**NC**

**The standard is consistency with the standpoint of the skeptic.**

**Prefer –**

**1. Bindingness – The process of debating requires taking a skeptical approach to your opponents’ arguments and attempting to disprove their most basic principles, which means to say skepticial orientation is bad would deny your ability to respond to my arguments.**

**2. Inherency – All moral frameworks begin from the question of how to resolve skepticism which means it controls the internal link to all other framework education**

**3. Holding ourselves to a standard of absolute truth is necessary: A) Culpability – Truth is the standard to which we hold people accountable for their actions, absent an understanding of the way the world actually is, people could make up their own understandings which makes it impossible for us to every justify why something someone did was bad, incorrect, etc and tell them to change B) Outcomes – The truth of the world is the ultimate determiner of the success of our actions, for example, if we were to act as though climate change wasn’t real because it is convenient, we would die of climate change must faster C) Resolvability – Debate requires a maintenance of truth – if debaters could make arguments like affirm because 2+2=5 debate as a concept would become incoherent since there’s no metric to determine who is winning based on the truth of their claims.**

**Skepticism is correct –**

**[1] Culpability – Ethics must hold agents culpable as otherwise we cannot be responsible for moral wrongdoings since they occur externally to our wills and will happen regardless of whether we advise against them. That’s biologically impossible.**

Coyne 12 **Jerry Coyne, [Professor in the Department of Ecology and Evolution at The** [**University of Chicago**](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Organizations/Schools/University+of+Chicago)**], “Why You Don’t Really Have Free Will,” *USAToday*, January 1st, 2012** [**https://www.ethicalpsychology.com/2013/12/why-you-dont-really-have-free-will.html?m=1**](https://www.ethicalpsychology.com/2013/12/why-you-dont-really-have-free-will.html?m=1)

The first is simple: **we are biological** creatures, **collections of molecules that must obey the laws of physics**. **All the success of science rests on the regularity of those laws, which determine the behavior of every molecule in the universe.** Those molecules, of course, also make up your brain — the organ that does the "choosing." And **the neurons and molecules in your brain are the product of both your genes and your environment,** an environment including the other people we deal with. Memories, for example, are nothing more than structural and chemical changes in your brain cells. **Everything that you** think, say, or **do, must come down to molecules and physics.** True "**free will**," then, **would require us to somehow step outside of our brain's structure and modify how it works**. Science hasn't shown any way we can do this because "**we" are simply constructs of our brain.** We can't impose a nebulous "will" on the inputs to our brain that can affect its output of decisions and actions, any more than a programmed computer can somehow reach inside itself and change its program.

**[2] Objectivity – Ethics must provide absolute accounts of goodness else agents simply act on their own passions and inferences which makes it impossible to evaluate any action as correct or incorrect. However, objectivity is impossible. Moral facts are impossible due to the is/ought gap**

**Gray [Bracketed for clarity]** Grey, JW. "The Is/Ought Gap: How Do We Get "Ought" from "Is?"" *Ethical Realism*. N.p., 19 July 2011. Web. 28 Oct. 2015. https://ethicalrealism.wordpress.com/2011/07/19/the-isought-gap-how-do-we-get-ought-from-is/

