# JF22 – NC – Determinism

## T

#### A: Interp – If the affirmative reads offensive theoretical arguments that impact into fairness and/or education, they must provide an example violation with each one of them. To clarify, every interpretation must explain how I would violate in the NC.

#### B: Violation – You do not provide a corresponding violation to each theoretical argument

#### C: Standards –

#### 1. Advocacy shift – The 1ar can contrive a violation, shift meaning of their interp after I concede a spike. Like “one uncondo route” could mean at least one route, one position, or turns count as a route. Infinite abuse since you just need a risk of a violation and I can’t respond to the shell in the 2NR.

#### 2. Norming – Without an exact text of a violation it’s impossible know what the aff considers a good norm which makes setting norms on theory impossible since you’ll always change the norm based on the NC, which defeats the purpose of reading theory in the first place. Norming is a voting issue since it controls the internal link to any type of abuse insofar as we set and follow good norms.

#### Voters –

#### fairness – 1) intrinsic good 2) all arguments presume

#### DTD – 1) irreperably skewed + already wasted time 2) k2 deterrence 3) DTA non-sensical on theory esp when it’s preemptive

#### competing interps

#### no RVIs

## 1NC

### just, like, a lot of spikes ig

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement

#### 1] 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.

#### 2] Truth is a necessary part of any statement since any statement fundamentally asserts that some property is true. All statements devolve into some conception of truth-value since when you assert that your role of the ballot is true you concede to the validity of truth testing. Frege, Frege, Gottlob. “The Thought: A Logical Inquiry” in Logicism and the Philosophy of Language: Selections from Frege and Russell. Broadview Press. March 2003. Pg. 204.

It may nevertheless be thought that we cannot recognize a property of a thing without at the same time realizing the thought that this thing has the property to be true. So with every property of a thing is joined a property of thought, namely, that of truth. It is also worthy of notice that the sentence “I smell the scent of violets” has just the same content as the sentence “it is true that I smell the scent of violets”. So, it seems, then, that nothing is added to the thought by my ascribing it the property of truth.

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

#### Isomorphism

#### no aff analytics because then we each get one speech to read cards

#### 5] Text: Five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true which means the sole judge obligation is to vote on the resolution’s truth or falsity. This outweighs on common usage – it is abundantly clear that our roles are verified. Any other role of the ballot enforces an external norm on debate, but only truth testing is intrinsic to the process of debate

#### i.e. proving statements true or false through argumentation. Constitutivism outweighs because you don’t have the jurisdiction not to truth test – if a chess player says you should break the rules for a more fun game, the proper response is to ignore them as a practice only makes sense based on its intrinsic rules. Jurisdiction is also an independent voter and a meta constraint on anything else 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 – otherwise they could just hack against or for you which means it also controls the internal link to fairness since that’s definitionally unfair. If we win one argument

#### Permissibility negates- Lack of obligation proves the resolution false- the res specifically says you have to prove obligation, you cannot be obligated and lack an obligation simultaneously

**Presume neg- A. We assume statements to be false until proven true. That is why we don’t believe in alternate realities or conspiracy theories. The lack of a reason something is false does not me it is assumed to be true. B. Statements are more often false then true. If I say this pen is red, I can only prove it true in one way by demonstrating that it is indeed red, where I can prove it false in an infinite amount of ways.**

**Definitions from my favorite website Merriam-Webster**

**Space is defined as “: one of the degrees between or above or below the lines of a musical staff”**

**Outer defined as “: being away from a center”**

**Appropriation defined as “: the act of getting or saving money for a specific use or purpose”**

**Private defined as “: an enlisted person of the lowest rank in the marine corps or of one of the two lowest ranks in the army”**

#### 4. Neg definition choice – The aff should have defined ought in the 1ac as their value, 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.

#### And evaluate after the 1NC because that’s most reciprocal

#### And no 1ar analytics

#### Paradoxes –

#### a) Meno’s – in order to discover something, it must not be known, but in order to know to discover something, it must already be known – this makes the quest for knowledge incomprehensible and thus impossible,

#### b) Good Samaritan – affirming negates – it ought to be the case that we eliminate nukes if they exist now, however that can only be the case if nukes exist, THUS it is obligatory that nukes aren’t eliminated,

#### c) Zeno’s – 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

**Ought[[3]](#footnote-3) is defined as express[ing] obligation. To negate means *to contradict***[[4]](#footnote-4)**. To contradict means *to speak or declare against***[[5]](#footnote-5)***.* Debate itself requires consistency with non-contradiction and proactive justification, any doubt of proof flows neg. Luca,** Luca, Andrei. “LogicWarrior Demand Reason.” LogicWarrior, 9 Oct. 2017, www.logicwarrior.net/tag/law-of-non-contradiction/.This law is another seemingly obvious point but in practice **the Law of Non-Contradiction is the foundation of argumentative validity**. The Law of Non-Contradiction makes logic truth preserving so that you’ll never go from a true point and arrive at a false point. Contradiction negates logic, and while true paradox may be something fun which to reflect unless you’re attempting to unite with the godhead by reaching nirvana, contradiction simply has no place in logic. This is not to say that something can’t *appear* to be self-contradictory and this idea is the basis of a lot of statements of reflection. **In the course of debate** another definition may become useful: Both **a claim and not that claim can’t be true. So, if a statement holds even a teensy** weensy **bit of falseness, it must be entirely false.**

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. Ought, Merriam Webster, first defintion [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/contradict [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. http://www.dictionary.com/browse/contradict [↑](#footnote-ref-5)