## 1

#### Interperetation debaters must not read “Fluidity leads to differentiation in ethics as each subject’s ethicality arises from their own affective relations indexed to themselves”

Offense –

1] infinite abuse – under a normsetting model I would lose every round since they would just read this argument and I’d lose since they just have to prove the resolution is true under one subjects index.

2] Accessibility – arg justifies racism like hitlers index being true to prove the res.

Paradigm issues

Dtd – deter future abuse

Competing interps race to top best norms

Cant weigh case

Nc theory first - norming

## 2

#### The role of the ballot and RoJ is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement– anything else moots 7 minutes of the nc – other frameworks collapse since you must say it is true.

#### Theory is coherent and comes first.

#### Prefer,

#### 1] Constituitivism – The topic is given to us to debate by the topic comitee and five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true. These are the only roles we have going into the round which means the judge only has the jurisdiction to vote on arguments that prove the truth or falsity of the resolution.

#### 2] Inclusion – Any offense functions under truth testing but hyperspecific RoBs exclude all other discussion and hurt underpriveledged debaters that don’t have the resources to engage in those arguments.

## 3

#### Permissibility and presumption Negate,

#### 1] Text – Ought is defined as expressing obligation[[3]](#footnote-3) which means absent a proactive obligation you vote neg since the aff can’t prove an obligation. O/W since text is the only thing we have access to prior to the round.

#### 2] Safety – It’s ethically safer to presume the squo since we know what the squo is but we can’t know whether the aff will be good or not if ethics are incoherent.

#### 3] Real world – Policymakers don’t pass policies they aren’t sure about, they shelve them for later.

#### The standard is consistency with determinism.

#### 1] Thermodynamics – The first law of thermodynamics states energy can neither be created nor destroyed, only converted. Thus, free will, which comes from nothing, can’t translate into physical action.

#### 2] Biology – Every organism has controlled responses to stimuli because of its inherited genes and environment. That applies to humans, i.e. when we cut onions we cry.

#### 3] Physiology – You can always ask why did you take that action? Which would be infinitely regressive. Thus, the only solution is our actions are just complex sets of reflexes. That outweighs, simplest solutions are more likely to be true since theres less room for mistake.

#### 4] Causation – Every effect has a cause by definition, thus free will, which has no cause is illogical.

#### 5] Nature – the universe is infinite, that justifies determinism since any individual act is too small to alter the fate of the universe, Horne 1

Herman H. Horne, 1912, “The Arguments for Determinism”, Excerpt from Free Will and Human Responsibility: A Philosophical Argument, https://web.csulb.edu/~cwallis/100/articles/arguments\_for\_determinism.html

This argument has been somewhat anticipated in the preceding paragraph. It is but a generalization of all the four preceding arguments. A philosophy of nature is a general theory explanatory of all the occurrences of nature. Now the ideal of scientific explanation in physics, chemistry, biology, physiology, and everywhere is mechanical. Events do not happen because anybody or any will wants them to happen; they happen because they have to happen; they happen because they must. And it is the business of science to find this necessary connection between the occurrences of nature. The universe, by this hypothesis, whole and part, is governed by the action of mechanical law. The reign of law is universal. Man is a very small creature upon a small earth, which is itself a comparatively small planet in one of the smaller solar systems of an indefinitely large number of solar systems which partially fill infinite space. The universe is a physical mechanism in which law rules, and man is but a least part of this universal machine. How then can he do otherwise than he does do? A single free-will act would introduce caprice, whim, chance, into a universe whose actions are so mechanically determined that an omniscient observer of the present could predict infallibly all futurity. . . .

#### 6] Sociology – Every year, statisticians accurately predict the number of people who get married the next year. This type of data can only be explained through determinism since it shows human behavior is predetermined.

#### 7] Ethics - All frameworks with a bindingness or motivation claim necessitate determinism since that framework would say in a given situation a moral agent must/will act in a specific way. If they deny this justification, it proves their framework triggers permissibility since it’s escapable and can’t guide action.

#### 8] Arbitrariness – if determinism is false then you imply that human acts are random since they aren’t based on any previous cause. Ethics can’t be arbitrary because otherwise it wouldn’t guide action since anything is permissible.

#### 9] The best neuroscientific, psychological, and medical evidence agrees, Lavazza 16

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/> ///recut from AHS PB

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, 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).

#### 10] Molecular Physics proves we are just constructs of molecules, Coyne 12

Jerry Coyne, [Professor in the Department of Ecology and Evolution at The [University of Chicago](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Organizations/Schools/University+of+Chicago)], “Why You Don’t Really Have Free Will,” *USAToday*, January 1st, 2012. Recut from SM

The first is simple: we are biological creatures, collections of molecules that must obey the laws of physics. All the success of science rests on the regularity of those laws, which determine the behavior of every molecule in the universe. Those molecules, of course, also make up your brain — the organ that does the "choosing." And the neurons and molecules in your brain are the product of both your genes and your environment, an environment including the other people we deal with. Memories, for example, are nothing more than structural and chemical changes in your brain cells. Everything that you think, say, or do, must come down to molecules and physics. True "free will," then, would require us to somehow step outside of our brain's structure and modify how it works. Science hasn't shown any way we can do this because "we" are simply constructs of our brain. We can't impose a nebulous "will" on the inputs to our brain that can affect its output of decisions and actions, any more than a programmed computer can somehow reach inside itself and change its program.

#### Negate,

#### 1] Determinism states obligatory responsibility doesn’t exist because everything is predetermined so the aff can’t prescribe action.

#### 2] The concept of intellectual property is incoherent, you can’t reduce something that doesn’t exist, Risser 10

[Rita Risser, July 2010, "Creative Determinism and the Claim to Intellectual Property on JSTOR", No Publication, https://www.jstor.org/stable/27904152, date accessed 9-12-2021] //Lex AT

3. Determinism and property Generally it is felt that in order for an individual to justifiably claim a work as her own, it must be 'deeply attributable' to her: the individual must be more than the accidental cause of the work, she must be respon sible for it and merit praise or criticism for the work. Many who consider the question of determinism and human action argue that an individual must have some control over her actions in order to be justifiably praised or blamed in this way. However, there is disagreement about whether or not, given causal determinism, an individual can have the right kind of control over her actions so as to justify praise or blame. Some argue that an individual must be the ultimate originator of her actions and works in order to justify praise or blame. She must, as Galen Strawson puts it, be the "ultimate, buck-stopping originator" of her actions for her to be "truly deserving of praise or blame" (Strawson 1986, 26). But it is hard to see how this can obtain if causal determinism is true. There will always be some cause, some prior event, outside the individual that is an external source for her actions. For example, an individual does not decide to bring herself into existence, with all her peculiarities and tastes. This has been determined for her. If [they are] she is not the ultimate originator of her actions, then how can [they] she be said to have control over them, and therefore justifiably praised or blamed for these actions? If Dennett and others are correct, then ultimate, perhaps even appre ciable, control is lacking in the creation of cultural works. If, therefore, individuals are not the ultimate originators of their creative works, but are merely their accidental and proximate cause, then, in what sense may an individual be praised or blamed for these works? And without a basis for praise or blame, then on what basis does an individual claim ownership for a creative work?

1. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
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* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)