## 1 – Theory

#### Interpretation: debaters must include the URL in citations for their evidence.

#### Violation: they didn’t – examples include their first Korsgaard, Farr, and Ripstein cards.

#### Standards:

#### [1] NSDA rules – the unified manual says to include the URL.

NSDA 21 National Speech and Debate Association, “High School Unified Manual,” 1 September 2021, National Speech and Debate Association, accessed 11 September 2021, pg. 30, <https://www.speechanddebate.org/wp-content/uploads/High-School-Unified-Manual-2021-2022.pdf> ~ST~

Written source citation. To the extent provided by the original source, a written source citation must include:

1. Full name of primary author and/or editor

2. Publication date

3. Source

4. Title of article

5. Date accessed for digital evidence

6. Full URL, if applicable

7. Author qualifications

8. Page number(s)

#### That’s a voter – if we can choose what rules to break, I can make speeches however long I want, which is a side constraint to substance. Also proves the shell is reasonable and predictable because it’s by far the most common standard.

#### [2] Evidence ethics – no way to check whether their quote exists because we can’t find it on the internet – they can just make up whatever “evidence” they want, and there’s not enough time for us to verify that it is actually legit evidence. Pasting into a search engine doesn’t solve – a) many texts have weird formatting that prevents it from functioning, and b) difficult to find the correct version or one without a paywall. That’s a voter – a) debate is meaningless if we’re academically dishonest and have no argument credibility, b) uncredible evidence means we don’t know if their claims are true, which also serves as a substantive indict, and c) debate should prepare for the real world, in which small ev ethics violations are punished severely – large repercussions the control internal link to other impacts.

#### Also links to inclusion – small school debaters tend to use cards from the wiki. Bad citations negatively impact their research. That’s a voter because inclusion is a prereq to debate.

#### C/A voters

## 2 – Theory

#### Interpretation: the affirmative must read a ROTB in the form of a delineated text in the 1AC.

#### Violation: they didn’t

#### Standards:

#### [1] Strat skew – they can read offense under different ROTBs and a new ROTB in the 1AR, so they never substantively lose, which moots engagement. They can read a hyperspecific ROTB in the 1AR so that only undercovered offense matters. Infinite abuse – a new 1AR ROTB allows for dumping on the neg ROTB, making negating impossible since there’s no 3NR to answer 2AR extrapolations. Stable advocacies also key to fairness – otherwise you aren’t bound by what you say – independent voter since it justifies saying the N word, then shifting out of their reps.

#### [2] Reciprocity – a) restarting ROTB debate in 1AR puts them at a 7-6 time skew advantage; a 1AC ROTB solves, b) we have 1 speech to respond while they have 2 and can comparatively weigh in the 2AR, and c) I can only read a ROTB in my constructive, so they should as well since it’s definitionally an equal burden.

## 3 – 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.

#### 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.

#### Their A-C arguments are abt presumption, not permissibility, but permissibility’s a substantive argument so they don’t apply. The D point is also presumption because it’s abt whether things are true, not moral obligation. They didn’t cite any ev for their E point.

#### Determinism negates – lack of free will disproves moral obligations.

#### The 1AC says that morality must begin from free actions derived from practical reason. However, their framework is missing an internal link as to why humans actually are free agents that can choose what actions to take – if we disprove free will, vote neg.

#### 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 – that’s the intent-foresight distinction.

#### [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.
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