# Monism NC

## NC[2:00]

**The standard is consistency with metaphysics. Metaphysics is the foundation of philosophy and action – the correct theory ensures consistency with reality. Landauer et al,** Landauer, Jeff, and Joseph Rowlands. *Reason Is Absolute*, [www.importanceofphilosophy.com/Metaphysics\_Main.html](http://www.importanceofphilosophy.com/Metaphysics_Main.html). **Metaphysics is** the branch of philosophy responsible for the study of existence. It is **the foundation of a worldview**. It answers the question "What is?" **It encompasses everything that exists, as well as the nature of existence** itself. It says whether the world is real, or merely an illusion. It is a fundamental view of the world around us. **Metaphysics is the foundation of philosophy. Without an explanation** or an interpretation **of the world around us, we would be helpless to deal with reality**. We could not **feed ourselves, or act** to preserve our lives. **The degree to which our metaphysical worldview is correct is the degree to which we are able to comprehend the world, and act accordingly. Without this firm foundation, all knowledge becomes suspect**. Any flaw in our view of reality will

#### Metaphysics is a prerequisite to any other moral theory.

#### Next, Monism, the thesis that there exists only one thing and that plurality is impossible, is the only coherent account of metaphysics- 3 warrants

#### First, if there were multiple things, then there would have to be spaces between those things, i.e. if there are two squares, then there must be a space between them. If there were no space, those things would just be one thing, because there would be no distinction. But, that space between things is itself an object. If it were not, it would have to be a part of the other two objects, which would mean there would in fact be no space between the objects and they would be the same. Objects are only differentiable because of space between them, but since those spaces are just new objects, there must be a space between the space and the object, which would just become a new object. Thus, plurality is impossible since any way of distinguishing between things just bridges the distinction by adding an object which must become self-identical with both of the objects you aim to draw a distinction between.

#### Second, assuming plurality, anything can be infinitely subdivided to create different objects within an object. For instance, I can bisect a rectangle and that rectangle becomes two rectangles, and I can bisect those and they become two rectangles ad infinitum. If dividing is infinite and the object is always halved, that one object's parts are infinitely small. But non-existent parts cannot add to a quantity of any size, so nothing would exist. Even if parts do have some size, there are an infinite number of them at the base of the division, and an infinite number of finitely small things is infinitely big. Multiple infinitely large things is impossible since they would extend infinitely into one another, so finite parts still proves pluralism impossible. Monism solves division altogether since the thesis of monism is that you can't divide an object into other objects.

#### And Third, Schaffer 13,

<https://stanford.library.sydney.edu.au/archives/spr2013/entries/monism/> To my knowledge there is one main argument for **existence monism,** which is that it **provides the simplest sufficient ontology.** The idea is that **we can give a complete account of the phenomena in which the world is the only concrete object mentioned, so** that **there is need to posit any further concreta.** The argument may be formulated as follows: 1. **The world is the only concrete object needed to explain how the world evolves.** Somewhat more precisely, 1 claims that **the complete causal story of the world can be told in terms of the physical aspect of the world** (a path in physical configuration space), together with whatever laws of nature govern temporal evolution. **No pieces of the world** (such as tables or particles) **need be mentioned in this story.** To take a toy example, **consider** **a** Newtonian **world containing** what the folk would describe as **a rock shattering a window. The complete causal story here can be told purely in terms of the world's occupational manner** vis-à-vis Newtonian configuration space.[[16](http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/monism/notes.html%22%20%5Cl%20%2216)] **The rock and the window need not be mentioned.** **The world bears all the causal information.** The argument then adds that **recognizing** proper **parts of the world is recognizing what is** either **explanatorily** **redundant** or epiphenomenal: 2. If the world is the only concrete object needed to explain how the world evolves, then if there were proper **parts of the world,** these proper parts **would be explanatorily** **redundant** or epiphenomenal **entities.** If the world suffices to explain everything, then **there is nothing left for** its proper **parts to explain.** Its proper **parts can at best explain what the world already suffices for.** So if the proper parts explain anything at all they are redundant, while if they explain nothing at all they are epiphenomenal. The argument continues with a rejection of both explanatorily redundant and epiphenomenal entities: 3. There are no explanatorily redundant or epiphenomenal entities. Such a rejection is best defended on methodological grounds. **Occam's Razor cuts against** both **explanatorily redundant** and epiphenomenal **entities, as there can be no need for positing [them]** either.[[17](http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/monism/notes.html%22%20%5Cl%20%2217)] From which the argument concludes: 4. **The world has no** proper **parts.** The conclusion may seem shocking, but the argument is valid, and the premises seem plausible.[[19](http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/monism/notes.html%22%20%5Cl%20%2219)]

#### Now Negate:

#### First, ought statements regulate conduct between agents. Even a purely mental duty to "one-self" assumes a tangible distinction between the self and the mind holding the duty; otherwise, it wouldn't be a duty because it is purely self-imposed. Thus, if there are not multiple agents, ought statements are false. Permissibility negates because ought is linguistically used to form an obligation, for instance if I say you ought to give to charity, I mean an obligation, not that you may.

