## AC (terms and conditions are at the bottom)

### ROB

**The Role of the ballot is to the test if the resolution is true.**

**1] Inclusion: a) other ROBs open the door for personal lives of debaters to factor into decisions and compare who is more oppressed which causes violence in a space where some people go to escape. b) Anything can function under truth testing insofar as it proves the resolution either true or false. Specific role of the ballots exclude certain offense**

**2] Constitutivism: The ballot asks you to either vote aff or neg based on the given resolution a) Five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true which means its intrinsic to the nature of the activity b) the purpose of debate is the acquisition of knowledge in pursuit of truth – a resolutional focus is key to depth of exploration which o/w on specificity. It’s a jurisdictional issue since it questions whether the judge should go outside the scope of the game.**

**3] Reject the western binary of truth and futurism in favor of a more nuanced understanding of the world.**

Graham **Priest**, Distinguished professor of philosophy at City University of New York and professor emeritus at the University of Melbourne. His latest book is One (2014), Beyond true and false, 5 May **2014**, <https://aeon.co/essays/the-logic-of-buddhist-philosophy-goes-beyond-simple-truth> ///BA PB

At the core of the explanation, one has to grasp a very basic mathematical distinction. I speak of the difference between a relation and a function. **A relation is something that relates a certain kind of object to some number of others** (zero, one, two, etc). **A function**, on the other hand, **is a special kind of relation that links each such object to exactly one thing**. Suppose we are talking about people. Mother of and father of are functions, because every person has exactly one (biological) mother and exactly one father. But son of and daughter of are relations, because parents might have any number of sons and daughters. Functions give a unique output; relations can give any number of outputs. Keep that distinction in mind; we’ll come back to it a lot. Now, in logic, one is generally interested in whether a given claim is true or false. Logicians call true and false truth values. Normally, and following Aristotle, it is assumed that ‘value of’ is a function: the value of any given assertion is exactly one of true (or T), and false (or F). In this way, the principles of excluded middle (PEM) and non-contradiction (PNC) are built into the mathematics from the start. But they needn’t be. To get back to something that the **Buddha** might recognise, all we need to do is **make value of into a relation instead of a function**. Thus T might be a value of a sentence, as can F, both, or neither. We now have four possibilities: {T}, {F}, {T,F} and { }. The curly brackets, by the way, indicate that we are dealing with sets of truth values rather than individual ones, as befits a relation rather than a function. The last pair of brackets denotes what mathematicians call the empty set: it is a collection with no members, like the set of humans with 17 legs. It would be conventional in mathematics to represent our four values using something called a Hasse diagram, like so: {T} ↗ ↖ {T, F} { } ↖ ↗ {F} Thus the four kotis (corners) of the catuskoti appear before us. In case this all sounds rather convenient for the purposes of Buddhist apologism, I should mention that the logic I have just described is called First Degree Entailment (FDE). It was originally constructed in the 1960s in an area called relevant logic. Exactly what this is need not concern us, but the US logician Nuel Belnap argued that FDE was a sensible system for databases that might have been fed inconsistent or incomplete information. All of which is to say, it had nothing to do with Buddhism whatsoever. Even so, you might be wondering how on earth something could be both true and false, or neither true nor false. In fact, the idea that some claims are neither true nor false is a very old one in Western philosophy. None other than Aristotle himself argued for one kind of example. In the somewhat infamous Chapter 9 of De Interpretatione, he claims that **contingent statements about the future**, such as ‘the first pope in the 22nd century will be African’, **are neither true nor false. The future is, as yet, indeterminate**. So much for his arguments in the Metaphysics. **The notion that some things might be both true and false is** much more unorthodox. But here, too, we can find some **plausible** examples. **Take the** notorious ‘paradoxes of self-reference’, the oldest of which, reputedly discovered by Eubulides in the fourth century BCE, is called the **Liar Paradox**. Here’s its commonest expression: **This statement is false.** Where’s the paradox? **If the statement is true, then it is indeed false. But if it is false, well, then it is true. So it seems to be both true and false.**

#### 4] Fairness: a) novices know how to debate the resolution – means its most inclusive for half the debate population b) predictability: the res is the only predictable stasis point we have going in to the round

#### 5] Topic Ed: we learn more about the topic by debating the resolution

#### 6] Isomorphism: ROBs that aren’t phrased as binaries maximize leeway for interpretation as to who is winning offense. Scalar framing mechanisms necessitate that the judge has to intervene to see who is closest at solving a problem. Truth testing solves since it’s solely a question of if something is true or false, there isn’t a closest estimate.

