

# Paraphrase Theory:

## Interpretation:

When evidence is introduced in a round it must be read as a full cut card, and not paraphrased.

## Violation:

They paraphrase all of their case evidence.

## Standards:

### ***First: Evidence Ethics***

Paraphrasing reduces nuanced and in-depth evidence into bias two-sentence summaries, empirically proven by the widespread use of misconstrued evidence in this activity. Cards ensure tags are grounded in direct quotes making it easier to check for misrepresentation, which deters cheating. Evidence ethics are key to fairness. They can make infinite arguments through misrepresentation, while we are limited to the topic literature. Also, education. If their cards do not say what they say they do we are not learning from experts, we are learning what they want us to.

### ***Second: More Research***

Paraphrasing encourages lazy research practices, in which teams only find mediocre evidence, and then misconstrued it instead of reading more topic literature in order to find the best evidence. This harms education because teams read less literature and on net learn less about the topic.

### ***Third: Prep Skew***

If we want to know the quote of their evidence, not only does it require us to use prep time while they do not have to, but it also takes longer to read through the parts they paraphrase when compared to our quotes. This destroys fairness because it reduces our time to prepare in-round strategy.

## Voters:

### ***Fairness:***

Abuse prevents objective evaluation of substance and the round, which is your intrinsic role as a judge.

### ***Education:***

Which is why schools fund debate, and is the only long-lasting, portable skill.

### Drop the Debater:

***1:*** Drop them because a vote for us endorses a positive model of debate. Wins and losses determine the direction of the activity, and teams losing for bad practices incentivises change in the future, which makes debate more educational and fair as a whole.

**2.** All of their cards paraphrased, so drop the argument becomes drop the debater regardless.

### Reverse Voting Issues (R.V.I.)

This shell is not a reverse voting issue, meaning that they cannot gain offense on an RVI or a counter interpretation, since it chills theory for two reasons.

***A)*** We should be allowed to test the legitimacy of the other team. We shouldn't lose for being wrong, or no one would ever risk checking back against abuse.

***B)*** It encourages good debaters to be intentionally abusive. People will bait theory with horrible evidence ethics and then win off of RVI's.