#### We interpret that debaters must read at least the year for all of their evidence.

#### They violate this interpretation, because \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

­­

#### You should prefer our interpretation for 3 reasons.

#### 1: Rules. The NSDA themselves require teams to at least read the year. Rules are key to fairness so teams are bound into a playing field where we cant just read things against what the NSDA wants. Its like giving a 5 minute rebuttal.

#### 2: Evidence Ethics. Evidence can be read out of context if the card is from years ago, thus reading dates discourages teams from running outdated evidence. Not reading dates skews the ground within the debate because it allows for them to have access to arguments that used to be true but now are not, while we are restricted to the current topic literature.

#### 3: Time skew. Not reading dates makes teams alter their strategy and take prep to call for cards to find the date. This destroys fairness because it decreases our time to prepare in-round strategy and argumentation.

#### Overall, judges are asked to vote for who the better debaters are. Everyone needs a fair opportunity to present their own arguments and contest each others’ arguments, or the basis for determining the better side is fundamentally skewed.

#### Drop them for 2 reasons

#### A vote for us endorses a positive model of debate. Wins and losses determine the direction of the activity, teams losing for bad practices incentivizes change in the future.

#### A neg ballot signifies a remedy to the competitive advantage they gained from not reading dates.