#### Interpretation: debaters must write down the text of all theory interpretations before the speech they’re read in [if…]

#### Violation:

#### The standard is verifiability:

#### We don’t know the exact text of your interp, so we don’t know whether I meet or not, how much abuse a counterinterp can solve, or how much the interp generates. that outweighs since the judge risks making the incorrect decision on the theory interp which always implicates the ballot since theory’s a voting issue. Biggest harm to fairness since the round is no longer decided on the merits of the arguments we make but rather what the judge *thought* was true.

#### Skews strat – exact text of your interp means that I know whether my counter interp is truly competitive or whether I actually meet so I can’t craft a strategy on the theory debate. Key to fairness – I can’t win the round without a reasonable understanding of it.

#### After the speech doesn’t solve since you could misremember and that could change the evaluation of the round especially since you’re incentivized to change the interp for a strategic benefit.

#### X-apply his voter *fairness is a voter since debate is a competitive activity adjudicated on the basis of wins and losses so no debater should have an advantage.*

#### Drop the debater – I invested time and altered strat, substance is never fair for me, and deterrence – you won’t do it again so it creates norms. Outweighs –

#### aff abuse o/w neg abuse , 7-4 6-3 time skew and the fact that the neg can pick the perfect, reactive 1nc strategy

#### meta theory constrains evaluation of your shell – we don’t know if it’s true or not because the form of the theory argument as evaluable is called into question by my shell.

Interpretation: the negative may only read theory shells that indict the affirmative for potential advocacy shifts after the shift has occurred.

Violation

Standards

Qualitative Ground - The only way to answer preemptive advocacy shift shells is to prove that I potentially would not have shifted but that’s terrible ground because my offense would be warranted by an unverifiable argument. Grants you a free source of no risk offense that I cannot beat back so all you have to do is win drop the debater. Qualitative ground is key to fairness because even if I have ground it isn’t actually helpful if it isn’t of good quality.

Topic Education – my interp definitionally increases topic education because there is a chance the theory debate never occurs – in my world the shell would only be read if the shift occurs so if I don’t shift my advocacy then it isn’t read. Even if its unlikely you still completely eliminate chances of no theory debate so my interp is still net beneficial.

My shell is qualitatively better in solving the same abuse you criticize a) 2nr theory checks – you can read the shell after the shift occurs – and is more persuasive because it is based on actual verifiable arguments b) CX solves your offense – ask me to be bound to a certain advocacy.

interpretation: if the aff/neg justifies competing interpretations, they must specify whether that paradigm entails [norm setting or in-round abuse] [and the requirement of an explicit competitive counter interpretation text] [and text or spirit of the interpretation].

b. violation: you just say theory is a matter of competing interps.

c. standards:

1. strategy skew – absent specification of what competing interps means, you can spin warrants for CI to force a loss on theory based on what I fail to do. Skews strategy since I don’t know the optimal way to respond to theory – makes each assertion about CI a no-risk issue in rebuttal speeches. That’s key to fairness since theory skew prevents me from justifying that my practices are fair. You can weigh as well is not responsive - I can do that under my interpretation as well, it’s a question of whether *you* should establish a clear delineation of how offense and defense function on theory – but that is key ground if I want to contest competing interpretations since I need to know what disads against that paradigm even apply to your extrapolation of it. [Abuse is supercharged because you don’t even justify CI proactively, just assert why reasonability is bad]. And specifying is preferable since different judges and regions have differing implicit assumptions about theory – clarity in terms of evaluation makes theory debates easier to resolve and less interventionist since we start the paradigm debate earlier rather than in late rebuttal speeches. That’s key to fairness since if the round is decided arbitrarily the judge isn’t voting for the better debater.