NC

1ST OFF

My criterion is Sutilitarianism, defined as maximizing the happiness of Joe Su, or myself.

This is the best criterion for 8 reasons.

1, me being happy is a good thing. I want to be happy.

2, me being happy is not a bad thing and is in fact a good thing.

3, if I am not happy, I will be sad. Me being sad is a bad thing.

4, if I am not not happy, I will be not sad. Me being not sad is not a bad thing and is a good thing.

5, if I am not not not happy, I will be not not sad. Me being not not sad is not not a bad thing.

6, I am the only person that exists. There is no way I can confirm you exist but I am able to confirm that I exist, so logically I’m the only person that matters because I’m the only one that exists

7 I made morality lol

8 it sounds cooler than their criterion and things that sound cooler are more likely to be actually cooler

My sadness is the biggest impact to the round because I control morality

8 is bigger than their number, so you should prefer my framework

Sutil negates

Subpoint A) my friends have bids and I don’t which makes me feel worth less than them and makes me sad

Examples: Nate “Middle name debate” Weimar, Shreya “real gamer” Joshi, Elizabeth “Immanuel K.” Yamamoto

Subpoint B) my friends who don’t have bids are still better than me which also makes me sad, ie Ria “professional mock trialer” Tomar and Michael “kinda sus” Meng

Subpoint C) This topic is bad and doesn’t have any phil nc’s. The topic being bad makes me sad. That outweighs because I control the internal link to all education in the round. If i decide we shouldn’t discuss larp, then i will prevent the debate from being about that.

2ND OFF:  
Counterplan advocacy: the appropriation of outer space by private entities other than Joe Su is unjust.

I called dibs on outer space first. Any appropriation of outer space by anyone else violates my dibs.

Mutually exclusive because duh

Net benefit is that I’m happy which is the highest impact in the round

3RD OFF:  
Reject cards

1. Accessibility, a) not everyone can cut cards from sites with paywalls but everyone has the ability to use reason. Debaters from smaller schools don’t have the massive backfiles that big schools do, rejecting cards solves b) prevents racist/sexist/homophobic/transphobic authors from being read in debate, those authors exclude debaters who identify as those things which is violent against those debaters. Also if any debater says anything discriminatory their opponent can just argue against that analytically or make that an independent voter with analytics.
2. Appeal to authority, there is no logical reason why authors should be preferred over debaters making arguments in-round. Just because they have some fancy letters behind their name in the order p h and d doesn’t mean their arguments are more logically sound than mine. Your argument to prefer cards is that someone else said it instead of you but I could just pay some random person on the street to say that same thing. Outside sources aren’t necessary
3. Confirmation bias, your use of cards just backs up conclusions you had already reached which is fallacious. The only solution is to reject cards and argue through logic, starting from the ground up.
4. Critical thinking, cards remove the ability to critically think because we just repeat what other people said instead of thinking for ourselves. Removing them solves and forces us to think in order to respond to arguments instead of just reaching into backfiles
5. External world skepticism, their empirics about the real world can’t be verified because we could all be deceived by an evil demon or be brains in vats and be deceived into thinking the external world is as it is without knowing. If that’s the case, the content of their cards is meaningless and we don’t need to care about them.
6. Prevents evidence ethics violations, you can’t have an evidence ethics violation if you don’t have evidence so I create the most academic integrity
7. No reason why you need cards in the first place because you can just make the argument analytically
8. Tetlock proves that experts don’t know jack shit and are literally the same as dart-throwing monkeys

4TH OFF:

1. The ROTB is TT - A) Isomorphism: alternative RTBs aren’t binary win/loss, and thus cannot function in debate B) Constitutivism: the ballot and tab software presents decisions as aff/neg, not who best achieves some good value. Also, “affirm” is “To state that is true” [1] and negate is “to deny the existence or truth of”, which independently proves truth testing. C) Key to 1) Ground Parity: The wording committee and topic selection process exist to identify topics with a range of defensible arguments on both sides, “role of the ballot” claims can frame the round in ways that make my ground either absurd or morally abhorrent 2) Predictability: The only face value of a resolution is it’s truth or falsity as a statement – not some inherent other framework

2. Zeno’s paradox. If I want to travel some distance, I must first travel half of that distance, but then I have to travel half of that distance and so on into infinity. This proves motion impossible, so you negate.

3. Good Samaritan paradox. If I want to solve x problem, x problem has to exist first which would mean I want that problem to exist. Means doing the aff is silly so you negate

4. Decision making paradox. If I make a decision, I have to make a decision to make that decision, which would be a metadecision. But then I have to make a decision to make that decision, and so on into infinity. This means that decisions are impossible, so you negate.

5. Place paradox. If x is in some place, then that place has to be in another place, but that place has to be in another place, and into infinity. This means that places can’t exist, and the private entities take place in a place, so you negate.

6. Grain paradox. A single grain of wheat doesn’t make sound when dropped, but a handful do.

7. There are no obligations to other states, so any action at the state level is permitted under justice. For something to be unjust it must violate some established duty. The constituting obligations of states are not international so justice doesn't constrict interstate action. International law doesn't establish obligations because first the OST clarifies that none of its language restricts sovereignty and second so no action determined at the state level violates any obligations under justice and all state actions are just. Thus, you negate on face

8. justice is state contextual because principles must be determined in a deliberative framework to avoid arbitrary imposition by elites. Because there is no third party arbiter to fairly determine principles of global justice, all actions determined by states meet justice contextually and you negate a priori

9. Rule following paradox. In order to follow a rule, I need another rule to clarify that rule, but I need another rule to clarify that rule so I need infinite rules in order to clarify, so following rules is impossible. Means the aff is impossible so you autonegate

10. Outer space is defined as the space outside celestial bodies. **New World Encyclopedia 19:**

**Outer space** (often called space) **consists of the relatively empty regions of the universe outside the atmospheres of celestial bodies. *Outer* space is used to distinguish it from airspace and terrestrial locations.** There is no clear boundary between Earth's atmosphere and space, as the density of the atmosphere gradually decreases as the altitude increases. **For practical purposes, the Fédération Aéronautique Internationale has established the Kármán line,** at an altitude of 100 kilometers (62 mi), **as a working definition for the boundary between aeronautics and astronautics.** This line was chosen because, as Theodore von Kármán calculated, a vehicle traveling above that altitude would have to move faster than orbital velocity to derive sufficient aerodynamic lift from the atmosphere to support itself. The United States designates people who travel above an altitude of 50 miles (80 km) as astronauts. During re-entry, roughly 120 kilometers (75 mi) marks the boundary where atmospheric drag becomes noticeable, depending on the ballistic coefficient of the vehicle.

"Outer space." *New World Encyclopedia,* . 8 Jan 2019, 21:11 UTC. 18 Dec 2021, 03:22 <https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/p/index.php?title=Outer\_space&oldid=1017020>.

Neg definition choice, aff should’ve defined in ac