# The Terror at Fort Calhoun

## 1AC

### Story

#### Three Mile Island, Chernobyl, Fukushima… Sometime, perhaps long in the future, perhaps this very time, a strange occurrence begins at the Fort Calhoun Nuclear Generating Station half an hour outside of Omaha, Nebraska. For as long as anyone could remember, the waste from this plant had been mishandled; spilling into the Missouri River with little care for its final destination. Workers, unaware of the extent of the danger in their palms, would move the spent nuclear fuel into trenches built too deep and too close to the waters which lapped hopefully for a taste of the poison.

#### The incidents began after a few workers disappeared over the course of two months. More were hired, more disappeared – gone, without a trace. Worry of terrorism was in the air:

#### “What if they are stealing away materials – or kidnapped?”

#### Bioterrorism was technologic in its form – this would have been preferable to what was on the horizon.

#### Late at night a security guard for the Station drove his Jeep in circular paths, kicking up gravel into the sky forming clouds that seemed to follow him across the darkness. Near the edge of the station, his attention was drawn to a cracked door hinge leading from the edge of the security fence to the woods adjacent the facility. Examining the door, he saw that it had been brutally cracked. Against his better judgement, he stepped through the door to examine the tall grass at the edge of the woods.

#### His eyes set upon boot prints. He traced them through the woods, to an opening near the edge of the Missouri River. A scene that basked the entirety of the forest in a raw glow was before him. Stark naked, all of the workers who had disappeared were scattered across an open grove in the wood. Their eyes teamed with life, more so than a conscious human being could contain. Their color was neither green, yellow, nor orange and in them he felt that he had finally seen the true hue of the sun.

#### The ground beneath him sung, as if it had been a string on a violin plucked. He felt an intense sensation throughout his body, as if he was vibrating, as the singing found itself the language of man:

#### “So audacious, your people. You’ve even named this era of destruction after yourselves – Anthropocene. Tisk, tisk, tisk. Damage exported will be imported too. “Power of gods” is what they called fission, have you left unnoticed the very atomic structure of your selfhood?...”

#### At these words, his vision shifted in both scope and perspective. His awareness told him that he was inside himself, his eyes the same color as the others. He was both a single and every atom, watching the war of molecules against the previously unknown radiations seeping through the ground beneath him. In this image, articulation escaped him.

#### He felt both the bodies around him and himself, be deconstructed. Painfully, atom by atom, quark by quark. He was all of the pieces and felt all of their strain, the forces of the world were abound in the deepest points of his flesh. All in a moment, he was whole again, yet felt more whole than he had ever before… Teeming with life, more than a conscious human being could contain.

#### “I am no ruler, no god, and no deity. I have given you a gift, shown you the stakes of refusal to care. Now, we take back DNA, rhizomes, microcosms, the power of fission and fusion, the mysteries of life against those that wish to use it as mere pawns against the world”

#### With this, the security guard, all the workers, infected trout in the rivers, dirt saturated with contaminated waters, every matter and unfounded form in the sphere of our existence – took up arms against those that were unknowing and willed destruction.

### Cards

#### We affirm that countries ought to prohibit the production of nuclear power.

#### Our affirmation is an act of science fiction – a reading of the resolution within a fictional world – which bends meaning through storytelling. Our implementation may not occur in this reality, but it does occur in *a* reality; in the world we have constructed.

#### Past horror tropes rely on nature as an external force which hunted down humanity. In contrast, our Ecohorror exposes the intimately connected relationship between the human body and natural force. A par excellence example is radiation – the fact that our bodies betray us through a cancer due to our own faults. This perspective charts new paths of environmental policy based around bodily connections to the world.

Christy Tidwell, 2014

“Monstrous Natures Within: Posthuman and New Materialist Ecohorror in Mira Grant’s Parasite”, Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment 21.3 (Summer 2014).

