**Interpretation: The affirmative must garner offense solely from the implementation of the resolution. To clarify, you may not garner offense from a methodology that goes further than just the text of the resolution. To further clarify, extra topicality bad.**

**Violation: Their advocacy says they defend the resolution and then a bunch of other stuff about how they garner offense from \_\_\_.**

**Standards:**

1. **Predictability: There are infinite branches of literature and methodologies you could defend. You get to cherry pick your specific aff and frontline it for months while I come into the round with no way of having prep against it.**
2. **Ground: You get to pick any method you want, which a) artificially inflates aff solvency and offense because you can tailor your methodology to your role of the ballot and b) kills negative ground because you shifted the stasis point of the debate. Even if I get to read disads to the resolution you can just leverage your method or delink because you defend more than just the resolution.**

**3. Infinite Abuse: Garnering offense from things that aren’t solely the resolution allows you to pick trivially true methodologies and auto win every time. I.e. you can say “I defend racism is bad, and that the resolution is true” which gives you methodological offense that I can never contest.**

**Drop the debater:**

**No RVIs:**

**Competing Interps:**

**Fairness is a voter because the ballot makes debate a game, and without fairness you’re voting for the better cheater not the better debater.**

**The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best proves the truth or falsity of the Resolution; the affirmative must prove it true and the negative must prove it false. Prefer:**

**A) Text: Five dictionaries define negate as to deny the truth of and affirm as to prove true which means the sole judge obligation is to vote on the resolution’s truth or falsity. Constitutivism outweighs because you don’t have the jurisdiction not to truth test. Jurisdiction is a meta constraint since every argument you make concedes the authority of the judge fulfilling their jurisdiction to vote aff if they affirm better and neg the contrary.**

**B) Logic: Any counter role of the ballot collapses to truth testing because every property assumes truth of the property i.e. if I say, “I am awake” it is the same as “it is true that I am awake” which means they are also a question of truth claims because it’s inherent.**

**C) Ground: Any offense can function under truth testing whereas your specific role of the ballot excludes all strategies but yours. This is bad for education because me engaging in a debate I know nothing about doesn’t help anyone.**

**D) Truth Testing is a prerequisite to other role of the ballots because without truth we’re operating off of lies which is what fuels propaganda and oppression.**

**1** [**http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate**](http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate)**,** [**http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate**](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate)**,** [**http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate**](http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate)**,** [**http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate**](http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate)**,** [**http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate**](http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate)

***2 Dictionary.com – maintain as true, Merriam Webster – to say that something is true, Vocabulary.com – to affirm something is to confirm that it is true, Oxford dictionaries – accept the validity of, Thefreedictionary – assert to be true***

**Presumption Negates**

**1. We presume things false, this is why people don’t believe things like conspiracy theories.**

**2. There are an infinite number of ways to prove something false and only one way to prove it true.**

**3. The neg burden is to deny the evidence of truth so if there’s no offense as to why the resolution is true the neg has fulfilled their burden.**

**Permissibility Negates**

1. **The aff has to prove a prohibition but if the resolution is permissible no prohibition is present.**
2. **Anything else means the aff could just not read a framework and the resolution would be permissible so they would auto win.**

**Moral Skepticism Negates:**

1. **Unjust is defined as characterized by injustice. Thus, if nothing is unjust or just, i.e. good or bad, the aff is false, because they must prove some moral system provides a prohibition on private appropriation of outer space.**

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/unjust>

1. **If the reasons for skep are true the resolution is an incoherent statement. I.e. if we don’t have free will it makes to sense to say appropriation of outer space is bad because agents couldn’t have done otherwise.**

**Moral Skepticism is true:**

**1.  Free will doesn’t exist, this means morality doesn’t exist because it doesn’t make sense to say someone ought to have acted differently if they couldn’t.**

