Evaluate the theory debate after the 2NR, not the 2AR: 1) I have no 3NR, so evaluating the theory debate after the 2AR puts me at a structural disadvantage since I can’t point out 2AR argument shifts or extrapolations and to respond to new 2AR arguments. 2) Time skew: the aff has 7 minutes of speech time between the 3 minute 2AR and 4 minute 1AR, while I only have a 6 minute 2NR. At worst, even if you don’t structurally preclude new 2AR arguments, this means you should err neg on the theory debate if it’s close to counterbalance the aff advantage. **Also**, 2AR theory weighing is always illegitimate because the aff would always win 2AR theory debates--I have no 3NR and conceded arguments are assumed true. He had the chance to weigh in the 1AR--for example, by taking a stance on fairness vs. education--and didn’t do it. **Next**, Don’t evaluate new 1AR theory because a) I only have one speech to respond and she has a 2AR to clarify argument. Thus she can just blow up dropped arguments in the next speech making it impossible for me to win. B) The neg is already at a huge disadvantage because the aff gets to speak first and last and gets infinite pre round prep time; new layers in the 1AR just exacerbate the skew. **At worst,** grant 2NR RVI’s because the 1AR can uplayer nullifying all previous NC offence and I don’t have time to deal with multiple shells and substance. **Next,** Neg abuse if justified by aff abuse, the only way for me to compensate for the existing disadvantages was to read an abusive position myself, don’t drop me for trying to compensate for a disadvantage. This also functions as a reason why my shell comes first, my abuse was just adaptation for compensation. Finally, err heavily neg on the theory debate, if she doesn’t line by line the shell don’t buy embedded clash, this forces her to actually engage the theory debate rather than just uplayering in the 1AR.