# No RVIs

## Reasons

#### 1: Theory is a litmus test to see if my opponent falls under the rules for debate, proving that your argument is not illegitimate is not sufficient for a ballot. No one should win for being fair.

#### 2: RVIs discourage people from checking real abuses because they are afraid they might lose from an RVI

#### 3: RVIs turn every debate into theory since substance can no longer decide the round. Topic specific education is important because the resolution changes every month for a reason so we have a limited amount of time to clash on topical issues whereas we can always talk about theory.

#### 4: If we can run RVIs, we can also run reverse RVIs. Making me answer an RVI wastes my time so my opponent should lose the round – we can never reach the end of the chain. This proves why RVIs are ridiculous.

**5: RVI’s encourage good theory debaters to run abusive positions so that they can win on theory – it’s a cyclical impact.**

## A2 Time skew

#### 1: They can just read theory on me, which solves time skew since they can just weigh the abuse of each argument

#### 2: NONUNIQUE: I spend time on theory too – they are missing comparison.

#### 3: NONUNIQUE: Every argument skews time. People make short arguments, just learn how to answer them.

## A2 Your fault for initiating theory

#### 1: Its your fault for being abusive. If it’s frivolous, then it should be easy to answer it and move on to substance. If we care about substantive debate, RVIs make it worse because it turns the ENTIRE debate into theory.

## A2 Reciprocity

#### 1: You can run theory on me if I’m unfair, then you can weigh the shells since we link into the same impacts about education and fairness

#### 2: Competitive symmetry doesn’t require reciprocity on each given issue. For example, in StarCraft the three character types all have different advantages but the win ratios are balanced.

## A2 Minimize frivolous theory

#### 1: TURN: RVIs chill legitimate theory since debaters will be afraid of their opponent going for a frivolous RVI. This is worse than minimizing frivolous theory, as it can be dealt with quickly because it’s not a legitimate argument and judges don’t want to vote on it,

#### 2: Frivolous theory can be solved in other ways. For example, reasonability discourages frivolous theory since there’s a higher threshold for demonstrated abuse.

#### 3: EMPIRICALLY DENIED: IN LD, they are trending towards more RVIs but frivolous theory is increasing. Debaters just try to become really good at theory to play both sides of each issue, so skilled debaters will just go for frivolous theory anyway.