# 1AR shell [:45]

A. Interpretation – the neg may not claim that they are allowed to have new 2NR answers to 1AR extensions of AC [preempts/spikes/etc.]. *THIS IS AN OFFENSIVE* theory interpretation – my standards actively indict both their practice of *trying to access* new 2NR answers and their *actually making* new 2NR answers if they end up doing so. It’s a reason to *VOTE THEM DOWN*

B. violation – They clearly violate since they read a shell that says they access 2NR answers.

C. standards – 1. Time skew – I am forced to spend time justifying that conceded arguments can’t be answered in the 2NR since if the neg can get new answers to any aff spike, the aff loses all the time they spent making the argument. Mooting the strategic value of the AC is the worst form of unfairness since it exacerbates 1AR impossibility – being able to access a constructive speech is the only way to give a winnable 1AR.

2. 1AR restart – mooting aff spikes means that the aff can only start engaging in the theory debate in the 1AR – means that the NC is always incentivized to initiate theory because they’ll have the NC and 2NR, 13 minutes, on the theory debate while I’ll only have 7. Destroys substantive education and outweighs other skews since I’m structurally precluded from having a fair chance at proving I’m not abusive.

D. voters

Crossapply fairness, education, competing interps, drop the debater

Now go to their shell

## On their shell, overview to the theory debate – [:45]

An offensive theory interp makes a claim about something your opponent can’t do or must do and why they violate, leading to abuse. If the neg reads plans bad that is an offensive interp. If the aff reads plans are OK that is not a reason to vote aff – just a counter-interp. All your quote-unquote [make airquotes] interp does is justify why it would be good for debate if you *CAN* make new 2NR answers, not why I must or mustn’t do something, meaning your shell is a purely defensive counter-interp that permits a practice rather than indicting one. Thus the shell isn’t a game over issue unless you have an RVI, which you don’t, so you winning the shell doesn’t mean drop me.

But, here’s a counter-interp even if you think the neg’s shell is offensive.

Counter-interp – the aff may claim that the neg does not get new 2NR answers to spikes. All the offense to my interp also justifies the counter-interp, and I will be generating offense via turns on their shell. Give me the RVI if I’m winning offense on theory since the 1AR needs it –

1. Being able to leverage conceded arguments in the 1AR is the only way to win since neg up-layering on framework and contention make beating every argument impossible. Since they make this impossible, I can’t be expected to win substance specifically against this shell.

2. Time skew – neg doesn’t need RVIs since their speeches are longer than the prior aff speech so even if the aff is all in on theory you still have time enough to match that and extend substance. The 1AR uniquely is screwed since I can’t split 4 minutes on theory and substance when you have a 6 minute 2N to sit on either one.

Now to the standards

## A/T 1AR context necessary to answer arguments [:15]

1. No abuse – my arguments are already clear in the AC so no additional context is needed.

2. No abuse – CX checks if you’re confused.

3. This argument doesn’t make sense – the spike is already a complete argument. The 1AR will just add a new, separate argument building off of the prior conclusion which now serves as a premise of the new argument, which you can contest the logic of.

4. Turn – it infinitely skews my strategy if your 2NR can just sit on any argument extended out of the aff since you are incentivized to call things preempts to get access to new answers. For example you can say framework cards are preempts to other frameworks.

## A/T Jargon is unclear [:10]

1. Crossapply 1&2 on the 1AR context argument – my argument is already clear plus CX checks too.

2. No abuse – if I have unexplained jargon you should just point it out as a reason why my argument is bad since the interp can’t be followed.

## A/T Clash [:20]

1. TURN forcing your NC to err on the side of caution and answer args increases clash.

2. TURN if you can wait till the 2NR that’s worse since rather than clashing throughout the whole debate we only end up clashing and answering each other during our second rebuttals.

3. TURN interps in the aff are a good thing – both debaters can agree to terms for the debate rather than me being able to read binary 1AR theory and avoid substantively engaging you.

*4. TURN my paragraph theory interps have clash standards – just follow them it’ll lead to more clash.*

*5. Clash doesn’t matter – it’s always nonunique since by virtue of saying anything in the round a debater is clashing with the other.*

## A/T Spikes are hiding not debating [:20]

1. Spikes test many core and peripheral skills, all of which play into what constitutes better debating. **Overing ‘16** explains the argument:

**Spikes** are an integral part of the game. They **test skills such as strategic thinking,** pre-emption, **prediction, case construction and argument interaction. They’re analogous to leading off in baseball, which tests the pitcher’s attentiveness, not a core baseball skill, but a skill nonetheless.** If the negative drops a bad spike argument, it’s her fault and she should lose. Debate is a game, and at this point in LD’s evolution, dealing with spikes is a predictable part of that game! In fact, **Marshall admits that “trick debaters… are doing what a good debater should do… mak[ing] strategic choices”** [The Concept of Good Debate,” para. 6).

2. Intuitive notions of better debating don’t matter – if they did we wouldn’t spread and we’d go for persuasion and rhetorical appeal, like politicians or orators do. LD debate is flow based and spikes track with debating on the flow.

3. Reductio ad absurdum – if short, high-value arguments are bad you would criticize perms, I-meets, and a plethora of other reasonable and necessary arguments.

## A/T Exclusion [:40]

1. Personal ethics solves – if someone lets me know they have a learning disability, I’ll read an aff without spikes.

2. Even if literally being excluded from debate is the worst impact, you do not get access to that impact. A tricky aff won’t actually make people quit. Your author Marshall had to debate tricky people like Fried and Tupler from USchool*,* but Marshall obviously didn’t quit.

3. TURN – being forced to have theory debates is worse for people with dyslexia since theory debates are really muddled and have a lot of blippy extemped arguments. If I have theory interps in the aff the neg can just agree to them and avoid a theory debate, decreasing exclusion.

4. TURN – when debaters with learning disabilities are aff, negs are going to try and label particular aff arguments preempts so they can access new 2NR answers, which are harder for affs with learning disabilities to flow and is worse since they don’t even have CX or much prep time with which to clarify arguments.

*5. No abuse – flowing problems are readily solved by me formatting my arguments clearly, flashing to you or letting you see my case, etc.*

*6. Nonunique – util debate has cards cut down to two sentences long, framework debate has blippy triggers, and K debate uses lit with dense rhetoric, all of which are hard for people with linguistic disability. Means your shell terminates in absurdity – the NC doesn’t need to say anything since the 2NR gets new answers to everything.*