# 1NC TFA State Round 1

## 1

### Speaks

#### Give me 30 speaks—prevents arbitrary biases from seeping into the decision.

## 2

### CP

#### CP Text – In a Democracy, a Free Press ought to prioritize Objectivity over Advocacy, except for instances of Solution Journalism.

#### Advocating for a particular Solution suspends Objectivity in favor of Partial Campaigning.

Salvesen 18, Ingerid. "Should journalists campaign on climate change." (2018). (Ingerid Salvesen has written and produced stories for several of Norway´s biggest newspapers and media companies. Before she chose freelancing she worked, amongst others, as a foreign affairs reporter for the leading Norwegian news agency, NTB, and as a long form writer for the Magazine of Norway´s largest business daily, Dagens Næringsliv. As a journalist, she is interested in questions of environment, migration and inequality, and has increasingly been covering climate change science and politics. Together with two journalist colleagues, she started an independent foreign affairs podcast in 2016 called "Du verden!".)//Elmer

Still, it was not just climate science generally the Guardian embraced in its campaign, but a specific policy proposal – and this was met with criticism at the time. Yet Alan Rusbridger argue that it is acceptable for editorial objectivity to be suspended on matters which has such profound moral and social consequences as climate change arguably does have, and he likened it with apartheid and tobacco: “You can view this in two ways. One is that this is a moral issue, like tobacco and apartheid - you should not have your money with these companies, as they are irresponsible. Or you can argue that it is financially recklessness - these are stranded assets and if you are investing in a long-term perspective you are being irresponsible. We are not going to be neutral about that, or impartial about that – this is a campaign and here is what you can do” His latter point was one of the key arguments for running the KIITG-campaign: the perceived benefits of offering people an actionable alternative. The journalists in favour argued it would make the project stand out from normal journalism on climate change where you are mainly just offered (more of the same) information, and also it was argued it could break the feeling of hopelessness that they thought the public (and even many of the journalists themselves) were feeling when reading about climate change. “The advantages of a news organisation stepping into an advocacy role is that you provide a mechanism for taking action”, says Aron Pilhofer. “A campaign gives people agency and ownership and something that they can touch”, argued James Randerson.

#### Solution Journalism solves Climate Change and Deforestation.

Lake 17 Rebecca Lake. CONSTRUCTIVE NEWS: CAN SOLUTIONS JOURNALISM SAVE OUR FORESTS?. <https://www.un-page.org/constructive-news-can-solutions-journalism-save-our-forests?fbclid=IwAR1v5jjkjQ_CxDeUJZaMzQdDG_1mdbYfmpzqYsSFvWRYN2aszSAFAffFpq4> [UNDP Communications Consultant]

