# 1NC

## 1

#### Interp: Debaters must disclose tournaments on the 2021-2022 NDCA LD wiki under the actual name of the tournament on tabroom for every round at said tournament.

#### Violation: The name is not Apple Valley on tab

Graphical user interface, application, table

Description automatically generated

#### 1] The standard is inclusion - they make debate inaccessible to novices or small schools who compete on the circuit but don’t have access to resources or have knowledge of debate lingo to know the shorthand nicknames for tournaments. Two internal links to accessibility - 1) lets debaters see if you won or lost on tab going for specific strategies or hitting specific strategies, letting debaters adapt around that and b) lets debaters see what speaks judges gave to help them see how good you were at going for x argument. Independently links into reciprocity since if I disclosed one way and you didnt’ you had the advantage in this round. Outweighs - none of their standards matter if debaters can’t access them and means reasonability is uniquely wrong since even a 1% risk of exclusion is bad, you obviously don’t say some level of exclusion is justified

#### Fairness and education are voters – its how judges evaluate rounds and why schools fund debate

#### Neg theory is DTD - 1ARs control the direction of the debate because it determines what the 2NR has to go for – DTD allows us some leeway in the round by having some control in the direction

#### Competing interps – Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation – it also collapses since brightlines operate on an offense-defense paradigm

#### No RVIs – A – Going all in on theory kills substance education which outweighs on timeframe B - Discourages checking real abuse which outweighs on norm-setting C – Encourages theory baiting – outweighs because if the shell is frivolous, they can beat it quickly D – its illogical for you to win for proving you were fair – outweighs since logic is a litmus test for other arguments E - Kills norm setting since debaters can never admit they’re wrong – outweighs since norm setting is the constitutive purpose of theory F – They are the logic of criminalization that over-punish people-of-color for trying to create productive discourse

#### NC theory first - 1] They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] We have more speeches to norm over it 3] It was introduced first so it comes lexically prior.

#### DTA on 1AR shells - They can blow up blippy 20 second shells in the 2AR but I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention

#### No new 1ar theory paradigm issues- A] New 1ar paradigms moot any 1NC theoretical offense B] introducing them in the aff allows for them to be more rigorously tested

## 2

#### Interpretation - the affirmative can only garner offense from the hypothetical implementation of their plan text

#### Resolved means a legislative policy

Words and Phrases 64 Words and Phrases Permanent Edition. “Resolved”. 1964.

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### "Resolved" requires a policy.

Merriam Webster '18 (Merriam Webster; 2018 Edition; Online dictionary and legal resource; Merriam Webster, "resolve," <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resolve;> RP)  
: a legal or official determination especially: a legislative declaration

#### Violation- They defend the resolution as a general principle and refuse to defend impacts under implementation

#### A] Clash, the resolution serves as a predictable stasis point to enhance accessible research and equitable ground, but obfuscating that limit makes negative preparation impossible because any ground we receive is self-serving, concessionary, and from distorted literature bases---defining a role for negation is essential to sustaining competition and comes before any affirmative offense---the impact is debatability

#### B] Limits —re-contextualizing the resolution lets them defend any method exploding limits, which erases neg ground and renders research burdens untenable for points of difference for third- and fourth-line testing, DAs, PICs, CPs, that are all intuitive points of research are null and void, our interp link turns creativity by allowing both sides to predict arguments, research deficits, and clash---we access the a stronger internal link because of equitable burdens

#### TVA – Read the affirmative advocacy and offense while defending that negatives can read and weigh neg offense through defending implementation

## 3

#### Interp – Debaters must have recordings of their speeches and send them if requested

#### Violation – They didn't

#### Prefer

#### 1] Cheating – debaters can fake internet drop offs and then steal prep which decks reciprocity. O/Ws since it destroys competitive incentives and educational value since they are structurally ahead

#### 2] Accidents possible, external conditions like power going out, wifi dropping off, or excessive background noise make it impossible to hear in real time, recordings ensure that a speech isn’t given twice, which allows them to remodify and change their strat or incite judge intervention which is the worst violation of procedural fairness

#### 3] Key to check clipping cards and make cheaters lose with literal proof

## 4

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement – anything else moots 7 minutes of the nc – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that a world is better than another before you adopt it.

#### They justify substantive skews since there will always be a more correct side of the issue but we compensate for flaws in the lit.

#### Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – T/F binary is descriptive and technical.

#### Negate because either the aff 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

#### a priori's 1st – even worlds framing requires ethics that begin from a priori principles like reason or pleasure so we control the internal link to functional debates.

#### The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true so it's constitutive and jurisdictional. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I've met my burden.