### Framework

**The standard is consistency with indexed moral truths.**

#### Prefer:

1] Indexed reasons are the only way to avoid contradictions. Reichardt**,** Reichardt, Bastian. "Studies in Logic, Grammar, and Rhetoric." University Bonn (n.d.): n. pag. Print.//Scopa Second-Order Moral Relativism is a statement about the indexicality of moral truth. **A sentence like “Polygamy is morally wrong” is not true *simpliciter* but rather** **true relative to a given moral frame** of reference and false relative to another one. By **indexing moral truth** relativists **do[es] not assume that moral disagreements are contradictions.** If a moral sentence is true relative to one frame of reference and false to another one, then people from these different cultures do not contradict each other. **Just like the sentence that an object is moving might be true relative to one frame of reference and false to another one is not a contradiction but a valid consequence** from the special theory of relativity.

#### Contradictions are a side constraint on any ethical theory – otherwise u could say both we should and should not do something meaning ethical statements are impossible.

**2] Ethical Theories are insular**

**Walker,** Walker, JC. “ EPISTEMOLOGY AND JUSTIFYING THE CURRICULUM OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES.” British Journal of Educational Studies , The University of Sydney, [www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/3121553.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Aabe696486e418db1b8534ae1ee024f9d.//FSU](http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/3121553.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Aabe696486e418db1b8534ae1ee024f9d.//FSU) SS. The move from naive falsificationism back into the sort of holism we were considering earlier, has occurred on two fronts. First, **even on the assumption that there is nothing problematical about the notion of observation,** according to the Duhem-Quine thesis, **observations do not apply directly to particular statements**. Test situations are complex and a particular statement to be falsified will therefore be part of a fabric of statements describing not only the total test situation but also all of the assumptions built into it. **We can thus save a particular statement from falsification, come what may, by suitably altering the truth value of other statements in the fabric; and for well-integrated theories the fabric will be the whole theory. This makes the total theory, rather than the individual (observation) statement, the smallest unit of knowledge**. Nor need it be the theory that responds to every unkind observation. **If a particular observation threatens extensive revision we are at liberty to use the theory to correct the observation** (as Newton did with the Astronomer Royal's observa- tions). **The reason why this is a permissible strategy brings us to our second point: there is no sharp epistemological division between theory and observation**. This is sometimes called the theory-ladenness thesis. **Whether we talk of observing the sun rising or of seeing lines on an oscilloscope, the language we use to describe these things is language that contains certain commitments to a view of how things are. This is because expressions figuring in our descriptions are to be understood, at least partly, in terms of the role they play in some theory**. Thus the expression 'sun' and 'rising' will carry certain theoretical baggage that disposes us to understand them as referring to some objects or happen- ings rather than others. On this view, **the language we use to formulate observation statements is language that figures in some theory, even the theory or theories behind ordinary discourse. So there is no theory-free way of describing observations. This means that the observation statements used to falsify a theory are only as good as the theory in which the language of observation statements is expressed**: a form of our earlier holistic point about self-reference

### Offense

#### The negative and I affirm the resolution resolved: a just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike –

**Here’s how logic works**

**1] Overthinking paradox- the 1NC is a form of unnecessary overthinking that prevents decisions to be made so don’t evaluate it**

**Wikipedia** [Brackets Original. “Analysis Paralysis”. Wikipedia. No Date. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bonini%27s_paradox>]

Analysis paralysis (or paralysis by analysis) describes an individual or group process when overanalyzing or overthinking a situation can cause forward motion or decision-making to become [frozen] "paralyzed", meaning that no solution or course of action is decided upon. A situation may be deemed too complicated and a decision is never made, due to the fear that a potentially larger problem may arise. A person may desire a perfect solution, but may fear making a decision that could result in error, while on the way to a better solution. Equally, a person may hold that a superior solution is a short step away, and stall in its endless pursuit, with no concept of diminishing returns. On the opposite end of the time spectrum is the phrase extinct by instinct, which is making a fatal decision based on hasty judgment or a gut reaction.

**2] The only time a statement is invalid is if the antecedent is true, but the consequent is false.**

**Stanford** <https://web.stanford.edu/~bobonich/dictionary/dictionary.html> Abbreviated Dictionary of Philosophical Terminology An introduction to philosophy Stanford University //Massa

[In a] Conditional statement: an “if p, then q” compound statement (ex. If I throw this ball into the air, it will come down); p is called the antecedent [condition], and q is the consequent. **A conditional asserts that if its antecedent is true, its consequent is also true**; **any** conditional **[statement] with a true [condition] antecedent and a false consequent must be false.** **For** any other combination of true and **false [conditions]** antecedents and consequents, **the** conditional **statement is true.**

**3] Principle of explosion is true which proves the resolution true.**

**Wikiwand**. “Principle of Explosion.” Wikiwand, 0AD, [www.wikiwand.com/en/Principle\_of\_explosion](http://www.wikiwand.com/en/Principle_of_explosion). //Massa
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The principle of explosion (Latin: ex falso (sequitur) quodlibet (EFQ), "from falsehood, anything (follows)", or ex contradictione (sequitur) quodlibet (ECQ), **"from contradiction, anything (follows)"), or the principle of**[**Pseudo-Scotus**](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Pseudo-Scotus), is the law of [classical logic](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Classical_logic), [intuitionistic logic](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Intuitionistic_logic) and similar logical systems, according to which any statement can be proven from a contradiction.[[1]](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Principle_of_explosion#citenote1) That is, once a contradiction has been asserted, any proposition (including their negations) can be inferred from it. This is known as **deductive explosion**.[[2]](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Principle_of_explosion#citenote2)[[3]](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Principle_of_explosion#citenote3) The proof of this principle was first given by 12th century French philosopher [William of Soissons](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/William_of_Soissons).[[4]](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Principle_of_explosion#citenote4)

