# 1NC R4 UH

## 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 it questions whether the judge should go outside the scope of the game

#### 1] The[[3]](#footnote-3) “(with a unit of time) the present; the current.” but appropriation has no specified time frame

#### 2] appropriation[[4]](#footnote-4) is a sum of money or total of assets devoted to a special purpose.” but outer space cannot own a sum of money

#### 3] of[[5]](#footnote-5) “expressing an age” but the rez is atemporal

#### 4] outer[[6]](#footnote-6) is “further from the center or inside..” but the resolution is aspacial and doesn’t specify distance

#### 5] space[[7]](#footnote-7) is to “the dimensions of height, depth, and width within which all things exist and move” but the rez doesn’t volume

#### 6] by[[8]](#footnote-8) is “indicating the amount or size of a margin.” but the resolution and entities doesn’t specify

#### 6] private[[9]](#footnote-9) is “(of a person) having no official or public role or position.” so entities have no authority over appropriation

#### 7] entity[[10]](#footnote-10) is “the existence of a thing as contrasted with its attributes” but the rez doesn’t spec

#### 8] is[[11]](#footnote-11) describes being “Stay in the same place or condition.” so action is impossible and negate on presumption

#### **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.

#### 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.

## 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

#### Skepticism negates

#### 1] Resolution can never be true because the aff has to prove they prescribe an obligatory moral action, but no moral actions negates textually, it makes no sense to affirm if they cant win not appropriating is good

#### 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. Those ethical obligations have to be 100% correct and have a 100% certainty behind them because ethical theories will collapse if obligations can be contingent

#### 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.**

## 3

#### Interpretation – the Affirmative must specify what enforcement mechanism that they use

#### 2] Violation: they don’t

#### 3] Standards

#### a] Shiftiness – vague plan wording wrecks Neg Ground since it’s impossible to know which DAs link or which CPs are competitive since different types of enforcement shift out of basic neg ground like Space Mining, Space Col, and Satellites – absent 1AC specification, the 1AR can squirrel out of links by saying they don’t effect a certain type of ssat or they don’t reduce private appropriation enough to trigger the link.

#### b] Topic Education – nuanced debates about private property in Outer Space requires specification since each form of enforcement has specific issues related to it so generalization disincentivizes in-depth research. Topic Education is a voter since we only debate the topic for two months.

#### Fairness is a voter since it’s debate is a game so it’s a jurisdictional question and sequencing to evaluating any other argument in the debate.

#### Espec Spec isn’t regressive – it’s a core discussion central to the literature, we’ve read a card proving predictability, and is a floor for topic debates.

#### – CX doesn’t check - 1] Skews pre-round prep – key to in-depth clash, 2] Judges don’t flow CX, 3] Unverifiable and Irresolvable, 4] Skews CX Time since it forces me to clarify rather than pursue lines of argumentation, and 5] Allows them to change advocacy based on what my CX questions are which irreparably skews my Neg Strat.

#### Education is a voter since it is the only portable and durable skill that influences our subject formation. Fairness is a voter since a] debate is a game, competition equity matters proven by desire for wins, b] is worthless without rules and equal access.

#### Drop the debater – a] deters future abuse through a loss and b] set better norms for debate since you are less likely to repeat a practice you can lose for

#### Competing interps – [a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear model of debate, [b] it creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate through offense [c] offense defense paradigm is the best method for evaluation since you can compare benefits under both interps easier.

#### No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, if logic isn’t true then you should hack against them, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices

## 4

#### Interp: debaters must record their speeches

#### Violation: They didn’t record, that was cx

#### A] Cheating – debaters can fake internet drop offs and then steal prep which decks reciprocity. O/Ws since it destroys competitive incentives and educational value.

#### B] Accidents

## 5

#### Interp: Debaters must show-up to the tech-check

(NSDA, National Speech and Debate Association) Online Speech and Debate Competition Tips No Date <https://drive.google.com/uc?export=download&id=15gZxwk_e7FdlEAiRU0yrqOUQDbExZ-4h> DOA 9/18/21 Cho

Test your technology - It never hurts to test your technology more than once. In fact, problems can arise because of mistakes such as forgetting to plug in your computer the night before. Test everything; if there is an issue that occurs right before the round, it is best to have it resolved early. If you have backup technology, you may also want to test that. If your computer dies, but you know how to use your phone and you have printed a copy of your case, you may be able to keep going in a pinch.