Everyday day we are bombarded with devasting news about our natural world. From the latest IPBES report which warned of ‘unprecedented’ species extinction to mass deforestation and the rise of global temperatures, the daily cycle of bad news is relentless. And the research says audiences are switching off in droves because of this. According to a recent study conducted by the Reuters Institute, nearly 50 per cent of survey respondents said they currently avoid the news media because it had a negative effect on their moods. Almost a third said they avoided news because it made them feel helpless. Can a different approach to journalism, one which presents potential solutions alongside the problems, bring readers back and ultimately inspire change? Giselle Green, Editor of Constructive Voices, says news that only conveys doom and gloom isn’t actually telling us the entire story. She is among a growing cohort of journalism practitioners calling for more solutions to be featured alongside traditional news stories. “Basically constructive journalism, sometimes referred to as solutions reporting, is all about how journalism can react to problems,” explains the former BBC journalist. “It’s rigorous reporting, it’s not just fluffy stories that make you smile. It should spark a constructive response among audiences.” Some of the world’s biggest media organizations are already experimenting with a solutions approach. This includes the Guardian’s Upside series, which aims to seek out answers, solutions, movements and initiatives to some of the biggest problems besetting the world. In this series, articles ranges from ‘A new leaf: the hardy trees reforesting the Amazon’ to global examples of where carbon taxes are actually popular. Documentary films about climate change such as the recently released 2040 — by acclaimed Australian filmmaker Damon Gameau — are also looking to inspire audiences by showing viewers what’s possible with solutions that already exist. From regenerative farming to independent community solar power grids, 2040 presents just a small handful of climate solutions that have the potential to inspire and empower audiences worldwide. Nevertheless, many journalists and media outlets remain sceptical. Some claim that the approach can devolve into biased or “feel-good” advocacy, rather than a critical examination of important social issues that hold the powerful to account. However, proponents of solutions journalism argue that while the approach doesn’t necessarily try to uncover ‘hidden information’ or scandalous wrongdoings, it can still be influential by showcasing what governments and business could and should be doing. To further explore the potential of solutions journalism in the context of climate change and deforestation, the UNDP’s Green Commodities Programme, with the Good Growth Partnership, facilitated a shared learning experience in the Peruvian Amazon for eight international journalists. The initiative began with a two-day workshop in Lima, where selected journalists had the opportunity to consider the powerful role international media plays in reporting deforestation predominately driven by agricultural commodities. Despite extensive efforts over the past decade to slow tropical deforestation, the latest findings from WRI’s Global Forest Watch report paint a grim picture. Around 12 million hectares of forest in the world's tropical regions were lost in 2018, equivalent to 30 football fields per minute. Yet, while the urgency to halt deforestation is increasingly dominating headlines, the why and the how of doing so – the solution focus — is not as well known. Throughout the workshop – which was co-hosted by the Thomson Reuters Foundation and supported by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and Partnership for Action on Green Economy (PAGE) — the journalists were encouraged to consider the solutions for key sustainability and development issues in major agricultural commodity supply chains. Led by Sara El-Khalili of the Thomson Reuters Foundation, workshop guest speakers included Giselle Green of Constructive Voices, Paul Dickinson, Founder and Executive Chair of CDP (formerly the Carbon Disclosure Project). Deep insights into sustainability issues in Peru were provided by James Leslie, UNDP-Peru’s Technical Advisor on Ecosystems and Climate Change. After attending the opening high-level session of the Good Growth Conference in Lima — where the journalists had the opportunity to interview the Ministers of Environment and Agriculture from Peru and Ecuador — the reporters journeyed into the Amazon to put what they had learned about solutions journalism into practice. For Alejandra Agudo Lazareno, a reporter for Spain’s El Pais daily newspaper, ‘solutions journalism’ isn’t entirely a new concept. “In Planeta Futuro we regularly write pieces with positive points of