**A: Interpretation:** On the 2015 Nov/Dec resolution the aff can fiat that the jury may nullify in the face of perceived injustice but not that they will nullify.

**B: Violation-** They assume the Jury will nullify

**C: Standards-**

1. Fiat Abuse: They can just fiat solvency for they advantage area and claim that they reap external benefits from the nullification. This destroys my ground because I don’t get access to certain solvency pushes that are key to neg ground. Key to fairness to ensure equitable access to offense.
2. Real World: In the real world there are tons of reasons that a jury will not nullify in the face of perceived injustice, which is key analysis of the topic. Without this analysis we lose a lot the real world benefits that come from debating this topic. Real world is key to education because we it ensures we get education on real world issues.

**D-Voter**: Fairness is a **voter** because unfair arguments arbitrarily skew your evaluation of the round and it precedes substance because it frames its evaluation. Drop the debater **a)** to set a precedent for the best norms of debate, **b)** to deter future abuse, **c)** to rectify time lost running theory, and **d)** the round has been irreversibly skewed so we can’t return to substance fairly. **At worst,** drop the arg means reject all aff offense **a)** my shell is about the entire aff advocacy being abusive, not just a particular argument, so you reject all aff arguments since even turns to the NC will still link into their advocacy, **b)** my shell criticizes an omission that the aff made so dropping the argument can only mean rejecting their advocacy because the aff cant compensate by reading a new text in the 1ar in the same way that they can cross an argument off the flow if its abusive. Use **competing interps** because **a)** what is reasonably fair is arbitrary and **b)** reasonability encourages debaters to get away with increasingly unfair strategies through defense on theory. And, don’t vote on the RVI **a)** both debaters have the burden of being fair, and no one deserves to win for just meeting that burden, **b)** to prevent the deterrence of legitimate theory, **c)** to prevent abusive debaters from winning with huge scripts, and **d)** the aff has the burden of being topical so winning a counter interp only shows that he met the burden.