## METATHEORY

### May not read planks that don’t contribute to the abuse [:40]

1. Interpretation – debaters may not read planks in an interpretation if those planks do not contribute to the abuse story. To clarify, if I meet those planks, or you don’t actually explain why violating them links to your standards, you violate my shell.
2. Violation – one of their planks … [explain the planks that don’t meet]
3. Standards – the sole standard is extra offense; by having extra planks there are arguments that don’t actually indict the violation and thus are irrelevant since theory is read against abuse but that abuse just doesn’t exist. Multiple impacts **A.** strategy skew – allows you to generate offense on theory from nothing – means you always have an unfair advantage on theory since I need to answer arguments I shouldn’t have to **B.** substantive education – you arbitrarily strengthen your abuse story, making getting back to substance harder and **C.** resolvability – it becomes impossible to use your interpretation to evaluate the theory debate since we can’t delineate what is and isn’t offense, precludes considering fairness since if we can’t resolve the round at all we can’t resolve it for the better debater.

D. voters – crossapply fairness, that means my shell comes first since I couldn’t fairly engage yours so this layer is justified. Drop the debater still applies since we can’t go back to substance or theory now we need to vote on this shell, and so we can deter abusive theory shells. Crossapply competing interps.

### Must write down theory interps [:40]

1. Interpretation – debaters must write down the exact text of their theory interpretations before reading them in the round.
2. Violation – I ask in CX and you can’t show me, you say you didn’t write it down. Cx binding.
3. Standards – 1. Shiftiness – by not having the interp written down there’s no way for me to generate turns or i-meets to your shell since you can delink them by changing the wording. This unfairly prevents me from winning since I can’t demonstrate I wasn’t abusive and get back to substance. Shiftiness also kills resolvability since if I do end up going for an argument inconsistent with how you claim your interp was worded the judge has no way to resolve that, destroys fairness or education since who will win is now unfairly out of both our hands and also makes educational clash meaningless since the decision is arbitrary anyways.

2. norm setting – you kill norm setting since there’s no way for us to compare what your world for debate looks like with mine without an explicit interp delineating it. Also we need a text of the interp to abide by and follow in future rounds even if your shell is won. Links to any theory voter and outweighs since it’s the fundamental purpose of theory under CI in the first place.

D. voters – crossapply fairness, that means my shell comes first since I couldn’t fairly engage yours so this layer is justified. Drop the debater still applies since we can’t go back to substance or theory now we need to vote on this shell, and so we can deter abusive theory shells. Crossapply competing interps.

### Must spec definition of competing interps [:45]

1. Interpretation – if a debater reads theory and defends a paradigm of competing interpretations, then they must specify the definition of competing interpretations in the form of an explicit text. To clarify, C.I. has different components and different debaters defend different variations – for example, sometimes it just means offense/defense while other times it means norm-setting.
2. Violation – they don’t, check your flow and call the speech doc post round
3. Standards – 1. Strategy skew – by not having the meaning of competing interps specified I have no way to formulate responses on theory since you can exclude my arguments by clarifying competing interps after the fact. For example if competing interps means norm setting maybe I need an explicit counterinterp and auto-lose if I don’t but if it just means offense defense I do not. Strategy skew kills fairness cause I don’t have a coherent path to the ballot.

2. Quality of theory debate – since you can be shifty and get out of engaging my arguments there is less clash on the theory debate. And since it’s harder for me to understand how I’m supposed to answer theory I won’t do so as well. Quality of theory debate links to any voter and precludes since it’s a prerequisite to ensure we accurately assess and punish abuse in any form.

D. voters – crossapply fairness, that means my shell comes first since I couldn’t fairly engage yours so this layer is justified. Drop the debater still applies since we can’t go back to substance or theory now we need to vote on this shell, and so we can deter abusive theory shells. Use competing interps – I define it as offense/defense, to prevent judge intervention we should look to who has the most offense not some arbitrary brightline.

### Must specify which layer comes first [:55]

1. Interpretation – if the negative reads arguments linking to fairness or education as reasons to drop the affirmative and also a pre-fiat criticism of the affirmative that links to a role of the ballot, then they must specify which layer comes first either in their speech or when asked in CX.
2. Violation – [they don’t have any spec in the speech doc, and CX is binding, and they don’t say]
3. The sole standard is strategy skew – I have no way to form a coherent 1AR since no matter how I allocate my time, you’ll be able to collapse to whatever I’ve undercovered and weigh that layer first, screwing over the 2AR. Even if I split evenly 2 minutes on each you’ll still win with 6 minutes to win either and outweigh, no way the 2AR can cover all your substance or all your weighing. Impacts **1.** Fairness – can’t access the ballot without a coherent strategy **2.** Clash – since you can give a 2NR that just goes for whatever I cover less we don’t engage either layer in depth. Clash is the unique education we get from rounds and key to fairness since it’s the basis of determining the better debater via a round. Also turns the kritik since your role of the ballot says we should get good discussion about [\_] but my shell shows that won’t happen.