Ecohorror as a genre is often defined in terms of “revenge of nature” narratives in which nature enacts violence on humans in response to the damage caused by human behaviors. In this figuration, nature is out there, separate from humanity. It is something that humans act upon and that also acts upon humans. In ecohorror films such asFrogs (1972), Long Weekend(1978), The Happening(2008), The Bay(2012)— and film is where most scholarship on ecohorror has developed thus far—nature is the enemy of humanity. Andrew Tudor notes the rise in popularity of this type of horror narrative in the mid-twentieth century: “In effect, the familiar invaders of the fifties and sixties are transmuted into the ‘natural nasties’ of the seventies. Invasion no longer comes from space (or from whatever that metaphorical ‘out there’ represented) but from our immediate natural environment”(62). Although this shift from space to the “immediate natural environment” brings the invasion closer to home, it is still framed as an invasion by a nature that is exterior to humanity. This definition of ecohorror, therefore, is fundamentally predicated upon a relationship between humanity and nature that does not allow for their interconnectedness. But human and nonhuman are never truly separate; it is important, therefore, to note ecohorror narratives that challenge this division of human and nonhuman, internal and external. Brian Merchant notes a shift in twenty-first-century ecohorror films from “tangible foe or beast or creature”to “more pervasive and inescapable”attackers. He writes,“We bend our cinematic villains and beasts to reflect not just the nature of what we fear, but the scope. And now that we humanfolk have changed everything, from the chemical composition of the atmosphere on down, we have everything to fear.”If we have everything to fear, then even our own bodies—not to mention what lives in our bodies—are not safe. This shift from a focus on“out there”to “in here”echoes a shift within environmental studies as well. As William Cronon wrote nearly twenty years ago, we must“rethink wilderness”(69) and its “dualistic vision in which the human is entirely outside the natural” (80).“If wildness can stop being ( just) out there,”he writes,“and start being (also) in here, if it can start being as humane as it is natural, then perhaps we can get on with the unending task of struggling to live rightly in the world—not just in the garden, not just in the wilderness, but in the home that encompasses them both”(90). Stacy Alaimo and Susan Hekman extend this logic to include bodies and materiality: Rather than centering environmental politics on a wilderness model, . . . beginning with the co-extensive materiality of humans and nonhumans offers multiple possibilities for forging new environmental paths. Environmental justice movements, for example, locate “the environment”not in some distant place, but within homes, schools, workplaces, and neighborhoods. (9) These new environmental paths extend into the realm of horror, particularly in horror texts that locate horror within the body. Stories about parasites are one source for such narratives, since they move the horror from the external (attacking amphibians, rampaging rabbits, etc.) to the internal world of the human body and because they are centered on the intimate relationship between human characters and nonhuman parasites. Parasite-focused horror stories are not new, of course. Robert Heinlein'sThe Puppet Masters(1951) and the various versions of Invasion of the Body Snatchers are parasite classics, for instance. However, these parasite stories do not necessarily or inherently function as ecohorror. Instead, because these narratives focus not on the relationship between human and (terrestrial) nonhuman but on loss of individuality and fears of conformity (especially relevant in Cold War America), these and others like them (includingSlither[2006]) are alien invasion stories. David Cronenberg'sShivers(1975; also known asThey Came from Within) represents another, more visceral, approach to parasites in horror. Cronenberg is best known for films like Videodrome(1983) andThe Fly(1986), both of which, alongsideShivers, represent classics of body horror, where the focus is on exploring the limits and the permeability of the human body. Shivers, about a scientist who creates a parasite that is part aphrodisiac and part venereal disease and then sets about implanting this parasite in people to spread sexual freedom and animal instinct through society, takes seriously fears of merging with another being or the loss of human control or bodily integrity (issues raised in other body horror as well). Thisfilm's focus on the body and animality ties it more closely to ecohorror, butShiversis not vitally concerned with ecological issues.

#### Humanities perceived exceptionalism from nature is the keystone of the Anthropocene in which any form of difference or deviancy is rendered disposable in order to preserve the humanist order – this is necropolitics.

Rosi Braidotti, 2013

Braidotti was the founding Director of the Netherlands research school of Women’s Studies, she is currently Distinguished University Professor at Utrecht University and founding Director of the Centre for the Humanities as well as the founding Professor in Women’s Studies. “The Posthuman”, Polity Press, pg 111-113.

