# 1AC Berkeley Round 4

## 1AC

### Speaks

#### Give me 30 speaks—prevents arbitrary biases from seeping into the decision.

### FW

#### Ethics must begin a priori

#### 1] Empirical uncertainty—evil demon could deceive us and inability to know others experience make empiricism unreliable—outweighs since it would be escapable because people could say they don’t experience the same.

#### 2] Constitutive authority—I could infinitely question any ethical theory by asking “why” but only practical reason solves because asking “why” concedes the authority of reason.

#### 3] Naturalistic fallacy—experience only tells us what is, not what ought to be, but it’s impossible to derive an ought from descriptive premises so there needs to be a priori premises.

#### 4] Action theory—reason is key to evaluate intent and unify actions – otherwise we could infinitely divide actions. For example, if I was brewing tea, I could break up that action into multiple actions. If we were never able to unify action, we could never classify actions as moral or immoral since those actions would be divisible.

#### 5] Principle of explosion is true. Either the aff is winning OR they get the ballot is a statement where denying the first part that the aff is winning proves the second part that they should get the ballot.

**Wikiwand**. “Principle of Explosion.” Wikiwand, 0AD, [www.wikiwand.com/en/Principle\_of\_explosion](http://www.wikiwand.com/en/Principle_of_explosion). //Massa
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The principle of explosion (Latin: ex falso (sequitur) quodlibet (EFQ), "from falsehood, anything (follows)", or ex contradictione (sequitur) quodlibet (ECQ), **"from contradiction, anything (follows)"), or the principle of**[**Pseudo-Scotus**](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Pseudo-Scotus), is the law of [classical logic](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Classical_logic), [intuitionistic logic](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Intuitionistic_logic) and similar logical systems, according to which any statement can be proven from a contradiction.[[1]](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Principle_of_explosion#citenote1) That is, once a contradiction has been asserted, any proposition (including their negations) can be inferred from it. This is known as **deductive explosion**.[[2]](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Principle_of_explosion#citenote2)[[3]](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Principle_of_explosion#citenote3) The proof of this principle was first given by 12th century French philosopher [William of Soissons](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/William_of_Soissons).[[4]](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Principle_of_explosion#citenote4)

As a demonstration of the principle, **consider two contradictory statements – "All lemons are yellow" and "Not all lemons are yellow"**, and suppose that both are true. If that is the case, **anything can be proven**, e.g., **the assertion that "unicorns exist", by using the following argument:**

1. We know that **"All lemons are yellow"**, as it **has been assumed to be true.**
2. **Therefore**, the two-part statement **"All lemons are yellow OR unicorns exist” must also be true**, since the first part is true.
3. However, **since we know that "Not all lemons are yellow"** (as this has been assumed), **the first part is false, and hence the second part must be true, i.e., unicorns exist.**

#### 6] No objective reality.

MIT ’19 (Emerging Technology from the arXiv archive page; Covers latest ideas from blog post about arXiv; 03/12/2019; “Emerging Technology from the arXiv archive page”; <https://www.technologyreview.com/2019/03/12/136684/a-quantum-experiment-suggests-theres-no-such-thing-as-objective-reality/>; *MIT Technology Review*; accessed: 11/19/2020; MohulA)