As a demonstration of the principle, **consider two contradictory statements – "All lemons are yellow" and "Not all lemons are yellow"**, and suppose that both are true. If that is the case, **anything can be proven**, e.g., **the assertion that "unicorns exist", by using the following argument:**

1. We know that **"All lemons are yellow"**, as it **has been assumed to be true.**
2. **Therefore**, the two-part statement **"All lemons are yellow OR unicorns exist” must also be true**, since the first part is true.
3. However, **since we know that "Not all lemons are yellow"** (as this has been assumed), **the first part is false, and hence the second part must be true, i.e., unicorns exist.**

**4] Dogmatism Paradox – disregard the 1NC**

**Sorensen** Sorensen, Roy, Professor of Philosophy at Washington University in St. Louis. "Epistemic Paradoxes.” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. 21 June 2006. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/epistemic-paradoxes/>. PeteZ

Saul Kripke’s ruminations on the surprise test paradox led him to a paradox about dogmatism. He lectured on both paradoxes at Cambridge University to the Moral Sciences Club in 1972. (A descendent of this lecture now appears as Kripke 2011). Gilbert Harman transmitted Kripke’s new paradox as follows:

If I know that h is true, I know that any evidence against h is evidence against something that is true; I know that such evidence is misleading. But I should disregard evidence that I know is misleading. So, once I know that h is true, I am in a position to disregard any future evidence that seems to tell against h. (1973, 148)

**5] Vote aff because it’s simple – evaluating responses to this is complicated so don’t**

**Baker 04’** [Baker, Alan, 10-29-2004, "Simplicity (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)," <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/simplicity/>]

With respect to question (ii), there is an important distinction to be made between two sorts of simplicity principle. Occam's Razor may be formulated as an epistemic principle: if theory T is simpler than theory T\*, then it is rational (other things being equal) to believe T rather than T\*. Or it may be formulated as a methodological principle: if T is simpler than T\* then it is rational to adopt T as one's working theory for scientific purposes. These two conceptions of Occam's Razor require different sorts of justification in answer to question (iii). In analyzing simplicity, it can be difficult to keep its two facets—elegance and parsimony—apart. Principles such as Occam's Razor are frequently stated in a way which is ambiguous between the two notions, for example, “Don't multiply postulations beyond necessity.” Here it is unclear whether ‘postulation’ refers to the entities being postulated, or the hypotheses which are doing the postulating, or both. The first reading corresponds to parsimony, the second to elegance. Examples of both sorts of simplicity principle can be found in the quotations given earlier in this section.

**6] Affirm because either the neg is true meaning its bad for us to clash w/ it because it turns us into Fake News people OR it’s not meaning it’s a lie that you can’t vote on for ethics**

**7] Decision Making Paradox- in order to judge we need a decision-making procedure to determine it is a good decision. But to chose a decision-making procedure requires another meta level decision making procedure leading to infinite regress so just vote aff to break the paradox.**

**8] GCS- I am the greatest conceivable spencer so vote for me because I am infinitely good. To prove this, I will make them contest the aff and say they are not under my control.**

**9] There are infinite worlds, the aff is logical in one which is sufficient.**

**Vaidman 2** Vaidman, Lev, 3-24-2002, "Many-Worlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)," No Publication, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/qm-manyworlds/>

-MWI: Multiple Worlds Interpretation

**The reason for adopting the MWI is that it avoids the collapse of the quantum wave.** (Other non-collapse theories are not better than MWI for various reasons, e.g., nonlocality of Bohmian mechanics; and the disadvantage of all of them is that they have some additional structure.) **The collapse postulate is a physical law that differs from all known physics in two aspects: it is genuinely random and it involves some kind of action at a distance**. According to the collapse postulate the outcome of a **quantum experiment is not determined by the initial conditions** of the Universe prior to the experiment: **only the probabilities are governed by the initial state**. Moreover, Bell 1964 has shown that there cannot be a compatible local-variables theory that will make deterministic predictions**. There is no experimental evidence in favor of collapse and against the MWI.**

**10] Negative arguments presuppose the aff being true since they begin with a descriptive premise about the affirmative such as the aff does x, and then justify why x is bad. However, if the aff does not have truth value, that entails the descriptive premise would also not have truth value, which is contradictory.**

1. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Dictionary.com – maintain as true, Merriam Webster – to say that something is true, Vocabulary.com – to affirm something is to confirm that it is true, Oxford dictionaries – accept the validity of, Thefreedictionary – assert to be true* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)