view. But it’s not something I usually consider in the case deforestation and commodities,” she explained. “In general, this experience has been a great opportunity to gain new knowledge from other news outlets and learn more about the ways in which humanity is trying to do the right thing for the planet,” said Alejandra whose story was inspired by the successful sustainable development strategies being implemented in Peru’s San Martin region. This immersive approach to learning conducted in the heart of one of the world’s most important ecosystems is a defining feature of the Good Growth Conference. Being in the Amazon helped conference delegates, and journalists, gain a deeper connection to their work as well as the resilience and motivation needed to sustain collective efforts for change. For Bhimanto Suwastoyo of the Palm Scribe, the Good Growth Journalism Initiativeprovided a valuable opportunity to understand the deforestation challenge from different angles and perspectives. During his time in Peru, the Indonesian journalist reported on how the small Amazonian community of Chazuta transitioned from illicit coca production (for cocaine) to sustainable cocoa. “My takeaway from the training, and the Good Growth Conference, is that nothing beats on-site learning visits to motivate solution-based journalism and that the best solutions to problems, in any field, usually involve as many stakeholders as possible working together to arrive at the solution.” “I will now approach a story by first looking at it through the lenses of a number of different perspectives,” explained Bhimanto whose publication, The Palm Scribe, aims to help the palm oil sector foster a healthier and more constructive public discourse. Eromo Egbejule, West Africa Editor of The Africa Report, used his time in the Amazon to examine new approaches to sustainable agriculture in Latin America which could be applied across the Atlantic. “One of the biggest takeaways I gained from participating in the Good Growth Journalism Initiative was being exposed to what’s already being achieved in Peru and neighbouring countries.” “I heard Costa Rica’s remarkable story. The country managed to reverse what was one of the highest deforestation rates in the world, with radical reforms backed by political willpower. It’s a lesson countries in Africa ought to learn.” Eromo detailed his findings in an article he published in the Africa Report: Lessons on political willpower from Costa Rica and Peru. Meanwhile Fabiano Maisonnave, Amazon correspondent for Folha de São Paulo, used his time at the Good Growth Conference to investigate the environmental impacts of the invasive tilapia fish species, which was introduced in Peru three decades ago. “I noticed that every restaurant in the small Amazonian community of Sauce was only serving one variety of fish [tilapia],” he explained. On the other side of the forest system, in the Brazilian state of Tocantins, officials are currently experimenting with how best to cultivate the foreign fish species which was previously banned and has already decimated native fish stocks in Peru and Bolivia. During the conference, Fabiano was able to observe an exchange of ideas between Peru’s San Martin Production Director, Raúl Belaunde, and Marcelo Soares, head of Tocantins State's environmental licensing agency in Brazil. Belaunde — who participated in and co-hosted the week-long event with the Governor — explained that the tilapia in his province is “impossible to control” and regretted his country’s decision to introduce it. “I don’t think the Tocantins representative was deterred, but at least the Peruvian government officials were able to share and recommend best practices which may help to mitigate some risks to Brazil’s Amazonian ecosystem,” explained Fabiano. Fabiano’s report quotes a number of Brazilian conservationists and regional experts who are urgently seeking more information about the risks of tilapia cultivation as they try to avoid the same fate as neighbouring Amazonian countries. For Switzerland-based journalist, Paula Dupraz-Dobias, the chance to speak with the indigenous leaders of San Martin’s Quechua community meant she was able to gain first-hand accounts and local wisdom directly from those who know the forests best. “Listening to - and reporting on - indigenous peoples may allow us to learn from their wisdom, particularly in how we can live from resources at our doorstep and better appreciate the fragility of our global environment.” she said when asked about the opportunity to visit the indigenous community of Alto Pucalpillo. “Unfortunately, very often the voices of indigenous communities are dismissed in global discussions on climate change and sustainable development goals. Hopefully our access as journalists to these communities can help project their voices - and wisdom -to a wider audience.”