**Neuroscience proves we don’t have free will.**

**Stenger,** Victor. "Free Will Is an Illusion." The Huffington Post, HuffPost Science, 1 Aug. 20**12**, [www.huffpost.com/entry/free-will-is-an-illusion\_b\_1562533?guccounter=1&guce\_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xlLmNvbS8&guce\_referrer\_sig=AQAAABGkWQhgoezVxE1J5Eg\_t\_6MTA09Dlur7r7S69XPyC18OV-6bd4lcOLSns-fKN5\_2kDLNupyxGpvAQDuvwtbo5Gx10reInWy6KCUaHpCHm9pfm33t9wsFp6KLqIiAcqr-SoMp8WRTa0uVFHh597oieGv6NQDtCx6k4ssydbYJ3vX](http://www.huffpost.com/entry/free-will-is-an-illusion_b_1562533?guccounter=1&guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xlLmNvbS8&guce_referrer_sig=AQAAABGkWQhgoezVxE1J5Eg_t_6MTA09Dlur7r7S69XPyC18OV-6bd4lcOLSns-fKN5_2kDLNupyxGpvAQDuvwtbo5Gx10reInWy6KCUaHpCHm9pfm33t9wsFp6KLqIiAcqr-SoMp8WRTa0uVFHh597oieGv6NQDtCx6k4ssydbYJ3vX).  Accessed 24 Jan. 2021. ICW NW

Research in neuroscience has revealed a startling fact that revolutionizes much of what we humans have previously taken for granted about our interactions with the world outside our heads: **Our consciousness is** really **not in charge of our behavior.** Laboratory experiments show that **before we become aware of making a decision, our brains have already laid the groundwork for it.** In a recent book, [*Subliminal: How Your Unconscious Mind Rules Your Behavior*](http://www.amazon.com/Subliminal-Your-Unconscious-Rules-Behavior/dp/0307378217/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1338562815&sr=8-1), physicist Leonard Mlodinow reviews a wide range of psychological experiments that demonstrate the dominant role the unconscious plays in our behavior. This recognition challenges fundamental assumptions about free will and the associated religious teachings about sin and redemption, as well as our judicial concepts of responsibility and punishment. If our brains are making our decisions for us subconsciously, how can we be responsible for our actions? How can our legal system punish criminals or God punish sinners who aren’t in full control of their decision-making processes? Is free will an illusion? In his recent book titled [*Free Will*](http://www.amazon.com/Free-Will-Sam-Harris/dp/1451683405/ref=sr_1_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1338562877&sr=1-1), neuroscientist Sam Harris pulls no punches. He tells us in no uncertain terms: “Free will is an illusion.” **We don’t exist as immaterial conscious controllers, but are instead** entirely **physical beings whose decisions and behaviors are the fully caused products of the brain and body.** [Philosophers](http://www.amazon.com/Contemporary-Introduction-Free-Will/dp/019514970X/ref=sr_1_5?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1338562961&sr=1-5) identify several different positions on the question of free will. *Incompatibilists* hold that free will is incompatible with determinism, the idea that our behavior is fully determined by antecedent causes such as fate, acts of God, or laws of nature. These split into two camps. *Libertarians* hold that we have free will since humans transcend cause and effect in ways that make us ultimately responsible. *Determinists* hold that we don’t have free will because either determinism is true or indeterminism (randomness) doesn’t give us control or responsibility. Both these groups are opposed by *compatibilists*, who argue that free will is compatible with determinism, or indeterminism for that matter. What exactly is determinism? Two centuries ago, French physicist Pierre Laplace pointed out that, according to Newtonian mechanics, the motion of every particle in the universe can in principle be predicted from the knowledge of its position, momentum, and the forces acting on it. This is the *Newtonian world machine*. Since, as far as physics is concerned, we are all just particles, then this would seem to make free will an illusion indeed. However, we now can say with considerable confidence that the universe is not a Newtonian world machine. The *Heisenberg uncertainty principle* of quantum mechanics showed that, deep down, nature is fundamentally indeterministic. But does quantum indeterminacy play an important role in the brain, and thus open a way for free will? Probably not, and here’s why. The moving parts of the brain are heavy by microscopic standards and move around at relatively high speeds because the brain is hot. Furthermore, the distances involved are large by these same microscopic standards. It is easy to demonstrate quantitatively that **quantum effects in the brain are not significant.** So, even though libertarians are correct that determinism is false at the microphysical, quantum level, **the brain is** for all practical purposes **a deterministic Newtonian machine, so we don’t have free will** as they define it. Although the brain is likely deterministic when it comes to the control of behavior, **there’s plenty of “pseudo-randomness”** (as opposed to “pure” quantum randomness) **in the thermal motions of our brains and in the environment that feeds us data.** It’s possible **that** this **can provide sufficient uncertainty to give us the “feeling” of free will.** Or, perhaps uncertainty plays no direct role and it is simply our lack of awareness about what causes our decisions that we interpret as being exempt from the causal laws of nature. Either way, this means that ultimately **we do not have libertarian free will, even though we might be under the impression we do.**

