# Unger NC

## NC

#### [1] Use epistemic confidence in the debate i.e evaluate all offense under the winning framework 5 warrants [A] You use confidence to choose to use modesty which cedes the validity of confidence and [B] Modesty is incoherent, you can’t be 60% sure of Deont and 40% sure of Util, you can’t split ethical theories. [C] Modesty invites judge intervention- judges become calculators for determining how much you are winning the framework debate by and how strong your offense links to the framework. [D] Modesty encourages debaters to read extinction scenarios to outweigh under modesty which kills clash on the fw debate which kills phil ed.

#### [2] 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.

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

#### Epistemology first because it determines how we know what we know, absent that claims are impossible because they have no knowledge so negate on presumption because the aff is a quest for knowledge

#### Thus, immaterialism, or the view that matter doesn’t exist is the only coherent account of meta physics- Prefer

#### [1] The Sorites of Decomposition

Unger79 [Unger P. (1979) I Do Not Exist. In: Macdonald G.F. (eds) Perception and Identity. Palgrave, London] [\\GHAS](file://GHAS) [bracketed for clarity]

Tables, as well as chairs, have often been believed to be paradigms of existing things or entities, but I shall argue that they do not exist at all. They are, if you will, only fictions, though nothing whatever depends on my use of such a term of convenience. My argument will be in the form of an indirect proof, wherein I reduce to absurdity the supposition of their existence. According to our modern scientific view, if there are any tables, then each of them is constituted of, or is composed of, or comprises, or consists of, or whatever, many atoms, and still more 'elementary particles', but only a finite number of each. Now, nothing here depends on the expression 'is constituted of, or on any similar expression. Baldly put, the point is this: where and when there are no atoms present, there and then there is no table. This idea is not crucial to the argument; a 'less scientific' analogue will work as well, so far as the purer logical features go. But it is good to have nature appparently so co-operative.Now, at the same time, according to our common-sense view of the matter, which for something like a table is, of course, all but definitive, one atom, or only a few, removed, or added, quite innocuously, will not make a relevant difference. If you have a table at the start, then, after an atom has been gently ticked off the edge somewhere, there will still be a table present. These simple ideas, when brought into combination, leave nothing for reason but to conclude that there really are no tables. It takes no great acumen to see this, as the reasoning is utterly simple, and most just and suitable to the subject before us.For, if there is a table there, then it has only a finite number of atoms - say, a billion billion [atoms]; it does not matter. The net removal of one, then, leaves us with a supposed table of a billion billion minus one atoms; after two are removed, the supposed table has a billion billion minus two; and so on. After a billion billion atoms have been removed, we have a table consisting of no atoms at all. In this simple fashion, I suggest, we have reduced to an absurdity the supposition that the table in question exists, or ever did exist. As this argument may be most readily generalised, we may conclude that there really are no such things as tables.

#### [2] The Comparative Representation Problem

Bishop George Berkeley of Cloyne, Irish Philosopher, Bishop, and namesake of the city Berkeley California, A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge, 1710, ///AHS PB

From the principles I have laid down, it follows that human knowledge can naturally be classiﬁed under two headings—knowledge of ideas, and of spirits. I shall take these separately. First, as to ideas or unthinking things, our knowledge of these has been very much obscured and confused, and we have been led into very dangerous errors, by supposing a two-fold existence of the objects of sense, •one intelligible, or in the mind, •the other real and outside the mind. The latter has been thought to give unthinking things a natural existence of their own, distinct from being perceived by spirits. This, which I think I have shown to be a most groundless and absurd notion, is the very root of scepticism: as long as men thought that real things existed outside the mind, and that their knowledge was real only to the extent that it conformed to real things, it followed that they couldn’t be certain that they had any real knowledge at all. For how can it be known that the things that are perceived conform to those that aren’t perceived, i.e. that exist outside the mind? 87. Colour, shape, motion, extension, and the like, considered only as so many sensations in the mind, are perfectly known, because there is nothing in them that isn’t perceived. But if they are looked on as signs or images that are meant to copy things existing outside the mind, then we are all involved in scepticism ·through a line of thought that goes like this·: We see only the[ir] appearances of things, not their real qualities. We can’t possibly know what a thing’s size, shape or motion is, really and absolutely, in itself; all we can know is how its size etc. relate to our senses. Our ideas can vary while things remain the same, and which of our ideas—whether indeed any of them— represent the true quality really existing in the thing is something we have no way to discover. For all we know, everything that we see, hear, and feel may be only phantom and empty chimera, and not at all agree with the real things existing in the real world. All this scepticism follows from supposing a difference between things and ideas, and that the former exist outside the mind, or unperceived. It would be easy to expand on this topic and show how the arguments advanced by sceptics in all ages depend on the supposition of external objects.

### Offense

#### [1] States and Nuclear Arsenals are all material properties but if they don’t exist the resolution becomes incoherent so you negate.