We saw in the previous chapter that the posthuman predicament understood as the bio-political management of living matter is post-anthropocentric in character, raising the need for a Life/zoe-centred approach. Now I want to go a step further and argue that posthuman vital politics shifts the boundaries between life and death and consequently deals not only with the government of the living, but also with practices of dying. Most of these **are** linked to inhuman(e) social and political phenomena such as poverty, famine and homelessness, which Zillah Eisenstein aptly labelled as ‘global obscenities’ (1998). Vandana Shiva (1997) stresses the extent to which bio-power has already turned into a form of ‘biopiracy’, which calls for very grounded and concrete political analyses. Thus, the bodies of the empirical subjects who signify difference (woman/native/earth or natural others) have become the disposable bodies of the global economy. Contemporary capitalism is indeed ‘bio-political’ in that it aims at controlling all that lives, as Foucault argues, but because Life is not the prerogative of humans only, it opens up a zoe-political or post-anthropocentric dimension. If anxiety about extinction was common in the nuclear era, the posthuman condition, of the anthropocene, extends the death horizon to most species. Yet there is a very important difference, as Chakrabarty points out: ‘A nuclear war would have been a conscious decision on the part of the powers that be. Climate change is an unintended consequence of human actions as a species’ (2009: 221). This not only inaugurates a negative or reactive form of pan-human planetary bond, which recomposes humanity around a commonly shared bond of vulnerability, but also connects the human to the fate of other species, as I argued in the previous chapter. Death and destruction are the common denominators for this transversal alliance. Let me give you some examples of contemporary ways of dying to illustrate this political economy. The posthuman aspects of globalization encompass many phenomena that, while not being a prioriinhumane, still trigger significant destructive aspects. The postsecular condition, with the rise 112 The Inhuman: Life beyond Death of religious extremism in a variety of forms, including Christian fundamentalism, entails a political regression of the rights of women, homosexuals and all sexual minorities. Significant signs of this regression are the decline in reproductive rights and the rise of violence against women and GLBT people. The effect of global financial networks and unchecked hedge funds has been an increase in poverty, especially among youth and women, affected by the disparity in access to the new technologies. The status of children is a chapter apart; from forced labour, to the child-soldier phenomenon, childhood has been violently inserted in infernal cycles of exploitation. Bodily politics has shifted, with the simultaneous emergence of cyborgs on the one hand and **renewed forms of vulnerability** on the other. Thus, next to the proliferation of pandemics like SARS, Ebola, HIV, birdflu and others, more familiar epidemics have also returned, notably malaria and tuberculosis, so much so that health has become a public policy issue as well as a human rights concern. The point is that Life/zoe can be a threatening force, as well as a generative one. A great deal of health and environmental concerns as well as geo-political issues, simply blur the distinction between life and death. In the era of biogenetic capitalism and nature–culture continuum, zoehas become an infra-human force and all the attention is now drawn to the emergency of disappearing nature. For instance, the public discourse about environmental catastrophes or ‘natural’ disasters – the Fukushima nuclear plant and the Japanese tsunami, the Australian bushfires, hurricane Katrina in New Orleans, etc. – accomplishes a significant doublebind: it expresses a new ecological awareness, while re-inserting the distinction between nature and culture. As Protevi argues (2009), this results in the paradoxical re-naturalization of our bio-technologically mediated environment. The geo-political forces are simultaneously re-naturalized and subjected to the old hierarchical power relations determined by the dominant politics of the anthropomorphic subject. Public discourse has become simultaneously moralistic about the inhuman forces of the environment and quite hypocritical in perpetuating anthropocentric arrogance. This position results in the denial of the man-made structure of the catastrophes that we continue to attribute to forces beyond our collective control, like the earth, the cosmos or ‘nature’. **Our public morality is simply not up to the challenge of the scale and the complexity of damages engendered by our technological advances. This gives rise to a double ethical urgency: firstly, how to turn anxiety and the tendency to mourn the loss of the natural order into effective social and political action, and secondly, how to ground such an action in the responsibility for future generation, in the spirit of social sustainability that I have also explored elsewhere** (Braidotti, 2006).

#### Science-fiction is pedagogically crucial – it attracts students and educates about science – that’s necessary to democracy and helps expand policies in nearly all parts of modern society.

Mark Brake and Rosi Thornton, 2003

Brake is a Principle Lecturer and Professor of Science Communiation at the University of Glamorgan, Thornton is a teacher of Science and Science Fiction at the University of Glamorgan. “Science fiction in the classroom” Phys. Educ. 38 31.

