### Combo Shell

Interp: cant read no neg arguments, reject neg fairness concerns, and all neg interps counter interps

### Truth Testing

#### 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 and it’s a lie that you can’t vote on for ethics

#### no 1ar arguments bc they require intervention to evaluate them against the nc

#### 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. Truth Testing comes before theory because it questions the validity of theory and your ability to test its true which means it’s a procedural framing question of what arguments should look like.

#### 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] member[[3]](#footnote-3) is “a part or organ of the body, especially a limb” but an organ can’t have obligations

#### 2] of[[4]](#footnote-4) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time

#### 3] the[[5]](#footnote-5) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but the WTO isn’t a disease

#### 4] to[[6]](#footnote-6) is to “expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location)” but the rez doesn’t have a location

#### 5] reduce[[7]](#footnote-7) is to “(of a person) lose weight, typically by dieting” but IP doesn’t have a body to lose weight.

#### 6] for[[8]](#footnote-8) is “in place of” but medicines aren’t replacing IP.

#### 7] medicine[[9]](#footnote-9) 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.

#### 8] Good Samaritan Paradox -- affirming negates because in order to say you want to fix x problem, that assumes x problem exists in the first place, thus eliminating nukes presupposes nukes exist which means negation is a prior question

The 1ar by Agastya cannot have overview responses because it allows them to avoid line by line engagement, must concede truth testing so we learn the value of debating truth and falsity and come to an objective conclusion, if they don’t they should lose

#### 9] Zeno’s Paradox – motion is impossible, because moving half way causes half more and half more which is infinitely regressive and means elimination of arsenals is logically impossible. Agastya must call me by the name Cesh at least once in CX, cx is when we’re having actual conversation and it’s a nickname im trying to adopt which is k2 accessibility that controls the Il to everything else, if not drop them and vote neg.

#### **10] 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.

#### Permissibility Negates

#### A] aff has burden of proof and any eeason they’re wrong negates

#### B] you believe statements are false until proven true which is why you don’t believe in things like simulations and demons

#### Reject 1ar Theory and independent voting issues as reasons to reject the team,

#### a. 7 - 6 time skew means they have a structural advantage

#### b. No 3nr, so 2ar gets to weigh however they want

#### c. Judges are more likely to by 2a arguments as they are the

#### last speech

#### d. Too many theory flows make it impossible to test the aff

#### e. You get a 2-1 speech advantage

#### f. We only get 2 speeches of new arguments to deliberate over your shell which isn’t enough time

#### g. there’s no such thing as infinite abuse as NC only has 7 minutes

#### h. 1ar theory is used as a strategic advantage

#### Even if you don’t buy reject it-it’s a reason why its’ drop the arg and reasonability

### Log On

#### 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.

## Case

**Procedural fairness is a voter and outweighs/comes before nibs and aprioris a] it’s an intrinsic good – debate is fundamentally a game and some level of competitive equity is necessary to sustain the activity, b] probability – debate can’t alter subjectivity, but it can rectify skews which means the only impact to a ballot is fairness and deciding who wins, c] it internal link turns every impact – a limited debate promotes in-depth research and engagement which is necessary to access all of their education.**

### Negating is harder

#### [a] Aff has the ability to read the first framework and spikes which I have to coincide with and react to which outweighs since a) you have infinite prep time to frontline your aff before round so you’ll always be ahead of me and b) this turns my ability to react since you can mold my advocacy until I’m forced into generics that you are ready to debate.

#### [b] You speak first and last which means you have a psychological judge persuasion advantage since you frame the round in their mind and are the last thing they remember.

#### [c] Aff sets the stage for the debate by choosing the advocacy which means they can exclude all neg ground and win easily.

#### [d] This link turns everything in your underview and means I get presumption and neg flex on theory because it’s inherently harder to debate my side. Also means free I-meets on aff theory unless you prove how it directly outweighs the skew since its structural and comes out of round.

#### [e] Only neg fairness matters – aff infinite prep means they frontline everything and they already have the structural advantage.

#### [f] Neg theory comes first because affirming is easier – also if the 1NC was abusive, it’s because the 1AC was abusive.

### Give the neg an RVI on 1ar and 1ac theory

#### To clarify this includes your spikes which should also mean if I win an offensive reason to reject one of your spikes it triggers an RVI.

#### [1] Not having an RVI incentivizes you to read a bunch of blippy underdeveloped spikes in the 1AC as well as a short 1ar shell solely as a time suck scewing my strategy. Strat skew key to equal access to the ballot.

#### [2] Infinite abuse: absent an RVI, the aff can read game over arguments like evaluate the theory debate after the 1ar putting the NC in a doublebind: either I answer them and waste time or concede them and auto lose.

#### [3] Under competing interps we should create the best norms for debate. RVIS encourage debaters to actually test issues, including the spikes you are trying to defend as good norms.

#### [4] Forcing them to go for their interp ensures debaters wont just spam spikes, but instead only preempt genuine abuse, which means A) we spend more rounds on substance and B) people read shorter underviews and more substance.

#### [5] I have already invested a large amount of the 1NC on theory instead of substance, and not having an RVI allows them to completely ignore this flow of the debate and dump on case, making negating impossible.

### P and P negate

#### 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 [is to]: maintain as true.

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

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)
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3. https://www.google.com/search?q=member+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=member+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i60l3.1863j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. 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-4)
5. 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-5)
6. https://www.google.com/search?q=to+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=to+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i60l3.1415j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 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-7)
8. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/for#:~:text=English%20Language%20Learners%20Definition%20of,meant%20to%20be%20used%20with [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. 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-9)