# Lex dubs 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

#### Interpretation – Debaters must only read framework warrants that prove the truth of their framework outside the context of debate.

#### Violation – You read a performativity standard which appeals to the truth of your framework given the nature of debate.

#### Standards –

#### 1] Strat Skew: A] It allows you to extend one argument to invalidate 99% of the framework debate because contesting your framework concedes its authority B] creates a reducto-ad-absurdum where if I respond to it, you will just say that I relied your framework to respond to it creating a paradox. That makes the framework debate unwinnable and irresolvable. Resolvability is an independent voter since it forces intervention which takes the round out of debaters hands.

#### 2] Phil Ed: A] Encourages debaters to only read frameworks with good performativity warrants such as Agonism or Libertarianism which discourages phil research and B] kills clash since you never have to respond to 90% of objections to the framework since they all go away if you win one discourse argument. Phil ed is a voter since it’s how we learn to justify every concept in the world and in debate, including theory.

#### Fairness – Skews ability to evaluate substance – if one debater had ten minutes to speak and the other had three there would be incongruence that alters ability to judge the winner

**Education – it’s the only portable skill in debate and the reason schools fund debate**

#### 

## 3

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must not defend the resolution a general principle.

#### Violation: They do – after the advocacy text.

#### Standards:

#### 1 – Topic Education – General principle moots topic education because it allows debaters to recycle generic arguments which deny the truth of everything.

#### 2 – Ground: It gives them the ability to shift out of all CPs by saying they don't disprove the general principle of the AFF which is bad – Good policymaking requires making comparisons between similar courses of action – saying that CPs are bad doesn't answer this because we should have to opportunity to argue that in round. CPs teach us to find the best policy possible – debate should teach us to be better decisionmakers because it's the only transferable skill to the rest of our lives, also controls the I/L to ground because they get infinite advocacies but I only get one. DTA makes no sense on this shell since it indicts ur advocacy

Xapply voters

## 4

#### Paradigm for 1AR shells and independent voters:

#### Reject 1ar theory and independent voters:

#### A] Deters the 1NC from checking abuse out of fear for 1AR meta-theory, which destroys me since it's also preclusive. Turns their infinite abuse args. B]  Resolvability double bind—either you automatically accept 2AR responses to 2NR counter-standards which means they always win since I can't answer those responses, or you have to intervene to determine the credence you give those 2AR responses, which makes it irresolvable and unfair.

#### It’s DTA – They can blow up a blippy 20 second shell to 3 min of the 2AR while I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention and means 1AR theory is irresolvable so you shouldn’t stake the round on it.

#### 

## Case

#### 1] A free kantian sovietyy mandates a market-oriented approach to space—that negates

Broker 20 [(Tyler, work has been published in the Gonzaga Law Review, the Albany Law Review and the University of Memphis Law Review.) “Space Law Can Only Be Libertarian Minded,” Above the Law, 1-14-20, <https://abovethelaw.com/2020/01/space-law-can-only-be-libertarian-minded/>] TDI

The impact on human daily life from a transition to the virtually unlimited resource reality of space cannot be overstated. However, when it comes to the law, a minimalist, dare I say libertarian, approach appears as the only applicable system. In the words of NASA, “2020 promises to be a big year for space exploration.” Yet, as Rand Simberg points out in Reason magazine, it is actually private American investment that is currently moving space exploration to “a pace unseen since the 1960s.” According to Simberg, due to this increase in private investment “We are now on the verge of getting affordable private access to orbit for large masses of payload and people.” The impact of that type of affordable travel into space might sound sensational to some, but in reality the benefits that space can offer are far greater than any benefit currently attributed to any major policy proposal being discussed at the national level. The sheer amount of resources available within our current reach/capabilities simply speaks for itself. However, although those new realities will, as Simberg says, “bring to the fore a lot of ideological issues that up to now were just theoretical,” I believe it will also eliminate many economic and legal distinctions we currently utilize today. For example, the sheer number of resources we can already obtain in space means that in the rapidly near future, the distinction between a nonpublic good or a public good will be rendered meaningless. In other words, because the resources available within our solar system exist in such quantities, all goods will become nonrivalrous in their consumption and nonexcludable in their distribution. This would mean government engagement in the public provision of a nonpublic good, even at the trivial level, or what Kevin Williamson defines as socialism, is rendered meaningless or impossible. In fact, in space, I fail to see how any government could even try to legally compel collectivism in the way Simberg fears. Similar to many economic distinctions, however, it appears that many laws, both the good and the bad, will also be rendered meaningless as soon as we begin to utilize the resources within our solar system. For example, if every human being is given access to the resources that allows them to replicate anything anyone else has, or replace anything “taken” from them instantly, what would be the point of theft laws? If you had virtually infinite space in which you can build what we would now call luxurious livable quarters, all without exploiting human labor or fragile Earth ecosystems when you do it, what sense would most property, employment, or commercial law make? Again, this is not a pipe dream, no matter how much our population grows for the next several millennia, the amount of resources within our solar system can sustain such an existence for every human being. Rather than panicking about the future, we should try embracing it, or at least meaningfully preparing for it. Currently, the Outer Space Treaty, or as some call it “the Magna Carta of Space,” is silent on the issue of whether private individuals or corporate entities can own territory in space. Regardless of whether governments allow it, however, private citizens are currently obtaining the ability to travel there, and if human history is any indicator, private homesteading will follow, flag or no flag. We Americans know this is how a Wild West starts, where most regulation becomes the impractical pipe dream. But again, this would be a Wild West where the exploitation of human labor and fragile Earth ecosystem makes no economic sense, where every single human can be granted access to resources that even the wealthiest among us now would envy, and where innovation and imagination become the only things we would recognize as currency. Only a libertarian-type system, that guarantees basic individual rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness could be valued and therefore human fidelity to a set of laws made possible, in such an existence.

#### 2] Private entities utilize their own property and resources to fund and conduct space exploration which means – Prohibition of it is a violation of a) Their ability to use their own property (like their rocketships or fuel) to set their ends in space and b). Their freedom to explore unknown horizons such as space.

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