#### Violation: They were late, screenshots in doc, 15 b4 expected (12:45 CST)

Graphical user interface, application

Description automatically generated

#### 1] Tech issues – testing tech pre-round is key to functional debates like audio quality and sound settings. O/Ws A] Sequencing – controls the internal link to other standards B] Reversibility – you could get disqualified for being late.

#### 2] Prep Skew – I had to spend 15 minutes checking my tech while they could be prepping which irreparably skews the burdens in their favor. O/Ws on structural abuse since it’s the only verifiable impact.

#### 3] Delay – Late tech-checks and preventable tech issues delay RFDs and future pairings 2 impacts – (A) Scope – delaying the tournament skews flight 2 neg debaters, big prep-squads (B) Late rounds cause sleep-deficits which is bad for your health and skews your ability to effectively clash and engage.

#### 4] Disqualification – you could get disqualified which is a lexical pre-requisite to other standards.

## 6

#### Interpretation - the affirmative can only garner offense from the hypothetical implementation of their plan text

#### Resolved means a legislative policy

Merriam Webster '18 (Merriam Webster; 2018 Edition; Online dictionary and legal resource; Merriam Webster, "resolve," <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resolve;> RP)  
: a legal or official determination especially: a legislative declaration

#### Violation- They defend the resolution as a general principle and refuse to defend impacts under implementation

#### A] Clash, the resolution serves as a predictable stasis point to enhance accessible research and equitable ground, but obfuscating that limit makes negative preparation impossible because any ground we receive is self-serving, concessionary, and from distorted literature bases---defining a role for negation is essential to sustaining competition and comes before any affirmative offense---the impact is debatability

#### B] Limits —re-contextualizing the resolution lets them defend any method exploding limits, which erases neg ground and renders research burdens untenable for points of difference for third- and fourth-line testing, DAs, PICs, CPs, that are all intuitive points of research are null and void, our interp link turns creativity by allowing both sides to predict arguments, research deficits, and clash---we access the a stronger internal link because of equitable burdens

#### TVA – Read the affirmative advocacy and offense while defending that negatives can read and weigh neg offense through defending implementation

## 7

#### Interpretation: Debaters may not change any parts of the affirmative within 10 minutes of the round if they have sent a version of the 1AC that was not open sourced

