# Skep NC

## NC [1:30]

#### Permissibility negates- Lack of obligation proves the resolution false- the res specifically says you have to prove an 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. [B] Statements are more often false than true. If I say this pen is red, I can only prove it true one way where I can prove it false in an infinite amount of ways.

#### Skepticism is true and it negates-

#### [1] Moral Skep: Justice requires us to act immediately since waiting in the face of injustice is itself an injustice. However, we need to be fully informed to avoid formulating a rule incorrectly and unjustly, so obligations are internally contradictory. Derrida,

But **justice,** however unpresentable it may be, doesn't wait.· It is that which **must not wait.** To be direct, simple and brief, let us say this: **a just decision is always required immediately, "right away." It cannot furnish itself with** infinite information and the **unlimited knowledge of conditions,** rules or hypothetical imperatives **that could justify it.** And **even if it did** have all that at its disposal, even if it did give itself the time, all the time and all the necessary facts about the matter, **the moment of decision,** as such, **always remains a finite moment of urgency** and precipitation, since it must not be the consequence or the effectof this theoretical or historical knowledge, of this reflection or this deliberation, **since it always marks the interruption of the** juridico- or ethico- or politico-**cognitive deliberation that precedes it,** that must precede it. The instant of decision is a madness, says Kierkegaard. This is particularly true of the instant of the just decision that must rend time and defy dialectics. It is a madness. **Even if time** and prudence,the patience of knowledge and the mastery of conditions **were** hypothetically **unlimited, the decision would be structurally finite,** however late it came, decision of urgency and precipitation, **acting in** the night of **non-knowledge and non-rule.**

**Absolute moral truth is impossible to attain, individual moral culpability is nonexistent, and categorical moral laws will eventually become obsolete – Ethics devolve to the individual perspective because people constantly gain new knowledge and shift identities. Anker1**

As mentioned and affirmed, all things (concepts, words, objects, subjects, etc.) are in a state of becoming. Gaining knowledge or insight into any of these particulars thus entails an unstable terrain. **If some-thing is constantly in a state of** also **becoming some-thing other, there is no stable ground for absolute knowledge** and judgment. Furthermore, and to complicate matters even more so, **it is not only the object** being considered **that exists in a state of transformation, but** also **the “subject” doing the interpretation. What we have** left **is a** thoroughly **perspectival** (Nietzsche) **relation to viewing and interpreting what we see and know of this world.** By affirming this, **knowledge becomes not** a ground or **an end in itself, but the means for a continual perspectival shifting**. Perspectivism, as a thoroughly ungrounded and continuously shifting mode of interpretation, furthermore affirms the uncertainty of an indeterminate subject, object, and conceptual becoming.

#### [2] Moral theories must be motivational or non-motivational. Double Bind. Either [A] they are non-motivational and won’t be followed so morality can’t guide action since guides need to be followed or [B] morality is motivational and people will do what is says no matter what so it’s just descriptive of action, not providing an obligation

#### [3] External World Skep: No amount of subjective evidence can ever prove objective knowledge. Searle,

**[Y]ou could have the best possible evidence about some domain and** still **be** radically **mistaken**. You could have the best possible evidence about other people’s behavior and still be mistaken about their mental states. You could have the best possible evidence about the past and still be mistaken about the future. You could have the best possible evidence aboutyour own perceptualexperiences and still be mistaken about the external world. This is so **because you could be dreaming, having hallucinations**, be a brain in a vat, **or** be **deceieved** systematically by an evil demon.Strange situations, yes, but **it is impossible to disprove the potentiality for** any of **these scenarios.”**

**That negates since providing an obligation requires that [A] the one assigning the obligation has some externally reliable source of authority and [B] it assumes we know the facts about a situation and can make a case for an obligation which is impossible.**

#### [4] Paradoxes- [A] Meno’s- In order to discover something, it must already be known – this makes the quest for knowledge incomprehensible and thus impossible [B] Good Samaritan- 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 to exist to solve, which makes a moral attempt inherently immoral [C] Induction- either it’s the case we can predict the outcome of a situation, or we cannot. We cannot, insofar as no situation is ever replicated exactly, and even if it can, there’s no guarantee the outcome will be the same. If we can predict situations, that means everyone can, which means we will always predict each other, making a paradox of action. Insofar as we always attempt to predict the outcomes of each other’s actions, and will cancel out the obligations