**2. The aff is in a double bind. Either a) morality is motivational and people are going to follow it no matter what so it’s just descriptive, not imposing an obligation. Or b) it’s not and there’s no point to morality because everyone just disregards it so obligations aren’t present because guides have to be followed to be guides.**

**3. If I prove rules are incoherent there can’t be morality since morality is just a set of rules as to how we should live our lives. Rules are incoherent because they don’t outline how to follow each part of them meaning there are infinite interpretations. Another rule is needed to clarify but there are infinite ways to interpret that rule and it’s infinitely regressive.**

**4. Morality requires us to act immediately in the face of injustice, because otherwise we would be complicit in something bad under it. However, it also requires us to think about what to do in the face of injustice because it won’t let you just randomly act, i.e. it obligates us to hesitate. This means morality would require you to act immediately and hesitate at the same time which means it’s logically incoherent.**

**5. Good Samaritan Paradox: In order to solve X problem one must want X problem to exist since it’s existence is a precondition for it becoming non-existent, which makes any attempt to be moral inherently immoral.**

**6. In order to pick an ethical system you need a criteria for making the decision. However, you also need a criteria for how you’re going to pick which criteria to use for picking an ethical theory, and a criteria for the criteria for the criteria you use for picking an ethical theory etc. This means we can never justify a moral theory, because justification for ethics is infinitely regressive, so it can’t impose an obligation.**

**7. Ethics can never impose obligations because even if you win that some facts about the world are true, they don’t bind people to act. I.e. you can justify your framework all you want, but it doesn’t matter if people can just respond “I don’t care”.**

**Joyce** , Richard (Professor of Philosophy at Victoria University Wellington, New Zealand). The Myth of Morality. 2001. [Bracketed for grammatical clarity] // (N8)

Back to the [Suppose] external reason[s]. **Suppose it were claimed,** instead, that **I have a reason to refrain from drinking the coffee because it is tapu** and must not be touched. This reason claim will be urged regardless of what I may say about my indifference to tapu, or my citing of nihilistic desires to tempt the hand of fate. **[r]egardless of my desires (it is claimed) I ought not drink** - l have a reason not to drink. But how could that reason ever explain any action of mine? Could the external reason even explain my [action] from drinking? Clearly, in order to explain it the external reason must have some causally efficacious role [in] among the antecedents of the action (in this case, an omission) — l must have. in some manner. "internalized" it. **The only possibility, it would seem, consistent with its being an external reason, is that I believe the external reason** claim [but] : I believe that the coffee is tapu. There's no doubting that such a belief can play a role in explaining actions - including my refraining from drinking the coffee. The question is whether the belief alone can[not] produce action, to which the correct answer is “No.” A very familiar and eminently sensible view says that **in order to explain an action** the **belief must couple with desires** (such that those same desires had in the absence of the belief would not have resulted in the action). And this seems correct: **if I believe that the coffee is** [bad] **tapu but really just don’t care about that, then I will not refrain from drinking it.** So in order for the belief to explain action it must couple with [desire] elements - but in that case the putative external reason collapses into an internal one.3

**8.  Zeno’s Paradox: Something is stationary in a moment of time but since time is just a collection of movements the thing is always stationary. From one moment to the next there’s no time in between for it to move since moments come right after each other, there’s no gap.**

**9. Private is defined as a soldier of one of the three lowest enlisted ranks. But they can’t appropriate space which means prescribing injustice to that action doesn’t make sense.**

<https://www.dictionary.com/browse/private>