## OFF

### 1

#### Interp – if the aff defends anything other than the entire resolution then they must provide a linked article or a card by an author who explicitly advocates against the 1AC advocacy. To clarify, you must have a counter-solvency advocate. Violation – Standards – 1] Limits – there are infinite things you could defend outside the exact text of the resolution which pushes you to the limits of contestable arguments, even if your interp of the topic is better, the only way to verify if it’s substantively fair is proof of counter-arguments.

#### 2] Shiftiness – having a counter-solvency advocate helps us conceptualize what their advocacy is and how it’s implemented. Intentionally ambiguous affirmatives we don’t know much about can’t spike out of DA’s and CP’s if they have an advocate that delineates these things.

#### 3] Research – forces the aff to go to the other side of the library and contest their own view points, as well as encouraging in depth-research about their own position.

#### Fairness because debate’s a game and education because it’s the only portable skill from debate. Drop the debater – a) Deters future abuse, b) Rectifies time loss, c) DTA encourages baiting – Debaters could fill their cases w/ abusive args, baiting theory and then just drop the argument in the next speech and go for undercovered substance

#### 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

### 2

#### Interp – the aff must explicitly delineate a comprehensive role of the ballot and how the round plays out under it in the form of a text in the 1AC. To clarify, they must –

#### - Clarify how offense links to it, e.g. address the pre-fiat vs post-fiat distinction

#### - Clarify whether theory is relevant under it

#### - Clarify how to weigh between competing advocacies, e.g. if the ballot is determined by the flow

#### Violation – there’s no text in the 1AC

#### Standards –

#### 1] Engagement – if I don’t know how the role of the ballot functions, it’s 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.

#### 2] 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.

### 3

#### No 1AR theory – a) 1ar theory means it’s game over for the 2nr because of the 2ar collapse – the negative will inevitably undercover something, b) I can respond to 1ar only once which both kills resolvability and kills reciprocity since they can respond to 1nc shells twice.

#### Reasonability on 1ar theory – 7 minutes of the 1nc means they will always find there’s something abusive we did – reasonability’s key to incentivizing in-depth discussion rather than a 2ar collapse on theory.

#### Drop the arg on 1ar theory – 1ar theory is incentivized to restart the debate and avoid the 1n. Drop the arg solves because if one position the 1nc was abusive, then ignoring it in the 2ar allows evaluation of substance.

#### RVIs on 1ar theory – anything thing else puts me in a double bind because I’ll either overcover substance and undercover theory or vice versa which makes negating impossible – RVIs solve by creating another route to the ballot to compensate.

#### Competing interps –

#### 1] Norm setting – if you can’t defend why your model of debate is BETTER than your opponents’ model, then you should be held accountable for still using it – o/w on longevity since people follow rules in the future, not just this round

#### 2] Jurisdiction – even a marginal skew impairs your ability to determine the better debater and only competing interps allows us to determine that via offense defense

#### 3] Infinite abuse – unfair practices should be minimized but reasonability allows people to get away with defense, creating a race to the bottom where debaters try to get away with as much “reasonable” abuse as they can.

#### 4] Their indicts are potential abuse claims – if I win abuse on the interp then it isn’t frivolous and proves you’re unreasonable

### 4

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement –

#### The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – five dictionaries define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm 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.

#### Answers collapse to truth testing since they require truth value i.e. truth testing is false requires proving that it is true that truth testing is false. Inclusion is a fallacy of origin because just because something is a prerequisite doesn’t make it more important

#### Nothing leaves this round other than the result on the ballot which means even if there is a higher purpose, it doesn’t change anything, and you should just write whatever is important on the ballot and vote for me.

#### 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.

#### 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

#### 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.

#### New 2nr answers to everything – otherwise the 1ar could outspread me

#### 1] appropriation[[1]](#footnote-1) is defined as “a sum of money or total of assets devoted to a special purpose.” but that’s a noun.

#### 2] of[[2]](#footnote-2) defined as “expressing an age” but the rez is atemporal.

#### Neg definition choice – anything kills 1nc strategy since I premised my engagement on your lack of a definition.

#### **1] We’re in 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.

#### 2] Paradox of tolerance- to be completely open to the aff we must exclude perspectives that wouldn’t be open to it which makes complete tolerance impossible.

#### 3] 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.

#### 4] 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.

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

#### 6] Arrows Paradox- If time is divided into 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 and vice versa; therefore, no model can be useful.

