### 1

#### Interpretation—the aff must disclose the affirmative speech document 30 minutes before round if asked preround.

#### Violation—they didn’t – screenshot in the doc

Graphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generated

#### Vote neg for prep and clash—two internal links—

#### a) neg prep—4 minutes of prep is not enough to put together a coherent 1nc or update generics—30 minutes is necessary to learn a little about the affirmative and piece together what 1nc positions apply and cut and research their applications to the affirmative

#### b) aff quality—plan text disclosure discourages cheap shot affs. If the aff isn’t inherent or easily defeated by 20 minutes of research, it should lose—this will answer the 1ar’s claim about innovation—with 30 minutes of prep, there’s still an incentive to find a new strategic, well justified aff, but no incentive to cut a horrible, incoherent aff that the neg can’t check against the broader literature.

#### [D] Paradigm Issues

#### 1 – Drop the debater –

#### 2 - Comes before 1AR theory —

#### 3 - Use competing interps –

#### 4 - No RVIs –

#### 5 – Fairness is a voter –

#### 6 – Education is a voter –

### 2

#### The burden of the negative is to prove that the aff will not logically happen in the status quo, making the aff burden to prove that it will – 4 warrants

#### 1] – Debate Method is Logic – everything stems from logical reasoning, including our arguments – logical syllogisms like the story the affirmative tries to tell prove that

#### 2] Semantics

#### 2A] Text – Oxford Dictionary defines ought as “used to indicate something that is probable.”

(<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought>)

#### 2B] Ought is “used to express logical consequence” as defined by Merriam-Webster

(<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought>)

#### 2C] Outweighs on common usage,

Richard Robinson 2, “Ought and Ought Not,” Philosophy, Vol. 46, No. 177 (Jul., 1971), pp. 193-202.)

**"That ought to be easy to find." "He ought to be here soon." "**I have oiled the bearing and loosened the nut; that ought to do it." **"He ought to have reached London by now." Many ought-sentences express neither a prescription nor a valuation, but an estimate of probability. "He ought to be here soon" can be meant in the same sense as "He will probably be here soon."** Thus there are at least four uses

#### 2D] And, Neg definition choice – the aff should have defined ought in the 1ac because it was in the rez so it’s predictable contestation, by not doing so they have forfeited their right to read a new definition – kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement on a lack of your definition.

#### 3] Access - My model of debate ask debaters to think and is not controlled by research that is inherent unfair via coaching and money. Whereas questions of truth and logic are accessible to all

#### Next is my offense

#### 1] Inherency – either a) the aff is non-inherent and you vote neg on presumption or b) it is and the aff wouldn’t logically happen in the status quo

#### 2] Paradox of tolerance- to be completely open to the aff we must exclude perspectives that wouldn’t be open to the aff which means it’s impossible to have complete tolerance for an idea since that tolerance relies on excluding a perspective. Tolerance is thus destroy and you must negate against the claim of obligation because it is an self-defeating paradox

### 3

Ev ethics

Interpretation – debaters must send citations for evidence in the doc

Violation – multiple – Belief Revision is a violation

Standards

Lying

Checking truth

Debates

CX no check – I lose 6 mins