## 1

#### The ROB is to determine the truth or falsity of the resolution:

#### 1] It’s the most logical – the better player wins the debate, because debate’s a game. You don’t say vote for the player who shoots the most 3 points, but whoever wins the game.

#### 2] It’s constitutive of the activity. Five dictionaries1 define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm2 as to prove true, so it’s the only burden that’s intrinsic to the activity.

#### 3] Jurisdiction – the judge only has an obligation to vote on who supported or denied the resolution, anything else means they can hack for or against us or flip a coin based on their mood – meaning it’s a meta-constraint on anything else.

#### 4] Fairness – other role of the ballots moots 6 minutes of 1AC offense, making it unfair to debate.

#### 5] Answers collapse since they presuppose that your arguments have truth to it. If you prove something false it means you’re actually saying ‘it’s true that their argument is false’.

#### 6] Negating is harder – they have 1 more speech than me in which they can LBL ALL of the 2NR and pull off 2AR ethos. My name is Rajat Reddy, not “the aff”, “the affirmative debater”, or “the opponent”, so I meet all shells.

#### 7] P+P 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] 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.

**D] 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 – treat this as a shell if they engage in it.**

## 2

#### [1] 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.

#### [2] 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.

#### [3] 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

#### [4] 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.

#### [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] Space is defined as “period of time” according to Merriam webster, but going private companies going into a period of time can’t be unjust it makes no sense – so vote neg on presumption

## 3

#### Interpretation: If debaters defend a Kantian ethic, they must delineate which branch or subbranch of Kantianism they endorse in explicit text in the 1AC. To clarify, delineating a branch/sub-branch of kantianism is a good norm.

#### There are several distinct ones

Vleeschauwer 16[Herman Jean de Vleeschauwer- Emeritus Professor of Philosophy “Kantianism” Encyclopædia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Kantianism#ref27103> March 2016] UT AI

* Epistemological Kantianism: those that conceive of the critical philosophy as an epistemology or a pure theory of (scientific) knowledge and methodology
  + Empirical Kantianism: Rooted in physiological or psychological inquiries
  + Logistic Kantianism: Stresses essences and the use of logic
* Metaphysical Kantianism: Rely on inductive metaphysics to make conclusions about the world in accordance with sciences
* Axiological Kantianism: concerned with value theory, branched, first, into an axiological approach which interpreted the methods of all three of Kant’s Critiques
  + Relativistic Kantianism: regarded the critical philosophy as a system of thought dependent upon social, cultural, and historical conditions

The critical philosophy has been subjected to a variety of approaches and methods of interpretation. These can be reduced to three fundamental types: those that conceive of the critical philosophy as an epistemology or a pure theory of (scientific) knowledge and methodology, those that conceive of it as a critical theory of metaphysics or the nature of being (ultimate reality), and those that conceive of it as a theory of normative or valuational reflection parallel to that of ethics (in the field of action). Each of these types—known, respectively, as epistemological, metaphysical, and axiological Kantianism—can, in turn, be subdivided into several secondary approaches. Historically, epistemological Kantianism included such different attitudes as empirical Kantianism, rooted either in physiological or psychological inquiries; the logistic Kantianism of the Marburg school, which stressed essences and the use of logic; and the realistic Kantianism of the Austrian Alois Riehl. Metaphysical Kantianism developed from the transcendental idealism of German Romanticism to realism, a course followed by many speculative thinkers, who saw in the critical philosophy the foundations of an essentially inductive metaphysics, in accordance with the results of the modern sciences. Axiological Kantianism, concerned with value theory, branched, first, into an axiological approach (properly so-called), which interpreted the methods of all three of Kant’s Critiques—Critik der reinen Vernunft (1781, rev. ed. 1787; Critique of Pure Reason), Critik der practischen Vernunft (1788; Critique of Practical Reason), and Critik der Urteilskraft (1790; Critique of Judgment)—as normative disciplines of thought, and, second, into an eclectic or relativistic Kantianism, which regarded the critical philosophy as a system of thought dependent upon social, cultural, and historical conditions. The chief representatives of these submovements are identified in the historical sections below.

#### Violation: They don’t

#### Standards

#### 1] Shiftiness-They can shift out of my turns based on whatever theory of the good they operate under due to the nature of a vague standard. Especially true because the warrants for their standard could justify different versions of Kantianism coming first and I wouldn’t know until the 1ar which gives them access to multiple contingent standards. CX can’t resolve this impact and is independently bad because A] Not flowed B] skews 6 min of prep during the aff C] They can proactively lie and there’s no way to check D] debaters can be intentionally shady.

#### 2] Real World- Philosophers need to be as specific as possible when delineating their theory since there are so many nuances and contextual applications of philosophy that require us to understand the core differences within the philosophy. That outweighs since debate has no pedagogical value without portable application.

#### This spec shell isn’t regressive- it literally determines what framework the affirmative defends and how to link offense back to it