# Extensions

### Overview

#### There are a couple of key framing issues. First is that I have to win a risk that skep is true and you vote negative. The aff has to prove the existence of a proactive obligation, but they’ve conceded multiple reasons why their framework cannot generate obligations. Even if they win their framework the rez’s statement of obligations is incoherent. Which means you vote negative because the ought becomes incoherent and the rez becomes false.

### Derrida

#### You’ve conceded Derrida, Big Mistake. You’ve conceded the warrant in Derrida that says a just action must be taken immediately otherwise it becomes immoral. But here is the problem, if we DO act immediately, we don’t have full knowledge of the situation, in which case the action is not moral and thus the obligation is not completed. Thus, obligations are internally contradictory and therefore the ought in the res is incoherent.

### Anker

#### Oopsie, you conceded the Anker evidence. It says that morality is impossible to attain because individuals are in a constant state of flux. Not only do objects change with the interpretation of knowledge, which means there is no absolute base for knowledge, it also says that subjects are in a constant change, which means we can never have a categorical morality because identities always shift- proven by slavery which was seen as moral back in the 1800s but now seen as bad- identities and knowledge have shifted perspectives. Means we can never achieve morality! Takes out the Ac framing and independently negates

### Motivationalism

#### You’ve dropped the Motivationalism double-bind. This is a game over issue. You’ve conceded that moral theories are bifurcated into being motivational and non-motivational. If the theory is non-motivational, agents won’t complete the obligation. Also flow that as a solvency deficit. Even if the theory is motivational, agents will complete the action no matter what. In that case the action becomes descriptive as the agent was not obligated. This means that obligations can’t motivate or they become descriptive, means you are stuck in huge double bind and the judge votes neg.

### External World Skep

#### You’ve conceded the Searle Evidence, which says that you could have the best evidence about some particular domain but be mistaken. This is because some external force we are unaware of is controlling our minds. It sounds absurd, but the fact that we can’t disprove it means we can’t be confident that obligations are correct. Now Extend the analytic A point that says there has to be some reliable external source prescribing the obligation, but that can’t be true cause our knowledge is false. This means it’s a game over issue for the AC. Even if they are winning every issue in this round, external world skep takes it out because we can’t be sure the aff has the correct world interpretation. Now extend the B point that says obligations assume we know facts about the world, but since we can’t prove that true we can’t prove obligations to be true, auto negate here.

### Paradoxes

#### You’ve conceded Meno’s paradox. You’ve conceded that gaining knowledge is impossible, thus the aff is epistemologically false. Either it’s the case that something is known in which case inquiry is useless, or that something is unknown and discovery is needed, but discovery is impossible because you don’t know what you are trying to find. Triggers epistemological skep and takes out the aff because its predicated on knowledge.

#### You’ve also conceded Good Samaritan. You glossed over the warrant that says to desire to fix a problem requires your desire of the problem to exist. Which makes any moral attempt to fix a problem immoral. Also if you want to fix the problem, you need the squo to exist to be able to fix, so affirming negates under good Samaritan.

#### You’ve conceded the induction double bind. Either we can or can’t predict situations. If we can’t predict situations, it takes out the entire aff since it’s entirely predicated on inductive reasoning. But, if we can predict situations so can everybody else. Thus, we will try to predict each other’s actions which cancels out obligations.

# Frontlines

## A2 Moral Repugnance

#### [1] Insofar as you’ve conceded Truth Testing, you have to prove Skep DESCRIPTVELY false. You can’t just prove why it would be bad to have skep. You conflate bad and false. Your argument just says why it would be better not to follow skep, not why skep is false. This means that skep is still descriptively true in which case the judge negates.

