# NC

## 1

#### Interp: Debaters may not read that aff theory is drop the debater, no RVIs, Competing Interps and Aff Fairness issues come before NC arguments.

#### Violation – Their UV

#### 1] Standards –

#### a] Infinite Abuse - They can read a theory shell that’s DTD/no RVI/CI that means their standard automatically comes before any 1nc standard since aff fairness comes first, it also means it comes as the highest layer because I cant weigh between other shells because the aff has the highest fairness adv. So this means that as long as they read a shell I violate in the 1ar I will lose. Independently controls the IL to clash because I can’t clash if I always lose – strongest IL to education because it’s the only form of unique education we get from debate

#### 2] Paradigms—

#### a] Vote neg on substance – a] I was so skewed on substance so that I couldn’t win it b] I couldn’t engage in the aff in the first place

#### b] Fairness – its constitutive to debate as competitive activity that requires objective evaluation. Controls the IL to education because you don’t learn from an already skewed round.

#### c] Neg theory is DTD - 1ARs control the direction of the debate because it determines what the 2NR has to go for – DTD allows us some leeway in the round by having some control in the direction

#### d] Competing interps – Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation – it also collapses since brightlines operate on an offense-defense paradigm

#### e] Norming outweighs – a] constitutivism – it’s the intrinsic purpose of theory b] magnitude – it’s the only out of round impact which link turns their arguments because they assume a good model of debate

## 2

Interp—the aff may not have 1AR theory and drop the debater and no 2n responses

Violation—their underview

Norming—these paradigms together allow the 1ar to read a shell and leverage no 2n theory to deny the neg responses to that shell—ensures the aff will always win on theory and proliferates infinite abuse

Outweighs—many novices quit the activity from losing to abusive underviews so it leads to a less accessible space AND norming comes first because it defines the role of theory

CA paradigms

# Case

## TT

#### Presumption and permissibility 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) ought means the aff has to prove an obligation if that definition is legitimate which means lack of that obligation negates. Even under their role of the ballot 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.

#### A] Ought is “used to express logical consequence” as defined by Merriam-Webster

(<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought>) //Massa

#### B] Oxford Dictionary defines ought as “used to indicate something that is probable.”

<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought> //Massa

#### Prefer on 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. Also, better since it focuses on real world instances rather than recycling old frameworks.

#### Negate:

#### [1] Strike means “hit forcibly and deliberately with one's hand or a weapon or other implement.” (Oxford Languages) which means the res is the Government ought to guarantee an unconditional right to stab people which causes anarchy.

#### [2] 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

#### [3] Guarantee means “a formal pledge to pay another person's debt or to perform another person's obligation in the case of default.” (Oxford Languages) which means they have to pledge to pay another person’s debt right to strike which is incoherent.

#### [4] To means “indicate movement” (Merriam Webster), but that means the resolution is incoherent because the word ought cannot move to the word provide – they’re both abstract concepts. Means you negate on face because you can’t even know what the resolution looks like and an incoherent claim can’t have truth.