#### Second, the resolutional statement's truth is dependent on there being distinctions between things – states and nuclear arsenals. If there is one thing, then the statement is false so you vote neg.

## Frontlines

### A2 Theory

#### [1] Monism takes out theory. If everything is one abuse is impossible. Theory is read because there is another “party”, but since everything is one, theory is incoherent.

#### [2] Since Theory functions off the foundation of pluralism, because it assumes multiple parties are involved, it is not consistent with metaphysics. Here is the problem, if we are not consistent with metaphysics our epistemology becomes suspect, that’s Launder. You should not feel comfortable voting off arguments that assume plurality because they have a false take on reality, thus if their underlying structure is false the entire thing is false.

### A2 Kritik

#### [1] Takes out the K- the kritik assumes pluralism but the NC critiques that assumption which means we are a kritik of the kritik. Also means we operate on a higher level because our framework is a prereq to being able to cohere an accurate account of the world, absent that, your epistemology is flawed and the judge should not feel comfortable voting on false epistemology, err neg here.

## 2NR Moves[1:00]

### Presumption/Permissibility

#### First the presumption/permissibility debate- presume neg because we assume statements to be false until proven true, that’s why we don’t believe in alternate realities or conspiracy theories. That means intuitively you would presume neg. Next is this probability warrant- If I say this timer is white there is only one way to prove it true, while there are an infinite number of weights to prove it false. This probability argument outweighs and if you are unsure which was presumption flows just choose neg because of probability.

#### On Permissibility- ought means to prove a proactive obligation, that means proving a lack of obligation proves the resolution false. You can’t have an obligation and a lack of obligation simultaneously.

### Epistemic Confidence

#### Use epistemic confidence. Evaluate and filter all in round offense under the winning framework. That means if I win the NC framework outweighs or precludes the Framework you vote negative because we have linked offense under the framework.

**The standard is consistency with metaphysics. First the weighing. The NC framing comes first because without an accurate view of reality all our epistemology is false. All of our knowledge comes from an assumption of how the world works, that’s launder. That means even if you don’t buy the Truth Testing NC and don’t want to vote under that, you can independently vote on epistemology. Extend the analytic under Launder that says Epistemology outweighs and comes lexically prior to framework because [1] it determines how we know what we know and [2] all claims require epistemology which means we have to evaluate epistemology first before we can evaluate other thesis claims like the AFF. You can’t impact turn epistemology because that concedes the validity of epistemology in the first place. So if we win on the indict of epistemology vote negative even if they win their offense because the underlying epistemology is false. Now on the NC framework.**

#### Monism, or thesis that everything is one, is the only coherent account of metaphysics.Here is the implication. Any argument based off the assumption of pluralism (i.e an advantage, etc. ) are false because they aren’t consistent with metaphysics. Now the extensions!

#### Now extend the 1st warrant that says for there to be multiple objects there must exist a space between objects. Now here is the problem, that space between things is itself an object. If it were not, it would have to be a part of the other two objects, which would mean there would in fact be no space between the objects and they would be the same, thus plurality is false. Takes out all pluralistic arguments.

#### Now extend the 2nd warrant that says even if we assume plurality, infinitely dividing objects till they become infinitely small. But the issue is that infinitely small objects have no finite mass, thus plurality is false. Even if the infinitely small objects had size it would be incoherent because an infinite amount of infinitely small things added together becomes infinitely big. Multiple infinitely large things is impossible since they would extend infinitely into one another, so finite parts still proves pluralism impossible.

#### Now extend the 3rd warrant that says Monism is proved true under Occam’s razor. It can explain the world in the most succinct manner relative to pluralism, thus it is proved true.

#### Now you negate because ought statements assume plurality because of multiple agents, so the res becomes incoherent. Even if you obligate yourself, you are making a tangible distinction between the mind and the body, otherwise it wouldn’t be a duty because it is purely self imposed. You can also negate on the fact that the res mentions multiple distinct empirical entities which become false under the standard, so you can negate on that fact.