**A-Interpretation:** Debaters may not read a Plantext that says the USFG ought to enact a plan in coordination with the 50 states.

**B- Violation:** You do.

**C- Standards:**

1. **Topic Lit**: Your solvency advocate does not advocate that the 50 states do it in coordination with the USFG, meaning it puts impossible research burdens on me because it does not exist in the literature. Also controls the internal link to ground because since it is not in the aff lit alternative actors would become negative ground. Key to fairness both debaters have reciprocal research burdens.
2. **Multi-Actor Fiat**:You just fiat that the 50 states will work with the US which is a major abuse of fiat. It becomes extremely hard to make indicts to the aff because you can just reinterpret your definition of in coordination to shift out of solvency deficit arguments so they don’t apply. Key to fairness and real world education to ensure that the plan works in the real world

**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. Educaiton is the voter because it is the only reason schools fund debate. 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