## 1 – T

#### Interpretation: The affirmative debater must defend that a just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

#### Violation: They defended the Chinese government, which is unjust.

Human Rights Watch 21 Human Rights Watch, "China: Crimes Against Humanity in Xinjiang," 19 April 2021, Human Rights Watch accessed 6 November 2021, https://www.hrw.org/news/2021/04/19/china-crimes-against-humanity-xinjiang

(New York) – The Chinese government is committing crimes against humanity against Uyghurs and other Turkic Muslims in the northwest region of Xinjiang, Human Rights Watch said in a report released today. The Chinese leadership is responsible for widespread and systematic policies of mass detention, torture, and cultural persecution, among other offenses. Coordinated international action is needed to sanction those responsible, advance accountability, and press the Chinese government to reverse course.

#### Standards:

#### [1] Precision – The counter-interp justifies arbitrarily doing away with words in the res, which decks neg ground and prep because the aff is no longer bounded to a topical advocacy. The judge doesn’t have the jurisdiction to vote aff if there wasn’t a legitimate aff.

#### [2] Limits and ground – They can literally defend anything, which explodes my prep burden because there are infinite potential affs. Uniquely harms small school debaters who are incapable of cutting large backfiles which harms inclusion – that’s a voter since we have to make the debate space safe, and it’s a pre-requisite to debate.

#### [3] Inclusion – defending China as just is exclusionary to those who suffer from its violence – they try to hide authoritarianism in spite of clear systemic oppression.

#### TVA: use ideal theory – a) promotes philosophical clash unique to LD whereas we can debate policy in any other instance, b) solves their offense because they can argue these problems exist with a just government.

#### Voters:

#### Fairness – a) debate is a competitive activity that objective evaluation to function, and b) debaters quit if it’s unfair, which makes it an internal link to all other impacts.

#### DTD – a) deters future abuse so they won’t reviolate, and b) T indicts the entire aff.

#### Prefer competing interps – a) you can’t be “reasonably topical,” b) reasonability is arbitrary, and c) collapses because brightlines concede offense-defense paradigm.

#### No RVIs – a) you don’t win for being fair, b) people will bait theory to win on the RVI, which causes abuse, c) people will be scared to call out real abuse for fear of being out-teched on the RVI, and d) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong, which forces me to argue for bad norms.

## 2 – Theory

#### [Extemp] May not justify DTD 1AR theory eval theory after 1AR inf abuse

## 3 – Theory

#### [Extemp] Cant deny neg ability to make arguments inf abuse

## 4 – Determinism

#### The ROTB is truth testing.

#### [1] Five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true – it’s intrinsic to the activity.

#### [2] Every statement is a question of truth – saying the res is false is the same as saying, “it is true that the res is false.” That means other ROTBs collapse to truth testing.

#### Determinism negates – lack of free will disproves moral obligations. For clarification this is not a FW bc it doesn’t provide an alternative method of evaluating morality.

#### If consequentialism is true, it entails that X cause will lead to Y effect. That means X cause is an effect of a cause prior to X itself, which means causal chains of events structure action.

#### First, everything is determined.

#### [1] All effects and causal chains are the necessary result of past causes.

Timpe no date, Kevin Timpe, professor of philosophy at Northwest Nazarene University, "Free Will," no date, Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed 21 August 2021, <https://iep.utm.edu/freewill/> ~ST~

Most contemporary scholarship on free will focuses on whether or not it is compatible with causal determinism. Causal determinism is sometimes also called “nomological determinism.” It is important to keep causal determinism distinct from other sorts of determinism, such as logical determinism or theological determinism (to be discussed below). Causal determinism (hereafter, simply “determinism”) is the thesis that the course of the future is entirely determined by the conjunction of the past and the laws of nature. Imagine a proposition that completely describes the way that the entire universe was at some point in the past, say 100 million years ago. Let us call this proposition “P.” Also imagine a proposition that expresses the conjunction of all the laws of nature; call this proposition “L.” Determinism then is the thesis that the conjunction of P and L entails a unique future. Given P and L, there is only one possible future, one possible way for things to end up. To make the same point using possible world semantics, determinism is the thesis that all the states of affairs that obtain at some time in the past, when conjoined with the laws of nature, entail which possible world is the actual world. Since a possible world includes those states of affairs that will obtain, the truth of determinism amounts to the thesis that the past and the laws of nature entail what states of affairs will obtain in the future, and that only those states of affairs entailed by the past and the laws will in fact obtain.