#### Warming causes Extinction

Kareiva 18, Peter, and Valerie Carranza. "Existential risk due to ecosystem collapse: Nature strikes back." Futures 102 (2018): 39-50. (Ph.D. in ecology and applied mathematics from Cornell University, director of the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability at UCLA, Pritzker Distinguished Professor in Environment & Sustainability at UCLA)//Re-cut by Elmer

In summary, six of the nine proposed planetary boundaries (phosphorous, nitrogen, biodiversity, land use, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution) are unlikely to be associated with existential risks. They all correspond to a degraded environment, but in our assessment do not represent existential risks. However, the three remaining boundaries (**climate change**, global **freshwater** cycle, **and** ocean **acidification**) do **pose existential risks**. This is **because of** intrinsic **positive feedback loops**, substantial lag times between system change and experiencing the consequences of that change, and the fact these different boundaries interact with one another in ways that yield surprises. In addition, climate, freshwater, and ocean acidification are all **directly connected to** the provision of **food and water**, and **shortages** of food and water can **create conflict** and social unrest. Climate change has a long history of disrupting civilizations and sometimes precipitating the collapse of cultures or mass emigrations (McMichael, 2017). For example, the 12th century drought in the North American Southwest is held responsible for the collapse of the Anasazi pueblo culture. More recently, the infamous potato famine of 1846–1849 and the large migration of Irish to the U.S. can be traced to a combination of factors, one of which was climate. Specifically, 1846 was an unusually warm and moist year in Ireland, providing the climatic conditions favorable to the fungus that caused the potato blight. As is so often the case, poor government had a role as well—as the British government forbade the import of grains from outside Britain (imports that could have helped to redress the ravaged potato yields). Climate change intersects with freshwater resources because it is expected to exacerbate drought and water scarcity, as well as flooding. Climate change can even impair water quality because it is associated with heavy rains that overwhelm sewage treatment facilities, or because it results in higher concentrations of pollutants in groundwater as a result of enhanced evaporation and reduced groundwater recharge. **Ample clean water** is not a luxury—it **is essential for human survival**. Consequently, cities, regions and nations that lack clean freshwater are vulnerable to social disruption and disease. Finally, ocean acidification is linked to climate change because it is driven by CO2 emissions just as global warming is. With close to 20% of the world’s protein coming from oceans (FAO, 2016), the potential for severe impacts due to acidification is obvious. Less obvious, but perhaps more insidious, is the interaction between climate change and the loss of oyster and coral reefs due to acidification. Acidification is known to interfere with oyster reef building and coral reefs. Climate change also increases storm frequency and severity. Coral reefs and oyster reefs provide protection from storm surge because they reduce wave energy (Spalding et al., 2014). If these reefs are lost due to acidification at the same time as storms become more severe and sea level rises, coastal communities will be exposed to unprecedented storm surge—and may be ravaged by recurrent storms. A key feature of the risk associated with climate change is that mean annual temperature and mean annual rainfall are not the variables of interest. Rather it is extreme episodic events that place nations and entire regions of the world at risk. These extreme events are by definition “rare” (once every hundred years), and changes in their likelihood are challenging to detect because of their rarity, but are exactly the manifestations of climate change that we must get better at anticipating (Diffenbaugh et al., 2017). Society will have a hard time responding to shorter intervals between rare extreme events because in the lifespan of an individual human, a person might experience as few as two or three extreme events. How likely is it that you would notice a change in the interval between events that are separated by decades, especially given that the interval is not regular but varies stochastically? A concrete example of this dilemma can be found in the past and expected future changes in storm-related flooding of New York City. The highly disruptive flooding of New York City associated with Hurricane Sandy represented a flood height that occurred once every 500 years in the 18th century, and that occurs now once every 25 years, but is expected to occur once every 5 years by 2050 (Garner et al., 2017). This change in frequency of extreme floods has profound implications for the measures New York City should take to protect its infrastructure and its population, yet because of the stochastic nature of such events, this shift in flood frequency is an elevated risk that will go unnoticed by most people. 4. The combination of positive feedback loops and societal inertia is fertile ground for global environmental catastrophes **Humans** are remarkably ingenious, and **have adapted** to crises **throughout** their **history**. Our doom has been repeatedly predicted, only to be averted by innovation (Ridley, 2011). **However**, the many **stories** **of** human ingenuity **successfully** **addressing** **existential risks** such as global famine or extreme air pollution **represent** environmental c**hallenges that are** largely **linear**, have immediate consequences, **and operate without positive feedbacks**. For example, the fact that food is in short supply does not increase the rate at which humans consume food—thereby increasing the shortage. Similarly, massive air pollution episodes such as the London fog of 1952 that killed 12,000 people did not make future air pollution events more likely. In fact it was just the opposite—the London fog sent such a clear message that Britain quickly enacted pollution control measures (Stradling, 2016). Food shortages, air pollution, water pollution, etc. send immediate signals to society of harm, which then trigger a negative feedback of society seeking to reduce the harm. In contrast, today’s great environmental crisis of