**AT- Contingent Standards Bad (quick)**

I Meets:

1. I meet, I advocated or went for one standard in all speeches.
2. A standard is a comprehensive ethical theory that sets guidelines for action, so skepticism isn’t a standard and I don’t violate the text of their interp.
3. I meet I’m not proactively advocating skepticism if they trigger it it’s their fault not mine
4. I meet, I would have conceded in CX that I won’t kick out of the framework if they turn the contention, they just didn’t ask.

AT-Strat Skew

1. Turn-they can independently turn either framework so turn I’m maximizing their available strategies. I give the neg the option to either a) concede my framework and go for turns, or b) respond to my framework and go for arguments that reverse the direction of the contingency like skep negates, so I’m creating more possibilities for offensive strategy on the AC.
2. They could have run one too since they negated, which would have solved any abuse by leveling the playing field.
3. Most defensive responses to framework justifications take the form of collapsing the relation between the contingency and the original argument, or delinking the nc from the criticism that the AC attempts to escape which removes the strategic value of the contingency, so the abuse is extremely trivial if it exists at all, so there isn’t a significant fairness deficit.
4. I don’t skew their strategy since they know exactly how the contingency functions, they can formulate a strategy that doesn’t trigger it, or they can formulate a strategy that does; the choice is theirs.
5. The AC doesn’t defend that skepticism is true, so the only way to trigger the contingency is for them to respond to my framework. Since all their offense in the theory debate flows from the action of triggering the contingent standard, they’re the one creating the abuse.
6. There is no distinction between a framework with contingent standards and a long framework; they have to spend a comparable amount time making defensive responses to my framework and the contingency as if I had spent the time I used running the contingency running another linear justification for my argument, so there is no abuse, or at worst the abuse isn’t unique.
7. All arguments skew strategy in some manner because they influence what arguments the other debater will make, and there is no way to verify what constitutes sufficiently fair or unfair strat skew so reject this standard because it has no brightline or weighing metric.

**AT- Contingent Standards Bad (Long) … 2:45**

As an overview, contingencies simply specify the part of the impact in the framework that would already implicitly be there. For instance, if a debater claims their metaethic is key to avoiding skep, then that can be rewritten as the contingency: If my metaethic is false then skepticism is true. Not specifying the end state of moral theorizing, or not allowing impacts to winning or losing a framework discounts the possibility of warranting a framework argument. Framework debates inevitably have layers and endpoints, so talking about them or articulating them clearly can’t be abusive because disqualifying contingencies obliterates the possibility of making reasons to prefer arguments for a framework, so their interp reduces to absurdity.

Next, A. is the counterinterp: debaters may establish one new evaluative mechanism if the other debater justifies the link to that mechanism and the mechanism is explicit in the affirmative case.

B. I meet.

C. Standards:

1. Philosophical ground- A) A necessary step in justifying any normative system is evading skepticism, so the AC’s strategy is well grounded in philosophical literature. For instance, Gauthier claims his philosophy is the only non-circular approach, Rawls claims the veil of ignorance is the best way to escape relativism, and so on. The entire point of normativity is to disprove nihilism. Banning justification via skep cuts out literally all relevant philosophical literature which is uneducational. B) the AC maximizes philosophical education because it explores alternative ways to justify ethical theories than the traditional linear proof for the ethic.

Moreover, since their interp denies debaters access to philosophical literature it is unfair because they destroy debaters’ ability to utilize pre-round prep. This outweighs their abuse story because (A) it is structural and affects all rounds and (B) winning in-round arguments (like winning standards) will always skew strategy in-round regardless.

And loss of philosophical ground outweighs strat skew because the loss of the ability to create a cogent, ethically sound standard is more severe than the minor skew I create. It is immediately apparent how to craft a strategy that generates offense off my AC, but if I can’t run a logically sound framework I literally cannot craft a strategy at all; I can’t generate AC offense.

1. Critical thinking- my minor abuse fosters critical thinking because the neg a) has to plot their strategy around this new case structure, and b) the neg has to come up with responses to multiple types of justifications for my standard, namely the skepticism contingency and the other justifications for my ethical framework. Critical thinking is great for education because the ability to creatively analyze arguments is a cornerstone for deeply understanding claims made in any academic discipline.

And, education is 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 better for debate than a rule that only ensures fairness.

And, vote off my interp independent of the RVI because it proves they’re being uneducational. I’ll grant their arguments for why you should vote on theory, but my shell offense-ively proves they’re bad.

But theory *is* an RVI:

A) This is the logical conclusion of the competing interpretations 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 which outweighs their abuse because it verifiably destroys my ground. Strategy skew just forces them to explore different ground.

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.

**Off their shell… 1:00**

AT-Strat Skew

1. Turn-they can independently turn either framework so I’m maximizing their available strategies. I give the neg the option to either a) concede my framework and go for turns, or b) respond to my framework and go for arguments that reverse the direction of the contingency like skep negates, so I’m creating more possibilities for offensive strategy on the AC.
2. Turn-the AC doesn’t defend that skepticism is true, so the only way to trigger the contingency is for them to respond to my framework. Since all their offense in the theory debate flows from the action of triggering the contingent standard, they’re the one creating the abuse.
3. Most defensive responses to framework justifications take the form of collapsing the relation between the contingency and the original argument, or delinking the nc from the criticism that the AC attempts to escape which removes the strategic value of the contingency, so the abuse is extremely trivial if it exists at all, so there isn’t a significant fairness deficit.
4. I don’t skew their strategy since they know exactly how the contingency functions, they can formulate a strategy that doesn’t trigger it, or they can formulate a strategy that does; the choice is theirs.
5. There is no distinction between a framework with contingent standards and a long framework; they have to spend a comparable amount time making defensive responses to my framework and the contingency as if I had spent the time I used running the contingency running another linear justification for my argument, so there is no abuse, or at worst the abuse isn’t unique.
6. All arguments skew strategy in some manner because they influence what arguments the other debater will make, and there is no way to verify what constitutes sufficiently fair or unfair strat skew so reject this standard because it has no brightline or weighing metric.