A.    Interpretation: If the aff defends an epistemically modest paradigm of framework debate, then they must defend the whole resolution. To clarify, either epistemic modesty or a plan is permissible but the combination isn’t.

B. violation:

C. Standards:

1. Ground: there are an infinite number of plans on this topic - you can specify any combination of worker or geographic area that makes it nearly impossible for me to have comparative levels of prep to every single one. A solvency advocate or disclosure is insufficient - the probability that I research your specific plan equitably given the massive topic lit is virtually zero - even if I can make some responses those are always trumped by carded frontlines; there are a massive amount of plans disclosed on the wiki*.* A key strategy in overcoming unpredictable plans is reading a separate framework because as long as the plan is T - it’ll link to the NC and I don’t need to win blocks of carded indicts to your advantages. epistemic modesty prevents me from doing that since it says that even if you lose your framework your offense is relevant, and it’ll have 100% strength of link since I didn’t have the best prep on the offense to the AC. You can just spend 4 minutes on framework in the 1AR and muddle it up so your plan stays relevant. Defending whole res solves since I don’t need to specific prep to answer it. Ground key to fairness since it determines access to the ballot. EM proactively destroys neg strategy in this instance since it functionally *forces* me to win the contention to infinite numbers of plans rather than having framework become a meaningful strategic option.

A. Interpretation: If the aff reads a consequentialist framework [and does not justify their standard ethically] they must specify which theory of good they defend in the AC. To clarify, this means that the text of the standard must include the type of consequentialism they defend, for example minimizing existential risk or maximizing happiness. Err toward spirit of the interp – abuse is contextualized by the standards and otherwise you permit abuse to occur based on blippy semantic I meets.

B. Violation:

C. Standards:

1. Stable ground –Each nuance of the ethic entails different obligations and would exclude different offense. **MASTIN**[[1]](#footnote-1) describes five different theories of good: Some **consequentialist theories include**: **Util**itarianism, **which holds that an action is right if it** **leads to the most happiness for the greatest number of people** ("happiness" here is defined as the maximization of pleasure and the minimization of pain). **Hedonism**, which is the philosophy **[holds] that pleasure** **is** the **most important** pursuit of mankind, **and** that **individuals** **should** strive to **maximise** **their own total** **pleasure** (net of any pain or suffering). **Epicureanism** is a more moderate approach (which still seeks to maximize happiness, but which **defines happiness** more **as a** **state of tranquillity** than pleasure). Egoism, which holds that an action is right if it maximizes good for the self. Thus, Egoism may license actions which are good for an individual even if detrimental to the general welfare.Asceticism, in some ways, the opposite of Egoism in that it describes a life characterized by abstinence from egoistic pleasures especially to achieve a spiritual goal. Altruism, which prescribes that an individual take actions that have the best consequences for everyone except for himself, according to Auguste Comte's dictum, "Live for others". Thus, individuals have a moral obligation to help, serve or benefit others, if necessary at the sacrifice of self-interest. **Rule Consequentialism**, which is a theory (sometimes seen as an attempt to reconcile Consequentialism and Deontology), **[holds] that moral behaviour involves following certain rules**, but that those rules should be **chosen** based **on** the **consequences that** the selection of **those rules have**. Some theorists holds that a certain set of minimal rules are necessary to ensure appropriate actions, while some hold that the rules are not absolute and may be violated if strict adherence to the rule would lead to much more undesirable consequences. **Negative Consequentialism**, which **focuses on minimizing bad consequences rather than promoting good consequences**. This may actually require active intervention (to prevent harm from being done), or may only require passive avoidance of bad outcomes.

Impacts

1. If I read turns in the 1N the aff can use a vague standard to pick and choose the responses to filter out they don’t want to deal with. This would exclude large amounts of ground and moot speech time leaving me severely disadvantaged in the 2N. Key to fairness since I can’t form a strat against the AC even if I have a basis for accessing the ballot. Especially true because the warrants for your standard could justify different versions of consequentialism as coming first […] which allows you to pick and choose and makes it harder to form a strat against the AC. Gives you access to multiple contingent standards based on what
2. Strat Skew- I lose 6 minutes of time during the AC to generate a strategy because I don't know what turns or strategy I can go for during the 1N. This shows that CX wouldn't check back for the abuse because I still lose 6 minutes of time that would have been used for strat.
3. Makes the round irresolvable since we can’t weigh different mechanisms for the good – also skews strategy since it determines what counts as offense at all – i.e. Benatar would probably link harder under a hedonistic conception of util – weighing ground is key since it ensures we can compared arguments which clash to access the ballot.

Interpretation: if the aff defends a specific theory of the good under consequentialism, i.e. minimizing existential risk, then every framework warrant must explicitly warrant that theory of the good, not just consequentialism [if they claimed in CX the warrants justify the standard even if they lose the theory of the good]. Or the aff must at least specify another theory of right and good – like hedonism or negative consequentialism – that would be justified by each individual framework warrant ALONE in the form of a text in the 1AC.

B. Violation: standard text is min. existential risk but most warrants are generic.

C. Standards:

Ground. If most of your warrants are generic but each becomes sufficient to justify the standard, you’ve arbitrarily over-claimed the impact of your framework warrants to justify a narrower version of consequentialism. Allows you to exclude offense that would normally link – giving you the advantage since you’re better prepped on the specifics of the standard text. Ground key to fairness since judges vote on offense.

Strategy skew. Answering certain framework warrants changes the conclusion of your syllogism – if I answer the framework warrant that justifies existential risk, and you go for the ones that only justify consequentialism in the next speech, certain categories of offense become relevant even though they previously weren’t. I can never form a coherent understanding of how offense functions and that kills neg strategy unless I know what sort of theory of the good you can utilize. You’re also incentivized to go for certain warrants to justify a new version of util and exclude my offense or mitigate its strength of link. Not only does new offense matter, but you get to cherry pick what offense matters after I picked my turns. Strategy key to fairness – it’s the basis of any ballot story.

1. Luke Mastin, Consequentialism, The basics of philosophy http://www.philosophybasics.com/branch\_consequentialism.html [↑](#footnote-ref-1)