D. Voter – Crossapply fairness, means my shell outweighs theirs because it proves I couldn’t fairly engage and show I’m not abusive. Comes before the role of the ballot 1. It’s a procedural constraint – we can’t evaluate who best [\_] without fairness 2. It’s key to inclusivity since people will quit if they don’t think they can win rounds. If they don’t debate they don’t get your benefits and 3. Fair version of the K – just meet my interp, that world is fair and includes your discussion. Drop the debater, [their args still apply so crossapply them] OR [1. It’s the only way to deter abusive arguments otherwise it’s incentivized for the time tradeoff on theory 2. Substance is skewed by the introduction of an unfair argument, it’s shaped the remainder of my strat so we can’t just go back. 3. It was something they didn’t do so drop the arg isn’t an option – we need to drop them.] Crossapply competing interpretations.

## NEG ADVOCACY THEORY

### Must spec the status of the counterplan when reading it [1:25]

1. Interpretation – if the neg reads only one counterplan, alternative, or any sort of advocacy other than the status quo, then the advocacy must be the first off they read and they must specify in the form of an explicit, delineated text what the status of the advocacy is immediately after reading the advocacy text. To clarify, the neg has to specify in speech whether the [\_] is conditional, unconditional, or dispositional and if so what the conditions for kicking it are.
2. Violation – they don’t, check your flow and call the speech doc post round
3. Standards – 1. Stable advocacy – having the status in an explicit text is key to ensuring they don’t change the status to nullify 1AR arguments and strategy – judge’s don’t pay attention to CX and don’t flow; even if they do there’s still a risk I forget to ask or that it’s unclear. Stable advocacy key to educational clash with their position and also necessary for me to have any fair chance at linking my arguments for a winnable 2AR.

2. Prep skew – I should know the status of the CP early in the NC since that affects time allocation and thus my prepping. If you wait till CX to clarify, I lose the entirety of the NC, which should be 7 minutes for me to brainstorm answers. Violates fairness since you know the AC is unconditional and have the entire 6 minutes with which to prep so I need to be able to prep during the NC too, also hurts education since I’ll have less time to think of arguments.

3. Value of CX – asking in CX encourages you to be shady, unclear, and hesitant, or waste lots of time explaining dispo. Kills fairness since you knew the AC is unconditional, you didn’t need to waste CX clarifying my advocacy’s status but I do yours, so I unreciprocally lose CX for strategy. It’s also key to education we shouldn’t just clarify since CX is the only time we can engage in back and forth dialogue, mimicking real world discussion.

D. voter – Fairness is a voter since the ballot tells you to vote for the better debater but abuse skews the judge’s evaluation of that, education is a voter since schools fund debate for learning so it’s a prerequisite, drop the debater 1. It’s the only way to deter abuse otherwise debaters are incentivized to be abusive for the time tradeoff on theory 2. Substance is skewed by the introduction of an unfair argument, it’s shaped the remainder of the 1AR strat. *Means my shell’s abuse outweighs 2NR theory – if I was abusive, it was just reactive to the NC.* 3. It was something they didn’t do – we can’t go back in time and make them spec we can only drop the debater. Use C.I. 1. reasonability is arbitrary and begs intervention 2. norms best maximize education and fairness 3. Reasonability requires offense/defense to determine the best bright line so we should just skip the middleman and use offense/defense.

