Off case –

The aff argues that their framework provides a moral reason to affirm. To win this, they must win that morality is possible and exists. If I prove that morality does not exist then that is sufficient to negate because the aff would not have proved a moral obligation to affirm.

Presumption Negates

1. We presume things false, this is why people don’t believe things like conspiracy theories.

2. There are an infinite number of ways to prove something false and only one way to prove it true.

3. The neg burden is to deny the evidence of truth so if there’s no offense as to why the resolution is true the neg has fulfilled their burden.

Permissibility Negates 1.

The aff must prove an Prohibition because unjust indicates a moral prohibition. If an action is permissible, definitionally, no prohibition is present and you negate.

The value premise is morality because justice is a question of morality

Morality does not exist for \_\_ reasons:

1. External world skep: The only way we know the world exists is through our 5 senses. However, the only way to confirm the validity of our 5 senses is with our 5 senses. There is no external way to confirm our experience because we are constrained by it. Therefore, we are unable to confirm the existence of knowledge in the world. If the world isn’t real there’s no morality because there’s no implication to our actions.

2. Morality requires objectivity to reason. However, we are influenced by arbitrary external factors through which we see all new arguments. This makes morality impossible. Street:

Where I think the objection goes wrong, then, is as follows. The objection gains its plausibility by suggesting that rational reflection provides some means of standing apart from our evaluative judgments, sorting through them, and gradually separating out the true ones from the false—as if with the aid of some uncontaminated tool. But this picture cannot be right. For what rational reflection about evaluative matters involves, inescapably, is assessing some evaluative judgments in terms of others. Rational reflection must always proceed from some evaluative standpoint; it must work from some evaluative premises; it must treat some evaluative judgments as fixed, if only for the time being, as the assessment of other evaluative judgments is undertaken. In rational reflection, one does not stand completely apart from one’s starting fund of evaluative judgments: rather, one uses them, reasons in terms of them, holds some of them up for examination in light of others. The widespread consensus that the method of reflective equilibrium, broadly understood, is our sole means of proceeding in ethics is an acknowledgment of this fact**:** ultimately, we can test our evaluative judgments only by testing their consistency with our other evaluative judgments, combined of course with judgments about the (nonevaluative) facts. Thus, if the fund of evaluative judgments with which human reflection began was thoroughly contaminated with illegitimate influence—and the objector has offered no reason to doubt this part of the argument—then the tools of rational reflection were equally contaminated, for the latter are always just a subset of the former. It follows that all our reflection over the ages has really just been a process of assessing evaluative judgments that are mostly off the mark in terms of others that are mostly off the mark. And reflection of this kind isn’t going to get one any closer to evaluative truth, any more than sorting through contaminated materials with contaminated tools is going to get one closer to purity. So long as we assume that there is no relation between evolutionary influences and evaluative truth, the appeal to rational reflection offers no escape from the conclusion that, in the absence of an incredible coincidence, most of our evaluative judgments are likely to be false.

Street, Sharon. “A Darwinian Dilemma for Realist Theories of Value.” Philosophical Studies January 2006. Pgs 118-121

2. The means “Used adverbially with comparatives to indicate how one amount or degree something varies in relation to another.” (Oxford dictionary). But this means the resolution is incoherent thus you negate.

4. Space means “to set some distance apart.” (Dictionary.com) but this doesn’t apply to what entities can appropriate so the res is false

5. Free will does not exist. Scientific research confirms that our subconscious makes decisions for us. Therefore, we are not morally responsible for our actions and morality does not exist. **Stenger:**

**“Research in neuroscience has revealed** a startling fact **that** revolutionizes much of what we humans have previously taken for granted about our interactions with the world outside our heads: **Our consciousness is really not in charge of our behavior.** Laboratory **experiments show that before we become aware of making a decision, our brains have already** laid the groundwork for **[made] it.** In a recent book, *Subliminal: How Your Unconscious Mind Rules Your Behavior*, physicist Leonard Mlodinow reviews a wide range of psychological experiments that demonstrate the dominant role the unconscious plays in our behavior. **This** recognition **challenges fundamental assumptions about free will** and the associated religious teachings about sin and redemption, **as well as** our judicial concepts of **responsibility** and punishment. If **our brains are making our decisions for us [without our willing input]** subconsciously, how can **[Thus] we [cannot] be responsible for our actions**? How can our legal system punish criminals or God punish sinners who aren't in full control of their decision-making processes? Is free will an illusion? In his recent book titled *Free Will,* neuroscientist Sam Harris pulls no punches. He tells us in no uncertain terms: "Free will is an illusion." We don't exist as immaterial conscious controllers, but are instead entirely physical beings whose decisions and behaviors are the fully caused products of the brain and body**.”**

Stenger, Victor. “Free will is an illusion.” *Huffington Post,* 6-1-2012.

#### **[1]** Appropriation means “the money thus authorized” (Dictionary.com), but this doesn’t apply to space so the res is incoherent

#### **[6] To go anywhere, you must go halfway first, and then you must go half of the remaining distance, and half of the remaining distance, and so forth to infinity – thus, motion is impossible because it necessitates traversing an infinite number of spaces in a finite amount of time.**

#### **[7] In order to say I want to fix x problem, you must say that you want x problem to exist, since it requires the desire of the problem’s existence to solve, which makes any moral attempt inherently immoral – meaning affirming is impossible.**

#### **[8] 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**

#### **[9] 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.**

#### **[6] 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.**

#### **[9] 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.**

**The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best proves the truth or falsity of the Resolution; the affirmative must prove it true and the negative must prove it false. Prefer:**

**A) Text: Five dictionaries define negate as to deny the truth of and affirm as to prove true which means the sole judge obligation is to vote on the resolution’s truth or falsity. Constitutivism outweighs because you don’t have the jurisdiction not to truth test. Jurisdiction is a meta constraint since every argument you make concedes the authority of the judge fulfilling their jurisdiction to vote aff if they affirm better and neg the contrary**

**B) Logic: Any counter role of the ballot collapses to truth testing because every property assumes truth of the property i.e. if I say, “I am awake” it is the same as “it is true that I am awake” which means they are also a question of truth claims because it’s inherent.**

**C) Ground: Any offense can function under truth testing whereas your specific role of the ballot excludes all strategies but yours. This is bad for education because me engaging in a debate I know nothing about doesn’t help anyone.**

**D) Truth Testing is a prerequisite to other role of the ballots because without truth we’re operating off of lies which is what fuels propaganda and oppression.**

*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*

*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*

Interp: Debaters can’t highlight in 2 different colors

Violation: They do

Standards:

1. Access: Hard to see, and if someone had dyslexia or some other thing it’s harder to see, but also harder in general
2. Incentive to just highlight in 12 different colors so they can’t see, ableist, avoids clash

Fairness is a voter because the ballot makes debate a game and without fairness you’re voting for the better cheater not the better debater.

Education is a voter because a) it’s the reason schools fund debate and b) it’s the only out of round impact.

Drop the debater

1. To deter future abuse,

2. If I prove abuse it means substance has already been skewed.

No RVIs,

1. Debaters don’t win for just being fair or educational,

2. It would encourage good theory debaters to be abusive so they can bait theory and win off an RVI.

3. It would discourage people from checking abuse because they’re afraid to lose to a good prep out.

Competing interps

1. Reasonability is arbitrary and requires judge intervention.

2. It encourages getting as close to the brightline as possible.

3. Creates best norms because they have to defend their norm is good.