## 1

#### Interpretation: debaters must not say all neg interps are counter-interps and reject all counter-interps

#### Violation – you did

Standard -

Infinite abuse – if I read a interp to call out any abuse in the AC it becomes a counterinterp which immediately gets rejected on face. This leads to infinite abuse in the AC since I can’t rectify any abuse

#### Drop the debater—the abuse has already occurred and my time allocation which leads to severance in the 1ar which ow/s on magnitude b) to deter future abuse, big punishment incentivizes people to stop bad practices especially true with infinte abuse standard that means the aff will always win

#### Competing interps – a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm b] it creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate.

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance b) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms, c) chilling effect – forces you to split your 2AR so you can’t collapse and misconstrue the 2NR, d) topic ed – prevents 1AR blip storm scripts and allows us to get back to substance after resolving theory d) Double Bind – either 1) my Theory shell is unwarranted in which case you shouldn’t have any problem answering it or 2) you’re actually abusive in which case the whole shell stands and outweighs.

#### The shell comes prior to [Apriories, Truth Testing ROTB, Trix nonsense] - 6 justifications

#### 1] Truth Testing- absent legitimate clash over the issues it makes it impossible to test the truth value of their arguments which is a side constraint on deliberation

#### 2] The shell indicts your ability to read these arguments in the first place which means you can’t weigh them

#### 3] You need an external body to verify whether your theory is correct. Anything else leads to self-justified truths that and psychopathic lying which prevents rigorous testing. Testing outweighs because it’s the constitutive purpose of debate

#### 4] Constitutivism- fairness is a constitutive process of debate proven by us following speech times, disclosing, flipping before round, etc. Their [trix arguments] assume the ballot which we have proven are constrained by procedural rules. Independently Constitutivism outweighs all other offense since it’s inescapable and affects how we play the game

#### 5] Inclusion- Only our model of debate creates a more inclusive atmosphere that allows for contestation and competitive equity. Inclusion should be used as an impact filter to all their arguments since accessibility controls the internal link to being able to debate in the first place

#### 6] Time Skew- Reading the shell means we took time to read the shell so we couldn’t mind sweep their arguments and respond to all of them in a technically efficient manner.