#### [2] Non Uq- Somebody with a different conception of morality in another country or time would say that you are the one being immoral, but you can’t weigh competing reasons without ascribing to some biased form of morality, the implication is that you can’t prove what is bad or good because that is begging the question of your own morality- also flow this as an additional reason skep is true

## A2 Theory

#### [1] Skep operates on a higher layer than theory. It is lexically prior in terms of the fact that it indicts theory’s assumption that morality exists (i.e voting off of an abuse story, fairness is a voter, etc.). Thus to begin to run theory means they first have to substantively beat skep. They haven’t done that, means that theory is inoperable in this round, skep is still true and you still negate. Don’t buy their layering arguments in the 2ar about how theory is prior.

#### [2] Insofar as you’ve conceded truth testing, theory has 0 offense. The judge can only vote on arguments that assert the truth or falsity of the resolution. Reading theory does none of that, so even if you are winning every standard there is no voter under theory that the judge can vote on. Voting on fairness and education don’t affirm the truth value of the rez.

#### [3] Cross Apply external world skep- we could never know your theory interp is correct because we could be fooled by external beings. Err neg on theory. You shouldn’t feel comfortable voting on this interp if we don’t know if it has the correct world interpretation- this is terminal defense on theory, err against it.

#### [4] Cross Apply Nardin, the rules of debate are set. Rule changes that claim to improve fairness or education aren’t justifications since the rules are absolute. The only rules are sides, speech times, and truth testing. Nardin takes out theory.

#### [5] Even if you believe in this abuse story vote neg, Cross Apply Good Samaritan Paradox- In order to fix the abuse story, you must first say you want the abuse story to exist. So any moral attempt to fix the abuse story is immoral because you desire the problem to exist in the first place. So if the judge wants to vote on theory, they need to vote neg because to fix the problem they need the “abuse” to exist so just vote neg to maintain it. Empirically proven by debaters reading frivolous T or finding some arbitrary T violation, you want the abuse so you can win.

#### [6] Cross Apply Derrida. Theory is a rule based on justice (i.e punishing the other side for being abusive). Here is the problem, justice requires us to act immediately because waiting in the face of injustice is itself an injustice. But we need to be fully informed as to not formulate the rule incorrectly and unjustly, so theory is internally contradictory because we don’t know when the rule is correctly formed.

**[7] Cross apply Anker- theory is a rule, but rules become obselete as identities are in constant shift, empirically proven with plans bad being a thing back then and now seen as ridiculous. Anker operates on a higher layer since it critiques rules which theory is based on.**

#### They need to beat back all these responses before making any weighing args or extending standards, each response independently takes out theory. No grouping arguments together, they are distinct with unique warrants.

## A2 Risk of Ethics

#### [1] This is mitigatory defense at best- Skep would deny any chance of ethics being true, so a 1% chance that skep is true still negates, and if we win a single warrant from the NC you automatically negate.

#### [2] Don’t buy this silly Pascal’s wager argument. There are hundreds of other competing moral theories, you only eliminated skep, so you have increased the probability of your ethical theory being true by a fractional percentage. This is super minuscule at best. So even if you prove ethics true, you still haven’t proven yours true relative to the hundreds of other ethical theories- flow this as another warrant for skep, our disagreement in ethics prove there is no such thing as morality.

**[3] Literally all philosophers develop their ethical code to escape skep- means that if your fw false skep is automatically true. Your philosopher would automatically concede skep true if we beat your fw, which means they vote for me.**

## A2 Intuitions

#### [1] Just because something is unintuitive does not mean it’s false- this is a bad conflation.

#### [2] This is a normative argument against why skep is bad, but you conceded truth testing so you still have not proven why skep is false, which means the judge can still negate on skep.

#### [3] Aspects of morality seem intuitive because it’s what has been drilled into you since you were a baby. Under this logic, racism seemed intuitive to slave holders in the 1800s- flow this as a turn, it’s a contradiction in their own faulty logic.

#### [4] Skep is the most intuitive, because it is apriori. I.E. absent social constructs everybody would follow their own individual course of action because illusory objective obligations don’t exist. Skep describes a natural state of affairs. Your preconceptions cloud your intuition.

