# I affirm,

EXPLANATION FOR CIRCUIT DEBATER: this aff is only awesome if you have 1ar’s prepped against it. Make sure you have extensions of the shells so you can go for theory. Have 1 ar restarts like: extra offense, benetar and dedev prepared so you can kick out of offense. The offense in this aff sucks and is only their to bait turns to enable a Benetar script.

**Presume aff** and err aff because of time skew, negs ability to adapt to the ac makes it easier to negate in LD. Prefer theoretical presumption since theory frames the evaluation of all substance. Fairness is a voter and precedes substance to ensure the ballot reflects debating skill and not unfair advantages. **And**, indicting assumptions triggers presumption since there are no standards by which to pass judgment on the resolution. **And,** the phrase “just governments” makes the resolution definitionally a conditional “if governments are just, then living wage”. Conditional logic dictates that if the antecedent is false, then the entire conditional is true. Thus, the impossibility or incoherence of just governments affirms.

**And**, the neg must impact all offense back to only proving the resolution prohibited and that just governments ought not require a living wage: **a)** allowing the neg to prove permissibility or prohibition gives them a 2-1 advantage. Reciprocity is key to ensure equal opportunities to win, **b**) permissibility is easier since it just requires lack of a decisive reason to act, but an obligation is a proactive justification. Ground is key to fairness since it controls our ability to make arguments.

I value morality. A priori reasoning is impossible so the only epistemologically sound basis for morality is experience. **Schwartz**:[[1]](#footnote-1)

The empirical support for the fundamental principle of empiricism is diffuse but salient. Our common empirical experience and experimental **psychology** offer **evidence[s] that humans** do not have any capacity to **[can’t] garner** knowledge except by **[non-]empirical [knowledge]** sources**.** The fact is that we believe that **there is no source of knowledge**, information, or evidence **apart from observation**, empirical scientific investigations, and our sensory experience of the world, and we believe this on the basis of our empirical a posteriori experiences and our general empirical view of how things work. For example, we believe on empirical evidence thathumans are continuous with the rest of nature and that **we rely** like other animals **on our senses to tell us how things are.** If humans are more successful than other animals, it is not because we possess special non-experiential ways of knowing, but because we are better at cooperating, collating, and inferring. In particular **we do[n’t]** not **have** any **capacity for** substantive **a priori knowledge. There is no known mechanism** by which **[to make it]** such knowledge would be made **possible.** This is an empirical claim.

Even if a priori reasoning is possible, it relies on experience to know how to exercise it. Epistemology comes first since it forms the basis for all knowledge, including moral truth. And, pleasure is inherently good. **Sinhababu[[2]](#footnote-2)**:

**We** can **form** a variety of **beliefs** on the basis of **[through] phenomenal introspection.** For example, we can judge that we are having sound experiences of particular noises and visual experiences of different shades of color. As we look upon a lemon and consider the phenomenal states that are yellow experiences, we can make some judgments about their intrinsic features. We can judge, for example, that they are bright experiences. And **[A]s we consider** our experiences of **pleasure, we** can make some judgments about their intrinsic features. We can **judge that** they are **[it is] good** experiences. **Just as one can look** inward **at** one’s **yellow** experiences **and appreciate** their **[its] brightness**, one can look inward at one’s pleasure and appreciate its goodness**.** Just as things are brighter as black is replaced by yellow in my visual field. And when I have a sudden experience of intense pain, it seems to me that things are much worsethan they were before. What **we discover through introspection** is **that pleasure** is the sort of thing that **makes** a **positive contribution[s]** to the goodness of a state[s] of affairs, just as **[and] pain detracts** from this sort of goodness. We cannot discover, just by introspecting on a pleasant experience, that we are in a total state of affairs that is better overall, because there are many other things going on in the world outside our phenomenology that may also contribute to the goodness of the total state of affairs we are in.