#### [5] Interpreting speech is impossible since it relies on a subjective frame of reference which causes regress.

**Harman** Gilbert “Quine’s Semantic Relativity” June 30, 2009 SJCP//JG

Philosophers sometimes approach meaning metaphorically, for example, by speaking of “grasping” meanings, as if understanding consists in getting mental hands around something.1 Philosophers say that a theory of meaning should be a theory about the meanings that people assign to expressions in their language, that to understand other people requires identifying the meanings they associate with what they are saying, and that to translate an expression of another language into your own is to find an expression in your language with the same meaning as the expression in the other language. One difficulty with taking seriously such metaphors of grasping, assigning, and attaching meanings is that people are not aware of doing these things in the way that they are aware of grasping doorknobs, attaching post-it notes, and assigning tasks to employees. In any event, Quine did not find such metaphors to be useful. In his view, to understand someone else is to interpret them—that is, to find a way to translate from their outlook into one’s own. Interpretation is translation. And translation is indeterminate. Part of Quine’s argument for indeterminacy of translation involves an appeal to ontological relativity.2 He argues that there is no fact of the matter as to whether another person’s word ‘gavagai’ refers to rabbits, rabbit-stages, undetached rabbit parts, rabbithood, or various other possibilities. Given any reasonable interpretation of a language, consider the total universe of entities in the extension of predicates or referred to by singular terms in that language so interpreted, and then consider any one-one mapping of that universe onto itself. Then define new relations of reference and extension, using this mapping, so that a term that originally referred to something now refers to what that thing is mapped to and a predicate with an extension originally containing various things now has an extension containing what those things are mapped to. Since, the sentences that are true with respect to the original interpretation are also true with respect to the new one, it would seem that the new interpretation satisfies the same reasonable constraints as the original. Quine argues that reference is a relative matter, like position and velocity. Non-relative absolute reference is, he says, like “absolute position, or absolute velocity, rather than position or velocity relative to a given frame of reference” (201). Furthermore in Quine’s view, radical translation begins at home . . . It is meaningless to ask whether, in general, our terms ‘rabbit’, ‘rabbit part’, ‘number’, etc., really refer respectively to rabbits, rabbit parts, numbers, etc., rather than to some ingeniously permuted denotations. It is meaningless to ask this absolutely; we can meaningfully ask it only relative to some background language. . . . Querying reference in any more absolute way would be like asking about absolute position, or absolute velocity, rather than position or velocity relative to a given frame of reference. When we ask, “Does ‘rabbit’ really refer to rabbits?” someone can counter with the question: “Refer to rabbits in what sense of ‘rabbits’?” thus launching a regress; and we need the background language to regress into. The background language gives the query sense, if only relative sense; sense relative in turn to it, this background language (200-201).

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

#### [7] Government means “the relation between a governed and a governing word.” (Oxford Dictionary). A relation can’t pass a plan, so the res is incoherent.

#### [8] In order to say I want to fix x problem, you must say that you want x problem to exist, since it requires the problem exist to solve, which makes any moral attempt inherently immoral and fairness is impossible since it would require giving each debater the same amount of speeches and time.

#### [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.

## UV

#### 1] NC theory first – 1] Abuse was self-inflicted- They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] Norming- We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea 3] It was introduced first, so it comes lexically prior.

#### 2] Neg abuse outweighs Aff abuse – 1] Infinite prep time before round to frontline 2] 2AR judge psychology and 1st and last speech 3] Infinite perms and uplayering in the 1AR.

#### 3] Reasonability on 1AR shells –checks 2AR sandbagging by preventing really abusive 1NCs while still giving the 2N a chance.

#### 4] DTA on 1AR shells – They can blow up blippy 20 second shells in the 2AR while I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention and means 1AR theory is irresolvable

#### 5] Reject infinite abuse claims – a] spikes solve—there are only so many theoretical issues anyway, b] infinite abuse doesn't exist since there are a finite number of rounds, c] if I win, I can't engage in 1AR theory then you could never check infinite abuse since we can't use your shells to determine what's abusive d] Functional limits solves – I only have 7 minutes so I can’t be infinitely abusive

#### 6] I get 2NR weighing – a) you can collapse to one thing in the 2AR for 3min and misconstrue the 2NR – I have no 3N to clarify, so I should be able to preempt the 2AR collapse and weighing now, b) resolvability – if I win offense back to one thing and you win offense back to another, weighing is key to determining what matters more so the judge can resolve the round without intervening, c) I need to be able to answer 1AR weighing with my own – otherwise they’ll always sandbag to one thing for 4min to exclude my offense

#### 7] New 2NR Responses- A] none of the spikes have a clear implication in the 1ac B] It’s key to robustly contest their norm. C] Stops them from hiding tricks in random parts of the aff

#### 8] Don’t allow new 2AR weighing – a) makes 2NR impossible since I have to respond to arguments before they are made, b) jurisdiction – you aren’t evaluating a debate since there was no opportunity to answer those args, c) they had the opportunity to make weighing args in the 1AR – don’t reward sandbagging weighing to the 2AR since it kills clash

#### 9] No RVIs – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms, c) chilling effect – forces you to split your 2AR so you can’t collapse and misconstrue the 2NR, d) topic ed – prevents 1AR blipstorm scripts and allows us to get back to substance after resolving theory

