# Lex r6 1nc

## 1

#### Permissibility and presumption negate:

#### [1] Resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove a proactive obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation

#### [2] Logic – Propositions require positive justification before being accepted, otherwise one would be forced to accept the validity of logically contradictory propositions regarding subjects one knows nothing about, i.e if one knew nothing about P one would have to presume that both the “P” and “~P” are true.

#### [3] Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false. This means you negate if there is no offense because the resolution is probably false.

#### Determinism is true and negates: A. The aff says the appropriation of outer space is unjust, but the action of appropriating space is predetermined making statements that prescribe one incoherent. B. Determinism denies the existence of free will which makes willing a moral obligation impossible. Norwitz quotes Inwagen who doesn’t agree with the terminal conclusion of the NC.

[Michael Norwitz, “Free Will and Determinism,” Philosophy Now, 1991.] SHS ZS

Inwagen presents three premises in his main argument: that **free will is** in fact **incompatible with determinism**, that **moral responsibility is incompatible with** **determinism**, and that (since we have moral responsibility) determinism is false. Hence, he concludes, we have free will. The argument for the first premise runs as follows [p.56]: “**If determinism is true**, then **our acts are the consequences of the laws of nature** and events in the remote past. But **it is not up to us what went on before we were born**, and neither is it up to us what the laws of nature are. **Therefore the consequences of these things** (including our present acts) **are not up to us**.” The argument for the second premise [p. 181]: “**If** (i) **no one is morally responsible for having failed to perform any act**, **and** (ii) **no one is morally responsible for any event**, **and** (iii) **no one is morally responsible for any state of affairs, then there is no such thing as moral responsibility**.” For the third premise van Inwagen does not present a concise summary of his line of argument. He takes it as being self-evident that we have moral responsibility, as we do, after all, continue to hold people morally responsible for their actions.

#### This negates irrespective of permissibility because it proves that agents cannot have moral obligations. Since “unjust” in the resolution implies moral obligations, without a moral obligation, the resolution is false.

#### [1] Causality: The first law of thermodynamics holds that nothing can be created or destroyed[[1]](#footnote-1), thus everything must have a cause if something cannot come from nothing. This means that either A. Free will, which definitionally causes itself, is illogical as it does not have one or B. Our free will is caused by something which is a contradiction and proves determinism true.

#### [2] Cognition – the best neuroscientific, psychological, and medical evidence show free will doesn’t exist. Lavazza

[Andrea Lavazza, Neuroethics, Centro Universitario Internazionale, Arezzo, Italy, Free Will and Neuroscience: From Explaining Freedom Away to New Ways of Operationalizing and Measuring It, 2016, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4887467/> ///AHS PB BRACKETED FOR CLARITY] SHS ZS

All these **experiments** seem to **indicate** that **free will is an illusion.** Yet, these relevant experiments can be interpreted in many ways. A possible view is that, in some way, **determinism can be observed directly within ourselves.** This interpretation might lead to the conclusion that **free will is just an illusion**. In fact, if one considers as a condition of free will the fact that it should be causa sui (i.e., it should be able to consciously start new causal chains), such a condition is incompatible with determinism as it is usually defined. For it, in fact, **all events are linked by casual relations in the form of natural laws**, **which started long before we were born** and which we cannot escape. However, **determinism has generally been regarded as a metaphysical claim**, not refutable by empirical findings. One could properly talk of automatism in the brain, not of determinism, based on the evidence available. (In any case, endorsing indeterminism might lead to consider our behavior as the causal product of choices that every time produce different results, as if we rolled a dice. This doesn’t seem to make us any freer than if determinism were overturned; cf. Levy, 2011). Most importantly, **another feature of freedom seems to be a pure illusion**, namely the role **of consciousness**. **The experiments considered** thus far heavily question **the claim that consciousness** actually **causes voluntary behavior**. **Neural activation starts the decisional process culminating in the movement, while consciousness “comes after”,** when “**things are done**”. **Therefore**, [and] **consciousness cannot trigger our voluntary decisions.** But the role of consciousness in voluntary choices is part of the definition of free will (but the very definition of consciousness is a matter of debate, cf. Chalmers, 1996). Empirical research in psychology also shows that **our mind works and makes choices without our conscious control**. As proposed by psychologist Wegner (2002, 2003, 2004) and Aarts et al. (2004), **we are “built” to have the impression to consciously control our actions or to have the power to freely choose, even though all that is only a cognitive illusion**. Many priming experiments show **that people act “mechanically**” (even when their behavior might appear suited to the environment and even refined). **Automatic cognitive processes**, of which we aren’t always aware, **originate our decisions**, and they were only discovered thanks to the most advanced scientific research. **Ultimately, consciousness**, which should exercise control and assess the reasons for a choice, **is thus allegedly causally ineffective**: a mere epiphenomenon, to use the terminology of the philosophy of mind. This is what has been called Zombie Challenge, “based on an amazing wealth of findings in recent cognitive science that demonstrate the surprising ways in which **our everyday behavior is controlled by automatic processes that unfold in the complete absence of consciousness**” (Vierkant et al., 2013).

## 2

#### Interp: Debaters must disclose round reports on the 2021-22 NDCA LD wiki for every round they have debated this season. Round reports disclose which positions (AC, NC, K, T, Theory, etc.) were read/gone for in every speech.Graphical user interface, application Description automatically generated

#### Violation: screenshot in the doc – they have barely any rounds and none from this tournaey

#### Standards:

#### 1] Level Playing Field – big schools can go around and scout and collect flows but independents are left in the dark so round reports are key to prep- they give you an idea of overall what layers debaters like going for so you can best prepare your strategy when you hit them. Accessibility first and independent voter – it’s an impact multiplier

#### 2] Strategy Education – round reports help novices understand the context in which positions are read by good debaters and help with brainstorming potential 1NCs vs affs – helps compensate for kids who can’t afford coaches to prep out affs.

#### 3] Pre-round prep –1ARs gives especially give an idea of what type of debater someone is – they could go for 1AR theory every round– otherwise I enter every round unknowing whereas you have an idea of what you want to go for from the start.

Voters

## 3

#### A: Interp – The affirmative must read all arguments concerning fairness or education first in the affirmative speech. To clarify, theory arguments must be read at the top of the affirmative case before all substantive arguments. Evaluate the spirit of my interp to disincentive blippy i-meets.

#### B: Violation – Spikes on bottom

#### C. Standards –

#### 1. Strat skew – Absent spikes on top, I don’t know what I have to do until after I formulate a strategy which means I will always violate at least one of your spikes. Two impacts a) infinite abuse since ill always violate a norm and b) kills time tradeoff since I’m forced to spend all my prep restarting my strategy. My interp solves and is always net beneficial since I can understand what makes the round fair before I violate which is better for your strategy.

#### 2. Substantive engagement – I have to be able to understand the parameters for a fair strategy in order to engage in that strategy. This also allows for a better debate on the substantive layer that you want since I can spend more time thinking about a substantive strategy rather than thinking about a shell I can read on you before I get hit with 8 different spikes.

Xapply voters

1. https://www.grc.nasa.gov/www/k-12/airplane/thermo1.html [↑](#footnote-ref-1)