And, logical consistency implies we value the happiness of others. **Sayre-McCord[[3]](#footnote-3)**

According to the second argument, the evaluative starting point is again **each person** thinking **[thinks their]** "my [their] **own happiness is valuable**,"but **[, which]** this fact about each person **is** takenas **evidence,** with respect to each bit of happiness that is valued, **that** that bit **[it] is valuable.** Each person is seen as having [has] reason to think that the happiness she enjoys is valuable, and reason to think of others -- given that they are in a parallel situation with respect to the happiness they enjoy -- that **[But]** each person's happiness is such that **there is the same evidence available** to each **for the value of** the **[another’s] happiness** that another person enjoys **as there is for** the value of **one's own** happiness**. If happiness is such that every piece of it is desired** by someone**, then** it seems as if,in taking ourselves to have reason to see the bit we value as valuable, **we are committed to** acknowledging the **value [happiness]** of all the rest.

Not maximizing wellbeing would thus be logically inconsistent, given that each values his own and that value is morally binding.

Thus, the standard is **maximizing expected well-being.**

**And,** the neg must specify what form of wage restrictions they defend and read empirical evidence contextualizing that form based on past instances. All other interps **a)** hurt aff ground because otherwise the neg could fiat a type that would be unlikely to happen, exploding neg ground since they get out of all harms. Cross-apply ground, **b)** are unpredictable because there would be no literature on the issue if it’s not based on past implementations. Predictability is key since it lets us prepare for arguments, **c)** kill real world education since we don’t debate about actual instances of extraction but about theoretical ones. Real world is key to ensure education from debate is relevant outside the activity, **d)** let them de-link from turns to specific forms of wage restrictions in the 2NR, making them a moving target because I have no way coherently derive offense against their position. Strat is key since I need to be able to form a coherent path to the ballot.

Additionally, **prefer the standard**:

**First**, obligations are always indexed for agents. We don’t say “obligations exist,” but rather “Y must fulfill X obligation.” And, the purpose of governments is util. **Goodin[[4]](#footnote-4):**

The great advantage of **Util**itarianism as a guide to public conduct is that it avoids gratuitous sacrifices, it ensures as best we are able to **ensure[s]** in the uncertain world of public policy-making that policies are **sensitive[ity] to people’s interests** or desires or preferences. The great failing of more deontological theories, applied to those realms, is that they fixate upon duties done for the sake of duty rather than for the sake of any good that is done by doing one’s duty. Perhaps it is permissible (perhaps even proper) for private individuals in the course of their personal affairs to fetishize duties done for their own sake. It would be a mistake for public officials to do likewise, not least because it is impossible. The fixation on motives makes absolutely no sense in the public realm, and might make precious little sense in the private one even, as chapter 3 shows. The reason **public action** is required at all **arises from the inability of uncoordinated individual[s]** action **to achieve** certain **morally desirable ends.** Individuals are rightly excused from pursing those ends. The inability is real; the excuses, perfectly valid. But libertarians are right in their diagnosis, wrong in their prescription. That is the message of chapter 2. The same thing that makes those excuses valid at the individual level – the same thing that relieves **individuals** to **organize** themselves into **collective units that are capable of acting where** they are isolated as **individuals are not.** When they organize themselves into these collective units, those collective deliberations inevitable take place under very different circumstances, and their conclusions inevitably take very different forms. Individuals are morally required to operate in that collective, in certain crucial respects. But they are practically circumscribed in how they can operate, in their collective mode. And **those** special **constraints [on individual action]** characterizing the public sphere of decision-making **give rise to the** special **circumstances that make util**itarianism peculiarly **apt for** public **policy-making**, in ways set out more fully in chapter 4. Government house utilitarianism thus understood is, I would argue, a uniquely defensible public philosophy.

This means absent util, the concept of just government is incoherent since governments cease to fulfill their specific obligations. Without these obligations a just government cannot exist.