Back in 1961, the Nobel Prize–winning physicist Eugene Wigner outlined a thought experiment that demonstrated one of the lesser-known paradoxes of quantum mechanics. The experiment shows how the strange nature of the universe allows two observers—say, Wigner and Wigner’s friend—to experience different realities. Since then, physicists have used the “Wigner’s Friend” thought experiment to explore the nature of measurement and to argue over whether objective facts can exist. That’s important because scientists carry out experiments to establish objective facts. But if they experience different realities, the argument goes, how can they agree on what these facts might be? That’s provided some entertaining fodder for after-dinner conversation, but Wigner’s thought experiment has never been more than that—just a thought experiment. Last year, however, physicists noticed that recent advances in quantum technologies have made it possible to reproduce the Wigner’s Friend test in a real experiment. In other words, it ought to be possible to create different realities and compare them in the lab to find out whether they can be reconciled. And today, Massimiliano Proietti at Heriot-Watt University in Edinburgh and a few colleagues say they have performed this experiment for the first time: they have created different realities and compared them. Their conclusion is that Wigner was correct—these realities can be made irreconcilable so that it is impossible to agree on objective facts about an experiment. Wigner’s original thought experiment is straightforward in principle. It begins with a single polarized photon that, when measured, can have either a horizontal polarization or a vertical polarization. But before the measurement, according to the laws of quantum mechanics, the photon exists in both polarization states at the same time—a so-called superposition. Wigner imagined a friend in a different lab measuring the state of this photon and storing the result, while Wigner observed from afar. Wigner has no information about his friend’s measurement and so is forced to assume that the photon and the measurement of it are in a superposition of all possible outcomes of the experiment. Wigner can even perform an experiment to determine whether this superposition exists or not. This is a kind of interference experiment showing that the photon and the measurement are indeed in a superposition. From Wigner’s point of view, this is a “fact”—the superposition exists. And this fact suggests that a measurement cannot have taken place. But this is in stark contrast to the point of view of the friend, who has indeed measured the photon’s polarization and recorded it. The friend can even call Wigner and say the measurement has been done (provided the outcome is not revealed). So the two realities are at odds with each other. “This calls into question the objective status of the facts established by the two observers,” say Proietti and co. That’s the theory, but last year Caslav Brukner, at the University of Vienna in Austria, came up with a way to re-create the Wigner’s Friend experiment in the lab by means of techniques involving the entanglement of many particles at the same time. The breakthrough that Proietti and co have made is to carry this out. “In a state-of-the-art 6-photon experiment, we realize this extended Wigner’s friend scenario,” they say. They use these six entangled photons to create two alternate realities—one representing Wigner and one representing Wigner’s friend. Wigner’s friend measures the polarization of a photon and stores the result. Wigner then performs an interference measurement to determine if the measurement and the photon are in a superposition. The experiment produces an unambiguous result. It turns out that both realities can coexist even though they produce irreconcilable outcomes, just as Wigner predicted. That raises some fascinating questions that are forcing physicists to reconsider the nature of reality. The idea that observers can ultimately reconcile their measurements of some kind of fundamental reality is based on several assumptions. The first is that universal facts actually exist and that observers can agree on them. But there are other assumptions too. One is that observers have the freedom to make whatever observations they want. And another is that the choices one observer makes do not influence the choices other observers make—an assumption that physicists call locality. If there is an objective reality that everyone can agree on, then these assumptions all hold. But Proietti and co’s result suggests that objective reality does not exist. In other words, the experiment suggests that one or more of the assumptions—the idea that there is a reality we can agree on, the idea that we have freedom of choice, or the idea of locality—must be wrong. Of course, there is another way out for those hanging on to the conventional view of reality. This is that there is some other loophole that the experimenters have overlooked. Indeed, physicists have tried to close loopholes in similar experiments for years, although they concede that it may never be possible to close them all. Nevertheless, the work has important implications for the work of scientists. “The scientific method relies on facts, established through repeated measurements and agreed upon universally, independently of who observed them,” say Proietti and co. And yet in the same paper, they undermine this idea, perhaps fatally. The next step is to go further: to construct experiments creating increasingly bizarre alternate realities that cannot be reconciled. Where this will take us is anybody’s guess. But Wigner, and his friend, would surely not be surprised.

#### Means action under one framework doesn’t preclude another. I can still have an obligation under the categorical imperative, even if the aff is bad under Hobbes so framing issues don’t exclude the offense.

#### That justifies universality—a priori principles apply to everyone since they are independent of experience and any non-universalizable norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative.

#### Prefer:

#### 1] Resource disparities—focusing on evidence privileges debaters with the most prep excluding lone-wolfs. A debater under my framework can easily be won without any prep since minimal evidence is required. That pre-req to accessing the activity.

#### 2] Performativity—freedom is the key to argumentation—willing we abide by their theory presupposes we own ourselves. Thus, it is logically incoherent to justify a standard without first willing that we can pursue ends free from others.

#### 3] The rules of logic claim that the only time a statement is invalid is if the antecedent is true, but the consequent is false.

SEP [Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.] “An Introduction to Philosophy.” Stanford University. <https://web.stanford.edu/~bobonich/dictionary/dictionary.html> TG Massa

Conditional statement: an “if p, then q” compound statement (ex. If I throw this ball into the air, it will come down); p is called the antecedent, and q is the consequent. A conditional asserts that if its antecedent is true, its consequent is also true; any conditional with a true antecedent and a false consequent must be false.  For any other combination of true and false antecedents and consequents, the conditional statement is true.