## Kant negates

#### A] Strikes fail to fulfill duty.

Fourie 17 Johan Fourie 11-30-2017 "Ethicality of Labor-Strike Demonstrates by Social Workers" <https://www.otherpapers.com/essay/Ethicality-of-Labor-Strike-Demonstrates-by-Social-Workers/62694.html> (Johan Fourie is professor of Economics and History at Stellenbosch University.) JG

Kantian Ethics Kantian ethics suggest that actions are morally permissible based on **whether it fulfils a person's duty** (Banks, 2006). To further the concept of duty, Kantian ethics held the notion of Categorical Imperatives which is believed to determine the morality of duties as it enforces and commands adherence, complicity and application. The Categorical Imperatives consist of three formulas. Once such a formula is to "act only on the maximum whereby at the same time you can will that it become a universal law" (Parrott, 2006, p. 51). Through this perspective, Kant held that persons are to engage in actions that they are willing to allow others to engage in as well without conditions and exceptions. Applying this formula to the ethicality of social workers **participating in labor strike** demonstrations, it becomes evident that such an action is **not morally permissible or executing its duty**. Arguably, as much as social workers are trained professionals and rendering services that are crucial to the functioning and well-being of society, they remain ordinary citizens who also at some point will **require crucial services**. Examples of these crucial services that may cause significant harm because of its absence due to labor strike action are **medical personnel, suicide watch centers, mental health care professionals, law enforcement, court systems**, municipal service delivery, etc. With these services not available, social workers will experience suffering, frustration, unhappiness, harm as the clients will do with their absence from the office. To this regard, participating and demonstrating labor strike action is not adhering to duty or morally permissible.

#### B] Strikes use others as a mere means to an end.

Fourie 17 Johan Fourie 11-30-2017 "Ethicality of Labor-Strike Demonstrates by Social Workers" <https://www.otherpapers.com/essay/Ethicality-of-Labor-Strike-Demonstrates-by-Social-Workers/62694.html> (Johan Fourie is professor of Economics and History at Stellenbosch University.) JG

A further formula of the Categorical Imperative is "so, act as to treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of any other context, never solely as a means to an end but always as an end within itself' (Parrott, 2006, p. 51). By this Kant meant people should be valued and respected as an individual and not used for the benefit of others. Participating in a labor-strike demonstration/action is **a direct violation of this** categorical perspective as it would not be ethically permissible because the severe dependence and well-being of clients, the effective functioning of the employer organization, and society **is used to duly and unduly influence the bargaining process for better working conditions**. In participating in the labor strike demonstration, the humanity, and well-being of clients and society **is not seen as crucial** **and as an 'end'**, but rather used to demonstrate the undeniable need for the skills and expertise of social workers. Furthermore, through withholding services, social worker professionals demonstrate that the well-being and welfare of society have lost its inherent importance/value. Though the value of overall well-being is taught throughout the social work training process and is enshrined in the professional ethical codes.

#### E] Also, if you prove that we aren’t reasoners capable of setting and pursuing our own ends, that means we don’t have free will. A. Practical reason necessitates the ability to set and pursue ones own ends, so if we aren’t reasoners, we couldn’t choose these actions. B. If we weren’t reasoners, we wouldn’t have control over the actions we take since the external laws of physics would regulat reactions. That negates. Norwitz.

[Michael Norwitz, “Free Will and Determinism,” Philosophy Now, 1991.] SHS ZS

Inwagen presents three premises in his main argument: that **free will is** in fact **incompatible with determinism**, that **moral responsibility is incompatible with** **determinism**, and that (since we have moral responsibility) determinism is false. Hence, he concludes, we have free will. The argument for the first premise runs as follows [p.56]: “**If determinism is true**, then **our acts are the consequences of the laws of nature** and events in the remote past. But **it is not up to us what went on before we were born**, and neither is it up to us what the laws of nature are. **Therefore the consequences of these things** (including our present acts) **are not up to us**.” The argument for the second premise [p. 181]: “**If** (i) **no one is morally responsible for having failed to perform any act**, **and** (ii) **no one is morally responsible for any event**, **and** (iii) **no one is morally responsible for any state of affairs, then there is no such thing as moral responsibility**.” For the third premise van Inwagen does not present a concise summary of his line of argument. He takes it as being self-evident that we have moral responsibility, as we do, after all, continue to hold people morally responsible for their actions.