**And**, the aff can read new offense linking into the aff framework in the 1AR since **a)** the neg gets the ability to formulate offense based upon the AC, so the aff should have the ability to do the same based on the NC, **b)** logically inconsistent otherwise since any turns the aff reads on the neg could potentially also be offense back to the aff standard so there’s no difference, and **c)** reasonable since it’s just an expansion of aff offense, the neg can still preclude on other levels such as the standard or pre-standard level.

**Second**, brain studies prove personal identity doesn’t exist. **Parfit**[[5]](#footnote-5)**:**

Some **recent medical cases provide striking evidence in favor of the Reductionist View.** Human beings have a **lower brain and** two **upper hemispheres**, which **are connected by a bundle of fibers.** In treating a few people with severe epilepsy, **surgeons have cut these fibers.** The aim was to reduce the severity of epileptic fits, by confining their causes to a single hemisphere. This aim was achieved. But the operations had another unintended consequence. **The effect**, in the words of one surgeon, **was the creation of ‘two separate spheres of consciousness.’ This effect was revealed by various psychological tests.** These made use of two facts. We control our right arms with our left hemispheres, and vice versa. And what is in the right halves of our visual fields we see with our left hemispheres, and vice versa. When someone’s hemispheres have been disconnected, **psychologists can thus present** to this person two different written **questions in the two halves of his visual field, and can receive two different answers** written by this person’s two hands.

**Also**, neg disads and counterplans must have a solvency advocate who advocates that they solve the specific harms of the aff. Otherwise it’s unpredictable because if there is no one that actually advocates their alternative I have no way of predicting their scenario out of the infinite number of other possible scenarios. Further, advocacies that aren’t based in the topic literature lack academic credibility and aren’t real-world. Cross-apply predictability.

In the absence of personal identity, only end states can matter. **Shoemaker**[[6]](#footnote-6)**:**

Extreme reductionism might lend support to utilitarianism in the following way. Many people claim that we are justified in maximizing the good in our own lives, but not justified in maximizing the good across sets of lives, simply because each of us is a single, deeply unified person, unified by the further fact of identity, whereas there is no such corresponding unity across sets of lives. But if the only justification for the different treatment of individual lives and sets of lives is the further fact, and this fact is undermined by the truth of reductionism, then nothing justifies this different treatment. **There are no deeply unified subjects of experience. What remains are merely the experiences themselves, and so any ethical theory distinguishing between individual lives** and sets of lives **is mistaken.** If the deep, further fact is missing, then there are no unities. **The morally significant units should then be the states people are in at particular times, and an ethical theory that focused on them** and attempted to improve their quality, whatever their location, **would be the most plausible. Util**itarianism **is just such a theory.**

**And**, the neg must defend a world with no type of living wage. To clarify, they must specify that they don’t defend employees getting this wage or higher even as a byproduct of another wage system. Any other interp kills aff ground since **a)** it destroys the distinction between what we’re prioritizing and lets them derive offense from aff impacts and **b)** gives them a quantitative advantage since they can either defend that a living wage is bad or that a different system better accomplishes the aff goals.

**Third,** the definition of ought implies utilitarianism. **Harris**[[7]](#footnote-7):

But this notion of **“ought” is an artificial** and needlessly confusing **way to think about moral choice [that]**. In fact, it seems to be another dismal product of Abrahamic religion—which, strangely enough, now constrains the thinking of even atheists. If this notion of “ought” means anything we can possibly care about, it **must translate into** a **concern about** the **actual** or potential **experience** of conscious beings (either in this life or in some other). For instance, **to say that we ought to treat children with kindness seems identical to saying that everyone will** tend to **be better off if we do. The person who claims that he does not want to be better off is** either **wrong** about what he does, in fact, want (i.e., he doesn’t know what he’s missing), or he is lying, or he is not making sense. The person who **insist[ing] that** he is committed to treating children with kindness for [the] **reasons** that **have nothing to do with** anyone’s **well-being is** alsonot making **[non]sense.** It is worth noting in this context that the God of Abraham never told us to treat children with kindness, but He did tell us to kill them for talking back to us (Exodus 21:15, Leviticus 20:9, Deuteronomy 21:18–21, Mark 7:9–13, and Matthew 15:4–7). And yet everyone finds this “moral” imperative perfectly insane. Which is to say that no one—not even fundamentalist[s] Christians and orthodox Jews—can so fully ignore the link between morality and human well-being.

