**A: Interpretation-** The affirmative cannot read arguments in the AC that a) indict negative practices and have implications back to fairness and education, b) function as theoretical paradigmatic issues that would indict the negative practice of reading theory, c) advance theoretical weighing claims or d) advance potential theoretical voting issues in the AC. To clarify, the aff can make arguments that create topical burdens and ones that exist solely for clarification but may not read *[insert spikes here]*,

**B: Violation-**

I clarified violations in CX...

**C: Standard-**

**Strat Skew:** a) Spikes give the aff a huge advantage on theory because they can advance claims and reinterpret those claims to take out any negative argument.  This is a horrible norm because without line by lining the arguments the aff I cannot read any negative strategy due to infinite possible adaptations to different spikes in the aff. b) it is a no risk issue for them because if I under allocate on the shell they will go for it and if I over allocate they will just kick it. c) since the arguments are so short judges don’t know how much credence to give on each spike which means the judge will give them extra leeway due to a lack of expectation for a coherent argument, full shells solve because there would be an expectation that the arguments are complete. This also has the strongest link to jurisdiction because the judges would have to do extra work to vote on these arguments causing intervention. d) Preemptive theoretical weighing and paradigmatic issues force the aff to answer back the original weighing in the AC, read new arguments in the NC and weigh between them, thus I am already at a huge disadvantage even know I am advancing theory for the first time. e) If they advance claims of DA or DD in the first speech I wont be able to respond to them until it is to late. Also I don’t know how standards weighing in one shell will apply to those in other shells in other speeches. If they read If they read For example if there was weighing that I contested to in the NC that was re-applied to a new shell in the 1AR it puts me in a double bind either 1) I already contested the original weighing meaning I concede that the shell is correct or 2) respond to the shell and contradict myself. And, Preemptive theoretical weighing denies the neg the ability to do original weighing and is impossible because I would have to weigh against every shell in the AC because I am blind to what shells he is actually going to go for.

**Clash:** spikes are short arguments that are used to avoid clash meaning they a) destroy education because they are impossible to respond to b) are unfair because he can extend a tiny dropped blip to avoid entire negative positions. Thus, don’t let him cross apply arguments why I cannot read theory against his spikes because I am indicting that practice in the first place. Thus, grant me leeway because it is key to checking back spike dumps and my arguments are in complete 4-point format. In the a scenario that there is a deadlock evaluate the interps individually weighing quantity of abuse. Also CX doesn’t solve a) you can be really shifty in cx b) it will force me to give you the entire neg strat giving you extra prep time c) it would be impossible to clarify all the spikes in 3 minutes . And you can do it to doesn’t make sense because this shell is a reason why you cannot preemptively make these arguments and at worst I only have one more speech to reextend these arguments. Also if they meet certain planks of the interpretation the other planks are independently abusive which is still a reason to vote them down.