#### Applies to humans – every thought is caused by neurochemical changes.

Cave 16 Stephen Cave, senior research fellow at the University of Cambridge, "There’s No Such Thing as Free Will," June 2016, The Atlantic, accessed 21 August 2021, <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2016/06/theres-no-such-thing-as-free-will/480750/> ~ST~

The sciences have grown steadily bolder in their claim that all human behavior can be explained through the clockwork laws of cause and effect. This shift in perception is the continuation of an intellectual revolution that began about 150 years ago, when Charles Darwin first published On the Origin of Species. Shortly after Darwin put forth his theory of evolution, his cousin Sir Francis Galton began to draw out the implications: If we have evolved, then mental faculties like intelligence must be hereditary. But we use those faculties—which some people have to a greater degree than others—to make decisions. So our ability to choose our fate is not free, but depends on our biological inheritance.

Galton launched a debate that raged throughout the 20th century over nature versus nurture. Are our actions the unfolding effect of our genetics? Or the outcome of what has been imprinted on us by the environment? Impressive evidence accumulated for the importance of each factor. Whether scientists supported one, the other, or a mix of both, they increasingly assumed that our deeds must be determined by something.

In recent decades, research on the inner workings of the brain has helped to resolve the nature-nurture debate—and has dealt a further blow to the idea of free will. Brain scanners have enabled us to peer inside a living person’s skull, revealing intricate networks of neurons and allowing scientists to reach broad agreement that these networks are shaped by both genes and environment. But there is also agreement in the scientific community that the firing of neurons determines not just some or most but all of our thoughts, hopes, memories, and dreams.

#### [2] Brain signals determine action before the conception of choice even arises – means we don’t control our actions

Fried et. al 11 Itzhak Fried, professor of neurosurgery, psychiatry and biobehavioral sciences at UCLA, Roy Mukamel, associate professor of psychology at Tel-Aviv University, Gabriel Kreiman, professor of ophthalmology at Harvard, "Internally generated preactivation of single neurons in human medial frontal cortex predicts volition," 10 February 2011, PubMed, accessed 21 August 2021, <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21315264/> ~ST~

There has been a long debate on the existence of brain signals that precede the outcome of decisions, even before subjects believe they are consciously making up their mind. The framework of multivariate decoding provides a novel tool for investigating such choice-predictive information contained in neural signals leading up to a decision. New results show that the specific outcome of free choices between different plans can be interpreted from brain activity, not only after a decision has been made, but even several seconds before it is made. This suggests that a causal chain of events can occur outside subjective awareness even before a subject makes up his/her mind. An important future line of research would be to develop paradigms that allow feedback of real-time predictions of future decisions to reveal whether such decisions can still be reverted. This would shed light on how tight the causal link is between early predictive brain signals and subsequent decisions.

#### Next, existence of obligations necessitates alternate possibilities.

#### [1] Action theory – alternatives distinguish what we do, a.k.a. actions, from what happens to us. Events in your life aren’t something you do without a potential alternate. For example, there’s no alternate if you wake up from a loud noise; it happens to you instead of being actively chosen.

#### [2] You can’t have an obligation to do something impossible; otherwise, we’d have responsibility over everything outside of our control. We can’t be responsible for the aff’s advantages – harms in the squo are outside of our control.

#### [3] Moral language – blaming someone assumes they had the ability to do otherwise – you wouldn’t hold a baby culpable for theft.

#### [4] Dichotomies – morality only exists in opposition to immorality. If there is only one action, then it can’t contain morality.

#### [5] Morality is prescriptive, not descriptive; if a subject is not the cause of their action, they can’t be guided by moral principles.

#### The res being requires alternate possibilities since it’s about moral obligation; thus, the res is independently false.

#### Also, permissibility negates:

#### [1] Lack of obligation proves the res false. Absent a proactive obligation, you vote neg since there’s a trichotomy between prohibition, obligation, and permissibility. Proving one disproves the other two since you can’t be obligated and lack an obligation simultaneously.

#### [2] Statements are more often false than true since I can prove something false in infinite ways but true in only one.
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