#### Implications:

**A] Neg a prioris affirm – denying the assumptions of a statement proves it valid – the aff is a set of conditionals since the offense being true relies on the framework**

**B] If the aff is winning, they get the ballot is a tacit ballot conditional which means denying the premise proves the conclusion that I should get the ballot.**

**4] Presumption and permissibility affirm –**

**A] Statements are true before false since if I told you my name, you’d believe me**

**B] Epistemics – we wouldn’t be able to start a strand of reasoning since we’d have to question that reason.**

**C] Illogical – presuming statements false is illogical since you can’t say things like P and ~P are both wrong.**

**D] Presuming obligations is logically safer since it’s better to be supererogatory than fail to meet an obligation.**

**E] Presuming statements false is impossible since we can’t operate in a world where we don’t trust anything.**

**F] Otherwise we’d have to have a proactive justification to do things like drink water.**

#### 6] There are infinite worlds, the aff is logical in one which is sufficient.

**Vaidman 2** Vaidman, Lev, 3-24-2002, "Many-Worlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)," No Publication, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/qm-manyworlds/>

-MWI: Multiple Worlds Interpretation

**The reason for adopting the MWI is that it avoids the collapse of the quantum wave.** (Other non-collapse theories are not better than MWI for various reasons, e.g., nonlocality of Bohmian mechanics; and the disadvantage of all of them is that they have some additional structure.) **The collapse postulate is a physical law that differs from all known physics in two aspects: it is genuinely random and it involves some kind of action at a distance**. According to the collapse postulate the outcome of a **quantum experiment is not determined by the initial conditions** of the Universe prior to the experiment: **only the probabilities are governed by the initial state**. Moreover, Bell 1964 has shown that there cannot be a compatible local-variables theory that will make deterministic predictions**. There is no experimental evidence in favor of collapse and against the MWI.**

#### Interpretation: The negative must concede the aff framework if it the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative and the advocacy is topical and disclosed

#### Violation: It’s preemptive

#### 1] Time skew- winning the framework moots 6 minutes of 1AC offense and forces a 1AR restart- outweighs on quantifiability and reversibility- we can’t get back time lost and it’s the only way to measure abuse.

#### 2] Topic Ed- every debate would just be a framework debate which crowds out core debates about the topic- outweighs- A] Timeframe- we only have 2 months to debate the topic B] Inclusion- Phil and K literature is dense and requires prior knowledge that excludes novices while topic literature is less esoteric C] Constitutivism- the only thing intrinsic to debate is the topic

#### Drop the debater and competing interps- the constitutive purpose of 1AC theory is to deter a practice and anything else lets them get away with it.

#### No RVIs on 1AC preemptive violations- allows them to read 7 minutes of a CI and autowins every debate- the whole 1AC can’t be the shell because they can just choose to not violate.

### Offense

#### Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust—we’ll defend the resolution as a general principle so PICs and CPs don’t negate since they don’t deny the general principle.

#### The aff is good under a standard of consistency with international law since the OST prevents appropriation.

#### Cosmopolitan obligations prove Kant affirms.

Walla 16 [(Alice Pinheiro, Department of Philosophy at Trinity College Dublin) “Common Possession of the Earth and Cosmopolitan Right” Kant-Studien Volume 107 Issue 1, 2016] TDI

