### 1NC – TT

#### The first role of the ballot is to determine the truth or falsity of the resolution. Prefer –

#### 1] Text – five dictionaries define negate as to deny the truth of and affirms to prove true which means the only obligation of the judge is to vote on the resolution’s truth/falsity. Outweighs on commonality – it is abundantly clear that our roles are verified. I’ve denied the truth of the resolution so I’ve met my burden.

#### 2] Any other ROB enforces an external norm on debate, but only truth testing is intrinsic to the process of debate, i.e., proving statements true or false through argumentation. Constitutivism outweighs because you don’t have the jurisdiction to not test the truth of the resolution – if someone says you should break the rules of the game to have more fun ten you should ignore them as a competition only makes sense when it has rules.

#### 3] All other ROBs collapse – any property assumes the truth of the property, i.e., if I say, “the sky is blue” it is the same as me saying “it is true that the sky is blue”, which means they are also a question of truth claim’s because it’s intrinsic. It also means that their ROB warrants aren’t mutually exclusive with mine.

#### 4] Anything else moots 6 minutes of the 1NC and strengthens their pre-round prep since I need to be able to compensate by choosing my own offense.

#### 5] 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 the problem. Truth Testing solves since it’s solely a question of if something is true or false, there isn’t a close estimate

#### 6] Epistemology – only truth testing includes all frames of discussion in considering what could prove or disprove a statement—everything else has the potential to exclude a point in that argument, which means it skews our ability to actually evaluate the argument—only truth testing actually evaluates the question in an accurate manner.

#### The second role of the ballot is to vote negative. Prefer –

#### 1] to[[1]](#footnote-1) is defined as “expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location)” but the word “ought” can’t move to the word recognize

#### 2] just[[2]](#footnote-2) is defined as “very recently; in the immediate past” but then a just government wouldn’t exist

#### 3] government[[3]](#footnote-3) is defined as “the relation between a governed and a governing word” but a grammatical relationship can’t recognize anything

#### 4] Inherency – either a) the aff is non-inherent and you vote neg on presumption or b) it is and it isn’t logically going to happen.

#### 5] Aff has an absolute burden of proof – any doubt means you negate since a claim not that claim can’t be true, so any risk of falsity is entirely false.

#### 6] **The universe is a hologram**

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.

#### 7] Decision Making Paradox- We need a decision-making procedure to enact the aff, but to choose a procedure requires another meta level decision-making procedure and so forth leading to infinite regress so just vote neg to break the paradox.

#### 8] The Place Paradox- if everything exists in a place, that place must have a place that it exists in and so forth. Therefore, identifying ought statements is impossible since it assumes the space-time continuum.

#### 9] Bonini’s Paradox- As a model of a complex system becomes more complete, it becomes less understandable and vice versa; therefore, no model can be useful.

#### **10] All analysis fails**

Wikipedia Summarizes [Wikipedia - “Paradox of analysis” <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paradox_of_analysis>] War Room Debate AI

A [conceptual analysis](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conceptual_analysis) is something like the definition of a word. However, unlike a standard dictionary definition (which may list examples or talk about related terms as well), a completely correct analysis of a concept in terms of others seems like it should have exactly the same meaning as the original concept. Thus, in order to be correct, the analysis should be able to be used in any context where the original concept is used, without changing the meaning of the discussion in context. Conceptual analyses of this sort are a major goal of [analytic philosophy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Analytic_philosophy).

However, if such an analysis is to be useful, it should be informative. That is, it should tell us something we don't already know (or at least, something one can imagine someone might not already know). But it seems that no conceptual analysis can both meet the requirement of correctness and of informativeness, on these understandings of the requirements.

To see why, consider a potential simple analysis:

(1) For all x (any given member of a class or set), x is a brother if and only if x is a male sibling

One can say that (1) is correct because the expression "brother" represents the same concept as the expression "male sibling," and (1) seems to be informative because the two expressions are not identical. And if (1) is truly correct, then "brother" and "male sibling" must be interchangeable:

(2) For all x, x is a brother if and only if x is a brother

Yet (2) is not informative, so either (1) is not informative, or the two expressions used in (1) are not interchangeable (because they change an informative analysis into an uninformative one) so (1) is not actually correct. In other words, if the analysis is correct and informative, then (1) and (2) must be essentially equal, but this is not true because (2) is not informative. Therefore, it seems an analysis cannot be both correct and informative at the same time.