Prefer this definition at Lex: **A)** **Topical Education:** Util forces debaters to actually cut new prep, read topic lit and be aware of current events, scenarios and studies, not just recycle the same philosophical frameworks every topic. Topical debates outweigh philosophical sincethey’re the only unique educational impact that we get from changing the topic, **B) Ground**: Most non-utilitarian philosophies are distributive or violation-based so debaters only need to win a violation, util requires weighing competing scenarios, that’s most important since real-world scenarios aren’t black and white. Also, those frameworks are unfair: the side that has to prove a violation is the only side that can make offensive claims, the other debater is limited to just defense. Cross-apply ground. **And, responses are non-unique**: It’s the very beginning of the topic, my definition forces people to actually do topical debate rather than recycling phil cases like people usually do ealy in topics and ensure we have a solid foundation before everyone gets sick of debating the topic by Harvard, so I enforce a minimum of education.

I defend the universal employer guarantee of a living wage. **Maloney[[8]](#footnote-8):**

**The living wage is** often defined as **the wage necessary to provide a** full-time, year-round **worker and** his or her **family with** the **sufficient income to ensure** an **adequate standard of living** and the ability to fully participate in society**.** A living wage of $18.40 has recently been proposed for all of New Zealand, with the possibility of a higher living wage of $24.11 for Auckland due to its relatively higher living costs (Waldegrave and King, 2012). These living wage levels would be 33.8% and 75.3%, respectively, above the prevailing minimum wage of $13.75 in this country. Living wage campaigns are currently underway in other New Zealand cities. In April 2013, the first Auckland business, Tonzu, pledged to pay a Living Wage. In May, The Warehouse announced a career retailer wage benchmarked against the Living Wage. It will be available to all staff with 5,000 hours of service who have undertaken specific training. In June 2013, the Wellington City Council resolved, in principle, to become a Living Wage employer. There is ample empirical evidence on the effects of living wage laws overseas that can inform this discussion about the possible consequences of adopting living wage provisions in this country. Most of this analysis comes from the experiences of numerous cities in the United States that have enacted living wage ordinances over the last two decades. There are a number of **common features of living wage laws** around the world **[include]**. Firstly, they havelimited coverage. Unlike minimum wage laws that provide a universal wage floor, living wage ordinances cover specific groups of workers often within narrow geographic boundaries. Secondly, they set **relatively high wage floors**, often 30% or more above the national minimum wage. Thirdly, they are **[and the] motivat[ion]** by an explicit attempt **to reduce poverty rates** by setting a wage consistent with a minimum standard of living**.**

Any other burden kills aff ground since living wage laws differ drastically depending on jurisdiction. **Holzer[[9]](#footnote-9):**

Despite these generally shared characteristics, and in addition to differences in the mandated wage and benefit levels specified, **living wage laws vary substantially across** local **jurisdictions**, as Table 1 also implies**.** For instance, **the[ir] scope** of coverage **varies** quite a bit even **[even] within** the **categories** of firmsdefined above – **with** some **laws applying** only tofull-time workers or limited tospecific **[differently]** occupational categories**.** **The** administrative **apparatus for implementing these laws** varies as well across local areas, with some localities hiring officials explicitly to enforce these laws and making them quite accessible to the public while others do not (Luce, 2004). **[and] the geographic scope** of coveragealso **var[y]**, as some laws apply to municipalities and others to counties; and, even in the case of the former, some cities face a situation where similar laws are being implemented in contiguous municipalities while many others do not**.** Finally, **some laws** also contain provisions that require workers to be hired that live in the covered communities, and some **are** explicitly **superseded by collective bargaining** provisions **while others are not.** All of these characteristics of the policy context and how the laws are designed and implemented will likely affect their impacts on labor market outcomes**.** One other characteristic seems to apply almost universally in these efforts: local living wage ordinances generally seem to directly affect very few workers. Most studies imply that, even among workers in the bottom decile of wage levels, only 2-3% are covered by these laws (e.g., Fairris and Reich, 2005), as so few work for firms that benefit from local service contracts or other forms of public financial assistance; and, even in larger cities, the absolute numbers of workers covered will be very modest. For example, consider a city with a total population of 1 million, half of whom are in the workforce. Of the 50,000 workers in the bottom decile of earnings, if 3% are directly covered by living wage ordinances, then only 1500 workers are so affected.