#### [2] Takes out the AC- ethics can’t function under a paradigm of immaterialism which means you negate

Unger79 [Unger P. (1979) I Do Not Exist. In: Macdonald G.F. (eds) Perception and Identity. Palgrave, London] [\\GHAS](file://GHAS) [bracketed for clarity]

As far as repercussions or consequences are concerned, however, my own arguments are of course enormously more effective than the original version. While this is rather obvious, the details may be worth some presentation.First, virtually all of our common-sense beliefs are untrue, and even as to nothing. Moreover, most of our learned studies are similarly unfortunate, at least in anything like their present formulations. Samuel Wheeler begins to put the point in a manner which is conjectural, and perhaps somewhat ironic: 'If there is no objective difference between possible persons and possible non-persons, much of what we believe about morality, psychology, etc., is in trouble.' 5 We may say, now, that the matter is not very conjectural, and that all of moral reasoning, as well as psychological understanding, looks to be in deep trouble indeed. This holds as well, of course, for the other studies concerning man. History, law and medicine are all a tissue of fictions, as are economics, linguistics and politics. Various related areas of philosophy, such as epistemology, the philosophy of language and the philosophy of mind, can contain nothing sound and true. Unless mathematics is clearly severed from connections with human beings, it too must fall prey to our sorites. Various other studies look to fare poorly. Biology, for example, is a tissue of nonentities and untruth, except as it becomes biochemistry perhaps, or something much of that sort. Astronomy too, except as it becomes astrophysics, or something similar, looks to be about anything but our universe.

#### [3] Ought implies an external obligation but if material objects don’t exist there is no external force to do the obligating and no agent to complete the obligation so obligations are incoherent and false so you negate.

# 2NR

## Epistemic Confidence

#### Use epistemic confidence. That means you evaluate all offense under the winning framework. 5 reasons [A] Modesty is incoherent because you can’t split ethical theories, you can’t be a half a utilitarian and a half a Kantian and still prescribe action it makes no sense. So even if they are winning normative reasons for why modesty is better, if modesty is incoherent you can’t use it so default to confidence. [B] Modesty uses confidence to choose to use modesty which cedes the validity of confidence which means we hijack modesty.

#### Rewrite:: [C] Modesty invites judge intervention- judges become calculators for determining how much you are winning the framework debate by and how strong your offense links to the framework. [D] Modesty encourages debaters to read extinction scenarios to outweigh under modesty which kills clash on the fw debate which kills phil ed. [E] Confidence sets the stakes higher on the fw debate so it incentivizes clash which is net-good for debate

#### What this means is that if we win the framework debate there is no way to vote aff on risk of offense. If their offense doesn’t win under the NC fw you shouldn’t feel comfortable affirming and should vote negative.

## Presumption/Permissibility

#### Extend that Permissibility negates- The aff has to prove the existence of a proactive obligation, and proving a lack of obligation either through prohibition or permissibility is sufficient to negate because permissible actions are not proactive ones.

#### Extend that Presumption negates- First is that we assume statements to be false until true, that’s why we don’t believe in big-foot. There is a burden of proof on the aff. Second is the probability weighing argument- there are an infinite amount of ways to prove a statement false but only one way of proving it true. Err neg on presumption because it’s probable that the rez is false.

## Overview

#### The standard is consistency with metaphysics. First the weighing. The NC framing comes first and outweighs because without an accurate view of reality all our epistemology is false, 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. Epistemology outweighs and comes lexically prior 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 or link turn epistemology because that concedes the validity of epistemology in the first place. Now, the thesis of the NC is that immaterialism, or that matter is impossible, is the only coherent account of metaphysics and that if matter is possible it’s impossible to prove. That means you negate because [1] States and Nuclear arsenals are material properties but if they don’t exist the res becomes incoherent. [2] The entire AC is logically false from framework, offense, to paradigm issues, so vote neg on presumption and [3] ought implies an external obligation but if nothing exists there is no external force to obligate you, triggers presumption.

#### 2 Warrants for this, First is the Sorites of Decomposition argument. Nothing exists because there is no brightline for what exists. The syllogism goes like this. Premise 1 is that this timer has a billion atoms- Premise 2 is that a removal of one atom is the most favorable and non-destructive way results in the timer still being a timer- Premise 3 is repeated application of premise 2 till there are no atoms left, but premise 2 says that the timer still exists which means the timer exists with no atoms which means nothing exists. This same syllogism applies to anything that consists of matter. If nothing exists, the AC is false because it based on materialism, it assumes real things exist but since they don’t vote neg on presumption.

# Frontlines

## A2 Loki’s Wager

#### [1] this doesn’t apply to actual matter, these only apply to qualitative statements like the difference between red and orange. It doesn’t apply to the matter and the forces that bind reality.

#### [2] We all have different conceptions of obvious differences, just because you say this is obviously orange doesn’t mean it’s orange for me which means absent brightlines we can’t set standard for anything which makes everything incoherent, so negate on presumption here.