#### Evaluate the debate after the 1NC – we each get 1 speech so it’s key to reciprocity

#### 11] Linguistics fail – words have no intrinsic meaning but are constructed by signs and signifiers. For example, pencil refers to a specific image pops in your head that doesn’t replicate all pencils.

#### Presumption and permissibility negate –

#### 1] Semantics – Ought is defined as expressing obligation which means absent a proactive obligation you vote neg since there’s a trichotomy between prohibition, obligation, and permissibility and proving one disproves the other two. Semantics outweighs – A. it’s key to predictability since we prep based on the wording of the res B. It’s constitutive to the rules of debate since the judge is obligated to vote on the resolutional text.

#### 2] Logic – Propositions require positive justification before being accepted, otherwise one would be forced to accept the validity of logically contradictory propositions regarding subjects one knows nothing about, i.e., if one knew nothing about P one would have to presume that both “P” and “~P” are true

#### 3] Intuitions – A. We assume statements to be false until proven true. That is why we don’t believe in alternate realities or conspiracy theories; B. Statements are more often false than true because any part of the resolution could be false.

#### 4] Negating is harder – A. The aff gets the first and last speech which controls 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 have infinite prep

### 1NC – Skep

#### To negate means to contradict. To contradict means to speak or declare against. Debate itself requires consistency with non-contradiction and proactive justification, any doubt of proof flows neg.

**Luca** [Luca, Andrei. “LogicWarrior Demand Reason.” LogicWarrior, 9 Oct. 2017, [www.logicwarrior.net/tag/law-of-non-contradiction/](http://www.logicwarrior.net/tag/law-of-non-contradiction/)]

This law is another seemingly obvious point but in practice the Law of Non-Contradiction is the foundation of argumentative validity. The Law of Non-Contradiction makes logic truth preserving so that you’ll never go from a true point and arrive at a false point. Contradiction negates logic, and while true paradox may be something fun which to reflect unless you’re attempting to unite with the godhead by reaching nirvana, contradiction simply has no place in logic. This is not to say that something can’t *appear* to be self-contradictory and this idea is the basis of a lot of statements of reflection. In the course of debate another definition may become useful: Both a claim and not that claim can’t be true. So, if a statement holds even a teensy weensy bit of falseness, it must be entirely false.

#### Skepticism is true and negates –

#### 1] Moral skep – justices requires us to act immediately since waiting in the face of injustice is itself an injustice. However, we need to be fully informed to avoid formulating a rule incorrectly and unjustly, so obligations are internally contradictory.

**Derrida** [Derrida, J. "The Force of Law: The 'Mystical Foundation of Authority.'" In  
\_Deconstruction\_and\_the\_Possibility\_of\_Justice\_ (edited by Drucilla Cornell,  
Michel Rosenfeld and David Gray Carlson), pp. 26-9]

But justice, however unpresentable it may be, doesn't wait.· It is that which must not wait. To be direct, simple and brief, let us say this: a just decision is always required immediately, "right away." It cannot furnish itself with infinite information and the unlimited knowledge of conditions, rules or hypothetical imperatives that could justify it. And even if it did have all that at its disposal, even if it did give itself the time, all the time and all the necessary facts about the matter, the moment of decision, as such, always remains a finite moment of urgency and precipitation, since it must not be the consequence or the effect of this theoretical or historical knowledge, of this reflection or this deliberation, since it always marks the interruption of the juridico- or ethico- or politico-cognitive deliberation that precedes it, that must precede it. The instant of decision is a madness, says Kierkegaard. This is particularly true of the instant of the just decision that must rend time and defy dialectics. It is a madness. Even if time and prudence, the patience of knowledge and the mastery of conditions were hypothetically unlimited, the decision would be structurally finite, however late it came, decision of urgency and precipitation, acting in the night of non-knowledge and non-rule.

#### And any account of morality is regressive since it predicates on 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.

