## 1

#### Interp: cannot say GCB force us to contest and affirm because either it’s true or it’s a lie

#### Infinite abuse -

#### Education is a voter it’s the reason why schools fund debate

#### 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

#### Competing interps – a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm

#### 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

#### 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.

#### NC theory first - 1] Abuse was self-inflicted- They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] Norming- We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea 3] It was introduced first so it comes lexically prior.

#### Neg abuse outweighs Aff abuse – 1] Infinite prep time before round to frontline 2] 2AR judge psychology and 1st and last speech 3] Infinite perms and uplayering in the 1AR.

#### Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is very aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to– reasonability checks 2AR sandbagging by preventing really abusive 1NCs while still giving the 2N a chance.

#### DTA on 1AR shells - They can blow up blippy 20 second shells in the 2AR while I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention and means 1AR theory is irresolvable so you shouldn’t stake the round on it.

#### RVIs on 1AR theory – 1AR being able to spend 20 seconds on a shell and still win forces the 2N to allocate at least 2:30 on the shell which means RVIs check back time skew – ows on quantifiaiblity

#### No new 1ar theory paradigm issues- A] the 1NC has already occurred with current paradigm issues in mind so new 1ar paradigms moot any theoretical offense B] introducing them in the aff allows for them to be more rigorously tested which o/w’s on time frame since we can set higher quality norms.

## OV