## Theory

#### Interpretation: if Affirmatives specify that their actor is the Supreme Court of the United States, they must include in the aff both a test case and legally sound justification that the Court would offer in its opinion which explains that the Constitution necessarily entails the aff advocacy.

#### Violation: they only cite common law as the justification for implementation and don’t have a test case.

#### \*\*Standards

#### Legal Precision:

#### [1]

#### SCOTUS minority and majority opinions become common law, which set precedent and have full force of law. Opinions trickle downwards since appellate courts use SCOTUS opinions to make their decisions and the opinions also change various sections of federal legislation that are not compliant with the ruling.

#### When the aff doesn’t specify why the court grants a right to protect the identity of sources, they omit a significant chunk of what would actually cause the material consequences in the world of the aff. It forecloses on process and topic debate by making it impossible for neg to link disads to the nuances of the AC. It is impossible for negs to generate offense against the aff without knowing what the content of the rulings are.

#### Kills engagement and disproves any argument about my shell trading off with substantive education—if it’s impossible for me to disprove the aff since they aren’t clear in the first place about what voting aff entails, that’s worse than them picking a ridiculous rationale like “Clarence Thomas said that the plan would kill base”.

#### [2]

#### The aff lacks a test case, but the only way that SCOTUS can rule on a case is if it is germane to a constitutional issue and has been appealed through the entire federal system. Suggesting that the court has the power to do otherwise relies on incorrect notions about the American legal system that further widespread miseducation about basic political concepts (that results in people like Trump being widely believed). The aff asserts without justification that the constitution entails a shield law, and construes the ruling of the court as an unchecked supreme authority that doesnt even need legal reasoning to make its decisions. That undercuts ENTIRELY the educational value of specifying SCOTUS since their model has ZERO correlation to reality. Also kills fairness in the round since they exclude my ability to engage the specifics of the aff—neg prep to this aff is only guesswork but they have infinite ability to frontline, which supercharges abuse because

#### [3]

#### Process debate Key:

#### Consequentialism requires specific focus to details, especially in a legal system where the connotations of specific words or the nuances of language in decisions have widespread implications for policy and governance. THEY CHOSE THEIR ACTOR—which means they HAVE to engage the shell and defend their practice specifically. The absolute lack of detail fails to reflect the way that legal decisions actually occur.

#### [4] Preempts

#### A] Being more specific is better than being as vague as they are now—competitive incentives discourage them from speccing something absurd since they’d lose if the aff is too minute and doesn’t have big impacts. If they cherrypick I can still use theory to check—I have ground in either extreme scenario but since they violate the interp I have no ground.

#### B] Brightline to infinite regress is contextualized by the interp—justification only has to be legally sound, which means that they just need to include arguemnts from law reviews – no speculation since all their args should be in the literature anyways—

#### C] Speccing from legal reviews makes for the most education since our args will be actor-specific—not impossible to spec potential justifications by the court since courts draw from existing common law and more topic- specific education too

#### D] If the court can always find a case, the burden should beon htem to spec—not just that till happ eventually, they completely refuse

#### Details of dispute not irrelev – look to abuse story

#### Voters:

Fairness

Education

Drop the debater

No RVIs on this shell specifically

1. Core of topic is implementation and choosing between proposals—defending the aff’s strategy is necessary but insufficient
2. Abuse is so large that It makes formulating a neg strat impossible—that’s the abuse story of the shell—it’s irreciprocal for them to get another out when I never had an out on their aff in the first place.

Competing Interps on this shell—

1. Every choice they made in their aff was intentional given the amount of resources they had working on it—Harvard Westlake inspires a lot of the circuit’s norms, such as a shift towards policy style arguments on the west coast, so it should be their burden to proactively defend the norms they set.
2. Reasonability collapses to competing interps—they would never be able to solve for any part of this shell’s abuse story since it’s all actual and structural abuse.