#### 2] External world skep – no amount of subjective experience can ever prove objective knowledge.

**Searle** [John Rogers Searle, “Mind, Language, And Society: Philosophy In The Real World.”, https://novacat.nova.edu:446/record=b1236325~S13]

[Y]ou could have the best possible evidence about some domain and still be radically mistaken. You could have the best possible evidence about other people’s behavior and still be mistaken about their mental states. You could have the best possible evidence about the past and still be mistaken about the future. You could have the best possible evidence about your own perceptual experiences and still be mistaken about the external world. This is so because you could be dreaming, having hallucinations, be a brain in a vat, or be deceieved systematically by an evil demon. Strange situations, yes, but it is impossible to disprove the potentiality for any of these scenarios.”

#### That negates since providing an obligation requires that A. the one assigning the obligation has some externally reliable source of authority and B. it assumes we know the facts about a situation and can make a case for an obligation which is impossible.

#### 3] All statements and moral theories are regulated by the falsifiability theory of meaning which prioritizes falsity over positive observation. This renders future knowledge in a state of indeterminacy and holds negative observations sufficient to disprove a theorem.

**Nickles** [Thomas."Falsifiability."NewDictionaryoftheHistoryofIdeas.2005. , <https://elearning.shisu.edu.cn/pluginfile.php/35320/mod_resource/content/1/Falsifiability%20%28Introduction%29.pdf>]

Falsifiable contrasts with verifiable. A claim is empirically verifiable if possible observation statements logically imply the truth of the claim. If actual observation statements do imply the claim, then it is verified. "This raven is black" verifies "There are black ravens." During the 1930s the logical empiricists of the Vienna Circle proposed verifiability both as a criterion of demarcation of science from nonscience and a criterion of meaning. Their idea was that a statement is meaningful if and only if it is verifiable in principle, and its meaning is given by its method of verification. For the logical empiricists, only empirically verifiable claims make genuine assertions about the world and are, in this broad sense, scientific. All other claims (metaphysical, religious, ethical, etc.) are cognitively meaningless. In his Logik der Forschung (1934; Logic of Scientific Discovery), Popper replied by rejecting the logical empiricists' concern with language and meaning and by noting that verifiability as a criterion of demarcation excludes scientific law claims and thus the core of science itself. For since a law claim is universal in scope (in simplest form, "All A's everywhere and everywhen are B's"), it cannot possibly be verified: there are always actual or potential instances beyond those so far observed. Yet a universal claim can be falsified by a single negative instance. The first observed black swan refuted the claim "All swans are white." (Law claims of statisticalprobabilistic forms are more problematic.) Based on this logical asymmetry of verification and falsification, Popper proposed falsifiability as a criterion of demarcation of science from nonscience, although not as a criterion of meaning. According to Popper, nonscience includes pseudoscience (e.g., Freudian psychology and Marxism) and metaphysics, the one fraudulent, the other sometimes providing a valuable heuristic for science. Many deep scientific problems have their roots in metaphysics, but to be scientific, a claim must take an empirical risk. Moreover, falsifiability, as the ongoing risk of falsification in our world, is a permanent status for Popper. No amount of successful testing can establish a hypothesis as absolutely true or even probable: it forever remains conjectural. That all scientific theories remain falsifiable entails fallibilism, the view that our best epistemic efforts remain open to future revision. There can be no certain foundations to knowledge.

#### 4] Uncertain truth statements are illogical.

**Unger 75** [Unger, Peter (1975): Ignorance (Oxford: Oxford University Press)] ///AHS PB

The very particular idea that knowing entails its being all right to be certain is suggested, further, by the fact that knowing entails, at least, that one is certain. As we saw in section 9 of the preceding chapter, that this is a fact is made quite plain by the inconsistency expressed by sentences like 'He really knew that it was raining, but he wasn't absolutely certain it was.' Such a sentence can express no truth: if he wasn't certain, then he didn't know.

#### 5] Induction – either it’s the case we can predict the outcome of a situation, or we cannot. We cannot, insofar as no situation is ever replicated exactly, and even if it can, there’s no guarantee the outcome will be the same. If we can predict situations, that means everyone can which means we will always predict each other, making a paradox of action insofar as we always attempt to predict the outcomes of each other’s actions, and will cancel out the obligations.