climate change may cause some harm but there are generally long time delays between rising CO2 concentrations and damage to humans. The consequence of these delays are an absence of urgency; thus although 70% of Americans believe global warming is happening, only 40% think it will harm them (http://climatecommunication.yale.edu/visualizations-data/ycom-us-2016/). Secondly, unlike past environmental challenges, **the Earth’s climate system is rife with positive feedback loops**. In particular, as CO2 increases and the climate warms, that **very warming can cause more CO2 release** which further increases global warming, and then more CO2, and so on. Table 2 summarizes the best documented positive feedback loops for the Earth’s climate system. These feedbacks can be neatly categorized into carbon cycle, biogeochemical, biogeophysical, cloud, ice-albedo, and water vapor feedbacks. As important as it is to understand these feedbacks individually, it is even more essential to study the interactive nature of these feedbacks. Modeling studies show that when interactions among feedback loops are included, uncertainty increases dramatically and there is a heightened potential for perturbations to be magnified (e.g., Cox, Betts, Jones, Spall, & Totterdell, 2000; Hajima, Tachiiri, Ito, & Kawamiya, 2014; Knutti & Rugenstein, 2015; Rosenfeld, Sherwood, Wood, & Donner, 2014). This produces a wide range of future scenarios. Positive feedbacks in the carbon cycle involves the enhancement of future carbon contributions to the atmosphere due to some initial increase in atmospheric CO2. This happens because as CO2 accumulates, it reduces the efficiency in which oceans and terrestrial ecosystems sequester carbon, which in return feeds back to exacerbate climate change (Friedlingstein et al., 2001). Warming can also increase the rate at which organic matter decays and carbon is released into the atmosphere, thereby causing more warming (Melillo et al., 2017). Increases in food shortages and lack of water is also of major concern when biogeophysical feedback mechanisms perpetuate drought conditions. The underlying mechanism here is that losses in vegetation increases the surface albedo, which suppresses rainfall, and thus enhances future vegetation loss and more suppression of rainfall—thereby initiating or prolonging a drought (Chamey, Stone, & Quirk, 1975). To top it off, overgrazing depletes the soil, leading to augmented vegetation loss (Anderies, Janssen, & Walker, 2002). Climate change often also increases the risk of forest fires, as a result of higher temperatures and persistent drought conditions. The expectation is that **forest fires will become more frequent** and severe with climate warming and drought (Scholze, Knorr, Arnell, & Prentice, 2006), a trend for which we have already seen evidence (Allen et al., 2010). Tragically, the increased severity and risk of Southern California wildfires recently predicted by climate scientists (Jin et al., 2015), was realized in December 2017, with the largest fire in the history of California (the “Thomas fire” that burned 282,000 acres, https://www.vox.com/2017/12/27/16822180/thomas-fire-california-largest-wildfire). This **catastrophic fire** embodies the sorts of positive feedbacks and interacting factors that **could catch humanity off-guard and produce a** true **apocalyptic event.** Record-breaking rains produced an extraordinary flush of new vegetation, that then dried out as record heat waves and dry conditions took hold, coupled with stronger than normal winds, and ignition. Of course the record-fire released CO2 into the atmosphere, thereby contributing to future warming. Out of all types of feedbacks, water vapor and the ice-albedo feedbacks are the most clearly understood mechanisms. Losses in reflective snow and ice cover drive up surface temperatures, leading to even more melting of snow and ice cover—this is known as the ice-albedo feedback (Curry, Schramm, & Ebert, 1995). As snow and ice continue to melt at a more rapid pace, millions of people may be displaced by flooding risks as a consequence of sea level rise near coastal communities (Biermann & Boas, 2010; Myers, 2002; Nicholls et al., 2011). The water vapor feedback operates when warmer atmospheric conditions strengthen the saturation vapor pressure, which creates a warming effect given water vapor’s strong greenhouse gas properties (Manabe & Wetherald, 1967). Global warming tends to increase cloud formation because warmer temperatures lead to more evaporation of water into the atmosphere, and warmer temperature also allows the atmosphere to hold more water. The key question is whether this increase in clouds associated with global warming will result in a positive feedback loop (more warming) or a negative feedback loop (less warming). For decades, scientists have sought to answer this question and understand the net role clouds play in future climate projections (Schneider et al., 2017). Clouds are complex because they both have a cooling (reflecting incoming solar radiation) and warming (absorbing incoming solar radiation) effect (Lashof, DeAngelo, Saleska, & Harte, 1997). The type of cloud, altitude, and optical properties combine to determine how these countervailing effects balance out. Although still under debate, it appears that in most circumstances the cloud feedback is likely positive (Boucher et al., 2013). For example, models and observations show that increasing greenhouse gas concentrations reduces the low-level cloud fraction in the Northeast Pacific at decadal time scales. This then has a positive feedback effect and enhances climate warming since less solar radiation is reflected by the atmosphere (Clement, Burgman, & Norris, 2009). The key lesson from the long list of potentially positive feedbacks and their interactions is that **runaway climate change,** and runaway perturbations have to be taken as a serious possibility. Table 2 is just a snapshot of the type of feedbacks that have been identified (see Supplementary material for a more thorough explanation of positive feedback loops). However, this list is not exhaustive and the possibility of undiscovered positive feedbacks **portends** even greater **existential risks**. The many environmental crises humankind has previously averted (famine, ozone depletion, London fog, water pollution, etc.) were averted because of political will based on solid scientific understanding. We cannot count on complete scientific understanding when it comes to positive feedback loops and climate change.

