to more specific clash with the aff. Scrolling to the bottom of the doc doesn’t solve: some people don’t flow off the doc and it forces me to miss the top part of the case while reading the underview.

**Paradigms – Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation. Drop the debater – a] indicts the aff so drop the arg is drop the debater b] deter future abuse Competing interps – a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm b] it creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate. No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices. c] Getting faster solves. 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. 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.**

## 2

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must not defend the resolution a general principle.

#### Violation: They do – that was on the contention.

#### Standards:

#### 1 – Topic Education – General principle moots topic education because it allows debaters to recycle generic arguments which deny the truth of everything.

#### 2 – Reciprocal burdens – proving a deductive argument is false only requires you win defense against one premise and proving an inductive argument is false is more difficult because of status quo bias. Our model solves because it eschews the idea that either side unilaterally carries the burden of proof, and requires both debaters to give an account of why their world is more desirable not principle.

#### 3 – Ground: It gives them the ability to shift out of all CPs by saying they don’t disprove the general principle of the AFF which is bad – Good policymaking requires making comparisons between similar courses of action – saying that CPs are bad doesn’t answer this because we should have to opportunity to argue that in round. CPs teach us to find the best policy possible – debate should teach us to be better decisionmakers because it’s the only transferable skill to the rest of our lives, also controls the I/L to ground because they get infinite advocacies but I only get one.

## 3

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must not claim they get 1AR theory as the highest layer and RVIs on NC theory.

#### Violation: The UV.

#### Standard is reciprocity – you already get access to the highest layer of the round, but I can’t read theory because you’ll just dump on it and anyway I’ll just lose to infinite 1AR shells.

## 4

#### Their philosophy structurally excludes the queer body – focus on reason and universalizability structurally excludes homosexuality – this isn’t an ad hom.

**Soble 3** – Alan Soble, The Monist 86:1 (Jan. 2003), pp. 55-89. Kant and Sexual Perversion

Kant immediately continues by completing his sparse inventory of three objectionable, sexually unnatural, practices: A second crimen carnis contra naturam is intercourse between sexus homogenii, in which the object of sexual impulse is a human being but there is homogeneity instead of heterogeneity of sex. . . . This practice too is contrary to the ends of humanity; for the end of humanity in respect of sexuality is to preserve the species without debasing the person; but in this instance the species is not being preserved (as it can be by a crimen carnis secundum naturam), but the person is set aside, the self is degraded below the level of the animals, and humanity is dishonoured. The third crimen carnis contra naturam occurs when the object of the desire is in fact of the opposite sex but is not human. Such is sodomy, or intercourse with animals. This, too, is contrary to the ends of humanity and against our natural instinct. It degrades mankind below the level of animals, for no animal turns in this way from its own species.75

#### Vote neg – they read morally repugnant arguments. Thus, the alternative is to drop the debater:

#### 1 – Accessibility – A] It’s a lexical prereq because you need people in debate for argumentation to exist. B] All aff arguments presuppose that people feel safe in this space to respond to them.

## 5

#### Paradigm for 1AR shells and independent voters:

#### 1 – Reasonability – 1AR theory is crazy aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to– reasonability checks 2AR sandbagging by preventing crazy abusive 1NCs while still giving the 2N a chance.

#### 2 – DTA – They can blow up a blippy 20 second shell to 3 min of the 2AR while I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention and means 1AR theory is irresolvable so you shouldn’t stake the round on it.

#### 3 – No new 1AR theory paradigm issues – A] the 1NC has already occurred with current paradigm issues in mind so new 1ar paradigms moot any theoretical offense