# 1NC

## 1

#### To find truth, we must doubt everything. Prefer:

#### [1] Philosophers have been arguing over morality for thousands of years with no progress which proves we’re not close to the truth so restarting from the bottom is key to accurate determination of truth.

#### [2] Logic – if we argue based on unjustified assumptions, then we are not being logical – logic key because we can only evaluate logical arguments.

#### Sinnott-Armstrong 15 Sinnot-Armstrong, Walter, (Philosopher), “Moral Skepticism”, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. 17/9/15. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/skepticism-moral/#MorExp>. //LHP AV

The final kind of argument derives from René Descartes (1641). I do not seem justified in believing that what I see is a lake if I cannot rule out the possibility that it is a bay or a bayou. Generalizing**, if there is any contrary hypothesis that I cannot rule out, then I am not justified in believing** that **what I see** is a lake. **This is** supposed to be **a common standard for justified belief**. When this principle is applied thoroughly, **it leads to skepticism**. **All a skeptic needs to show is that, for each belief, there is some contrary hypothesis that cannot be ruled out**. It need not be the same hypothesis for every belief, but skeptics usually buy wholesale instead of retail, so they seek a single hypothesis that is contrary to all (or many common) beliefs and which cannot be ruled out in any way.

#### [3] Theory – Defending theories with illogical assumptions guts predictability since any possible wrong thing can emerge that we aren’t prepared to contest.

#### Thus, the aff must make 100% sure they’re right to fulfill their burden or else you negate. Also, aff has an absolute burden of proof – any doubt means you negate since a claim not that claim can’t be true so any risk of falsity is entirely false.

#### Presumption and permissibility negate – a) more often false than true since I can prove something false in infinite ways which outweighs on probability b) real world policies require positive justification before being adopted which outweighs on empirics c) ought means the aff has to prove an obligation if that definition is legitimate which means lack of that obligation negates. Even under comparing worlds these arguments negate since it requires them to prove the statement that “the aff world is more desirable than the neg world” true. However, my args deny their ability to prove statements true so you presume neg. Also, I don’t need to win presumption to win, I just need to win any of the arguments below because the aff is false, not just no offense and if I’m textual I’m fair because the topic is the most predictable, so you could’ve engaged and I deny the truth of the res by disagreeing that its true and exists so I’ve met my burden.

#### 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

#### Prefer on 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. Also, better since it focuses on real world instances rather than recycling old frameworks and evaluate after the 1N so we both have one speech which is key to reciprocity.

#### Negate:

#### [Negate –

#### 2] of[[1]](#footnote-1) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time

#### 3] the[[2]](#footnote-2) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but the WTO isn’t a disease

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

#### 5] reduce[[4]](#footnote-4) is to “(of a person) lose weight, typically by dieting” but IP doesn’t have a body to lose weight.

#### 6] for[[5]](#footnote-5) is “in place of” but medicines aren’t replacing IP.

#### 7] medicine[[6]](#footnote-6) is “(especially among some North American Indian peoples) a spell, charm, or fetish believed to have healing, protective, or other power” but you can’t have IP for a spell.

#### [8] Inherency – either a) the aff is non-inherent and you vote neg on presumption or b) it is and it isn’t logically going to happen, and fairness is terminally unquantifiable.

#### [9] In order to say I want to fix x problem, you must say that you want x problem to exist, since it requires the problem exist to solve, which makes any moral attempt inherently immoral.

#### [10] To go anywhere, you must go halfway first, and then you must go half of the remaining distance ad infinitum – thus, motion is impossible because it necessitates traversing an infinite number of spaces in finite time and theory is paradoxical since it uses arguments to justify being unable to make arguments

#### [11] Rule following fails a) We can infinitely question why to follow that rule, as all rules will terminate at the assertion of some principle with no further justification b) Rule are arbitrary since the agent has the ability to formulate a unique understanding of them. It becomes impossible to say someone is violating a rule, since they can always perceive their actions as a non-violation.

#### [12] In order to find the answer to a question, you must ask if there is an answer, otherwise asking the question is pointless, but that requires asking whether or not there’s an answer to that question and so forth ad infinitum – this means the quest for knowledge fails and the acquisition of truth is impossible – negate since we can’t ensure resolutional truth value.

#### [13] you can’t be sure anything besides yourself exists – we could be deceived by a demon, dreaming, or in a simulation so the whole world could be nonexistent and text over spirit because it’s the only verifiable metric and key to set long term interp norms.