#### Vio- they did

A picture containing graphical user interface

Description automatically generated

#### Standards

#### A] Bait and switch

#### B] Neg strat skew

1. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Dictionary.com – maintain as true, Merriam Webster – to say that something is true, Vocabulary.com – to affirm something is to confirm that it is true, Oxford dictionaries – accept the validity of, Thefreedictionary – assert to be true* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <https://www.google.com/search?q=the+definitino&oq=the+definitino&aqs=chrome..69i57j0i67i433j0i67l2j46i433i512j69i60l3.1308j1j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> [Definition #3] [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <https://www.google.com/search?q=appropriation&sxsrf=AOaemvKQemU4kDt9dtiwQnUVUU7LW9GCoQ%3A1639410269344&ei=XWq3YbTHFI-tqtsPs_eviAo&ved=0ahUKEwj06fqVj-H0AhWPlmoFHbP7C6EQ4dUDCA4&uact=5&oq=appropriation&gs_lcp=Cgdnd3Mtd2l6EAMyCQgjECcQRhD5ATIECCMQJzIECCMQJzINCAAQgAQQhwIQsQMQFDIFCAAQkQIyBQgAEJECMgUIABCRAjIFCAAQgAQyBQgAEIAEMgUIABCABDoHCAAQRxCwAzoRCC4QgAQQsQMQgwEQxwEQ0QM6BQguEIAEOg4ILhCABBCxAxDHARCjAjoLCAAQgAQQsQMQgwE6CAguELEDEIMBOggIABCABBCxAzoICAAQsQMQkQJKBAhBGABKBAhGGABQ3wNY4gxgiQ5oA3ABeACAAbsBiAHTDZIBBDAuMTKYAQCgAQHIAQjAAQE&sclient=gws-wiz> [Definition #2] [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. <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-5)
6. <https://www.google.com/search?q=outer+definition&sxsrf=AOaemvIhqFMqUlofS44KTL7ifSUoUpqMpg%3A1639410214502&ei=Jmq3YdOBHpeAqtsP386owAY&ved=0ahUKEwjTrOf7juH0AhUXgGoFHV8nCmgQ4dUDCA4&uact=5&oq=outer+definition&gs_lcp=Cgdnd3Mtd2l6EAMyCggAEIAEEEYQ-QEyBggAEBYQHjIGCAAQFhAeMgYIABAWEB4yBggAEBYQHjIGCAAQFhAeMgYIABAWEB4yBggAEBYQHjIGCAAQFhAeMgYIABAWEB46BwgjELADECc6BwgAEEcQsAM6BwgAELADEEM6CgguEMgDELADEEM6EAguEMcBENEDEMgDELADEEM6BAgjECc6BAgAEEM6BwguELEDEEM6DQgAEIAEEIcCELEDEBQ6CAgAEIAEELEDOggILhCABBCxAzoPCAAQgAQQhwIQFBBGEPkBOgUIABCABDoFCC4QgAQ6CAgAEBYQChAeSgQIQRgASgQIRhgBUKUEWKULYNYMaAFwAngAgAG7AogB1gySAQc0LjMuMi4xmAEAoAEByAEUwAEB&sclient=gws-wiz> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. <https://www.google.com/search?q=space+definition&sxsrf=AOaemvJCUtDfS7K6xg7bvFxIzhK9FJW9zg%3A1639410218441&ei=Kmq3YYeqGquxqtsPsOKc6Ao&ved=0ahUKEwiH59f9juH0AhWrmGoFHTAxB60Q4dUDCA4&uact=5&oq=space+definition&gs_lcp=Cgdnd3Mtd2l6EAMyEggAEIAEEIcCELEDEBQQRhD5ATIKCAAQgAQQhwIQFDIFCAAQgAQyBQgAEIAEMgUIABCABDIFCAAQgAQyBQgAEIAEMgYIABAHEB4yBggAEAcQHjIGCAAQBxAeOgcIABBHELADOgcIABCwAxBDOggIABDkAhCwAzoKCC4QyAMQsAMQQzoJCAAQDRBGEPkBOgQIABANSgQIQRgASgQIRhgBUMADWM4KYPoLaAJwAngBgAG4AogByAaSAQcyLjMuMC4xmAEAoAEByAERwAEB&sclient=gws-wiz> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. https://www.google.com/search?q=bydefinition&sxsrf=AOaemvIC6dSnVeMkZO0wlH47wbNgFcIzjQ%3A1639411091334&ei=k223YeLmE4e4qtsPtbK\_wAw&ved=0ahUKEwii\_PSdkuH0AhUHnGoFHTXZD8gQ4dUDCA4&uact=5&oq=bydefinition&gs\_lcp=Cgdnd3Mtd2l6EAMyBggAEAcQHjIHCAAQsQMQQzIGCAAQBxAeMgYIABAHEB4yBggAEAcQHjIGCAAQBxAeMgYIABAHEB4yBAgAEAoyBggAEAcQHjIGCAAQBxAeOgcIABBHELADOgcIABCwAxBDSgQIQRgASgQIRhgAUMIDWI0EYNsFaAJwAngAgAFmiAG6AZIBAzEuMZgBAKABAcgBCsABAQ&sclient=gws-wiz [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. <https://www.google.com/search?q=private+&sxsrf=AOaemvKrE7ST0w4qUZ-RKdtZn9IgoX7yRg%3A1639411236676&ei=JG63YaHlKOGuqtsP_Per4AI&ved=0ahUKEwihh5zjkuH0AhVhl2oFHfz7CiwQ4dUDCA4&uact=5&oq=private+&gs_lcp=Cgdnd3Mtd2l6EAMyBAgjECcyBAgjECcyCAgAEIAEEMkDMgUIABCSAzIFCAAQkgMyCAguEIAEELEDMggIABCABBCxAzIFCAAQgAQyCAgAEIAEELEDMggIABCABBCxAzoHCAAQRxCwAzoFCAAQkQI6CAguELEDEIMBOg4ILhCABBCxAxDHARCjAjoFCC4QgAQ6CwguEIAEEMcBEKMCOgsILhCABBCxAxCDAToOCC4QgAQQsQMQxwEQ0QM6CAgAELEDEJECOg0IABCABBCHAhCxAxAUOgoIABCABBCHAhAUOgUIABCxA0oECEEYAEoECEYYAFDkBFi_C2CbDWgDcAF4AIAB4wGIAesJkgEFMC42LjKYAQCgAQHIAQjAAQE&sclient=gws-wiz> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. <https://www.google.com/search?q=worker+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=worker+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57.3726j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. <https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/be> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)