#### PICs Negate - the role of the neg is to prove the Aff bad, while the Aff should prove that they’re optimal. Every counterplan establishes an opportunity cost to the plan --- any limit on that is arbitrary – Independently, they spec US, so PICs are key neg ground and you don’t defend the general principle of the res

## 3

### Theory

#### Interpretation: The affirmative may not specify a democracy in which a free press ought to prioritize objectivity over advocacy

#### ‘A’ is indefinite – means you have to prove the rez in a vacuum, not a particular instance

CCC (“Articles, Determiners, and Quantifiers”, http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/determiners/determiners.htm#articles, Capital Community College Foundation, a nonprofit 501 c-3 organization that supports scholarships, faculty development, and curriculum innovation)

The three articles — a, an, the — are a kind of adjective. The is called the definite article because it usually precedes a specific or previously mentioned noun; a and an are called indefinite articles because they are used to refer to something in a less specific manner (an unspecified count noun). These words are also listed among the noun markers or determiners because they are almost invariably followed by a noun (or something else acting as a noun). caution CAUTION! Even after you learn all the principles behind the use of these articles, you will find an abundance of situations where choosing the correct article or choosing whether to use one or not will prove chancy. Icy highways are dangerous. The icy highways are dangerous. And both are correct. The is used with specific nouns. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something that is one of a kind: The moon circles the earth. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something in the abstract: The United States has encouraged the use of the private automobile as opposed to the use of public transit. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something named earlier in the text. (See below..) If you would like help with the distinction between count and non-count nouns, please refer to Count and Non-Count Nouns. We use a before singular count-nouns that begin with consonants (a cow, a barn, a sheep); we use an before singular count-nouns that begin with vowels or vowel-like sounds (an apple, an urban blight, an open door). Words that begin with an h sound often require an a (as in a horse, a history book, a hotel), but if an h-word begins with an actual vowel sound, use an an (as in an hour, an honor). We would say a useful device and a union matter because the u of those words actually sounds like yoo (as opposed, say, to the u of an ugly incident). The same is true of a European and a Euro (because of that consonantal "Yoo" sound). We would say a once-in-a-lifetime experience or a one-time hero because the words once and one begin with a w sound (as if they were spelled wuntz and won). Merriam-Webster's Dictionary says that we can use an before an h- word that begins with an unstressed syllable. Thus, we might say an hisTORical moment, but we would say a HIStory book. Many writers would call that an affectation and prefer that we say a historical, but apparently, this choice is a matter of personal taste. For help on using articles with abbreviations and acronyms (a or an FBI agent?), see the section on Abbreviations. First and subsequent reference: When we first refer to something in written text, we often use an indefinite article to modify it. A newspaper has an obligation to seek out and tell the truth. In a subsequent reference to this newspaper, however, we will use the definite article: There are situations, however, when the newspaper must determine whether the public's safety is jeopardized by knowing the truth. Another example: "I'd like a glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put the glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Exception: When a modifier appears between the article and the noun, the subsequent article will continue to be indefinite: "I'd like a big glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put a big glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Generic reference: We can refer to something in a generic way by using any of the three articles. We can do the same thing by omitting the article altogether. A beagle makes a great hunting dog and family companion. An airedale is sometimes a rather skittish animal. The golden retriever is a marvelous pet for children. Irish setters are not the highly intelligent animals they used to be. The difference between the generic indefinite pronoun and the normal indefinite pronoun is that the latter refers to any of that class ("I want to buy a beagle, and any old beagle will do.") whereas the former (see beagle sentence) refers to all members of that class