How is the is/ought gap evidence of moral anti-realism? Moral anti-realists think that there are no irreducible [moral facts](https://ethicalrealism.wordpress.com/2011/07/19/2010/11/04/what-are-moral-facts/)—all moral truths can be reduced to our beliefs, desires, commitments, and so on. Anti-realists don’t think that anything is right or wrong apart from something like a social contract—it’s practical to commit ourselves to behaving ethically insofar as we will benefit when everyone else makes the same commitment as well. Three reasons that the is/ought gap is often taken to be evidence for anti-realism is because (a) the anti-realist sees no reason to think that what morally ought to be the case is a “moral fact” beyond our beliefs, desires, and commitments; (b) the anti-realist sees no reason to think that we could ever know such moral facts exist; and (c) the anti-realist solutions to the is/ought gap could be superior to the realist solutions. Is what morally ought to be the case a moral fact? Facts are states of affairs—actual things that exist and relations between things that exist. That a cat is on the mat is a fact. It’s unclear how what morally ought to be the case can be a fact. What morally ought to be is often quite different from the actual state of affairs in the world. A thief steals, a murderer kills, and so on. People aren’t actually doing what they ought to do. How can a[n] state of affairs that ought to exist be said to be a fact when what ought to be the case is often quite different from what actually [is] exists or happens in the world? Anti-realists see no good answers for these questions, but they think anti-realism can solve the problem by avoiding it. If there are no moral facts, then we no longer need to answer these questions. How can we know what morally ought to be the case? Hume was an empiricist, so he thought we could only know about reality through observation. What we observe isn’t necessarily what ought to be. The actual state of affairs in the world can be quite different that what people morally ought to do. We do know what is the case because we can observe it. Looking at what is the case—the actually obtaining nonmoral facts—doesn’t seem to tell us what ought to be the case. So, it’s not obvious how we can know what morally ought to be the case assuming that it’s a moral fact. Anti-realists think that we can avoid this problem entirely by becoming anti-realists and admitting there are no moral facts.

**And, any account of morality is regressive since it predicates one universal rule on the existence of another moral rule. Since every human chain of reasoning must be finite according to our finite nature, such a reasoning process must terminate in a rule for which no reason can be given.**

**Thus, I contend the skeptic would negate the resolution.**

**1. The skeptical conclusion being true denies the existence of justice prima facie. It proves that nothing can be just nor unjust as ethics itself is an imaginary construct. That means the aff is incapable of proving the truth of the resolution.**

**2. Skep linguistically negates because sentences derive meaning from their linguistic properties corresponding to facts about reality. For example, a claim like “my dog has four legs” requires you to have a dog and for that dog to actually have four legs. If unjust means immoral and wrongfulness doesn’t exist, the statement is false.**

## Shell

**A] Interpretation: The affirmative debater must read a role of the ballot.**

**B] Violation: you dont**

**1] Engagement – If I don’t know how the role of the ballot functions, its impossible for me to engage the aff, since knowing what counts as offense for me is a prerequisite to being able to make meaningful arguments that clash with yours. Knowing what a legitimate advocacy is ensures that I read something that is relevant to your method, and knowing how to weigh gives us an explicit standard for what is relevant, preventing superficial clash where we each make vacuous preclusion claims. This is uniquely true of role of the ballots since there is no communal norm on what “preformative engagement” is in the same way there is for what counts as util offense. Few impacts:**

**2] Resolvability – if there's dispute about whether certain impacts matter at the end of the round, the judge has to intervene because there's no stable role of the ballot text to refer to**

#### 3] Strategy Skew – You make formulating a strategy impossible since I don’t know what links to your evaluative mechanism. My interp means we know what a legitimate neg advocacy is, otherwise you can make up reasons mine doesn’t link to the role of the ballot in the next speech, and by specing a role of the ballot I can know to make the most relevant arguments so you can’t arbitrarily preclude them in the next speech.

**Fairness is a voter since debate is a competitive activity that intrinsically requires equal footing when participating, to minimize one’s ability to participate in discussion disrespects the other member of the activity.**

**Drop the debater – 1. Deterrence – Prevents reading the abusive practice in the future since it’s not worth risking the loss which is k2 norm setting indefensible practices die out 2. TS – Otherwise you’ll read a bunch of abusive practices for the time trade off 3. Epistemic Skew – The round has already been skewed so it’s impossible to evaluate the rest of the flow 4. Drop the argument is incoherent under norm setting since you’re voting for the best rule, not a punishment of someone else’s wrong-doing 5. DTA treats all arguments in the aff as conditional which moots negative offense since I can’t turn them and read theory.**

**Competing interps – 1. Reasonability encourages a race to the margins of what counts as sufficiently fair which incentivizes as much abuse as possible 2. Norm setting – it encourages the most fair rule through debating competing models 3. Judge intervention – Reasonability begs the question of what the judge thinks is sufficient which takes the round out of the debaters hands.**

**No RVIs – 1. It deters legitimate theory vs good theory debaters because you will lose on a shell even if it’s a good norm 2. Baiting – incentivizes people to be abusive and script counter-interps to win on the RVI which increases the existence of bad norms**