Our intention in relation to teaching science has always been to broaden the franchise, both for science and for higher education in general. Recently there has been an explosive growth in the number of students entering higher education, with an increasing proportion of these young people uninterested in studying specialist degrees. Science is often portrayed in the media as being rather dull and dry; and claims of inability in the sciences and maths seem to somehow be socially acceptable. **If we are to attract students to science-based courses, perhaps** we need to recognize that they may wish to study some science but also acquire a degree of scientific literacy. It is our contention that knowledge of science is fundamental in a participatory democracy. We live in a society utterly dependent on science and technology; science itself implies social and economic change, and such change requires a sequence of vital decisions. How can a citizen with little or no understanding of science be an informed decision-maker in such a society? Science fiction exists not just as a rich genre of text and film but as a cultural phenomenon that encourages an imaginative way of observing and interpreting the world. In September 2000 the Science Museum in London opened its ‘Star Trek: Federation Science’ exhibition in an attempt to help the public understand space-age technology. Contributors were not unaware of the potential pitfalls, and were careful to avoid confusion between science fiction and fact. The success of this exhibition demonstrated the potential of this approach. A further example of this link is that the European Space Agency (ESA) is searching science fiction for ideas and technologies that could be used in future missions. Dr David Raitt, coordinator of the Innovative Technologies From Science Fiction For Space Applications project (ISTF), and other ESA researchers are currently scouring novels and short stories published in the early decades of the last century to see if technology has caught up with ideas that were futuristic when first put into print. Any good ideas turned up in the search will be assessed to see if they can help the agency in its mission to explore space. Knowledgeable fans are also being encouraged to send in suggestions to help ESA identify potential sources of good concepts. Authors such as Gregory Benford, Greg Bear and Larry Niven have helped NASA draw up ideas for a mission to explore Europa, one of Jupiter’s four largest moons and now known to have an icy surface. The agency looked to the authors to come up with inventive ideas for piercing the ice to get at the molten world below. NASA is also conducting research into futuristic ideas such as warp drives. The ultimate aim of its Breakthrough Propulsion Physics Project is a massless engine for a spacecraft that would be able to reach near-light speeds. The genre of science fiction has always been used as a way of examining the relationship between science, technology and society, both as an inspirational source guiding the direction of scientific development and as a way of popularizing and disseminating scientific ideas. Commercially, science fiction has an impressive history, and since many people’s main exposure to science is through science fiction, the portrayals of both the scientist and the nature of scientific activity are of crucial importance for issues relating to the public’s attitudes toward science. Unfortunately, the film industry has often portrayed scientists as being single-minded, obsessive, social outcasts, fostering unrealistic suspicions about science in many public debates. The best science fiction tackles deep philosophical or ethical issues and widens the audience’s perceptions of our universe. There is a rich heritage to be tapped here, including works such as The Time Machine; Brave New World; Yevgeny Zamyatin’s We; Blade Runner and The Matrix. A number of significant individuals stand out in the history of SF: H G Wells and Arthur C Clarke, of course. But also those like Philip K Dick (Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?, The Man in the High Castle), Kurt Vonnegut (Slaughterhouse 5, Galapagos) and Ursula Le Guin (The Dispossessed, The Left Hand of Darkness). Today this richness can be found through contributors as diverse as William Gibson (Neuromancer, The Difference Engine), Stephen Baxter (Anti-Ice, Voyage) and Iain M Banks (Excession,The Player of Games).

#### The role of the judge is to be a practitioner of vitalistic jurisprudence. Rather than imposing predetermined models upon organisms, we should embrace affects ability to chart new political paths through the focus on fluid interconnections. Such a focus on affective experiences enables us to structure political actions in a way that preserves complexity of both human and inhuman while enabling action that resists biopolitical violence.

Claire Colebrook et al, 2009

Claire Colebrook, Rosi Braidotti, and Patrick Hanafin, Colebrook is a professor of English at Penn State, Braidotti is a distinguished professor in the humanities at Utrecht University, and Hanafin is a professor of law at Birbeck University. “Rights of passage: law and the biopolitics of dying.” In: Braidotti, R. and Colebrook, C. and Hanafin, Patrick (eds.) “Deleuze and Law: Forensic Futures.” Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan Publishers Limited, pg. 1