#### Violation: they spec US

#### Standards:

#### 1] Precision – they justify arbitrarily doing away with words in the rez which decks ground and prep. Voter for jurisdiction since the judge can’t vote aff if there wasn’t a legitimate aff.

#### 2] Limits – there are hundreds of democracies, but other metrics means even more – explodes limits since there are tons of affs and combinations with different situations i.e. inherency in France is different from the US – there are no DAs that apply to every aff. Some examples are UK, Japan, US, India, etc.

#### 3] TVA – read your advantage under a whole rez aff. Answers PICs – potential doesn’t justify actual abuse and lack of prep means cheaty word and process PICs.

#### Fairness is a voter and outweighs – debate is a competitive activity that requires objective evaluation.

#### Drop the debater to deter future abuse.

#### Competing interps – reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention while encouraging a race to the bottom.

#### No RVIs – Logic – you don’t win for being fair, outweighs since arguments must be logical

## 4

### Theory

#### Interp: The affirmative debater may not say use no calc indicts and extinction first, and specify the resolution.

#### Violation: that’s their FW and they spec util

#### Abuse Story: the neg can never win the FW debate since even if I win the NC I lose to extinction first, can’t say that if I win my FW then they say all attacks are calc indicts, and I can’t win substantively since they can just cherrypick one really good extinction scenario that I can’t contest

#### Strat Skew: Kills negative engagement on the framework level by creating a 3 to 1 structural skew which o/ws A] Structural abuse outweighs since better debating can always combat substantive abuse but unequal burdens makes procedural evaluation skewed. B] They’ll say that we can just line-by-line their arguments but that doesn’t solve since it makes it a no-risk issue since they can still win under util + extinction first

#### Clash: it kills clash since negs are disincentivized from contesting the aff FW which A] kills phil ed which o/ws since it’s the only unique ed to LD B] topic ed is nonunique since topic lit includes more than just util literature. C] meeting any of the planks solves your interp because it allows for you to read your aff while still giving the neg the ability to engage.

## 5

### Theory

#### No 1AR Theory—-

#### 1~ The 2NR must overcover theory since they get 3 minute 2ar collapse on one of the layers and persuasiveness advantage of a 3 minute 2ar

#### 2~ Responses to my counter interp will be new which means 1ar theory necessitates intervention—-outweighs because it makes the decision arbitrary

#### 3~ I only have one chance to respond after it is introduced while they have two chances

#### 4~ Reject infinite abuse claims—a~ spikes solve—there are only so many theoretical issues anyway, b~ infinite abuse doesn't exist since there are a finite number of rounds, c~ if I win I can't engage in 1AR theory then you could never check infinite abuse since we can't use your shells to determine what's abusive d. Functional limits solves – I only have 7 minutes so I can’t be infinitely abusive