# 1NC

### 1

#### Interp: Debaters must send speech docs in PDF format.

#### Violation – they use Word

#### Prefer –

#### 1] PDFs are better for file exchanges – you don’t know how [your computer/Gmail filter/speechdrop/etc] could’ve changed the format of the docs which means all their arguments are suspect and precedes your offense.

Solid Documents ND [Solid Documents. “PDF vs DOC: When to Use Each”. No Date. Accessed 7/2/21. <https://www.soliddocuments.com/pdf/_word_format/170/1?id=170&tag=1> //Xu]

File Exchange: PDF is ideal for document exchange between users. Not only is it a compact format, but it can also store metrics and information about its own appearance (layout, fonts, content, color, etc.) within the document itself. This means that it may not have to rely on the fonts and settings that may or may not be installed on a user’s computer to display properly.

#### 2] Inclusion – not everyone has access to Word licenses, which often costs hundreds of dollars and excludes low resource debaters which o/w cuz it’s a litmus test to determining whether you are accessible and is an impact multiplier for other voters

Solid Documents 2 [Solid Documents. “PDF vs DOC: When to Use Each”. No Date. Accessed 7/2/21. <https://www.soliddocuments.com/pdf/_word_format/170/1?id=170&tag=1> //Xu]

Anyone Can View It: To view a Word document, you must have proprietary software (Microsoft® Office) installed on your computer. On the other hand, a PDF can be viewed by anyone who has the free Adobe® Acrobat® Reader, which is easy to download and which comes standard on many computers running Windows operating systems. This makes PDF the preferred format for creating a document that many can view.

### 2

#### Interpretation: If the affirmative debater says allow 2AR responses to blippy 1nc tricks, they must clarify what a blippy 1NC trick is in the 1AC.

#### Violation: They don’t

#### Infinite abuse - Extempt

#### Violation –

#### Prefer-

#### Infinite abuse-

#### Norming is an independent voter since justifying the value of debate necessarily justifies the norms of the activity being good in order for debate to be valuable.

### 3

#### A. Interpretation: If the affirmative defends anything other than [Insert Topic] then they must provide a counter-solvency advocate for their specific advocacy in the 1AC. *(To clarify, you must have an author that states we should not do your aff, insofar as the aff is not a whole res phil aff)*

#### B. Violation:

#### C. Standards:

#### 1. Fairness – This is a litmus test to determining whether your aff is fair –

#### a) Limits – there are infinite things you could defend outside the exact text of the resolution which pushes you to the limits of contestable arguments, even if your interp of the topic is better, the only way to verify if it’s substantively fair is proof of counter-arguments. Nobody knows your aff better than you, so if you can’t find an answer, I can’t be expected to. Our interp narrows out trivially true advocacies since counter-solvency advocates ensure equal division of ground for both sides.

#### b) Shiftiness-Having a counter-solvency advocate helps us conceptualize what their advocacy is and how it’s implemented. Intentionally ambiguous affirmatives we don’t know much about can’t spike out of DA’s and CP’s if they have an advocate that delineates these things. Evaluate the theory debate after the 2NR – it’s key to prevent the 2AR collapse that gets 3 minutes of new arguments which makes theory irresolvable

#### 2. Research – Forces the aff to go to the other side of the library and contest their own view points, as well as encouraging in depth-research about their own position.

### 4

#### Permissibility and presumption negate

#### 1] Obligations- the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove an obligation, 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: maintain as true.

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

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement – anything else moots 7 minutes of the nc – 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.

#### Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – T/F binary is descriptive and technical.

#### Negate because either the aff is true meaning its bad for us to clash w/ it because it turns us into Fake News people OR it’s not meaning it’s a lie that you can’t vote on for ethics

#### a priori's 1st – even worlds framing requires ethics that begin from a priori principles like reason or pleasure so we control the internal link to functional debates.

#### 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 so it's constitutive and jurisdictional. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I've met my burden.

#### Negate –

#### 1] of[[3]](#footnote-3) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time

#### 2] the[[4]](#footnote-4) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but the WTO isn’t a disease

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

#### 4] 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.

#### **5] The holographic principle is the most reasonable conclusion**

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.

#### 6] Paradox of tolerance- to be completely open to the aff we must exclude perspectives that wouldn’t be open to the aff which means it’s impossible to have complete tolerance for an idea since that tolerance relies on excluding a perspective.

#### 7] Decision Making Paradox- in order to decide to do the affirmative we need a decision-making procedure to enact it, vote for it, and to determine it is a good decision. But to chose a decision-making procedure requires another meta level decision making procedure leading to infinite regress since every decision requires another decision to chose how to make a decision.

#### 8] The Place Paradox- if everything exists in a place in space time, that place must also have a place that it exists and that larger place needs a larger location to infinity. Therefore, identifying ought statements is impossible since those statements assume acting on objects in the space-time continuum.

#### 9] Grain Paradox- A single grain of millet makes no sound upon falling, but a thousand grains make a sound. But a thousand nothings cannot make something which means the physical world is paradoxical.

#### 10] Arrows Paradox- If we divide time into discrete 0-duration slices, no motion is happening in each of them, so taking them all as a whole, motion is impossible.

### 5

#### The standard is consistency with the logical consequence of the resolution. Prefer this –

#### 1. Text – Oxford Dictionary defines ought as “used to indicate something that is probable.”

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

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

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

#### 2. Debatability – a) my interp means debates focus on empirics about squo trends rather than irresolvable abstract principles that’ve been argued for years b) Moral oughts cannot guide action due to the is/ought fallacy – we cannot derive moral obligations from what happens in the real world

#### 3. Neg definition choice – Anything else kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement on a lack of your definition.