### Must have a solvency advocate for a counterplan [1:10]

1. Interpretation – if the negative defends a counterplan other than the status quo, then they must have a qualified solvency advocate who advocates the implementation of all planks of their counterplan that distinguish it from the affirmative.
2. Violation – you don’t… [CX proves…] [explain their ev…]
3. Standards – the sole standard is topic literature; without a solvency advocate there’s no way to verify that there is lit on your position. Even if there’s lit about the harms that doesn’t mean that your plan is one that has actually been considered and thus had its specific benefits and harms debated. Many impacts: **1.** Ground – I have none with which to contest the validity of the CP, exacerbated since generics apply. They sidestep much of the AC offense with a CP which is why I uniquely need new evidence to read in the 1AR. Ground key to fairness since otherwise I have no basis with which to make arguments, also key to having substantive args with which to clash which is the unique education from debating **2.** Predictability – even if I do have ground the solvency advocate is key so that I actually stumble upon that lit base and know to cut that evidence in the first place. ***3.*** *Liberation strategies – if the CP isn’t in the literature that means it isn’t something that has been seriously considered to help oppressed groups. We should engage with critical literature better rather than make up our own strategies – debaters making up their own random non-lit based plans is exactly how privileged groups coopt the discourse of oppressed groups.*

D. Voters – Fairness is a voter since the ballot tells you to vote for the better debater but abuse skews the judge’s evaluation of that, education is a voter since schools fund debate for learning so it’s a prerequisite to debate, drop the debater 1. It’s the only way to deter abusive arguments otherwise it’s incentivized for the time tradeoff on theory 2. Substance is skewed by the introduction of an unfair argument, it’s shaped the remainder of my strat so we can’t just go back. 3. It was something they didn’t do so drop the arg isn’t an option – we need to drop them. Use C.I. defined as offense/defense comparing two norms for debate, this is best 1. reasonability is arbitrary so we should just compare offense 2. norms best maximize education and fairness 3. Reasonability requires offense/defense to determine the best bright line so we should just skip the middleman and use offense/defense

### Must have counter-advocacy text in the NC [:50]

1. Interpretation – the negative must have a counter-advocacy text in the NC
2. Violation – they don’t check the speech doc
3. Standards – 1. Strategy Skew – Not having an advocacy text means the neg is a moving target, kills 1AR strat because the neg can just delink my turns by saying they don’t defend what I criticize. Especially true on this topic given varying gun laws, some of your args might criticize the status quo as well. Strat key to fairness; otherwise I can’t have a ballot story.

2. Clash – it is impossible to clash unless I know what the aff advocacy is being compared to. Debate is comparative meaning that I need a set neg world to weigh against. Further if there’s no text they can shift and delink rather than engage my responses. Clash key to education cause it’s the unique benefit of a round, and fairness because it’s constitutive of debating meaning its key to evaluating who the better debater is.

D. is the voters – Fairness is a voter since the ballot tells you to vote for the better debater but abuse skews the judge’s evaluation of that, education is a voter since schools fund debate for learning so it’s a prerequisite, drop the debater 1. It’s the only way to deter abuse otherwise debaters are incentivized to be abusive for the time tradeoff on theory 2. Substance is skewed by the introduction of an unfair argument, it’s shaped the remainder of my strat. *Means my shell’s abuse outweighs 2NR theory – if I was abusive, it was just reactive to the NC.* 3. It was something they didn’t do – we can’t go back in time and make them spec we can only drop the debater. Use C.I. 1. reasonability is arbitrary and begs intervention 2. norms best maximize education and fairness 3. Reasonability requires offense/defense to determine the best bright line so we should just skip the middleman and use offense/defense.

#### Frontlines

AT CX Solves

1. Competing interps justifies voting for the debater with the preferable interpretation – my interp has some risk of a benefit over just asking in CX.
2. There’s a possibility I forget to ask – having a text solves that abuse.
3. Judges don’t pay attention to CX and even if they do they might not remember since they don’t flow – means CX can’t solve since it becomes irresolvable.
4. This skews CX time which is key to my prepping ability and questioning your args for concessions.
5. Uneducational since it’s valuable to use CX for back and forth dialogue which is real world educational rather than just clarifying your advocacy text.
6. Doesn’t solve – debaters in CX do their best to be shifty and draw out exchanges, being as resistant to giving concrete answers as possible.
7. Reciprocity is key to fairness since by definition it’s a question of equality – CX is unreciprocal because I already had an advocacy text in the AC.

AT “I defend aims/general negation”

1. Begs the q of what your aim is – that’s important, especially on this topic because negation can be as different as defending squo policies which still include substantial regulation, or getting rid of all gun laws.
2. Begs the question of aims being preferable – you give no reasons why aims is better than implementation, meaning that it’s 50/50 – I still have high risk of offense.
3. Your text solidifies your aim and makes sure you can’t shift out of turns, so even under aims, we would still want an advocacy text.

