A. Interpretation: Debaters must only read onetheory or T violation that is independently sufficient to win them the round *if I’m not granted the RVI or reasonability.*

B. Violation:He reads multiple theory shells each with an interpretation each of which is sufficient to win him the round with no prioritization of which shell comes first.

C. Standards

1. **Ground** – Skews ground because each of the shells are no-risk issues, which means they’ll always go for the one I undercover, which sets up an *un-reciprocal* burden on theory because the 1AR always has to answer both shells, but the 2NR can collapse based on which one there’s less ink on. The argument isn’t that debaters should be voted down for running theory, rather by reading multiple shells they cause a huge ground skew by forcing me to win terminal defense on all shells, whereas he just has to win marginal offense back to his interpretation under competing interps. Key to fairness because it determines access to the ballot, also best to determine who’s best for fairness and education, which controls the internal link to their impacts.

2. **Clash** – My interp allows for the best depth and clash – we go more in-depth on one single interp, thus determine whether I’m actually abusive; also net preferable under norms creation. Their interp limits my ability to make *qualitatively*sufficient args on the shells due to the 1AR time skew; reading multiple shells is *unnecessary* and exacerbates abuse. Key to fairness, allows us to truly engage rather than artificial coverage.

3. No RVI is especially harmful – I have to both win the shell *and* win the RVI in order for the shell to be a voting issue for me, which is un-reciprocal and harms fairness. Also creates a time skew, since there are two layers I have to win in the 1AR; uniquely a reason why the shell is a reason to drop them, rather than grant me the RVI.

Cross apply their voters – and meta-theory comes first since it questions the viability of their shells – if I don’t have access to justify my practices it in the first place, those abuse stories are meaningless.

A. interpretation: the aff/neg cannot read theory that is altruistic as opposed to a check on abuse.

B. Violation:

C. Standards:

1. Strategy skew - altruistic theory is bad because it destroys the purpose of theory as a check on abuse. If the neg can win by telling the aff what is most fair for the aff, neg will always stand up and read a shell in the 1N claiming that the 1AC could have set itself up to win better had it read something else instead. That means a) we lose substantive education about the topic since it encourages endless theory and b) causes infinite strategy skew since I am held responsible for my failings as a strategic debater as opposed to an unfair one, which I cannot defend as promoting better forms of debate.

1. Interpretation: the negative must disclose all broken topicality and theory interpetations on the ndca wiki *if the substance that they’re read against is disclosed prior to the round.*
2. Violation:
3. Standards:
4. Solves abuse – there are 100’s of interps in the AC that could possibly violate a theoretical interpretation, but are not all primary parts of my advocacy. I can’t predict exactly what you’re going to read theory on before the round so disclosure allows me to take the abusive part out of the AC while not altering my advocacy by much. Also solves better than your shell because I ensure that the abusive part is never read rather than having me voted down and trying to deter me
5. Deterrence – this means that theory is only read in the case where the interp is on the wiki and I still choose not to adapt to it which’ll probably never happen given that I would know that you’ve frontlined the theory debate and are more likely to win it.
6. Topic education – I definitionally increase topic education because I avoid the theory debate so we can spend more time on the topic. Means my interp is net beneficial because I also prevent abuse but don’t need to have the theory debate with it.
7. interpretation: If theoretical links and violations stem from something I didn’t do, violations must be from something in the round, like not having an alt text in the round, rather than an out-of-round practice like disclosure or the nature of disclosure.
8. Violation – disclosure theory criticizes something I didn’t do outside other round
9. 1) no limit on abuse claims – resource disparity and not donating are both worse for debate but I’m not responsible for things I could’ve done out of the round since I don’t alter your route to the ballot in it. This a) kills fairness since you can win from anything I didn’t do out-of-round that’s marginally better for debate b) kills substantive education since the discussion is no longer on practices that affect structural evaluation of the round but rather out of round assertions.

2) causes irresolvable assertions – uniquely true in the context of disclosure theory which causes competing unverifiable args about how large your school is, whether you knew about a case, or even whether you actually disclosed or unique mitigating circumstances. In-round practices are much more verifiable since the practice which could have tangible effects in the round is being questioned i.e. NIBs creating a 2-1 advantage. This kills fairness and education since you make theory claims impossible to resolve and instead a battle of competing assertions.

Verifiability is a meta-constraint on theory debate and control the internal link…