# Yes RVI

#### 1: I must invest time in order to answer theory because theory is a gateway issue. This means that to answer theory I must allocate time away from substance. Therefore, the only way for me to reasonably answer theory and not lose is to make theory a 2­way street so that the time I invest on theory is worth the opportunity cost.

#### 2: RVI’s discourage bad theory by making people think twice about running theory. Otherwise, debaters will run it every round because it is a no­risk issue and a time suck, giving my opponent a structural advantage in the round. Overuse of theory creates more problems than an RVI ever could.

#### 3: Theory gives my opponent the ability to go for substance or theory whereas I must go for both theory and substance. This is un­reciprocal as it gives my opponent twice as many outs in the round than I have. Reciprocity is key to fairness as un­reciprocal positions makes it easier for one debater to win the round.

#### 4: If theory is an issue of competing interpretations, then you have to vote for the interpretation that is preferable in order to discourage the worse interpretation. If theory and counter interpretations are run, the debate must finish there. One of them must be true. We’ve transcended the realm of substance and have to resolve the discussion on how debate should be in the future, forcing me to debate on the theoretical level, giving me ground for an RVI as that’s the ground I have to debate.