Fairness is a voter since debate’s a competitive activity with wins and losses and you can’t award the better debater a win if the round is skewed. **Fairness first**:

A. It precludes knowing who won a layer. Massey et al:

“Pre-Fiat Arguments” [same author quals] Emily Massey, Grant Reiter, Geoff Kristof 2/3/14 http://nsdupdate.com/2014/02/03/pre-fiat-arguments-by-emily-massey-grant-reiter-and-geoff-kristof/

Third, pre-fiat debaters claim that their impacts precede fairness. To see what’s wrong with this, we need just to remember why fairness matters in debate in the first place. **Fairness constrains substance since abuse skews the judge’s evaluation of who did the better debating on the substantive layer. It constrains pre-fiat impacts for** exactly **the same reason. Even if the better debater is the person who resists oppression the most, abuse skews the judge’s evaluation of who did** the better debating on **that** pre-fiat layer.

B. No impact to critical education – I can gain education and learn about a particular role of the ballot out of round but fairness is a necessary practice that must be practiced within rounds.

C. Inclusivity: an unfair model of debate kills the incentive for people to debate in the first place. That link turns all their offense since there’s no incentive to do work, read and come to tournaments to learn anything. **Speice and Lyle**[[1]](#footnote-1)

As with any game or sport, creating a level playing field that afford[ing]s each competitor a fair chance of victory is integral to the continued existence of debate as an activity. If the game is slanted toward one particular competitor, the other[s] participants are likely to pack up their tubs and go home, as they don’t have a realistic shot of winning such a “rigged game.” Debate simply wouldn’t be fun if the outcome was pre-determined and certain teams knew that they would always win or lose. The incentive to work hard to develop new and innovative arguments would be non-existent because wins and losses would not relate to how much research a particular team did. TPD, as defined above, offers the best hope for a level playing field that makes the game of debate fun and educational for all participants.

D. Legitimacy – if debates aren’t fair debaters won’t think that K debate is legitimate since they’ll think it of as merely an exclusionary move rather than a real, substantive, intellectual decision making issue. Thus, unfairness undermines the education argument out of the role of the ballot.

E. Reading unfair and nontopical AC’s only incentivizes avoiding the substance of the aff. Lots of judges find T against such strategies largely legitimate and the argument does have a stronger link. But if the aff is reasonably topical then frivolous arguments just look stupid and debaters are more likely to talk about liberating oppressed groups.

F. A fair [and topical] version of your [K/aff] solves my impacts cause you’re predictable and equitable as well as 99% of your impacts since we’ll still get good discussion relating to [Y]. All you had to do is [meet my interp by X].
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