# 1NC R1

## 1

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

#### Most educational since otherwise we wouldn’t use math or logic to approach topics. Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – T/F binary is descriptive and technical.

#### 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 which means it’s constitutive and jurisdictional, that outweighs since it’s a procedural question of arguments that they can evaluate

#### 1] a[[3]](#footnote-3) “used when expressing rates or ratios; in, to, or for each; per” but there are no numbers in the rez

#### 2] government[[4]](#footnote-4) is “direction; control; management; rule” but a direction can’t perform an action

#### 3] to[[5]](#footnote-5) is to “expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location)” but the rez doesn’t have a location

#### 4] recognize[[6]](#footnote-6) is to “(of a person presiding at a meeting or debate) call on (someone) to speak” but a right can’t speak

#### 5] an[[7]](#footnote-7) “forming names of organic compounds, chiefly polysaccharides” but a right isn’t an organic compound

#### 6] of[[8]](#footnote-8) “expressing an age” but the rez is atemporal

## 2

#### Permissibility and presumption negate

#### 1] Obligations- the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove an obligation, policies require positive justification 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

#### 4] Affirmation theory- Affirming requires unconditionally maintaining an obligation

Affirm [is to]: maintain as true.

That’s Dictionary.com- “affirm” https://www.dictionary.com/browse/affirm

#### Every reason is equally as violent in its creation.

**Derrida,** Jacques Derrida, “Force of Law: The Mystical Foundation of Authority” //Massa

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 effectof 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**

#### Negate – objective knowledge of the external world is epistemically nonsensical.

Neta 14 [Neta, Ram. “External World Skepticism.” The Problem of The External World, 2014, philosophy.unc.edu/files/2014/06/The-Problem-of-the-External-World.pdf.] //Massa

You take yourself to know that you have hands. But notice that, **if you do have hands, then you are not merely a brain floating in a vat of nutrient fluid and being electrochemically stimulated to have the sensory experiences** that you have now: such a brain does not have hands, but you do. So if you know that you do have hands, then you must also be in a position to know that you are not such a brain. **But how could you know that you are not such a brain? If you were such a brain, everything would seem exactly as it does now**; **you would** (by hypothesis) **have all the same sensory experiences that you’re having right now.** Since your **empirical knowledge of the world** around you **must somehow be based upon your sensory experiences, how could these experiences**—the very same experiences that you would have if you were a brain in a vat—**furnish you with knowledge that you’re not such a brain? And if you don’t know that you’re not such a brain, then you cannot know that you have hands.**

## 3

#### Yes Act-Omission Distinction

#### 1] Infinite obligations – no act-omission means you’re culpable for every possible omission implying they’re immoral for debating instead of curing cancer which is untenable. Answering this means you negate – (a) The 1AC is suboptimal compared to some alternative (b) State action would be frozen b/c they wouldn’t be able to decide b/t alternatives so the plan wouldn’t pass and you vote on presumption.

#### 2] Trolley Problem – Omissions allow us to escape culpability in otherwise unavoidable situations like when someone pulls the lever to kill 1 instead of 2 – otherwise we’re always categorically wrong which makes morality inaccessible, only the distinction solves. O/ws on Bindingness, if an agent is permanently violating their ethical standard, they can’t take moral action.

#### Negate

#### Not recognizing an unconditional right to strike is a legitimate moral action to avoid infinite culpability.

## 4

#### Interpretation – All theoretical paradigm issues must be contextual to their corresponding interpretations. To clarify, arguments that frame the evaluation of a particular shell should have particular framing arguments. //Massa

#### B] Violation – they don’t – *[Insert]*. Meeting our interpretation necessitates that arguments like DTD, CI, and RVIs should have specific reasons why those issues are good for their particular norm. Paradigm issues that apply to the content of all theoretical arguments, regardless of whether only the aff or neg has access to them, violate the interpretation. For example, drop the debater on spec shells for x reason meets our interp but aff theory is DTD does not.

#### C] Prefer –

#### Norming – specific framing arguments erase frivolous application of norms and generate in depth discussions of interpretations.

#### 1] 1ar theory sucks – 1acs are incentivized to read generic 1ar theory paradigm issues and deploy them to spam no-risk shells

#### 2] Contestation – no one engages in the particularities of a shell if they have the option to recycle the same reasonability block.

#### 3] Recourse – generic issues put all shells on the same argumentative plane. Must be from West Virginia is obviously different than 8 condo, but they’re weighed equally as norms and implications which is intuitively false

#### 4] Theoretical Abuse – Their model of debate justifies infinite theoretical abuse due to how difficult it is to answer their arguments under generic paradigm issues. For example, it’s near impossible to generate counter interp offense against some disclosure and spec shells because there’s just no good reason why you shouldn’t disclose things like round reports or whether you won or lost or why you shouldn’t spec the 10th plank of the colt peacemaker.
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