# 1NC

## 1

#### Interpretation: Tommy must explicitly number all a prioris, label them as their own off, or have a line break between an arguments before and after it. To clarify, hidden a-prioris bad.

#### Violation: there are hidden a prioris in \_\_\_

#### Inclusion- People who can’t flow as well, process fast blips, or have a hard time reading huge blocks of text due to disabilities get crowded out of the debate because they always lose to autowin arguments– that outweighs since inclusion is an impact filter

#### 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

## 2

#### Interpretation—Tommy must disclose all preemptive interpretations and offensive theory spikes 30 minutes before the round

#### Violation—they didn’t
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#### Vote neg for clash – they skirt meaningful discussion and debate by surprising us with a bunch of blippy spikes and 1ac shells which kills substantive education and clash – outweighs because it’s the only unique benefit of debate

## 3

#### 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.

#### Neg abuse outweighs Aff abuse – 1] Infinite prep time before round to frontline 2] 2AR judge psychology 3] 1st and last speech 4] Infinite perms and uplayering in the 1AR.

#### Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is very aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to

#### 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

#### RVIs on 1AR theory – 1AR being able to spend 20 seconds on a shell and still win forces the 2N to allocate at least 2:30 on the shell which means RVIs check back time skew

#### 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

## 4

#### 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] Negation Theory “to negate” means “to deny the truth of,” which means any argument that renders the resolution false is sufficient to negate.

#### 4] Trichotomy Triple there is a trichotomy between obligation, prohibition and permissibility; proving one disproves the other two because they are three intertwined moral terms which coexist within each other. Outweighs because it interacts with each term or moral obligation.

#### 5] Status Quo Bias – you should default to a world where you don’t make change because making change assumes that world will be better than the current world

#### **1] The holographic principle is the most reasonable conclusion**

Stromberg 15[Joseph Stromberg- “Some physicists believe we're living in a giant hologram — and it's not that far-fetched” <https://www.vox.com/2015/6/29/8847863/holographic-principle-universe-theory-physics> Vox. June 29th 2015] War Room Debate AI

Some physicists actually believe that the universe we live in might be a hologram. The idea isn't that the universe is some sort of fake simulation out of The Matrix, but rather that even though we appear to live in a three-dimensional universe, it might only have two dimensions. It's called the holographic principle. The thinking goes like this: Some distant two-dimensional surface contains all the data needed to fully describe our world — and much like in a hologram, this data is projected to appear in three dimensions. Like the characters on a TV screen, we live on a flat surface that happens to look like it has depth. It might sound absurd. But when physicists assume it's true in their calculations, all sorts of big physics problems — such as the nature of black holes and the reconciling of gravity and quantum mechanics — become much simpler to solve. In short, the laws of physics seem to make more sense when written in two dimensions than in three. "It's not considered some wild speculation among most theoretical physicists," says Leonard Susskind, the Stanford physicist who first formally defined the idea decades ago. "It's become a working, everyday tool to solve problems in physics." But there's an important distinction to be made here. There's no direct evidence that our universe actually is a two-dimensional hologram. These calculations aren't the same as a mathematical proof. Rather, they're intriguing suggestions that our universe could be a hologram. And as of yet, not all physicists believe we have a good way of testing the idea experimentally.

#### 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.

#### 3] Decision Making Paradox- in order to decide to do the affirmative we need a decision-making procedure to enact it, vote for it, and 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 since every decision requires another decision to chose how to make a decision.

#### 4] The Place Paradox- if everything exists in a place in space time, that place must also have a place that it exists and that larger place needs a larger location to infinity. Therefore, identifying ought statements is impossible since those statements assume acting on objects in the space-time continuum.

#### 5] Grain Paradox- A single grain of millet makes no sound upon falling, but a thousand grains make a sound. But a thousand nothings cannot make something which means the physical world is paradoxical.

#### 6] Arrows Paradox- If we divide time into discrete 0-duration slices, no motion is happening in each of them, so taking them all as a whole, motion is impossible.

