A. is the interpretation – Resolved is defined by google as
https://www.google.com/?gws\_rd=ssl#q=resolved+definition
**firmly determined to do something**

Doing something requires a shift from what currently is, so the affirmative must defend a shift from the status quo. They may not simply defend that jurors ought to nullify, rather, they must defend that in the criminal justice system, jurors ought to be informed of their power to nullify. **Seaman ‘15** explains the topic lit**:**

Julie Seaman, Associate Professor of Law, Emory University “Black Boxes: fMRI Detection and the Role of the Jury,” Akron Law Review, Vol. 42, 2015.
As far as the doctrine of jury nullification, **the Supreme Court settled** the question **more than 100 years ago** by holding **that a** criminal **jury has the power**, but not the right, **to acquit against the law**.20 **This power is a byproduct of** other features of the criminal justice system: **the general verdict;** the constitutional **protection against double jeopardy; and** the **secrecy of jury deliberations.** Indeed, it is this secrecy plus the general verdict that create the black box quality of the jury process. **Because of this** well-settled paradox – that juries retain the power to nullify even though they are not supposed to exercise it – **the scholarly debate over jury nullification has largely revolved around** the issue **whether juries should be informed of this power. Scholars are divided** on the question, **partly on normative** grounds **and** partly on **empirical grounds.** The normative issue is whether juries should have the power to decide the law if we could make them stop; the empirical issue is whether, were juries told of their power to nullify, this would result in more of the “bad” nullification.

B. is the violation – they only defend an obligation to jury nullify, not to inform juries of their ability to nullify – 1. AC 2. CX
C. is the standards – 1. Ground, multiple warrants: **A.** turns, DAs, and some NCs become nonunique since whatever harm they describe is already happening in the squo, I must fiat uniqueness through a CP but that doesn’t solve since the aff can always perm so there’s no unique neg offense. **B** the heart of the lit is proposing solutions and hypothesizing potential consequences of plans but if you defend the squo, the debate just becomes reporting descriptive facts about what already is **C.** Seaman says scholars focus on whether juries should be informed, and this debate has literature on normative and empirical issues meaning there’s lots of good topical and philosophical education **D.** consensus – courts have long agreed that juries can nullify they probably agree for good reason, which means debates would be quite one sided. My interp leaves ground for both sides. And ground is key to fairness since without it we don’t have arguments with which to access the ballot and key to education since it’s the basis for all substantive clash.

2. Fiat abuse – the whole problem with juries is that they aren’t perfect – some are sexist or racist, some are heavily biased for or against particular laws, and so forth. If you can just fiat that jurors will nullify in the instance of the injustice you want to fix, you fiat solvency. I have no way to engage and contest you substantively – obviously an injustice is bad and if your advocacy entails nullifying it, I have no ground, killing fairness and clash.

2. Fiat abuse – we should discuss different strategies for getting juries to nullify rather than just asserting they will. Assuming white juries and historically oppressive institutions will just choose to help the oppressed ignores history and reinforces oppression, **Curry:**[[1]](#footnote-1)

Asserted as axiom and sustained as a transformation in the "hearts and minds" of whites ad populum, the civil rights movement and its accompanying policy of integration continues to be understood as a fundamental shift in American race relations from an era of Jim Crowism and terrorism against Blacks during segregation to the more present day where racism is seen to be remnants of the past sustained by racial misunderstanding and collective ignorance. Following this logic, atonement theorists base[d] the possibility of racial reconciliation on an unfounded optimism rooted in the continuation of civil rights era reforms. For these scholars, racism is a question encountered at the extremities of unethical behavior. As presently understood, racism is a choice—an act of free will—to believe that skin color demarcates a real difference about that person and to treat said person or persons as inferior based on that difference. The racist act, then, becomes an attempt to realize in the world one's privations, not as an imaginative act, but an act cultivated by the realization that the world can in fact accept and support one's privations as reality. Thus the racist, as Fanon (1967) maintains is normal, not constrained by ethical calculations of morality, but empowered by them to not only act, but to act for the sake of "their" others. Traditionally we have taken ethics to be, as Henry Sedgwick claims, "any rational procedure by which we determine what individual human beings 'ought'—or what is right for them—or to seek to realize by voluntary action” (1981:1). This rational procedure is however at odds with the empirical reality the ethical deliberation must concern itself with. To argue, as is often done, that the government, its citizens, or white people should act justly, assumes that the possibility of how they could act defines their moral disposition. If a white person could possibly not be racist, it does not mean that the possibility of not being racist, can be taken to mean that they are not racist. In ethical deliberations dealing with the problem of racism, it is common practice to attribute to historically racist institutions, and individuals universal moral qualities that have yet to be demonstrated. This abstraction from reality is what frames our ethical norms and allows us to maintain, despite history **o**r evidence, that racist entities will act justly given the choice. Under such complexities, **the** only ethical deliberation concerning racism must be antiethical, **or a judgment** refus[e to]ing write morality onto immoral entities. In the case of reparations, this would entail a prima facie rejection of atonement, because these theories assume the morality of historically immoral racist actors, be they governmental or individual. When morality is defined not by the empirical acts that demonstrate immorality, but the racial character of those in question, our ethics become nothing more than the apologetics of our tyrannical epoch.

D. is the voters

Fairness, Education

Drop the debater on T since 1. The round is skewed right from the beginning with your reading an abusive AC meaning we can’t just go back to substance, also means my shell outweighs since 2. Even if we drop your advocacy you still lose the round because voting off anything else is functionally severance 3. As the aff your burden axiomatically is to read a topical position so failure to meet that means you lose 4. To rectify time spent reading T 5. Deterrence, allowing you to get away with abuse incentivizes it for the time tradeoff.

Use competing interpretations to evaluate the T debate 1. It’s about finding the best understanding of what terms in the res means so reasonability never works 2. Reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention.

1. Curry, Tommy J. "The Political Economy of Reparations: An Anti-Ethical Consideration of Atonement and Racial Reconciliation under Colonial Moralism." Race Gender and Class 18, no. 1 (2011): 125. < http://www.academia.edu/download/30638769/The\_Political\_Economy\_of\_Reparations.pdf > [↑](#footnote-ref-1)