Similarly to Grotius and Pufendorf, Kant tells us how external objects of choice can become the property of persons, that is, how the original suum can be extended to external objects. For Kant, this is far from being obvious. He assumes that we are born with a right to be free from unjustified interference in the exercise of our agency. This innate right also entails our physical integrity, but does not originally extend to objects outside us. The fundamental assumption which Kant shares with Grotius and Pufendorf is that rights can only be derived from something the person already has, that is, from the suum. Kant’s argument for the inclusion of external objects under the notion of right is that we must assume a legal capacity to become owners of objects, in order to avoid a contradiction. External freedom (and with it pure practical reason) would be depriving itself of the possibility of using objects of choice and thus contradicting itself (ein Widerspruch der äußeren Freiheit mit sich selbst). We must thus introduce a postulate of practical reason, assuming the possibility of becoming legal owners of objects. Once it has been established that external objects can become the matter of rights (i.e., that the suum can be extended to external objects), the next question Kant’s theory must address is the problem of acquisition of external objects. Acquisition is the empirical deed through which an external object is incorporated into a person’s suum. First or original acquisition is when an object becomes for the first time the possession of someone. Explaining the possibility of original acquisition is extremely important since all further acts of acquisition are derived from it. Interestingly, Kant argues that acquisition of land must be conceived as prior to the acquisition of objects. Possession of anything on a territory presupposes the possession of the territory itself, since objects are regarded as mere accidents of the substance on which they “inhere”, i.e. the land on which are located. Kant’s claim relies on the ontological dependence of accidents on the substance: just as the accidents cannot exist independently of the substance, movable objects cannot be acquired without the prior acquisition of land on which they are located. However, one may wonder if this ontological dependence can be extended to the relation between land and movable objects. Is it not possible to possess movable objects without possessing the land on which they are located? Katrin Flikschuh argued that unless one has some control over the land on which one’s possessions are situated one’s right to those possessions would be easily compromised. One would be at the mercy of others while pursuing one’s ends. While possession of external objects does not require that I myself possess the land on which these objects are placed, I must at least be able to enter some form of agreement with someone who owns or has control over the land lest I be in the situation of a squatter: someone who can be permanently pushed away with one’s possessions from one place to the other. If so, some kind of ownership of land or at least a right to control the land is necessary to secure one’s right to things. Because I can in principle occupy the space on which your object is situated by displacing your object from its location, displacing your object without your consent would be in principle no infringement upon your possession. We could think of a scenario where you would have to look for your car every time you leave work because it keeps being moved around from where you parked it in the morning. The car would still be yours, but you have no control over its location. However, secure possession of objects must entail the possibility of determining the location of one’s possessions. Although this is certainly correct, it seems to miss Kant’s fundamental point, which is not merely about the empirical conditions necessary for securing possession of objects, but about the normative priority of acquisition of land over acquisition of objects. Acquisition of land must be understood as normatively prior to acquisition of objects due to the spatial character of Kant’s theory of property and of his legal theory in general. Right has to do with external freedom, an aspect of freedom which would be irrelevant if we were not embodied rational beings, not only in space, but also confined with each other to the limited surface of the earth. The limited dimension of the planet (which also defines the limits of human expansion) renders the interaction and the possibility of impact on the mutual exercise of external freedom inevitable. Our agency can have, and will most likely have, an impact on the agency and rights of others. Nowadays we do not even need to travel to distant lands to do this: climate change proves that my external deeds can have a considerable impact on your agency and way of living wherever you are. In other words, we are globally interconnected, whether we want it or not. Therefore, there would be no problem of Right without the possibility of interaction which arises from our embodiment and the limited space to which we are confined. The problem of Right in Kant’s theory is thus essentially a spatial problem: we must bring the external exercise of freedom of a plurality of persons under a system of external freedom, that is, in accordance with universal laws which can regulate these interactions. Without universal laws, that is, a priori principles, there can be no necessity and consequently no rights and obligations that deserve the name. Therefore, although the problem of Right has an empirical component, namely the facts about the human condition mentioned above, the solution to the problem of right must nevertheless be provided by rational principles. The project of Kant’s legal philosophy in the Doctrine of Right is to provide the a priori principles capable of addressing the problem of right, taking into account the different levels of possible interaction and institutionalization of right: within individuals in a common polity (state right), between polities (international right) and as citizens of the world (cosmopolitan right). Although we can conceive possession of objects as separate from possession of land, this independence is only normatively possible through the idea that the first proprietor of land can dispose of the objects acquired via his acquisition of land. The idea is that persons were able to enter contractual relations with whoever first possessed the land and thus acquire movable objects independently of possessing the land themselves. Kant’s point is to explain where acquired rights to movable objects come from, normatively speaking. Once acquisition of objects becomes independent from possession of land, we need contracts regulating the location of objects, that is, agreements between possessors of land or those with jurisdictional rights over land and proprietors of movable objects. I can park my car in the street, even though the street does not belong to me, provided I satisfy certain requirements (I might need to pay a parking ticket or refrain from parking at certain areas at certain times and so on). Acquiring land for the first time must be regarded as a realization or “particularization” of innate right. But this is the beginning of another problem. First acquisition of a piece of land involves both singling out a specific part of land as my “dominion” and excluding others from access to it. However, Kant’s legal theory does not assign a right conferring function to empirical acts. If acquisition is to have a legal quality, its lawfulness cannot be grounded on an empirical act. Further, if empirical acquisition justified possession, we would have to regard possession as a legal relationship between a thing and a person. This is not an option in Kant’s theory, according to which legal relations pertain only between persons as beings capable of obligation and consequently as subjects of rights. Therefore, the legal foundation or title (Rechtsgrund, titulus possessionis) enabling the acquisition of land must be understood as follows: it must precede the empirical act of acquisition and is not created by it; is a relation between persons in regard to external objects, and finally it is able to impose an obligation on all others to respect one’s acquisition. The idea of the original community of the earth is what constitutes this Rechtsgrund: All human beings are originally in common possession of the land of the entire earth (communio fundi originaria) and each has by nature the will to use it (lex iusti) which, because the choice of one is unavoidably opposed by nature to that of another, would do away with any use of it if this will did not also contain the principle for choice by which a particular possession for each on the common land could be determined (lex iuridica) But the law which is to determine for each what land is mine or yours will be in accordance with the axiom of outer freedom only if it proceeds from a will that is united originally and a priori (that presupposes no rightful act for its union). Hence it proceeds only from a will in the civil condition (lex iustitiae distributivae), which alone determines what is right (recht), what is rightful (rechtlich), and what is laid down as right (Rechtens). But in the former condition, that is before the establishment of the civil condition, but with a view to it, that is provisionally, it is a duty to proceed in accordance with the principle of external acquisition. Accordingly, there is also a rightful capacity of the will to bind everyone to recognize the act of taking possession and of appropriation as valid, even though it is only unilateral. A unilateral will cannot impose an obligation on others. It is a contingent exercise of freedom and has no authority to impose an obligation. For this, we would need the consent of all others whose exercise of freedom is restricted by that unilateral act. Omnis obligatio est contracta: all obligation must be self-imposed. The idea of a united will of all therefore extends the scope of Kant’s reason based legal philosophy, introducing what seems to be a voluntaristic element in his theory. A unilateral will can only impose an obligation on others if it is the will of everyone that it be so. However, for Kant it is not enough that this be the will of all (as a contingent matter of fact), but that it is a priori the will of all. In Kant’s reason based legal theory, only reason can impart necessity. The necessity of respecting unilateral acts of acquisition is thus derived not from the unilateral acts themselves (which are empirical and therefore contingent), but from the united will of all, which is a priori and therefore necessary.