#### 7] Bonini’s Paradox- As a model of a complex system becomes more complete, it becomes less understandable; for it to be more understandable it must be less complete and therefore less accurate. Therefore no philosophical or political model can be useful.

#### 10] Good Samaritan Paradox -- affirming negates because in order to say you want to fix x problem, that assumes x problem exists in the first place, thus eliminating nukes presupposes nukes exist which means negation is a prior question

#### 11] Zeno’s Paradox – motion is impossible, because moving half way causes half more and half more which is infinitely regressive and means elimination of arsenals is logically impossible

## Case

### Offense

Resolved is obviously a policy forum – use context because obviously they wouldn’t make the res auto affirm

Affirm means to prove true – 5 dictionaries that’s tt

Experts, phDs, etc still understand stuff – just because not everyone understands it doesn’t mean it doesn’t exist

It says we have an infinite number of true or false statements

The res is not a conditional statement – they’re missing an i/l

No reason the res is a tacit ballot – we could flip that statement around and it negates

No warrant – they’ve just cut, if the first part is true the second part is

Relies on you knowing that H is true

You can vote neg because its simple too

No reason trivialism means you affirm

Debate is good – we can argue between facts – voting for it doesn’t make it true

Our decision making paradox is the fw

You aren’t the gcb, im the gcb, I will prove this by making you speak

Indexicals is racist – we can’t deny racism in an index. Drop them for not being inclusive. Also this means I can prove false in whatever world

Turn with GSP

No, answering the flat earth theory doesn’t assume its true, it assumes its false

Cross apply indexicals

### Underview

#### 1] Reject spikes that aren’t on top- it means I have to wait for the 1ac to finish to formulate a strategy since I don’t know what your going to read which moots 6 min of prep

#### 2] Reject Spikes that weren’t disclosed- prevents us from rigorously testing your norm and incentivizes surprise tactics

#### 3] Reject under views—one small theory analytic can take out huge chunks of the 1nc which kills substantive clash

#### 4] Give me new 2NR responses to theory spikes – anything else incentivizes hiding spikes and arguments which is a bad norm.

#### 5] Reject substantive arguments that affirm independent of offense under a framework—they all become functional NIBs, if I drop 1 I lose, which incentivizes proliferating them and going for what’s undercovered. a. Clash—debates become about concessions of dumb args, not argumentative engagement. Outweighs—it’s the constitutive purpose of debate. Allow me to apply this logic to other args—I don’t know what I may have missed.

Don’t drop me for responding to spikes – it makes me lose every round

Give me weighing in the 2nr – anything else means its impossible for me to react to the 1ar

Cx checks fail – the judge doesn’t flow cx and you could just deny it. Don’t reevaluate, kills my strat cuz we assume you violate

We can read nibs – reciprocity – u read nibs for 6 mins, I don’t read for 7 cuz my entire 1nc isn’t nibs

Neg analytics – I don’t have cards for everything, I can do o/v args – anything else is irreciprocal cuz u don’t need to lbl

I get arguments anything else ruins debate

Screenshots check – we can prove u did shit

Yes they can

No impredictability – ur the aff and we know that

No 2ar arguments – I cant respond

No its dtd – cross apply

That means the aff takes a stance that slavery is good which means u negate

### Framework

#### 1] premise 3 is wrong we cannot conceive abstract concepts in our mind into the reality thus the greater GCB can not exist

#### 2] premise 4 is wrong the most GCB thing in our mind would have be the GCB and previous representations that are lesser just proves we were wrong beforehand – learning new limits isn’t a contradiction just a shift in definition and understanding

#### 3] inclusion DA – it’s not good to talk about religious suppositions in debate because it bars people who are unable to question their religion in the first place – means they arbitrarily exclude people from the space which is an independent voter and is the i/l to their phil ed

#### 4] education DA – debates about religion go down to just that because they assert one thing to be infinitely true – your shell proves – means we don’t get topic lit – there are other formats suited way better for these loaded we only get this topic 2 months