Since the resolution specifies just governments, the aff is textually bound to defending multiple governments; this means forcing the aff to defend one particular monetary interpretation of living wage kills aff ground since I’m forced to retrofit data from one implementation to another area where it wouldn’t apply. Cross-apply ground.

**And,** the neg must read an explicit written text for their advocacy in the NC. This is key to aff strategy since otherwise the neg can change the functionality of their advocacy in the next speech. Having a text binds them to the particulars of their arguments and prevents them from shifting out of aff offense. Cross-apply strat skew.

I contend that affirming maximizes expected wellbeing.

**Contention 1** is **the economy.** The AFF reduces poverty. Prefer my evidence because it actually weighs the positive impacts of a living wage against the negative impacts of turns the NEG might read. The **PPIC**[[10]](#footnote-10)**:**

**A** pathbreaking **national study** finds that although living wage laws reduce employment, they also decrease poverty among urban families. A report **released** today **by the** nonpartisan **Public Policy Institute of California** (PPIC) **shows that the substantial pay increases** generated by such laws can **outweigh job losses** among low-income workers - **and the net effect is a** modest **decrease in** family **poverty. The report**, How Living Wage Laws Affect Low-Wage Workers and Low-Income Families, **is the first to examine actual experiences of cities with living wage laws and analyze** the **effects** of these policies **on the workers they were intended to assist.** Author David Neumark, a professor of economics at Michigan State University, looks at 36 cities with living wages across the nation, including Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Denver, Detroit, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, New Haven, San Francisco, and San Jose. The report finds that **if a city passes a living wage that is 50 percent higher than the** state's **minimum wage, it will raise the average wage of low-income workers** (bottom 10 percent of the income distribution) **by 3.5 percent.** In California, where the minimum wage is now $6.75, a living wage of $10.13 could increase wages by 24 cents per hour or $480 per year for full-time work. The study estimates that this increase would be substantially larger in cities - such as Cambridge, MA, St. Paul, MN, and Berkeley, CA - where living wage laws extend beyond city contractors to include businesses that receive some form of assistance from the city. A 50 percent increase in the living wage would also reduce employment among low-wage workers by 7 percent, according to the study. "Living wage laws will lead to some employment loss, but **on balance, the steep wage increases make it less likely that families with a living wage worker will live in poverty, especially in cities where the law applies more broadly,"** says Neumark. However, he cautions that other issues, such as the effect of living wage ordinances on city budgets, should be explored before drawing firm policy conclusions about these laws. The analysis also suggests that unionized municipal workers gain sizable wage increases in cites where living wage laws cover city contractors. "Because contractors are likely to pass on the increased cost of living wages, cities appear less inclined to contract out work that can be done by their own workers," says Neumark. "As a result, unions representing city workers have greater bargaining power." The study notes that labor unions are very active in the movement to pass living wage laws. The Public Policy Institute of California is a private, nonprofit organization dedicated to objective, nonpartisan research on economic, social, and political issues that affect the lives of Californians. The Institute was established in 1994 with an endowment from William R. Hewlett. David W. Lyon is President and CEO of PPIC.