#### **8] 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.

#### 9] 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.

#### 10] 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

### 5

#### The meta ethic is practical reason.

#### 1] Is-ought gap – empiricism can only observe what is since that’s the only thing in our perception, not what ought to be, but it’s impossible to derive an ought from descriptive premises which requires a priori premises to form morality.

#### 2] Empirical uncertainty– evil demon could deceive us, dreaming, simulation, and inability to know other’s experiences makes empiricism an unreliable basis for universal ethics.

#### 3] Infallibility – practical reason is the only unescapable authority because to ask why we should be reasoners is to concede authority to reason since the question itself uses reason – anything else is nonbinding and arbitrary.

#### Reason requires that maxims we act upon must be universalizable – any reasoner would know that two plus two equals four because there is no a priori distinction between agents so norms must be universally valid.

#### And willing an action that violates the freedom of others is a contradiction – if I decide to kill someone, that action is not universalizable because that would justify other people killing me too.

#### Thus, the standard is respecting freedom. Prefer additionally –

#### 1] Performativity—freedom is the key to the process of justification of arguments. Willing that we should 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.

#### Acquisition of property can never be unjust – to create rights violations, there must already be an owner of the property being violated, but that presupposes its appropriation by another entity.

Feser 1, (Edward Feser, 1-1-2005, accessed on 12-15-2021, Cambridge University Press, "THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN UNJUST INITIAL ACQUISITION | Social Philosophy and Policy | Cambridge Core", Edward C. Feser is an American philosopher. He is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at Pasadena City College in Pasadena, California. [https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)[brackets](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)%5bbrackets) for gen lang]//phs st

There is a serious difficulty with this criticism of Nozick, however. It is just this: There is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition of resources; therefore, there is no case to be made for redistributive taxation on the basis of alleged injustices in initial acquisition. This is, to be sure, a bold claim. Moreover, in making it, I contradict not only Nozick’s critics, but Nozick himself, who clearly thinks it is at least possible for there to be injustices in acquisition, whether or not there have in fact been any (or, more realistically, whether or not there have been enough such injustices to justify continual redistributive taxation for the purposes of rectifying them). But here is a case where Nozick has, I think, been too generous to the other side. Rather than attempt —unsatisfactorily, in the view of his critics—to meet the challenge to show that initial acquisition has not in general been unjust, he ought instead to have insisted that there is no such challenge to be met in the first place. Giving what I shall call “the basic argument” for this audacious claim will be the task of Section II of this essay. The argument is, I think, compelling, but by itself it leaves unexplained some widespread intu- itions to the effect that certain specific instances of initial acquisition are unjust and call forth as their remedy the application of a Lockean proviso, or are otherwise problematic. (A “Lockean proviso,” of course, is one that forbids initial acquisitions of resources when these acquisitions do not leave “enough and as good” in common for others.) Thus, Section III focuses on various considerations that tend to show how those intuitions are best explained in a way consistent with the argument of Section II. Section IV completes the task of accounting for the intuitions in question by considering how the thesis of self-ownership itself bears on the acqui- sition and use of property. Section V shows how the results of the previ- ous sections add up to a more satisfying defense of Nozickian property rights than the one given by Nozick himself, and considers some of the implications of this revised conception of initial acquisition for our under- standing of Nozick’s principles of transfer and rectification. II. The Basic Argument The reason there is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition of resources is that there is no such thing as either a just or an unjust initial acquisition of resources. The concept of justice, that is to say, simply does not apply to initial acquisition. It applies only after initial acquisition has already taken place. In particular, it applies only to transfers of property (and derivatively, to the rectification of injustices in transfer). This, it seems to me, is a clear implication of the assumption (rightly) made by Nozick that external resources are initially unowned. Consider the following example. Suppose an individual A seeks to acquire some previously unowned resource R. For it to be the case that A commits an injustice in acquiring R, it would also have to be the case that there is some individual B (or perhaps a group of individuals) against whom A commits the injustice. But for B to have been wronged by A’s acquisi- tion of R, B would have to have had a rightful claim over R, a right to R. By hypothesis, however, B did not have a right to R, because no one had a right to it—it was unowned, after all. So B was not wronged and could not have been. In fact, the very first person who could conceivably be wronged by anyone’s use of R would be, not B, but A himself, since A is the first one to own R. Such a wrong would in the nature of the case be an injustice in transfer—in unjustly taking from A what is rightfully his—not in initial acquisition. The same thing, by extension, will be true of all unowned resources: it is only after some- one has initially acquired them that anyone could unjustly come to possess them, via unjust transfer. It is impossible, then, for there to be any injustices in initial acquisition.7