This volume engages with the impact of a thinking of law with Gilles Deleuze. It is an attempt to engage in another mode of doing jurisprudence, which places the emphasis on the material bodies of citizens and their interests rather than the abstract formless subject of law. It is, as Claire Colebrook observes in her essay in this volume, a reconsideration of law and legal theory as a differential jurisprudence. In such a jurisprudence the emphasis would be placed on how the claims of some bodies might transform the relation between what counts as a speaking subject for law and what is silenced. This shift in the way we view the manner in which individual bodies are formed and subjugated by law provides an opening to another thinking of law, which emerges in the essays in this collection. In this regard the collection attempts to perform what one might term a vitalist jurisprudence or one in which the body obtains primacy over what Deleuze and Guattari termed the terror of the signifier. In doing so the essays in this volume explore the relation between law and life following the demise of the “linguistic paradigm” in criti- cal theory and the advent of a politics of “life.” How have recent events focused social, political and cultural attention on the living body and its maintenance and management? The central concept, through which the embodiment of the subject is examined, is that of “biopower.” Articulated by Michel Foucault, but brought to attention more recently in the work of Giorgio Agamben, this concept recognizes that the relation between life and law is both historical and necessary in that the law must operate on bodies but can only do so by establishing a border between the body of the polity, and the mere life excepted from political concern. For both Foucault and Agamben the contemporary advent of biopolitics occurs when the polity increasingly and invasively operates on this “mere” life, and the body or organism – rather than the self – becomes the object of political management. The manner in which the body, in its “mere life” (or what Agamben refers to as ‘zoe’) becomes the focus of contemporary power has led legal theory to explore new questions of the threshold between life and death and has led social theory to question the new extensions of the law and the polity into embodied life. In Alexandre Lefebvre’s contribution to this volume the possibilities of a differential jurisprudence are considered. Lefebvre reads the work of Oliver Wendell Holmes, the American legal realist jurist, through Bergson’s conception of the creativity of life in order to propose a reading of Holmes’ work on the notion of legal judgment as one which sees judgment as inescapably inventive. In doing so he attempts to develop a new image of jurisprudence that can appreciate the inventiveness of adjudication insofar as it is in time. In looking at Holmes’ work The Common Law, Lefebvre argues that the key theme animating this work is the notion that adjudication is based on the desire of a society insofar as desire changes in time. As such, the work of the judge cannot be assimilated to the straightforward recognition and application of rules to cases; instead, it has an inherently creative power. In their essays in this volume both Patrick Hanafin and John Protevi expand on what a jurisprudence of differentials might look like in analyzing a number of US court decisions on the right to die. These essays look at how in practice rights jurisprudence could be reconceived if analyzed in a manner, which moved beyond the liberal model of a deathbound jurisprudence. One of the cases discussed by Hanafin in his essay concerns the right of a body to decide its own death. As Hanafin points out, the state has taken over the calculation of such decisions and has done so according to an axiomatic: is the individual’s ongoing life capable of being managed and ordered by the social machine (in which case there can be no cessation of life) or is the body criminalized and thereby rendered capable of being put to death? A differential jurisprudence is already, Hanafin suggests, visible at the margins of this case, where various legal voices enter into debate to decide the points at which a life ceases to be liveable. John Protevi in his essay also demonstrates that we need to look beyond abstract and discursive conceptions of “the subject” to an ontology of singularities. At what point does a body’s corporeal relations – that is, the various relations among its organic and nervous potentialities – undergo a sufficiently major configuration to produce an incorporeal event? That is, we cannot reduce a person to mere physical and organic functions, for in addition to the breathing, speaking, moving and interacting body, selves are also capacities for perception, affection, memory and imagination. However, certain corporeal events – such as the state’s capacity to refuse a woman’s desire to terminate a pregnancy – will produce incorporeal events; that woman will now become a “mother.” That latter incorporeal event is not simply caused by a change in body, for it requires other – political – relations, such as the social institutions of parenting, the norms of gender bina- ries and the notion of the private nuclear family. For Hanafin cases that concern the border between life and death demand an inclusion of various voices that would go beyond the simple opposition between a state power that must preserve and maintain viable life. Protevi argues that Deleuze’s ontology gives us tools to examine thresholds of viability.

#### All politics are fictional. Literary genres are constantly overlapping – economics is both a socially constructed model, yet a useful tool – representation and cognition ensures that all things carry tinges of science-fiction.