**And,** all negative offense must only prove that the specific living wage is bad, rather than that compulsion of employers is generically bad. **a)** proving duties are generically bad is extra-topical because it makes living wage a meaningless specification in the resolution. Thus it allows the neg to garner offense from scenarios not under the umbrella of the topic. Textuality is key since the text determines what arguments we can topically make, **b)** generic compulsion bad or property rights offense ignores the particular issue of living wage by only discussing duties in general, meaning we also don't clash on specific issues of the topic such as poverty. Topical clash is key to education because it’s the only thing that extends out of the individual round.

**Also,** increasing income inequality is the biggest threat to economic growth. **Thompson 14[[11]](#footnote-11)**:

The top line numbers are looking brighter: **The global economy should grow by 3**.2**%** this year, up from 2.4% in 2013, according to the World Bank. **Yet** for many**, in** the **developed** world **and emerging markets** alike**,** the recovery from the worst economic crisis since the 1930s has a phantom-like quality. Many people can't see an improvement in their quality of life, and **the gap between the rich and poor is growing.**¶ "Since the global financial crisis, it's been a race to the bottom in jobs, wages and living standards," said Philip Jennings, general secretary of UNI Global Union.¶ Central **banks have pumped trillions of dollars** into the world financial system **to stabilize their economies, sending stock markets** and real estate prices **soaring to the** [**benefit of the wealthy**](http://finance.fortune.cnn.com/2014/01/17/qe-welfare/?iid=EL).¶ At the same time, **governments have** slashedpublic sectorjobs**, reduced protections** for those working in the private sector**,** [**cut welfare benefits**](http://money.cnn.com/2014/01/17/news/economy/food-stamps-cut/index.html?iid=EL) **and made pensions less generous -- changes that hit the** young and **most vulnerable the hardest**. Companies continue to [shed jobs](http://money.cnn.com/2014/01/17/technology/intel-jobs/index.html?iid=EL), too. The World Economic Forum, which is hosting its annual meeting of the business elite in the Swiss mountain resort of Davos this week, surveyed over 700 experts about what was **the biggest risk to the global economy over the next 10 years**.¶ The answer: **[is] a** yawning **gap in incomes that could put a huge strain on social cohesion**.¶

**And,** the neg must write down all theory interps and counter-interps before the NC. Otherwise they can shift their interpretation after CX to exclude arguments I bring up in it. Nobody can verify their exact interp at 400 words per minute and they’ll just say it was extemped and never write it down, letting them shift their strat. Cross-apply strat.

**Next,** societal collapse is inevitable when there’s a gap – 5000 years of empirical analysis prove. **Ahmed 14**[[12]](#footnote-12):

