## 1

#### Interp – Spikes must be a full shell

#### Violation -

#### Standards:

#### 1] Time – you can overwhelm the neg with dozens of spikes that moot my speech time, and we never get to substance

#### 2] Its impossible to meet – your 4 point in the uv means I can’t even meet your spikes, and your 3 point in the uv means I can’t make an argument

#### 3] It’s a no risk issue for the AFF – if I respond you can just kick if I don’t I auto lose

#### 4] It’s impossible to meet and win the round – 1 point means I can’t even make an argument in the round

#### Voters:

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity and you can’t decide who’s a better debater if its unfair

#### Education – the purpose of debate is to learn portable skills, like having to defend an advocacy or make arguments.

#### Dtd

#### 1] Otherwise it’s a no-risk issue for the AFF – can moot time with spikes and make it impossible to win on substance

#### 2] Punishes the debater – discourages them from engaging in future abuse and doesn’t allow unfair strategies to win the round

#### This shell comes before their spikes because we have to determine whether the spikes are fair before you evaluate them

**No RVIs: 1] Encourages theory baiting and chills checking real abuse. 2] Illogical b/c don’t win for being fair and logic is meta-constraint on arguments because it comes lexically prior.**

## 2

#### Interp – AFF can’t read a spike preventing me from reading arguments

#### Violation – they do

#### Standards:

#### 1] I auto lose – if I can’t make any arguments the AFF autowins

#### 2] Contradiction is good and key to clash – point of debate is to defend your arguments against other arguments

#### 3] You violate your own standards from most of your own shells –

#### Same voters and dtd for the same reasons

#### 

#### Evaluate all 4 of my shells before their spikes about theory being unfair – if I win the shell that means the shell was fair because they did actually violate and committed abuse. Also don’t let them read an rvi because of the chilling effect – they can bait theory if they are a good theory debater and win every round, also they say we shouldn’t have rvis as well.

## 3

#### Interp – the AFF must disclose their full case on the wiki

#### Violations – they don’t

#### Standards:

1] They bring in new offensive arguments conceded in cx their new uv point is offensive

2] turn their standards A and B

Same voters and dtd

## Case

### AT: Uv

1] This is my first circuit debate and its not clear how I’m supposed to disclose – also should’ve told me what the round report function was in the wiki. Also they violate worse – they read spikes that they didn’t disclose, and didn’t disclose a doc. Therefore if I do violate this shell, they violate worse by not disclosing their doc at all, especially because they are reading spikes which are voting issues.

3] abusive, contradiction is the point of debate

4] if I can’t meet the spikes I auto lose, and kills the point of the spikes

5] Impossible to answer all the spikes – also didn’t disclose all the spikes and therefore this is an unfair burden to place on the aff

6] I can make new 2n arguments because otherwise it kills class and reciprocity; you have 3 speeches and I have 1. Also you have bidirectional shells in the 1ar

7] Neg theory first, because aff gets last speech and controls flow of the round and also because I have to respond to all the spikes which moots time

8] I get analytics because they have analytics in their speech so key to reciprocity, also its impossible not to have any analytical arguments