## A2 Unsafe for debaters

#### [1] Non-uq- you could argue every moral theory is unsafe for some subset of the population. You could argue that kant is unsafe because it forces closeted LGBT folx to come out to their parents since lying is universally bad. Util is unsafe for black and jewish debaters because it was that ethical theorizing that led to slavery and the holocaust. This becomes regressive as we would be cutting out huge aspects of debate out till we don’t have anything we can debate about. If your arg was consistent, we’d kill larp, phil, and K debate. Which means this arg is a wash and can’t be weighed. If you do buy this argument- it takes out their fw and with no fw in the round vote neg on presumption.

## A2 Skep Bad Theory

#### [A] Interp: The neg may have skepticism arguments present in the NC if they contain the word skepticism

#### [B] I meet

#### [C] Standards

#### [1] Skep Education: Literally all philosophers have to deal with skep when defending their moral theory. The reason why Philsophers defend their ethical theory is to try to avoid skep. Skep is a huge part of phil and to completely ignore it because “it’s stupid or unfair” just does a disservice to the lit. We should be skeptical about everything-This is also key to topical education as the only way in which we can learn about the topic is if we get insight into skep in and of itself. This allows us to engage in topical debates in the future.

#### [D] Voters: Education because it’s the reason debaters debate. Fairness abuse is temporary at best, but the education you gain from this round you can take to the real world and EVEN OTHER Debate rounds where you can learn to counter this argument or similar ones if you hit it again. This outweighs fairness, because with no education schools wouldn’t fund debate. Education Is a prereq to fairness, education is the causal link to debate existing. My impact is proven because debaters are forced to learn about and counter skep which is education, but there hasn’t been a decline in debaters debating because of skep.

## A2 NIBS

#### [1] Non-uq debate has a bunch of NIBS I.E topicality, speech times, being present in the room, etc.

#### [2] No structural skew, you already spent the 1AC justifying an obligation. You can literally beat skep like any other type of argument and extend the 1AC advantage, etc to prove an obligation to vote aff.

#### [3] Non uq- Debaters always read T and Theory without RVI’s in which case those become NIBs, yet we don’t complain then.

#### [4] NIBS are real world, actions have certain side constraints in the real world. Ignoring them would be foolhardy- that means on a normative level we are key to education

#### [5] Nibs being unfair is not a reason to vote aff, doesn’t prove the truth value of the resolution.

## One NIB good

#### [A] Interp: Debaters may run one necessary but insufficient burden

# Atrocities

#### AT Justifies Atrocities: Overview – the NC makes no claim as to the ethicality of the action of the 1ac, it does not deny that we can claim x things are good or bad, but rather makes the claim that assigning an obligation based on those is conceptually incoherent. This is a descriptive claim that does not say one ought to do x, but rather x is how the world works which makes the aff incoherent. This means any response based on the morality of the NC are not responsive since the NC doesn’t make a moral claim about the world. 1. The NC just proves why assigning obligations is contradictory and self-defeating, not that we cannot make moral claims about the world. 2. There’s a pre/post fiat distinction that solves this argument – my argument is in the context of creating truth claims, not moral actions outside the round which means these types of responses don’t matter. 3. You conflate logic and reasoning with ethicality, the NC is an analysis of the logical inconsistencies with the aff that makes even their model of creating a new world net worse insofar as they are inconsistent with truth, which means I don’t make a claim to moral reasoning that would justify things like slavery.

# CW offense

#### AT Comparative Worlds Answers: I don’t have to win truth testing for my offense to function – 1. Denying an obligation is possible in one world proves that the squo is net preferable since that is the only world that maintains coherence and prevents the creation of a contradiction. 2. Contradictions are a side constraint to the existence of a preferable world since a. living in a world with contradictions justifies anything (ie saying racism bad and practicing slavery) b. contradictions are net worse in any world since it prevents the creation of some form of knowledge or coherent action which means any reason the aff produces a contradiction in conception is sufficient to negate even absent truth testing 3. Even if we compare worlds, any world with an obligation is contradictory which means at best you default to presumption since both worlds are bad, which means you vote neg since we presume the status quo over the creation of even more contradictions.