## 2AR

Meta level framing issues on the aff debate

1. no warrants in any of his arguments. Treat them with very low credence—allow a certain level of embedded clash

2. a bunch of epistemic reasons why you prefer the aff

A. prefer evidence over analytics

B. Prefer a consesnsus of psychologists

3. the only terminal impact on the substance debate is emotional trauma. That’s the only thing that has been impacted back to oppression—no where in the 2AR does he explain why discussions have some kind of independent impact separate from every other piece of offense

Inherency

1. No impact to resolution text

2. the aff is clearly inherent—its small, but inherent. The AAUP 14 evidence says that trigger warning requirements are currently chilling freedom of expression

3. meta theory issue—disregard this because it wasn’t formatted in an interp so I don’t know how to engage

Trauma in discussions in non/unique—studies prove that people get over their trauma by having difficult discussions. He’s conceded that real wolrld outweighs college on longevity—so if I prove that I’m better for resisting trauma

The confidence from discussions is contingent, not real. His arguments fly in the face of years of behavioral psychology

## AT: T-Any

### Counter Interps

#### Counter interp: the aff may *only* read a plan that removes trigger warning requirements. Solves the limits standard—there’s only one aff to prep against.

#### Second counter interp: the aff may read a plan removes trigger warning requirements if the plan text is disclosed on the NDCA LD wiki at least a month before the tournament. I meet. Net benefits:

#### 1. Policymaking – spec lets us focus the debate on a single implementable policy. Free speech without context is just an abstraction—the aff lets us focus on individual instances when it becomes important.

#### 2. Resolvability – the benefits and harms of different speech codes change depending on what the type of speech is—you can’t compare a trigger warnings advantage to a hate speech DA because they’re about different things.

#### 3. Stratskew – whole res means the neg can PIC out of any type of speech, kills fairness since you can scoop the entirety of the aff. Also, moots your standards – if people read PICs then you’ll have to do prep on specific countries in both worlds.

#### 4. Stable advocacy—without spec the aff can shift out of disads by saying specific harms don’t link to general principle—kills fairness since if arguments can be shifted the neg has no shot of winning. This turns predictability and outweighs because the aff can make unpredictable shifts in the 1AR. Also makes it impossible for the aff to engage—its unclear in whole res whether the neg defends the possibility of some speech restrictions, or every speech restriction in the status quo, or just one.

### Reasonability

#### Use reasonability on T with a brightline of the aff lifting free speech restrictions and cards in the literature. You still have link and impact turn ground and generics check which means you could have engaged, I’m in the direction of the topic. Key to substantive education because there’s less unnecessary theory which trades off with topical debate. It’s not arbitrary since I have a justified brightline.

### O/V

#### 1. Generics solve- you can read NCs, Ks, and impact turns. Any reason why speech codes are good also applies to the aff

#### 2. Lit solves- if it’s within the realm of the topic lit you should have cut cards which proves your standards link to laziness, not fairness.

#### 3. Disclosure solves—its on the wiki so you could have done prep. Trigger warnings are talked about extensively in the lit.

### AT: Ground

#### 1. Side bias impact turns—more aff ground’s good since it compensates for short 1AR and neg reactivity that make it harder to affirm.

#### 2. T-the fact that the plan isn’t happening now proves you have qualitative ground.

#### 3. Lots of great ground against this aff – tons of authors discuss trigger warnings good in the lit..

### AT: Textuality

#### A1. ny can be specific.

AHD 16 American Heritage Dictionary, “any” Fifth Edition, 2016 <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/any> JW

One or some; no matter which: Take any book you want. Do you have any information on ancient Roman architecture?

#### 2. Multiple grammatically correct interps of the topics means you have to weigh fairness and education first – nuke power could also mean states with nuclear weapons which is a very semantically plausible interp.

#### 4. Adhering to the strict resolution text doesn’t produce good debates—topics are written by traditional old lay coaches so modification is key to nat circuit competition.