### AT Nebel/Can’t spec reporter

#### Counterinterp: Affirmatives may specify a type of reporter.

Standards:

#### Stable advocacy/

Defending whole res means I can shift out of what a reporter is—makes the aff advocacy impossible to pin down. Unfair since aff can moot 100% of the 1nc by shifting out of links. Link turns limits because I’d have multiple affs in one round and outweighs limits on magnitude because the number of affs with a 1ar advocacy shift is double the number without it.

#### Ethics/

Defending all reporters means I’d have to defend Breitbart and Alex Jones using confidential sources to spread bigoted lies. Outweighs their offense—even if the interp is educational or fair, we have ethical reasons never to defend white supremacists [util—white supremacy causes suffering, democracy—white supremacy prevents us from getting to truth, kant—white supremacy disrespects the rationality of agents of color, etc]

#### \*On the interp\*

AT TVA – Counterinterp: Their interp plus my aff

My aff is really unique—I shouldn’t have to read the same whole res aff all topic—disincentivizes research since under whole res the incentive is to race to the biggest impact.

Phil ed is uniquely good since we can’t get it outside of LD –but I have to specify students to get access to offense about democratic socialization

unfair to force aff to defend whole res—1ar timeskew causes a structural disadvantage so I have to spec to check neg side bias and infinite ability to choose how to respond to the aff.

#### On semantics—turn

Definitions of who is a reporter in the topic lit are too ambiguous--grey area exists surrounding whether students, bloggers, and interns are reporters—proven by laws we cite in the aff like FFOIA. Speccing precludes semantics bc an aff that meets semantics Does Not Exist and also justifies pragmatics first because we shouldn’t pick and use a semantic interp of the topic if there aren’t good definitions to choose from.