#### I negate –

#### 1] the[[3]](#footnote-3) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but appropriation isn’t a disease

#### 2] of[[4]](#footnote-4) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time

#### 3] private[[5]](#footnote-5) describes “belonging to or for the use of one particular person or group of people only” and an entity[[6]](#footnote-6) is “independent, separate, or self-contained existence”

#### They don’t exist – circumvention.

Martinez 21 [Katherine Latimer Martinez (Seattle University School of Law). “Lost in Space: An Exploration of the Current Gaps in Space Law”. Seattle Journal of Technology, Environmental & Innovation Law: Vol. 11 : Iss. 2 , Article 4. 5-7-2021. Accessed 12/18/21. <https://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1022&context=sjteil> //Xu]

No company is able to operate in a purely private capacity and without State partnerships because of a need for government funding and the government’s need for additional research due to decreases in funding and resources.138 Private companies fall into two categories: (1) those focused on commercial space travel and (2) those focused on mining and space resources.

## 5

### Framework

#### Permissibility and presumption negate

#### 1] Obligations- the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove an obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation

#### 2] Falsity- Statements are more often false than true because proving one part of the statement false disproves the entire statement. Presuming all statements are true creates contradictions which would be ethically bankrupt.

#### 3] Negating is harder – A] Aff gets first and last speech which control the direction of the debate B] Affirmatives can strategically uplayer in the 1ar giving them a 7-6 time skew advantage, splitting the 2nr C] They get infinite prep time

#### The meta-ethic is procedural moral realism.

#### This entails that moral facts stem from procedures while substantive realism holds that moral truths exist independently of that in the empirical world. Prefer procedural realism –

#### [1] Collapses – the only way to verify whether something is a moral fact is by using procedures to warrant it.

#### [2] Uncertainty – our experiences are inaccessible to others which allows people to say they don’t experience the same, however a priori principles are universally applied to all agents.

#### [3] Is/Ought Gap – we can only perceive what is, not what ought to be. It’s impossible to derive an ought statement from descriptive facts about the world, necessitating a priori premises.

#### Practical Reason is that procedure. To ask for why we ought be reasoners concedes its authority since it uses reason – anything else is nonbinding and arbitrary. That hijacks their framework since you need reason to evaluate any relevant consequences.

#### Moral law must be universal—our judgements can’t only apply to ourselves any more than 2+2=4 can be true only for me – any non-universalizable norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative.

#### Prefer –

#### [1] Performativity—freedom is the key to the process of justification of arguments. Willing that we ought abide by their ethical theory presupposes that we own ourselves in the first place.

#### [2] All other frameworks collapse—non-Kantian theories source obligations in extrinsically good objects, but that presupposes the goodness of the rational will.

#### [3] TJFs and they outweigh since it precludes engagement on the framework layer – prefer for Resource disparities- Our framework ensures big squads don’t have a comparative advantage since debates become about quality of arguments rather than quantity - their model crowds out small schools because they have to prep for every unique advantage under each aff, every counterplan, and every disad with carded responses to each of them

### Offense

#### 1] Banning private space appropriation inhibits the sale and use of spacecraft and fuel- that’s a form of restricting the free economic choices of individuals

**Richman 12**, Sheldon. “The free market doesn’t need government regulation.” Reason, August 5, 2012. // AHS RG

Order grows from market forces. But where do **market forces** come from? They **are the result of human action. Individuals select ends and act to achieve them by adopting suitable means.** Since means are scarce and ends are abundant, **individuals economize in order to accomplish more rather than less.** And they always seek to exchange lower values for higher values (as they see them) and never the other way around. In a world of scarcity, tradeoffs are unavoidable, so one aims to trade up rather than down. (One’s trading partner does the same.) **The result of this**, along with other **features of human action**, and the world at large **is what we call market forces. But really, it is just men and women acting rationally in the world.**

## Case

### Underview

#### No time sjkew – we both have 13 mins

#### If I told you the earth was flat u wouldn’t believe me – which takes out that arg

#### Nothing is morally neutral – for example I drink water because it saves my life.

#### 2] I get spec shells – anything else allows them to be shifty in cx and not clarify their plan which is a net worse model

#### A] functional limits – I read 2 shells at worse which means no impact

#### B] if the shell is bad u can easily beat it back

#### C] no – youy could read a broad plan and spec the things we ask you to

#### 3] New 2nr responses to 1nc tricks without specifying what a blippy 1nc trick is a voting issue – it justifies them getting responses to every argument since they can redefine in the 1ar which is a terrible model. Idnepednetly no new responses because I legit cant respond back to them.

### Framework

#### 1] Objective truth operates independent of the empirical circumstances that constitute a subject i.e. regardless of how you actualize your own identity a triangle will definitionally have 3 sides, so objective accounts of agency functionally constrain any social fluidity.

#### 2] Deleuze assumes that there is no such thing as a priori reason because people are constantly affected by the external world, but that relies on assumptions like X is X, which uses a priori reason.

