# 1NC

## Theory – Amspec

THIS IS NOT A TOPICALITY SHELL - MONKEY ASS MARK

1. **Interp:** Debaters must specify the amount of money distributed through universal basic income
2. **Violation:** They do not quantify any UBI
3. **Standards**
4. Clash: Allowing late definition of income can moot all negative offense and defense since it amplifies or reduces certain consequences. This dodges proper engagement which is key to determining the truth of an argument
5. Ground: Reduces competition of Disads since UBI and means-tested welfare aren’t mutually exclusive. This means they could potentially coopt substantial NEG ground in late rounds making NEG argumentation over-limited
6. Predictability: Rebuttal responses can’t be targeted towards any specific UBI quantity making evidenced responses impossible because we can’t predict what number they will choose. This is another internal link into engagement and truth testing as evidence is key to grounded education
7. Semantics: For debate to have portable education in the policy sphere, we must have semantic education on the topic and the process of implementation. We can’t advocate for material real world policy if we don’t even know how much we want the UBI to be, which I might add is the MOST IMPORTANT ASPECT
8. **Voters**
9. Education: Debate only is tangibly valuable because it provides education that informs daily life. Inaccuracy of education should be minimized in order to protect the value of debate
10. Fairness: Debate is a game and you can’t properly choose a winner when it’s rigged

**Drop the Debater**

1. Reinforces the norm of fair and educational debate
2. Solves for immediate abuse by penalizing the debaters
3. I had to read this shell to maintain fairness and now am at further disadvantage on substance. Abuse can be infinite if you ever evaluate its contents

## Theory – New Tax Bad

**Interp:** Debaters may not fiat new and independent government revenue sources

**Violation:** They attempt to fund their UBI with an additional means of government revenue

**Standards**

1. Predictability: Since additional government revenue is never introduced in the resolution, there is no feasible way for us to predict what form of increase they will advocate. This opens a pandora’s box of potential tax options which creates unrealistic prep burdens for the negative team. \_ impacts
2. Unpredictability kills education through reducing engagement. When people do not have prepared and researched responses to a case, there is no opportunity for direct evidenced clash that determines the truth of the argument
3. Unpredictability kills fairness as the AFF has functionally infinite prep to prepare responses to welfare and case advantages. However, disads to UBI would be undermined as the NEG wouldn’t be able to write blocks to hyper specific methods of taxation and the advantages that those taxes individually generate

**Voters**

1. Education: Debate is only tangibly valuable because it provides education that informs daily decisions. It also controls an internal link to participation considering schools fund debate because it is educational
2. Fairness: If debates are unfair, nobody will want to debate in them given that it lacks any reward incentice

**Drop the Debater**

Cross apply the same implications from above

### Paradigm Issues (Both Shells)

**No RVI’s**

1. Discourages norm discussion which is key to critical thinking and activism. Education has to be applied to matter
2. Collapses debate to entirely RVI’s or no RVI’s which is anti-educational in both substantive and theoretical terms
3. You don’t win for not being abusive. It should be expectation and this is logically incoherent

**Prefer Competing Interps**

1. Clash: Reasonability is inherently intervention which reduces testing of our decision calculus and harms accurate norm-setting