Carl Freedman, 2000

Freedman is an Associate Professor of English at Louisiana State University. “Critical Theory and Science Fiction” Wesleyan University Press, University Press of London, 20-22.

It is a priori likely that most texts display the activity of numerous different genres, and that few or no texts can be adequately described in terms of one genre alone. Genre in this sense is analogous to the Marxist concept of the mode of production as the latter has gained new explanatory force by being contrasted, in the Althusserian vocabulary, with the category of social formation -a term that is preferred to the more familiar notion of society, because the latter connotes a relatively homogeneous unity, whereas the former is meant to suggest an overdetermined combination of different modes of production at work in the same place and during the same time. Though it is thus impossible simply to equate a given social formation with a given mode of production, it is nonetheless legitimate to affirm that (for instance) the United States "is" capitalist, so long as we understand that the copulative signifies not true equation or identity but rather conveys that, of the various and relatively autonomous modes of production active within the U.S. social formation, capitalism enjoys a position of dominance. In the same way, the dialectical rethinking of genre does not in the least preclude generic discrimination. We may validly describe a particular text as science fiction if we understand the formulation to mean that cognitive estrangement is the dominant generic tendency within the overdetermined textual whole. Accordingly, there is probably no text that is a perfect and pure embodiment of science fiction (no text, that is to say, in which science fiction is the only generic tendency operative) but also no text in which the science-fiction tendency is altogether absent. Indeed, it might be argued that this tendency is the precondition for the constitution of fictionality- and even of representation - itself. For the construction of an alternative world is the very definition of fiction: owing to the character of representation as a nontransparent process that necessarily involves not only similarity but difference between representation and the "referent" of the latter, an irreducible degree of alterity and estrangement is bound to obtain even in the case of the most "realistic" fiction imaginable. The appearance of transparency in that paradigmatic realist Balzac has been famously exposed as an illusion ;24 nonetheless, it is important to understand the operation of alterity in realism not as the failure of the latter, but as the sign of the estranging tendency of science fiction that supplies (if secretly) some of the power of great realistic fiction.25 Furthermore, just as some degree of alterity and hence estrangement is fundamental to all fiction, finally including realism itself , so the same is true (but here the limit case is fantasy) of that other dialectical half of the science-fiction tendency: cognition. The latter is after all an unavoidable operation of the human mind (however pre­critical, and even if clinically schizophrenic) and must exercise a determinant presence for literary production to take place at all. Even in The Lord of the Rings -to consider again what is perhaps the most thoroughgoing fantasy we possess, by an author who stands to fantasy rather as Balzac stands to realism ­ cognition is quite strongly and overtly operative on at least one level: namely that of the moral and theological values that the text is concerned to enforce. 26 It is, then, in this very special sense that the apparently wild assertions that all fiction is science fiction and even that the latter is a wider term than the former may be justified: cognition and estrangement, which together constitute the generic tendency of science fiction, are not only actually present in all fiction, but are structurally crucial to the possibility of fiction and even of representation in the first place. Yet in more routine usage, the term of science fiction ought, as I have maintained above, to be reserved for those texts in which cognitive estrangement is not only present but dominant. And it is with this dialectical understanding of genre that we may now reconsider the apparently difficult cases of Brecht, on the one hand, and Star Wars on the other.
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**Science Fiction Specific**

1. Science-fiction always errs away from the negative’s status-quo because it’s imaginative and relies on breaking away from reality.
2. The affirmative creates the world in which science-fiction happens which means it is closer to the fictional world’s status quo than the negative.

### No New in the 2

#### No New 2NR reasons to presume negative – they should have made them in the 1NC ----

#### Time Skew – 7:4:6:3 gives the negative a structural advantage where they can sandbag and make it impossible for the 2AR to respond.

#### Strategy – ruins aff strat by making it so we can’t collapse the debate, makes it so negatives will always win by being able to respond to arguments that are undercovered in the 1NC because 1AR strat is predicated on the 1NC.

#### 2NR Restart – our arguments are predicated on the 1NC, they enable the debate to begin again in the 2NR giving them a 6:3 time advantage to do comparative weighing and new arguments.

#### 1NC had the opportunity to generate arguments and the 1AR is our only opportunity to directly respond – gives them a 2:1 speech advantage which structural favors them – structural fairness is the only objective litmus test for fairness claims.
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