# 1NC vs Park City

## 1

### 

#### Interpretation: The aff must explicitly specify a comprehensive role of the ballot in the form of a text in the 1AC where they clarify how offense links back to the role of the ballot, such as whether post-fiat offense or pre-fiat offense matters and what constitutes that offense with implications on how to weigh

#### Violation: they don’t

#### Standards:

#### 1. Engagement – Knowing what counts as offense is a prerequisite to making arguments, so its impossible to engage the aff. Our interp ensures that I read something relevant to your method, and knowing how to weigh gives us a standard. Especially true since there is no norm on what “performative engagement” like there is for util offense

#### Few impacts:

#### a) Education – When two ships pass in the night we don’t learn anything - This also guts novice inclusion because now they can never learn arguments in round.

#### b) Turns the aff – Your impacts are premised on engaging with issues of oppression, but no one will take seriously a position that can’t be clashed with

#### c) Strategy Skew – You can recontextualize your ROTB to make up reasons why my offense doesn’t link in the 1AR

#### Framing: You can’t use your ROB to exclude my shell. My shell simply constrains how you read your ROTB. My method is your ROTB with specification, so if I’m winning comparative offense, the shell outweighs even if method debates in general preclude theory. If they go for the Aff first that proves the abuse of my shell since they should have specified in the AC.

#### Fairness before k– a] testing – you can’t evaluate their args because the round was skewed – if they have 10 minutes to win their aff or fairness bad and I have 1 for the opposite they will win b] they concede its authority via speech times and tournament procedure c] hacking – if they say it’s irrelevant then you can be unfair against them and vote for me d] the ballot can never alter subjectivities but it can rectify unfairness e] jurisdiction – the ballot says to vote for the better debater not the better cheater – that’s a metaconstraint, f] inclusion – nobody plays an unfair game – that’s lexically prior to their reading of the aff in debate

#### Education – it’s the only portable impact and why schools fund debate

#### CI – a) brightlines are arbitrary and self-serving which doesn’t set good norms b) it collapses since weighing between brightlines rely on offense defense

#### DTD – deter future abuse

#### No rvi

#### [a] Baiting—they’ll bait the theory debate and prep it out—justifies infinite abuse since they’ll get away with unacceptable practices

#### [b] 1AR all-outs—they’ll collapse entirely to theory which crowds out substance and kills education.

## 2

### FW

#### The litmus test for ethics is certainty and non-arbitrariness – blurry guidelines for ethics allows agents to inconsistently understand morality or arbitrarily opt out which renders ethics useless since it can’t serve as a guide to action.

#### Ethics must be derived from the a priori world –

#### [1] Uncertainty – our experiences are inaccessible to others which allows people to say they don’t experience the same, however a priori principles are universally applied to all agents.

#### [2] External Worlds Skepticism –

Chapman summarizes 14 [Andrew Chapman (lecturer in philosophy at the University of Colorado, Boulder). “External World Skepticism”. 1000-Word Philosophy: An Introductory Anthology. 6 FEBRUARY 2014. Accessed 12/11/21. <https://1000wordphilosophy.com/2014/02/06/external-world-skepticism/> //Xu]

You’re being deceived by a very powerful evil demon right now. This demon has the ability to manipulate your sensory impressions such that it will seem to you that things are some way when they are not that way at all. Accordingly, things are actually nothing like P. For example, suppose it seems to you as though you are in a room with a table and chair in it and that you are reading from a computer screen, etc. If (1) is true, then you actually are in a room with a table and chair in it and you are reading from a computer screen, etc. If (2) is true, then you are not in a room with a table and chair in it and you are not reading from a computer screen, etc. If (2) is true, things are very different from how they seem to you to be.1

\*Footnote 1\*

1 If the evil demon scenario is too far-fetched for you, imagine that you are dreaming or that you are hallucinating or even that you are in a laboratory and your visual cortex is being stimulated by electrodes.

\*Paragraph Following the First\*

Philosophers call (2) a skeptical scenario. In skeptical scenarios, you are radically misled, deceived, or bamboozled by your evidence in such a way that how things seem to you is different from how things actually are. Perhaps the most famous propounder of skeptical scenarios in the history of philosophy is René Descartes (1596-1650) in his Meditations on First Philosophy (1641). In the Meditations, Descartes considers that he might be dreaming or that he might be being deceived by the evil demon from our scenario (2) above. Hollywood has made much of skeptical scenarios in movies like Total Recall, The Matrix, and Inception. So back to our original question: Which of (1) or (2) is best supported or best justified by its seeming to you that P? If you’re being honest with yourself, you’ll conclude that how things seem equally well supports (1) and (2). From your internal, first-personal perspective, either of (1) or (2) could be true given how things seem to you. And if that weren’t bad enough, here comes the kicker: If both (1) and (2) are equally well supported by your evidence, how can you ever possibly know anything about the world outside your own skin? This is the problem of external world skepticism, perhaps the central problem of modern epistemology.

#### To ask for why we should be reasoners concedes its authority since it uses reason – anything else is nonbinding and arbitrary. Aggregation is nonsensical since it impedes on one persons ends for another

#### Moral law must be universal—our judgements can’t only apply to ourselves any more than 2+2=4 can be true only for me – any non-universalizable norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with liberty.

#### 1] Performativity – when you enter debate, you presume that you will be free to set and pursue ends in the round because of a system of reciprocally enforced constraints.

#### 2] Epistemic Confidence – a] modesty is arbitrary in calculating ethical value b] self-defeating – you wouldn’t take two different pills because a doctor recommended one and a stranger another

### Offense

#### 1] Space appropriation and exploration originates from private companies such as Space X and Blue Origin. Preventing such is a restriction on the ability of companies to set and pursue their ends and these companies gain contracts with the government for projects which turns promise breaking offense.

#### Presumption/permissibility negates – a] real world policies require positive justification before being adopted b] Unjust[[1]](#footnote-1) is “contrary to conscience or morality or law” so they need to prove the negative obligation

#### c) more often false than true since I can prove something false in infinite ways

## 3

#### The ROB is to determine the truth of falsity of the resolution –

#### 1] Textuality – five dictionaries[[2]](#footnote-2) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[3]](#footnote-3) as to prove true.

#### That OW –

#### a] Jurisdiction – judges are constrained through their constitutive purpose and proves it’s a side constraint on what arguments they can vote on.

#### b] Predictability – people base prep off the pregiven terms in the resolution.

#### 2] Isomorphism – alternative ROBs aren’t binary truth/false because of topic lit biases which increases intervention and takes the debate out of the hands of debaters.

#### 3] Inclusion – any offense functions under it as long as debaters implicate their positions to prove the truth or falsity of the resolution which maximizes substantive clash through ground and is a sequencing question for engaging in debate.

#### 4] Logic – any statement relies on a conception of truth to function – for example, I’m hungry is the same as its true that I’m hungry – logic is a litmus test for any argument and proves your ROB collapse since it relies on truth.

### NIBS

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

#### 2] of[[5]](#footnote-5) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time

#### 3] outer[[6]](#footnote-6) is “being away from a center” but the rez doesn’t have a center

#### 4] space[[7]](#footnote-7) is “an area rented or sold as business premises” but there aren’t premises

#### 5] entities[[8]](#footnote-8) are “an organization (such as a business or governmental unit) that has an identity separate from those of its members” but the rez doesn’t spec the members

1. https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/unjust [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <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-2)
3. *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-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> //Xu [↑](#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.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/outer> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. <https://www.google.com/search?q=space+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=space+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57.2076j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/entity> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-8)