AT “you can make any turns you want”

1. My whole point is just that you’ll delink from the args I make since your advocacy is vague. You say now that I could’ve read anything but had I actually done it you could’ve delinked – it’s at least a risk of offense.
2. Impossible – different turns can result in irresolvable scenarios, for example…

AT my evidence clarifies my advocacy

1. This is silly I shouldn’t be forced to read all your evidence to interpret your advocacy – creates serious prep skew.
2. Doesn’t make sense – evidence makes arguments about consequences of your advocacy, it’s not your advocacy itself.
3. Subjective – no way to determine that.
4. Unreciprocal – I have an advocacy text, you should too.

## NC SHELLS

### Must have a solvency advocate for a plan [1:10]

1. Interpretation – if the affirmative defends a parametrized advocacy, then they must have a qualified solvency advocate who advocates the implementation of all planks of their advocacy that shift from the status quo.
2. Violation – you don’t… [CX proves…] [explain their ev…]
3. Standards – the sole standard is topic literature; without a solvency advocate there’s no way to verify that there is lit on your position. Even if there’s lit about the harms that doesn’t mean that your plan is one that has actually been considered and thus had its specific benefits and harms debated. Many impacts: **1.** Ground – I have none with which to contest the validity of the plan, exacerbated since generics are either irrelevant or link far less to a plan. Ground key to fairness since otherwise I have no basis with which to make arguments, also key to having substantive args with which to clash which is the unique education from debating **2.** Predictability – even if I do have ground the solvency advocate is key so that I actually stumble upon that lit base and know to cut that evidence in the first place. ***3.*** *Liberation strategies – if the plan isn’t in the literature that means it isn’t something that has been seriously considered to help oppressed groups. We should engage with critical literature better rather than make up our own strategies – debaters making up their own random non-lit based plans is exactly how privileged groups coopt the discourse of oppressed groups.*

D. Voters – Fairness is a voter since the ballot tells you to vote for the better debater but abuse skews the judge’s evaluation of that, education is a voter since schools fund debate for learning so it’s a prerequisite to debate, drop the debater 1. It’s the only way to deter abusive arguments otherwise it’s incentivized for the time tradeoff on theory 2. Substance is skewed by the introduction of an unfair argument, it’s shaped the remainder of my 1NC strat so we can’t just go back. *Also means my shell’s abuse outweighs – if I was abusive, it’s just a reaction to the aff.* 3. It was something they didn’t do so drop the arg isn’t an option – we need to drop them. Use C.I. defined as offense/defense comparing two norms for debate, this is best 1. reasonability is arbitrary so we should just compare offense 2. norms best maximize education and fairness 3. Reasonability requires offense/defense to determine the best bright line so we should just skip the middleman and use offense/defense.

### A/T USchool Alienation a priori [1:05]

1. Interpretation – debaters may not claim that if their framework is false, that means the resolution is true.
2. Violation – the spike is in their fw (point out where)
3. Standards – 1. Philosophical education – this spike grants them an automatic out if there’s a framework debate at all since they can just trigger the resolution being auto-true, not only disincentivizing negs from reading NCs to begin with but also preventing philosophical clash when it does happen since the 1AR always has an easy out. Phil education is uniquely valuable since it teaches us to think critically and construct sound arguments, a skill applicable in any field. Outweighs since it’s specific to LD, other debate events cover political issues.

2. Reciprocity – NCs are key neg ground since the aff is always better prepared to debate under their own framework, exacerbated by infinite preround prep time with which to write frontlines. But this spike makes our strategies irreciprocal and thus by definition unequal and unfair because if I go for an NC they have 2 outs, the a priori and turns while I just have the NC.

3. Clash – one-liners that wash the rest of the debate are uniquely bad since they allow the aff to sidestep all framework and contention clash and invest their time in new weighing for an a priori. Clash key to fairness and education since it’s the basis of all in round arguments.

D. Voters – Fairness is a voter since the ballot tells you to vote for the better debater but abuse skews the judge’s evaluation of that, education is a voter since schools fund debate for learning so it’s a prerequisite to debate, drop the debater 1. It’s the only way to deter abusive arguments – especially on this shell since the framework spike I’m indicting is a short argument (although high-payoff) 2. Substance is skewed by the introduction of an unfair argument, it’s shaped the remainder of my 1NC strat so we can’t just go back. Also means my shell’s abuse outweighs – if I was abusive, it’s just a reaction to the aff. use C.I. defined as offense/defense comparing two norms for debate, this is best since 1. reasonability is arbitrary so we should just compare offense 2. norms best maximize education and fairness 3. Reasonability requires offense/defense to determine the best bright line so we should just skip the middleman and use offense/defense