**NIBS GOOD…4:00**

[Extend the NC within 1:45]

A. Counter-interpretation: On the Jan/Feb domestic violence topic each debater may run one and only one necessary but insufficient burden.

B. I meet the NC is necessary but insufficient

C. The standard is:

**Framework Ground:** Allowing one necessary but insufficient burden is crucial to framework ground because

A) Without allowing for side constraints we could not isolate the logical necessity of arguments. They are one of only 3 types of framework: necessary but insufficient burdens, comparative frameworks, and sufficient burdens, so excluding them destroys 33% of framework ground.

B) Crucial moral theorists like Nozick, and political theorists such as Glover discuss arguments in terms of their necessary but insufficient function. Allowing one necessary but insufficient burden allows for the inclusion of such authors into debate positions, and their interp excludes key framework lit.

C) On this topic specifically the negative has horrible ground because I have to somehow justify the counterintuitive notion that it is impermissible for victims of egregious and often life-threatening abuse not to take an act of self-preservation. This abuse is verified by the widespread consensus in the debate community that this topic is touchy and emotionally charged for many, for instance, palmer’s article on NSD update about this issue. Necessary but insufficient burdens about the nature of moral statements stray away from offensive arguments making them crucial neg ground.

D) It’s basically impossible to have an NC that isn’t insufficient because that would exclude any means-based framework ground since the converse of the resolution is just a prohibition meaning it doesn’t take an action, and generating offense from a state of affairs to a means based framework is impossible because it doesn’t involve action or intent. Thus, granting the neg the ability to run one necessary but insufficient NC is literally the only way to allow for neg framework; granting the aff interp means that the only acceptable neg argumentation is to grant the aff framework and turn it.

It doesn’t make sense to say that I can establish a framework and then prove whether that framework establishes whether the resolution is true or false because a) empirically every ethical framework that allows for dispute on the issue goes aff; hence there aren’t any creative, turnable NCs, and b) frameworks *do* go one way or the other; if they allowed for dispute they would cease to function as guides to action.

And, framework ground is key to fairness because it insures reciprocity of strategic options and preparation by allowing all sides the opportunity to select worldviews. This functions as an internal link turn to the AFF view on reciprocity. Preparation reciprocity **outweighs** in-round reciprocity because (A) it affects all rounds and (B) winning in-round arguments (like winning standards) will always skew in-round reciprocity regardless. And, my link to the voter outweighs theirs on strength of link because fairness deficits generated by denying me the ability to run a necessary but insufficient burden are quantifiable. They exclude specific moral theories, at least 33% of framework ground, and force me to defend arguments that people have actively and concretely labeled offensive meaning that their violation of fairness is most verifiable. And, I outweigh on magnitude because on this topic NIBs bad destroys almost every possible NC on this topic and limits me to defending util (on which the contention debate is *definitely* is skewed aff) or granting the AC framework. Also, my interp solves back for a reciprocity deficit 100% because they could have run one too. They’ll claim that its impossible to compare necessary but insufficient burdens but that’s false, they just have to do real debating instead of this theory bullshit and engage in a framework comparison.

And, framework ground is key to education because we debate to learn how arguments interact with each other. Learning about framework is more important than all other topical education because we join debate not to learn specifically about domestic violence but to learn how to make arguments on a variety of topics. So framework is pivotal to the critical thinking that is debate’s most exportable education.

Moreover, philosophical education is the most important type of education because it is unique to debate. While people are exposed to politics and current events in everyday life, most people don’t learn about philosophy outside of academic structures like a philosophy major or national circuit LD.

D. Voter. Education is a more important than fairness because:

1. The purpose of debate is to serve as an educational activity. That’s why schools and families support the huge cost of qualifying for and debating at the TOC.

2. Fairness is only instrumental to education. If we had a fair game but no education happened, then there would be no reason for it to be a curricular or academic activity. If debate is educational but slightly unfair, it could still be academic. So, when education competes with fairness, education should win.

3. Education has more exportable value than fairness. We are only debaters during high school but we carry education we gain into the real world; we don’t carry whether there was neg side bias into the real world.

4. Fairness is only necessary to provide constraints within which we can learn because it functions to provide a competitive incentive to learn more, which allows you to perform better in debate. Thus, as long as they don’t show an overwhelming deficit of fairness, prefer education.

5. Fairness functions to provide a competitive incentive to learn more, which allows you to perform better in debate.

6. People create rules for debate to make the game more accessible for debaters so they can get an educational benefit from the activity, but if I’m being educational the benefit is a moot point.

And, even if I’m losing the education debate prefer my interp because I generate links into *both* fairness and education meaning that my rule is marginally better for debate than a rule that only ensures fairness.

Next, the neg gets the RVI because a) This is the logical conclusion of the competing interps paradigm that seeks to identify the superior set of rules for debate, because it advances the most desirable rule. If this was not the case theory would not be a reason to vote for either side. b) if winning theory is a voting issue for them but not me then theory becomes a necessary but insufficient burden making them violate their own shell. C) If theory is a no risk issue debaters are encouraged to run it every round to force to the other side to dedicate substantial amounts of time to even have a chance at winning substance. The only way to prevent debaters from running trivial and unnecessary theory as a time-suck is to make it a two-way street. And, trivial theory is bad because it destroys the possibility of topical education, or real debate in general. D) The aff can win off of turns in the 2AR that are impossible for me to contest, so to check back against this disadvantage the neg should get the RVI.

Next, err neg on theory by evaluating all the possible ways the arguments in my shell could interact with the arguments they make in the 2A because my lack of a 3NR is crippling in terms of my ability to clarify the theory debate. Even though the aff has a short speech time, their ability to reframe the theory debate in ways I can’t contest is a much greater structural advantage. Moreover, their time skew is irrelevant because they chose to initiate the theory debate in the first place; they should have foreseen this problem and just answered the damn NC.

**Moreover, off their shell, fairness isn’t a voter…30 seconds**

1) The theory debate they initiated is more unfair than my abuse because to debate theory you have to pay thousands of dollars to go to camp and learn about these arguments. This makes debate more exclusionary because it builds a structural disadvantage into the activity, which will always outweigh the specific and singular abuse story articulated in their shell.

2) Fairness is antithetical to debate. Any good argument makes it harder to debate, I could just say that these theory arguments are so smart that I shouldn’t be forced to answer them. Additionally, every resolution gives sides some inherent advantages. To make debate fully equal we would have to not debate about topics.

3) It’s impossible to objectively determine which practices are unfair. The level of disagreement regarding appropriate practices in debate invites judge intervention, which means you should prefer objective means of making a decision like the case debate.