**Use a norm setting model – 1. It solves long term abuse whereas IRA only matters one round at a time 2. It’s best for the activity since it encourages deep reflection and debate about what the best world of debate looks like and strives toward it.**

**1NC Theory o/w – 1. Lexicality – If the neg was abusive it was reactionary to aff abuse which means it’s justified 2. Norm setting – 1ar theory can never set norms since I only get 1 speech so we can’t fully develop the debate**

## Shell

**Interpretation: Affirmative debaters must specify which universe the aff takes place in. The negative takes place in this one**

**There are multiple universes and the aff does not specify.**

**Victor Tangermann, Writer for cybernetics, Futurism This Physicist Believes There Are Countless Parallel Universes, OCTOBER 25TH 2019,** [**https://futurism.com/physicist-convinced-countless-parallel-universes**](https://futurism.com/physicist-convinced-countless-parallel-universes) **///AHS PB**

**“It’s absolutely possible that there are multiple worlds where you made different decisions,” he told the network. “We’re just obeying the laws of physics.” So if there are multiple worlds, how many are there? “We don’t know whether the number of worlds is finite or infinite, but it’s certainly a very large number,” Carroll claimed. “There’s no way it’s, like, five.” And he goes further, into a metaphysical view of the universe in which physical reality has much to do with the observer. “Before you look at an object, whether it’s an electron, or an atom or whatever, it’s not in any definite location,” Carroll told NBC. “It might be more likely that you observe it in one place or another, but it’s not actually located at any particular place.” Carroll isn’t the only one that has examined the possibility of many alternate realities. The likes of** [**Stephen Hawking**](https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-43976977) **and Erwin Schrödinger have suggested that many other parallel worlds exist as well. In his most recent work, Hawking** [**suggested that**](https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-43976977) **thanks to quantum mechanics, the Big Bang supplied us with an endless number of universes, not just one.**

**Violation- you don’t**

**Standards-**

1. **Stable ground- By not specifying which universe the aff takes place in they’re able to completely pivot in the 1ar to exclude all NC offense, which outweighs on infinite abuse**
2. **Resolvability- it becomes impossible to weigh absent knowing what universe the aff takes place in because every universe has different uq issues that I wouldn’t be able to weigh in ur case, which absent weighing invites judge intervention**
3. **Topic ed – how do we know what outer space we are talking about if we don’t know which universe we are talking about**

## Shell

**A: Debaters must have only one potential standard that, at any point in the round, can function as a mechanism for providing offense. To clarify, They may not claim that a specific impact transcends their standard and is the biggest impact back to “any standard”.**

**B-Violation: They read a value criterion of consequentialism and then assert that extinction impacts come first under all ethical theories. Also cx**

**C- Standards**

**1. Resolvability: It’s impossible to weigh between two conflicting impacts that are asserted to be the most important impact to any ethical theory. If I get up and claim that a “super deontological violation” transcends any ethical theory, the judge has no way to evaluate the round, since there’s no way we can weigh extinction impacts vs. the super violation because there’s no overarching standard under which that comparison is done. Resolvability is the BIGGEST impact on theory because if the judge can’t make an impartial decision, there IS no debate.**

## K

**Utilitarianism is morally repugnant:**

**1. Util justifies atrocities since it justifies allowing us to harm some for the benefit of others – even if they spew some pain quantifiability argument that doesn’t solve since there are still instances some get great benefit from others harm.**

**2. Util can’t justify intrinsic wrongness – We can’t know whether our action was good until we’ve evaluated the states of affairs they’ve produced since it’s based on the outcome of the action. For Example if asked the question “is rape okay?” a utilitarian would not be able to say yes because there are situations in which it would be morally obligatory to do so if it maximized pleasure.**

**Impact:**

**They read morally repugnant arguments. Thus the alternative is to drop the debater, to ensure that debate remains a space safe for all – the judge has a proximal obligation to ensure inaccessible practices don’t proliferate. Accessibility is a voting issue since all aff arguments presuppose that people feel safe in this space to respond to them.**