# T- Public

## 1NC

### 1NC shell- T Public

#### Interpretation: The aff may only defend that colleges and universities funded by the government enact the plan.

#### Violation: They defend certain private colleges/universities

US Legal (“Public college” <https://definitions.uslegal.com/p/public-college/> DOA 12/13/16) CW

Public college means “any institution of higher education or any technical or vocational school above the secondary school level, provided that such public school or public college is operated by a State, subdivision of a State, or governmental agency within a State, or operated wholly or predominantly from or through the use of governmental funds or property

#### Prefer semantically accurate interpretations:

#### A. It’s the only stasis point we know before the round so it controls the internal link to engagement, and there’s no way to use ground if debaters aren’t prepared to defend it. B. Grammar is the most objective since it doesn’t rely on arbitrary determinants of what constitutes the best type of debate – it’s the only impact you can evaluate. C. The AFF isn’t topical regardless of fairness or education since it doesn’t affirm the text - we wouldn’t debate rehab again just because it was a good topic. Regardless of theory, you negate substantively because they fail their resolutional burden.

#### Standards

#### 1. Ground generics –Not defending the government takes out core generic neg ground like college based politics, biopower or securitization. Generic neg ground key on this topic – too many specific affs that dodge common CPs and DAs. Ground key to fairness because we need an equal ability to make arguments to win

#### 2. Fiat abuse – Not following the actor in the resolution abuses fiat, which is bad for fairness because impact comparison will be difficult, and expand the range of scenarios for you to win off of – causes conflicting judge decisions because they are forced to vote off of non topical cases, which is also unfair because it tips the ballot in your favor. Key to jurisdiction and fairness, because otherwise explodes the number of actors and also creates irresolvable debates.

Voter

#### 1. Fairness, debates a competitive activity, 2. Education, only portable impact. Drop the debater because A. Norms- a loss deters future abuse, B. Timeskew- drop the arg means they can kick their offense for a positive time tradeoff. C. Gateway issue- unfair args skew the rest of the round. Evaluate Competing Interps, A. reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention, B. deterrence- debaters can get away with defense on theory, C. reasonability collapses into competing itnersp because we have offense defense debates about brightlines, D. it’s a binary- either the aff is topical or it’s not 5. No RVI: A. Chills theory- RVIs deter me from reading theory because good theory debaters will bait abuse and go for the RVI which causes infinite abuse. B. Kills substance- they will just collapse to the shell which ruins the possibility of us ever returning to having education. C. Illogical- you shouldn’t win for being fair. Logic is an impact because it’s the basis of argumentation. D. No abuse- you could read your own shell or prove that I violate and you don’t which equals the theory layer