**A new study** partly-**sponsored by NASA**’s Goddard Space Flight Center **has highlighted** the prospect **that global industrial civilisation could collapse in coming decades due to** unsustainable resource exploitation and increasingly **unequal wealth distribution.**¶ Noting that warnings of 'collapse' are often seen to be fringe or controversial, the study attempts to make sense of compelling historical data showing that "the process of rise-and-collapse is actually a recurrent cycle found throughout history." Cases of severe civilisational disruption due to "precipitous collapse - often lasting centuries - have been quite common."¶ The independent research project is based on a new cross-disciplinary 'Human And Nature DYnamical' (HANDY) model, led by applied mathematician Safa Motesharrei of the US National Science Foundation-supported National Socio-Environmental Synthesis Center, in association with a team of natural and social scientists. The HANDY model was created using a minor Nasa grant, but the study based on it was conducted independently. The study based on the HANDY model has been accepted for publication in the peer-reviewed Elsevier journal, Ecological Economics.¶ It finds that according to the historical record even advanced, complex civilisations are susceptible to collapse, raising questions about the sustainability of modern civilisation:¶ "The fall of the Roman Empire, and the equally (if not more) advanced Han, Mauryan, and Gupta Empires, as well as so many advanced Mesopotamian Empires, are all testimony to the fact that advanced, sophisticated, complex, and creative civilizations can be both fragile and impermanent."¶ **By investigating** the human-nature **dynamics of** these **past cases of collapse, the project identifies the** most salient interrelated **factors which explain civilisational decline**, **and** which may help **determine the risk of collapse today**: namely, Population, Climate, Water, Agriculture, and [Energy](http://www.theguardian.com/environment/energy).¶ **These** factors **can lead to collapse when they converge to generate** two crucial social features: "the stretching of resources due to the strain placed on the ecological carrying capacity"; and "the **economic stratification of society** into Elites [rich] and Masses (or "Commoners") [poor]" **These** social **phenomena have played** "**a central role in** the character or in the process of the **collapse**," **in all such cases over** "**the last five thousand years**."¶ Currently, high levels of economic stratification are linked directly to overconsumption of resources, with "Elites" based largely in industrialised countries responsible for both:¶ "... accumulated surplus is not evenly distributed throughout society, but rather has been controlled by an elite. The mass of the population, while producing the wealth, is only allocated a small portion of it by elites, usually at or just above subsistence levels."¶ The study challenges those who argue that technology will resolve these challenges by increasing efficiency:¶ "Technological change can raise the efficiency of resource use, but it also tends to raise both per capita resource consumption and the scale of resource extraction, so that, absent policy effects, the increases in consumption often compensate for the increased efficiency of resource use."¶ Productivity increases in agriculture and industry over the last two centuries has come from "increased (rather than decreased) resource throughput," despite dramatic efficiency gains over the same period.¶ Modelling a range of different scenarios, Motesharrei and his colleagues conclude that under conditions "closely reflecting the reality of the world today... we find that collapse is difficult to avoid." In the first of these scenarios, **civilization** **appeared to be on a sustainable path for quite a long time, but [now] even** using an **optimal[ly]** depletion rate and starting with a very small number of Elites**, the Elites** eventually **consume too much, resulting in a famine** among Commoners **that eventually causes the collapse of society.**

**Finally,** the neg must have a counter-solvency advocate from the topic lit that advocates against their DA or CP. A counter-solvency advocate is good litmus test to see if there is lit on both sides of issue. If there is no counter-solvency advocate, then there is no way to verify that there is literature on my side of the issue, key to fairness since it’s my only way to engage the argument.

**Underview to the AC:**

**One**, drop the arg on T and re-evaluate offense under the interp: **A)** binary T interps make the aff subject to T no matter what is run in the AC. I have to pick one interp, so don’t punish me for going into the round blind, **B)** the topic is vague due to the different types of wage systmes in the real world, so I have no way of knowing which interp I choose is right because of the vagueness, **C)** time skew makes it so that it is impossible to win substance and respond to T in the 1AR. Re-evaluating offense under their interp solves since I no longer am forced to engage both debates, giving me a chance to win. **At worst,** T is an aff RVI since the neg can spread out the 1AR, and I don’t have enough time to deal with multiple shells and then win on substance. Dropped “I meets” and “no abuse” claims deserve equal credence as counter-interps since CX grants time to clarify violations prior to running theory. **Also,** no 2nr RVIs since otherwise the neg would win every round by reading an abusive NC and collapsing to theory in the 2nr, which they would always win since I only have 3 minutes to respond to 6 minute scripts.

**Two**, evaluate theory as a matter of competing interpretations since **a)** what is reasonably fair is arbitrary and **b)** reasonability encourages debaters to get away with increasingly unfair strategies through defense on theory. Competing interps implies that you need to read an explicit text for any counter-interpretations on theory. If they don’t read a counter-interp, reject all their arguments on the standards level since you don’t know the rule they are advocating for, so you don’t know if their norms would solve for those problems.

**Three,** structurally prefer aff theory over theory in later speeches. **A)** Temporally prior: AC shells are more likely to be the best rule for debate because they are subject to scrutiny for more speeches than shells presented later, **B)** Culpability: The neg could have adapted to my interps whereas I don’t know what theory the neg is going to read, meaning look to aff theory first since violations are completely avoidable. **And**, the neg’s ability to layer the debate and adapt to the AC means that they can always have an advantage on each individual structural level, so *disregard aff substantive abuse* since it’s just a form of compensation for this disadvantage,
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