# T- In means throughout

## 1NC

### 1NC- T In- Shell

#### Interpretation: The aff must defend that public colleges and universities throughout the entire territory of the United States should enact the plan. To clarify, they may not defend specific schools or subsets of schools.

#### In means throughout

Words and Phrases 59, 1959 (p. 546 (PDNS3566)) Thomson West

In the Act of 1861 providing that justices of the peace shall have jurisdiction “in” their respective counties to hear and determine all complaints, the word “in” should be construed to mean “throughout” such counties. Reynolds v. Larkin, 14, p. 114, 117, 10 Colo. 126.

#### United States includes all areas the United States Federal Government has jurisdiction over

Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms 5 (Dictionary of Military, http://www.thefreedictionary.com/United+States, 2005)

Includes the land area, internal waters, territorial sea, and airspace of the United States, including the following: a. US territories, possessions, and commonwealths; and b. Other areas over which the US Government has complete jurisdiction and control or has exclusive authority or defense responsibility.

#### Prefer semantically accurate interpretations:

#### A. It’s the only stasis point we know before the round so it controls the internal link to engagement, and there’s no way to use ground if debaters aren’t prepared to defend it. B. Grammar is the most objective since it doesn’t rely on arbitrary determinants of what constitutes the best type of debate – it’s the only impact you can evaluate. C. The AFF isn’t topical regardless of fairness or education since it doesn’t affirm the text - we wouldn’t debate rehab again just because it was a good topic. Regardless of theory, you negate substantively because they fail their resolutional burden.

#### Standards:

#### 1. Limits- the resolution explicitly states *in* the U.S., which implies you do not limit it to a territory within the U.S. itself. This underlimits the ground available, since territories have diversifying college policies and types of implementation – it makes it impossible for neg ground to compete with the aff, so a blanket ban is both topical and more fair. Key to jurisdiction or else too many different territorial policies and key to fairness because is more predictable and better for ground. Also controls the internal link to clash and education – without a reasonable policy in the first place, you can’t have an educational or fair debate.

#### Voter

#### 1. Fairness, debates a competitive activity, 2. Education, only portable impact. Drop the debater because A. Norms- a loss deters future abuse, B. Timeskew- drop the arg means they can kick their offense for a positive time tradeoff. C. Gateway issue- unfair args skew the rest of the round. Evaluate Competing Interps, A. reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention, B. deterrence- debaters can get away with defense on theory, C. reasonability collapses into competing itnersp because we have offense defense debates about brightlines, D. it’s a binary- either the aff is topical or it’s not 5. No RVI: A. Chills theory- RVIs deter me from reading theory because good theory debaters will bait abuse and go for the RVI which causes infinite abuse. B. Kills substance- they will just collapse to the shell which ruins the possibility of us ever returning to having education. C. Illogical- you shouldn’t win for being fair. Logic is an impact because it’s the basis of argumentation. D. No abuse- you could read your own shell or prove that I violate and you don’t which equals the theory layer