### 1NC – New Affs Bad

#### Interp – the affirmative debater must disclose the affirmative 30 minutes prior to the round. To clarify, disclosure can occur on the wiki or over message.

#### Violation – they never messaged me

#### Prefer –

#### 1] 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 aff

#### 2] Academic Integrity – disclosing new affs is key to ensure that evidence isn’t miscut – 4 minutes of prep isn’t enough, especially since I need to save some for the 2NR and also construct a 1NC. This outweighs because if they can lie about their aff, everything else they could have said is a lie and should be disregarded. Key to education otherwise we wouldn’t learn what is true and what’s not.

#### Fairness because debate’s a game and education because it’s the only portable skill from debate.

#### Drop the debater – A] Their lack of disclosure makes substance irreparable because our entire argument is that we did not have a basis to engage the aff to begin with, B] Drop the arg means they lose since they lose their entire advocacy and cannot have offense. Competing interps – a) It fosters the best norms through encouraging the fairest rule b) Reasonability collapses by debating the brightline

#### No RVIs – a) Illogical – you shouldn’t win for proving that you’re fair or edication because it’s a prima facie burden – logic outweighs because it determines what args count as valid b) It incentivizes you to bait theory and win off a scripted CI c) people will be scared to read theory against good theory debaters and will never be able to check abuse

### 1NC – AT: 1AR Theory

#### 1] Reject 1AR theory –

#### A] Strat skew – new 1AR theory arguments force me to shift away from substance and overcover on the theory debate – means I’m not able to cover substance effectively because theory is an easy 2AR out.

#### B] Clash – new theory args distract away from substantive education and talking about the topic – o/w because we only have 2 months to talk about it.

#### C] Negating is harder – they have the first and last speech plus the fact that there’s no 3NR means all they must do in the 2AR is select the best arguments and weigh those.

#### D] The 1AR is not that hard– the fact that people are able to read theory shells and cover everything in the 1AR proves the time-skew effect is minimal

#### E] The 7-6 time skew means that it is endlessly biased towards the aff

#### F] 1AR theory is skewed to the aff because they have the advantage of 2AR judge psychology which is also a reason they shouldn’t get 2AR weighing.

#### H] You have infinite prep to plan out your strategy using 1AR while the NC is reactive and can’t possibly predict the 2AR strat

#### 2] Drop the arg on 1AR theory –

#### A] Late breaking theory is inherently unpredictable – the aff could run any shell in the 1AR against the 1NC which means we would never be prepared for it.

#### B] 2AR collapse – the aff could collapse to any shell in the 2AR that would kill 6 minutes of the 2NR which means I would never win.

#### 3] 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 – reasonability checks 2AR sandbagging by preventing really abusive 1NCs while still giving the 2NR a chance.

#### 4] Doesn’t come first – there’s always a theory violation the 1AR can find plus the fact that they have a positive time trade off to the 2NR so it isn’t a good check on abuse.

#### 5] Infinite abuse claims are wrong – A] Spikes solve – you can just preempt paradigms in the 1AC, B] Functional limits – the 1NC is only 7 minutes long

#### ] The lack of a 3N means

#### a. The 2N has to be both forward and backward looking to both respond to the 1AR and predict the 2AR

#### b. I can respond to new 1AR positions only once with the 2N, encouraging aff to always introduce new 1AR layers. This hurts clash – 1AR is incentivized to restart the debate and avoid the 1N. Key to education because clash allows us to explain and respond to arguments in-depth.

#### 2] Affirming is not hard

#### a. 1AR is not that short. People introduce 30 second shells all the time, so it’s long enough to introduce new layers while responding to NC layers

#### b. 2AR gets to weigh and the final say on the issues the 2N collapses to

#### c. Empirics on this debate is really close – there is only a 7% side bias, which is statistically not much.

#### 3] Aff gets infinite prep to frame the debate while neg is only reactionary – I can only hope to adapt but your frontlines ensure you will be always ahead

#### All of these arguments respond to aff spikes that assume affirming is harder, specifically spikes #
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