# Valley r4 1nc

## 1

#### Interpretation: debaters may not read multiple reasons to substantively auto affirm the the resolution. To clarify apriori bad

#### Violation: they did in their aff

#### Reciprocity: mutltiple aprirois put the neg at least at a 3-1 skew if not infinite skew which severely skews rhe neg time. Reciprocity key to fairness cuz it key to balanced burdens

#### Ableism: multiple aprioris are ableist cuz it forces debaters to minesweep find small game over issues while also trying to answer a full aff fwk anf theory args. They creates an epistemic skew on everything the aff says cuz it’s only true cuz I couldn’t minesweep it in time and also key to fairness ensuring th equity of all people in debate

#### Fairness first –

#### A] Inescapable – all arguments presuppose fair evaluation because otherwise the judge could just hack for the other side.

#### B] The judge has to indicate who won the round, fairness best coheres with this since if one debater had ten minutes to speak and the other had three there would be incongruence that alters ability to judge the truth value of your arguments so cross-applications don’t work.

## 2

#### Interpretation – The aff must clarify an explicit advocacy text in the text of the AC Violation – They don’t specify Standards – 1] Stable Advocacy – a) I have no idea what you defend which means I can’t formulate a 1nc until after the 1ac is read which decks disclosure and prep and means cx doesn’t check b) Anything else allows cherry-picking lit that supports your offense and then shifting out of indites by claiming you don’t defend them which makes the aff a moving target and skews neg strategy. 2] Resolvability – All arguments link to an advocacy text as otherwise there’s no uniqueness or links that can be used to develop comparisons between the aff and the neg. Absent an explicit text its impossible to weigh which crushes resolvability and that’s a voter since the judge needs to be able to make a coherent decision for anything else to matter.

## 3

Interp: debaters must disclose what aff they’re reading 30 minutes before the round and if it’s new they must disclose the plan text.

Violation: screenshot in the doc

Graphical user interface, text, application, email

Description automatically generated

#### First is prep and clash—two internal links—

#### [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 affirmative b) aff quality—plan text disclosure discourages cheap shot affs. If the aff isn't inherent or easily defeated by 20 minutes of research, it should lose—this will answer the 1ar's claim about innovation—with 30 minutes of prep, there's still an incentive to find a new strategic, well justified aff, but no incentive to cut a horrible, incoherent aff that the neg can't check against the broader literature.

#### [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. That ow because if they can lie about their arguments, everything else they could have said is a lie and should be disregarded.

Xapply voters

## 4

#### Permissibility and presumption negate – a. the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove an obligation, permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation b. Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false. This means you negate if there is no offense because the resolution is probably false. C. we don’t presume everything true, that’s why we don’t believe in conspiracy theories

#### The neg burden is to prove that the aff won’t logically happen in the status quo, and the aff burden is to prove that it will.

#### Prefer:

#### 1] Text –

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

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

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

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

#### 2] Debatability – A] it focuses debates on empirics about squo trends rather than irresolvable abstract principles that’ve been argued for years – Resolvability is an independent voter cuz otherwise the judge can’t make a decision which means it’s a constraint on any burden because otherwise the round is impossible B] moral framework debate is impossible.

Joyce 02 Joyce, Richard. Myth of Morality. Port Chester, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 2002. p 45-47.

This distinction between what is accepted from within an institution, and “stepping out” of that institution and appraising it from an exterior perspective, is close to Carnap’s distinction between internal and external questions. 15 Certain **“linguistic frameworks”** (as Carnap calls them) **bring** with them **new** terms and **ways of talking: accepting the language of “things” licenses making assertions** like “The shirt is in the cupboard”; **accepting mathematics allows one to say “There is a prime number greater than one hundred”;** accepting the language of propositions permits saying “Chicago is large is a true proposition,” etc. Internal to the framework in question, confirming or disconfirming the truth of these propositions is a trivial matter. But traditionally **philosophers have interest**ed themselves **in** the external question – **the issue of the adequacy of the framework itself:** “Do objects exist?”, “Does the world exist?”, “**Are there numbers?”,** “Are the propositions?”, etc. Carnap’s argument is that **the** external **question,** as it has been typically construed, **does not make sense. From a perspective that accepts mathematics, the answer to the question “Do numbers exist?” is just** trivially **“Yes.”** From a perspective which has not accepted mathematics, Carnap thinks, the only sensible way of construing the question is not as a theoretical question, but as a practical one: “Shall I accept the framework of mathematics?”, and this pragmatic question is to be answered by consideration of the efficiency, the fruitfulness, the usefulness,etc., of the adoption. But the (traditional) **philosopher’s questions** – “But is mathematics true?”, “Are there really numbers?” – **are pseudo-questions.** By turning traditional philosophical questions into practical questions of the form “Shall I adopt...?”, Carnap is offering a noncognitive analysis of metaphysics. Since I am claiming that we can critically inspect morality from an external perspective – that we can ask whether there are any non-institutional reasons accompanying moral injunctions – and that such questioning would not amount to a “Shall we adopt...?” query, Carnap’s position represents a threat. What arguments does Carnap offer to his conclusion? He starts with the example of the “thing language,” which involves reference to objects that exist in time and space. **To** step out of the thing language and **ask “But does the world exist?” is a mistake,** Carnap thinks, **because the very notion of “existence” is a term which belongs to the thing language, and can be understood only within that framework, “hence this concept cannot be meaningfully applied to the system itself.”** 16 Moving on to the external question “Do numbers exist?” Carnap cannot use the same argument – he cannot say that “existence” is internal to the number language and thus cannot be applied to the system as a whole. Instead he says that philosophers who ask the question do not mean material existence, but have no clear understanding of what other kind of existence might be involved, thus such questions have no cognitive content. It appears that this is the form of argument which he is willing to generalize to all further cases: **persons who dispute** whether propositions exist, **whether properties exist,** etc., do not know what they are arguing over, thus they **are not arguing over the truth of a proposition,** but over the practical value of their respective positions. Carnap adds that this is so because there is nothing that both parties would possibly count as evidence that would sway the debate one way or the other.

#### 3] 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 since there are structural barriers that preclude. Also you don’t get to say in the 1ar that the aff is non inherent because you took a stance in the aff that it was which is an academic integrity issue.