Interpretation: Debaters must disclose the position they plan on reading 15 minutes prior to the start of the round. They ought not disclose two completely different positions 15 minutes before round and only specify which one 8 minutes before the round.

Violation, they did; look to the screenshots above.

Standards: Engagement

Fairness is a voter, competition, double bind

No RVI’s

C.I

DTD to deter future abuse

They offered to meet the interp but there was no way for them do so, not my burden to ask which one, it’s common practice to disclose ONE aff

D:

Fairness is voter since its an intrinsic good to the activity. Debate requires effective competition to give meaning to the work we do, and the only way to actualize any benefit of the activity is if the judge can make a decision. Filter impacts via intrinsicness—Debate does not make us loyal to any content and isn’t a final consensus about any question – the only thing that happens is that one of us wins and the other loses. That means even if the impacts they’re claiming quantitatively outweigh my fairness impacts, fairness still acts as a gateway issue. It extrinsically comes first a) skew b) inclusivity and c) double bind – both control the internal link to case crosapps

And no RVIs

1. Incentivizes debaters to read abusive arguments and then win off the RVI
2. You shouldn’t get to win just by proving you were topical, this is specific to the topic

Competing Interps first

1. Reasonability is arbitrary and begs judge intervention to determine what is reasonable
2. Reasonability creates a race to the bottom incentivizing debaters to come as close to the brightline as possible

Drop the Debater to set a norm for debate, revaluation kills the 1NC and 2NR can never recover.