#### Their inherency proves the aff won’t happen. Either a) the aff is non-inherent and you vote neg on presumption or b) It is and it isn’t going to happen.

### 6

#### We’re hijacking utilitarianism - Consequentialism means determinism is true

#### 1] Induction- if x action leads to y result then x action must be influenced by prior action which means a causal chain of events structure my action rather than my will

#### 2] Focus on end states necessitates determinism because scientific models assume x will happen if y – anything else triggers permissibility

#### 3] Psychology- Neuroscience has demonstrated that our internal cognition is deterministic. Make them provide a counter study- you shouldn’t trust the word of a high-schooler about neuroscience

**Butkus** [Matthew A. Butkus(Professor in the department of Philosophy at McNeese State University, PhD - Health Care Ethics Duquesne University, MA – Philosophy Duquesne University). “Free Will and Autonomous Medical Decision-Making.” Journal of Cognition and Neuroethics. Volume 3, Issue 1. Pg 113-114. March 2015. Accessed 4/4/20. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/89a4/924e0111035dbda63d61631a169c654a04fa.pdf> //Recut Houston Memorial DX from BHPE]

**Psychology and neuroscience have demonstrated that consciousness, our day-today perception, our sense of self and identity, judgment, emotions, and intuitions are all predicated upon a number of causal cognitive elements that are outside our awareness— the bulk of our cognition is deterministic and preconscious. This determinism opens up avenues of undue influence into processes we normally assume to be under our control— it should be clear that this assumption is mistaken at best, inhuman and pernicious at worst.** We should not abandon ourselves to blind determinism, however—we possess the ability to reflect upon our motivations, and to engage in dialogic interaction with others, who may bring aspects of ourselves to the fore which would remain otherwise inaccessible. As a result, we can take back a measure of control, but only if we engage in honest dialectic and dialogue with others. In the context of patient autonomy and decision-making, the necessity of this dialogical process is especially evident—patients are already physically compromised, potentially in ways that can exert conscious and unconscious influence over their decision-making processes, above and beyond the normal potential sources of error found in heuristics and biases. Clinicians should be alert for such influences, recognizing that a medical illness can easily mask a deeper psychopathology. Affective disorders are very common, occur more in patients than in the general population, and tend to go unrecognized or dismissed as a normal reaction to their illness. The effect of these disorders, however, is quite pernicious. They fundamentally affect the efficacy of therapeutic interventions, morbidity and mortality, and rate of recovery—ignoring, dismissing, or failing to identify a comorbidity compromises the treatment of the obvious illness. By only treating the surface pathology, we potentially ignore the deeper wound. Many contemporary models of autonomy suffer from similar shortcomings—while ethics seeks to inform itself of philosophical, legal, theological, and medical constructs, it all too easily ignores the psychological, an unfortunate irony in light of the fundamental connection between cognitive and clinical psychology and ethical ideals of autonomous choice. Ethical theories that dismiss or fail to address psychological constructs are groundless; models derived from inhuman absolutes are so much fancy and fiction. What good is it to describe models of cognition that have little resemblance to how we actually think? The present autonomy model suggests that decision-making is a complex construct necessarily containing rational and emotional elements, intuitive judgments, and, as a result, potential sources of error. This seems to gel with day-to-day experience— many decisions are made by gut instinct and intuition, instead of a Cartesian rational process methodically and algorithmically exploring all possible influences, outcomes, and variables. This deterministic model gels with the phenomenon of basing day-to-day decisions upon distal causes—early education and environment, role models, learned behaviors, etc. This model suggests that as the severity of the outcomes increases to terminal, increasing reflection upon the causes and motivations of the decision is required—that a genuinely autonomous choice will explore the agent’s motivations, identifying and judging the appropriateness of each influence, determining if it is congruent with the value system adopted by the agent as a whole.

#### I defend the squo and that negates

#### 1] Actions are predetermined which means we aren’t culpable for actions we don’t take

### Case

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=of+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=of+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i61l3.1473j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. https://www.google.com/search?q=the+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=the+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i64j69i61j69i60l2.1976j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. https://www.google.com/search?q=reduce+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&sxsrf=AOaemvI3lZsbmnXg5WHeL4m6rYGn8Vf6Aw%3A1630610232638&ei=OCMxYbCaJpO0tQb6wpGoCA&oq=reduce+definition&gs\_lcp=Cgdnd3Mtd2l6EAMyCQgjECcQRhD5ATIECAAQQzIECAAQQzIFCAAQgAQyBQgAEIAEMgUIABCABDIFCAAQgAQyBQgAEIAEMgUIABCABDIFCAAQgAQ6BwgAEEcQsAM6BwgAELADEEM6BwgjEOoCECc6BAgjECc6BQgAEJECOhEILhCABBCxAxCDARDHARDRAzoKCAAQsQMQgwEQQzoHCAAQsQMQQzoICAAQgAQQsQM6CAgAELEDEIMBOgoIABCABBCHAhAUSgQIQRgAUMLMBFjS3QRgnt8EaAJwAngDgAG2A4gB-heSAQozLjExLjEuMi4xmAEAoAEBsAEKyAEKwAEB&sclient=gws-wiz&ved=0ahUKEwiwlru9gOHyAhUTWs0KHXphBIUQ4dUDCA8&uact=5 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. https://www.google.com/search?q=medicine+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=medicine+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59.2986j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)