#### [14] Solipsism is true—overwhelming mathematical probability proves

**Carroll 13** [Sean Carroll (Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, Moore Center for Theoretical Cosmology and Physics) “The Higgs Boson vs. Boltzmann Brains” August 22nd 2013 Preposterous Universe <http://www.preposterousuniverse.com/blog/2013/08/22/the-higgs-boson-vs-boltzmann-brains/> JW 1/22/15]

A room full of monkeys, hitting keys randomly on a typewriter, will eventually bang out a perfect copy of Hamlet. Assuming, of course, that their typing is perfectly random, and that it keeps up for a long time. An extremely long time indeed, much longer than the current age of the universe. So this is an amusing thought experiment, not a viable proposal for creating new works of literature (or old ones). There’s an interesting feature of what these thought-experiment monkeys end up producing. Let’s say you find a monkey who has just typed Act I of Hamlet with perfect fidelity. You might think “aha, here’s when it happens,” and expect Act II to come next. But by the conditions of the experiment, the next thing the monkey types should be perfectly random (by which we mean, chosen from a uniform distribution among all allowed typographical characters), and therefore independent of what has come before. The chances that you will actually get Act II next, just because you got Act I, are extraordinarily tiny. For every one time that your monkeys type Hamlet correctly, they will type it incorrectly an enormous number of times — small errors, large errors, all of the words but in random order, the entire text backwards, some scenes but not others, all of the lines but with different characters assigned to them, and so forth. Given that any one passage matches the original text, it is still overwhelmingly likely that the passages before and after are random nonsense. That’s the Boltzmann Brain problem in a nutshell. Replace your typing monkeys with a box of atoms at some temperature, and let the atoms randomly bump into each other for an indefinite period of time. Almost all the time they will be in a disordered, high-entropy, equilibrium state. Eventually, just by chance, they will take the form of a smiley face, or Michelangelo’s David, or absolutely any configuration that is compatible with what’s inside the box. If you wait long enough, and your box is sufficiently large, you will get a person, a planet, a galaxy, the whole universe as we now know it. But given that some of the atoms fall into a familiar-looking arrangement, we still expect the rest of the atoms to be completely random. Just because you find a copy of the Mona Lisa, in other words, doesn’t mean that it was actually painted by Leonardo or anyone else; with overwhelming probability it simply coalesced gradually out of random motions. Just because you see what looks like a photograph, there’s no reason to believe it was preceded by an actual event that the photo purports to represent. If the random motions of the atoms create a person with firm memories of the past, all of those memories are overwhelmingly likely to be false.

## 2

#### 1. Logic: Debate is fundamentally a game with rules, which requires the better competitor to win. Every other ROB is just a reason why there are other ways to play the game but are not consistent enough with the purpose of the game to vote on, just like you don’t win a basketball game for shooting the most 3s. 2. Fiat is illusory: 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. Answering this triggers constitutivism since the win is necessary for your scholarship which means rules inside of the game matter. 3. Isomorphism: 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. Truth testing solves since it’s solely a question of if something is true or false, there isn’t a closest estimate. 4. Inclusion: a) 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. b) Anything can function under truth testing insofar as it proves the resolution either true or false. Specific role of the ballots exclude all offense besides those that follow from their framework which shuts out people without the technical skill or resources to prep for it. 5. Normativity: Truth testing is the only ROB that encourages moral action guiding in every situation through an ethical fwk. Other ROBs pinpoint a problem, yet fail to apply in other ethical circumstances besides the one at hand. Proves that other ROBs trigger permissibility since they don’t condemn things that fall outside the scope of discussion. 6. Constitutivism: the ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic and five dictionaries[[7]](#footnote-7) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[8]](#footnote-8) as to prove true b) the purpose of debate is the acquisition of knowledge in pursuit of truth – a resolutional focus is key to depth of exploration which o/w on specificity. It’s a jurisdictional issue since it questions whether the judge should go outside the scope of the game.

## Case:

#### Reject 1AR Theory They have 7-6 time skew They have two speeches on theory and I have one which is def irreciporcal Its not inf abuse because I only have 7 mins If you don’t buy that, Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is crazy aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to– reasonability checks 2AR sandbagging by preventing crazy abusive 1NCs while still giving the 2N a chance. DTA on 1AR shells - They can blow up a blippy 20 second shell to 3 min of the 2AR while I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention and means 1AR theory is irresolvable so you shouldn’t stake the round on it. No new 1ar theory paradigm issues- A~ the 1NC has already occurred with current paradigm issues in mind so new 1ar paradigms moot any theoretical offense B~ introducing them in the aff allows for them to be more rigorously tested which o/w’s on time frame since we can set higher quality norms.
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