### 6

#### The standard is consistency with the logical consequence of the resolution. Prefer –

#### 1] Text –

#### Oxford Dictionary defines ought as “used to indicate something that is probable.”

<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought> //Massa

#### Ought is “used to express logical consequence” as defined by Merriam-Webster

(<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought>) //Massa

#### 2] Neg definition choice – the aff should have defined ought in the 1ac because it was in the rez so it’s predictable contestation, by not doing so they have forfeited their right to read a new definition – kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement on a lack of your definition.

#### Now negate –

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

## Case

### 1NC – Util

#### 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.

#### Util triggers permissibility –

#### 1] Util can’t guide action because it never has consistent rules – morality constantly changes based on each situation’s specific benefits. Without tangible rules to tell people how to be moral, they don’t know how to act.

#### 2] There’s always infinite pleasure and pain in the universe—util is incoherent since we can’t add or subtract from that

**Bostrom ’08** (Bostrom, Nick [Professor at University of Oxford, director of Oxford’s Future of Humanity Institute, PhD from London School of Economics]. The Infinitarian Challenge to Aggregative Ethics. 2008. http://www.nickbostrom.com/ethics/infinite.pdf)

In the standard Big Bang model, assuming the simplest topology (i.e., that space is singly connected), there are three basic possibilities: the universe can be open, flat, or closed. **Current data suggests a flat or open universe**, although the final verdict is pending. **If the universe is either open or flat, then it [that] is spatially infinite at every point in time and the model entails that it contains an infinite number of galaxies, stars, and planets**. There exists a common misconception which confuses the universe with the (finite) ‘observable universe’. But **the observable part**—the part that coulsd causally affect us—**would be just an infinitesimal fraction of the whole**. Statements about the “mass of the universe” or the “number of protons in the universe” generally refer to the content of this observable part; see e.g. [1]. **Many cosmologists [also] believe that our universe is just one in an infinite ensemble of universes** (a multiverse), **and this adds to the probability that the world is canonically infinite**; for a popular review, see

#### 3] Predictions are impossible – any action could theoretically cause nuke war in 10 billion years

#### A] There’s no non-arbitrary cutoff to calculations since ethics shouldn’t be, but even if there were, finite possibility of infinite extinction impacts on each side make expected utility equal.

#### B] Util Can’t guide action: it requires constantly calculating to determine the maximally productive time to make an action.

#### 4] Justifying predictions is circular – there’s no reason trends continue, which means they’re justified by experience, but that relies on extrapolating trends.

#### 5] Aggregation impossible – Multiple chemicals in the brain make me happy. So, there’s no way to compare them. Or determine which ones to maximize.

#### 6] Calculative regress: util requires we calculate how much time to spend on our calculations, then how much time to spend on those calculations to infinity, freezing action which means we can never do anything since we’re always calculating the time to calculate.

1. https://www.google.com/search?q=appropriation+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS920US920&sxsrf=AOaemvJSX8zM3wZoL-211d19iAOiAzyvOg%3A1640720628143&ei=9GjLYdKYCLykqtsPxp6wiAY&ved=0ahUKEwjS4tzRoIf1AhU8kmoFHUYPDGEQ4dUDCA4&uact=5&oq=appropriation+definition&gs\_lcp=Cgdnd3Mtd2l6EAMyDQgAEIAEELEDEEYQ-QEyBQgAEIAEMgUIABCABDIFCAAQgAQyBQgAEIAEMgUIABCABDIFCAAQgAQyBQgAEIAEMgUIABCABDIFCAAQgAQ6BAgjECc6BQgAEJECOhEILhCABBCxAxCDARDHARDRAzoFCC4QgAQ6CwguEIAEEMcBEKMCOgsIABCABBCxAxCDAToOCC4QgAQQsQMQxwEQowI6FgguEIAEEIcCELEDEIMBEMcBENEDEBQ6CAgAEIAEELEDOggIABCxAxCRAjoKCAAQgAQQhwIQFDoNCAAQgAQQhwIQsQMQFDoSCAAQgAQQhwIQsQMQFBBGEPkBSgQIQRgASgQIRhgAUABYjRFgoRNoAHABeACAAacBiAH8D5IBBDE5LjWYAQCgAQHAAQE&sclient=gws-wiz [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <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-2)