### Actual Underview

#### 1] 1AR theory is legit—anything else means infinite abuse—drop the debater, competing interps, highest layer—1AR is too short to make up for the time trade-off—no RVIs or 2NR theory and paradigm issues– 6 min 2NR means they can brute force me every time.

#### 2] Neg a priori’s do not negate

#### A] They assume I didn’t already meet my burden after the AC

#### B] Resolved is defined as settle or find a solution to (a problem, dispute, or contentious matter) so the past tense, resolved, means the resolution has already been solved

That’s Lexico- https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/resolve

#### C] A prioris 1st – they question the validity of logic which all your arguments are predicated upon

#### 3] If I win one layer, vote aff

#### A] They have 7 minutes to uplayer and nullify my offense

#### B] Forces engagement with the aff since they have to defend all arguments which means they read better ones.

#### C] Evaluate the debate after the 1AC – key to preventing the 1N from reading unfair arguments. Responses presume the debate hasn't already been evaluated.

#### 4] All neg interps are counter interps since the aff takes an implicit stance on every issue which means any neg theory interp requires an RVI to become offensive.

#### Evaluate the theory debate after the 1AR since a) the 6 min 2n can dump on theory making the 3 min 2AR impossible b) we both get 1 speech on theory.

#### 5] RVI on NC theory – you can read arguments such as T that are exclusively neg so I need them to compensate and weighing is structurally unfair since the 7-4-6-3 time skew means that the neg can just dump on weighing and the 2ar becomes impossible.

#### Only vote on fully verifiable interps because otherwise people lose on theory for no reason which kills the purpose of norm setting.

#### 6] Reject neg fairness concerns since

#### A] 13-7 time skew and 6-minute collapse gives the negative the strategic advantage and means the AFF must split 1AR time.

#### B] The NC has the ability to uplayer and restart the round and have time to generate offense that matters.

#### E] No neg analytics – I don’t have time to cover 100 blippy 1NC args since you can read 7 min of analytics and extend any of them to win. Answering this triggers, a contradiction since it relies on an analytic argument and those affirm since I spoke first and they were your fault for creating and you could’ve adapted.

#### 7] Affirming is harder

#### A] Neg is reactive – they tailor the 1NC before the round to exploit the aff’s weakness. Not reciprocal – affs enter the round unaware.

#### Also means no neg weighing – it supercharges the abuse since they can collapse in the 2NR and outweigh any turns I make.

#### Also means the neg must extend all of their arguments TWICE verbatim in the 2NR to compensate – means if neg gets weighing, they must weigh prefiat args against side bias since otherwise I’m just making the ground even.

#### 8] Accept aff interps and definitions

#### A] causes regress since we can infinitely debate what something means but the aff speaks first which means they should define it

#### B] moots 6 mins of the aff if you alter the way arguments function.