#### Deleuze triggers determinism. If I win this it proves the subject has no capcity for fluidity, and even if they do, it is a form of static fluidity that prevents true becoming, which denies their framework.

#### 1. If the subject is PURELY affect then the subject has no control over their reactions or actions since the way they relate to the world is entirely influenced by the physical substance of affect that makes up the world which means they have no capacity to be fluid.

#### 2. The best neuroscientific, psychological, and medical evidence evidence free will doesn’t exist. This article is a giant literature review of different fields.

Andrea **Lavazza**, Neuroethics, Centro Universitario Internazionale, Arezzo, Italy, Free Will and Neuroscience: From Explaining Freedom Away to New Ways of Operationalizing and Measuring It, **2016**, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4887467/> ///AHS PB BRACKETED FOR CLARITY

**All** these **experiments seem to indicate that free will is an illusion**. Yet, these relevant experiments can be interpreted in many ways. A possible view is that, in some way, determinism can be observed directly within ourselves. This interpretation might lead to the conclusion that free will is just an illusion. In fact, if one considers as a condition of free will the fact that it should be causa sui (i.e., it should be able to consciously start new causal chains), such a condition is incompatible with determinism as it is usually defined. For it, in fact, all events are linked by casual relations in the form of natural laws, which started long before we were born and which we cannot escape. However, determinism has generally been regarded as a metaphysical claim, not refutable by empirical findings. One could properly talk of automatism in the brain, not of determinism, based on the evidence available. (In any case, endorsing indeterminism might lead to consider our behavior as the causal product of choices that every time produce different results, as if we rolled a dice. This doesn’t seem to make us any freer than if determinism were overturned; cf. Levy, 2011). Most importantly, another feature of freedom seems to be a pure illusion, namely the role of consciousness. The experiments considered thus far heavily question the claim that consciousness actually causes voluntary behavior. **Neural activation starts the decisional process culminating in the movement, while consciousness “comes after”, when “things are done”. Therefore, [and] consciousness cannot trigger our voluntary decisions**. But the role of consciousness in voluntary choices is part of the definition of free will (but the very definition of consciousness is a matter of debate, cf. Chalmers, 1996). Empirical research in psychology also shows that our mind works and makes choices without our conscious control. As proposed by psychologist Wegner (2002, 2003, 2004) and Aarts et al. (2004), **we are “built” to have the impression to consciously control our actions or to have the power to freely choose, even though all that is only a cognitive illusion**. Many priming experiments show that people act “mechanically” (even when their behavior might appear suited to the environment and even refined). Automatic cognitive processes, of which we aren’t always aware, originate our decisions, and they were only discovered thanks to **the most advanced scientific research**. Ultimately, consciousness, which should exercise control and assess the reasons for a choice, is thus allegedly causally ineffective: a mere epiphenomenon, to use the terminology of the philosophy of mind. This is what has been called Zombie Challenge, “based on an amazing wealth of findings in recent cognitive science that **demonstrate** the surprising ways in which **our everyday behavior is controlled by automatic processes that unfold in the complete absence of consciousness**” (Vierkant et al., 2013).

#### That Negates – Determinism denies the moral value of prohibitions and obligations, if all actions are already locked in then trying to make subjects morally culpable for them is meaningless as it is already predetermined the subject would do that. This negates the prescriptive value of ought statements making the aff incoherent.

#### **Evaluate the debate after the 1nc for recpircoity – we both get one speech so it’s the best model.**

#### LBL

#### 1] Turn – not all deterritorization is good. For ex we should be able to say rape bad w/o deterritorizing it.

#### 2] Begs the question of how we deterritorialize and/or what our metric of deterritorialization is

#### 3] Not actionable – no one person can deterritorialize an institution so its unclear who should bear ethical responsibility – kills enforcement and triggers permissibility

#### 4] Turn – Positions that are too radical cause violent backlash from the state and crack down on the most vulnerable bodies first. Means their framework is inaccessible which o/w

#### 5] Micromovements fail – the state is way stronger and has centralized power meaning use of them causes collapse

#### 6] Joining divergent micropol strategies collapses – different groups have different goals which leads to infighting. Any reason why groups would disagree is a reason why you can’t randomly combine movements which would instead lead to incoherent decision making

#### 7] Infinitely regressive – whenever autonomous social mvts go to scale they become statist and then stratify groups – turns their offense. Autonegates b/c ethics can never be fulfilled so we can never have complete obligations

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)
3. <https://www.google.com/search?q=the+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=the+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i64j69i61j69i60l2.1976j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <https://www.google.com/search?q=of+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=of+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i61l3.1473j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. <https://www.google.com/search?q=private+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=private+&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i57j69i60j69i61.1372j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/entity> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-6)