# 1NC Doubles Loyola

## 1

#### A] 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 – they say 1AR theory is DTD, CI, etc without specifying conditions. Paradigm issues that apply to the content of all theoretical arguments 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] Contestation – no one engages in the particularities of a shell if they have the option to recycle the same reasonability block. Our model forces you evaluate interps practicality as a norm.

#### 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 a procedural

#### 4] Theoretical Abuse – They justify infinite theory abuse cuz of how difficult it is to answer their arguments under generics

## 2

#### Interpretation: If the affirmative debater discloses an aff at the flip then they cannot tell us a new aff 30 minutes before the round

#### Violation: They do, we inserted screenshots, the aff was kant before the flip and now its new
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#### The standard is infinite abuse, telling us the aff is kant before the flip caused me to flip negative, changing the aff post knowledge is abusive since it incentivizes teams to bait and switch vs teams in out rounds, our entire 1NC is based around previous disclosure, frame this debate through the norms that they justify, even if there was no abuse, we impacted out norming and how it’s a voter above. Infinite abuse is a voting issue, that was impacted on CPI where debaters leave the activity from arbitrary norms and push novices out, independent irreversibly skews this round.

#### The shell is DTD, its just as likely they are winning substance because we couldn’t adequately prepare for the aff there’s no argument to drop – our interpretation indicts an omission which means the only possible recourse is losing overcorrect instead of undercorrect because that lets them get away with abuse

#### Disclosure shells are CI, reasonability doesn’t make sense for disclosure

#### they knew exactly the norm they violate so they should be prepared to defend it anything else incentivizes arbitrary thresholds, for example judge intervention to determine the credence of cite box theory, specific offense framing solves, reasonability here lets them get away with murder, the abuse story is insane

#### No RVIs on disclosure, they knew their practice so letting them generate offense with a pre written CI is abusive since it incentivizes purposely having awful disclosure practices and being able to get away with it.

## 3

#### 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

#### Skepticism negates

#### 1] Resolution can never be true because the aff has to prove they prescribe an obligatory moral action as indicated by ought,

#### 2] Aff has 100% burden of proof, agents are categorically bound by your framework, if we don’t fulfill obligation under that then we are acting immorally since we are omitting.

#### We will only apply skepticism to instances of moral obligations being incoherent or the literal impossibility of the aff and relevant actors happening

#### 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**

#### Objective knowledge of the external world is epistemically nonsensical.

**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 recut CVHS SR

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.**

## 4

#### Interpretation—the aff must disclose the plan text, framework, and advantage area 30 minutes before the round. To clarify, disclosure can occur on the wiki or over message.

#### Violation—they didn’t

#### Vote neg for prep and clash—two internal links—a) 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.

#### All the disclose paradigm issues apply