**Credit to n8**

**1st off**

**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>

**2. 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. 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>

2nd off

1. The ROTB is TT - A) Isomorphism: alternative RTBs aren’t binary win/loss, and thus cannot function in debate B) Constitutivism: the ballot and tab software presents decisions as aff/neg, not who best achieves some good value. Also, “affirm” is “To state that is true” [1] and negate is “to deny the existence or truth of”, which independently proves truth testing. C) Key to 1) Ground Parity: The wording committee and topic selection process exist to identify topics with a range of defensible arguments on both sides, “role of the ballot” claims can frame the round in ways that make my ground either absurd or morally abhorrent 2) Predictability: The only face value of a resolution is it’s truth or falsity as a statement – not some inherent other framework
2. There are no obligations to other states, so any action at the state level is permitted under justice. For something to be unjust it must violate some established duty. The constituting obligations of states are not international so justice doesn't constrict interstate action. International law doesn't establish obligations because first the OST clarifies that none of its language restricts sovereignty and second so no action determined at the state level violates any obligations under justice and all state actions are just. Thus, you negate on face
3. justice is state contextual because principles must be determined in a deliberative framework to avoid arbitrary imposition by elites. Because there is no third party arbiter to fairly determine principles of global justice, all actions determined by states meet justice contextually and you negate a priori
4. Give me 30 speaks for wearing school drip, 1) it’s a fundraiser so helping fund debate, 2) motivates ppl to be more creative

3rd off:

#### **Interp: Debaters must not defend the hypothetical implementation of an explicit actor or action**

#### **Resolved in LD means statement of values**

**UPitt ND** University Of Pittsburgh Communications Services Webteam, copyright 2015-21, "Basic Definitions," Department of Communication , <https://www.comm.pitt.edu/basic-definitions> CHO

Affirmative/Pro. The side that “affirms” the resolution (is “pro” the issue). For example, the affirmative side in a debate using the resolution of policy, Resolved: The United States federal government should implement a poverty reduction program for its citizens, would advocate for federal government implementation of a poverty reduction program. Argument. A statement, or claim, followed by a justification, or warrant. Justifications are responses to challenges, often linked by the word “because.” Example: The sun helps people, because the sun activates photosynthesis in plants, which produce oxygen so people can breathe. Constructive Speech. The first speeches in a debate, where the debaters “construct” their cases by presenting initial positions and arguments. Cross-examination. Question and answer sessions between debaters. Debate. A deliberative exercise characterized by formal procedures of argumentation, involving a set resolution to be debated, distinct times for debaters to speak, and a regulated order of speeches given. Evidence. Supporting materials for arguments. Standards for evidence are field-specific. Evidence can range from personal testimony, statistical evidence, research findings, to other published sources. Quotations drawn from journals, books, newspapers, and other audio-visuals sources are rather common. Negative/Con. The side that “negates” the resolution (is “con” the issue). For example, the negative side in a debate using the resolution of fact, Resolved: Global warming threatens agricultural production, would argue that global warming does not threaten agricultural production. Preparation Time. Debates often necessitate time between speeches for students to gather their thoughts and consider their opponent's arguments. This preparation is generally a set period of time and can be used at any time by either side at the conclusion of a speech. Rebuttal Speech. The last speeches in a debate, where debaters summarize arguments and draw conclusions about the debate. **Resolution. A specific statement or question up for debate. Resolutions usually appear as statements of policy, fact or value.** Statement of policy. Involves an actor (local, national, or global) with power to decide a course of action. For example, Resolved: The United States federal government should implement a poverty reduction program for its citizens.Statement of fact. Involves a dispute about empirical phenomenon. For example, Resolved: Global warming threatens agricultural production. **Statement of value. Involves conflicting moral dilemmas. For example, Resolved: The death penalty is a justified method of punishment.** Topic. A general issue to debate. Topics could be “The Civil War,” “genetic engineering,” or “Great Books.”

#### **Is means** is Definition of is (Entry 1 of 4) present tense third-person singular of BE **dialectal present tense** first-person and third-person singular **of BE** dialectal present tense plural of BE

**Webster ND** Definition of IS," Merriam Webster, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/is> IS

#### **Dialectical present tense means logical coherence which implies no implementation**

**Your Dictionary ND**, "Dialectical Meaning," No Publication, <https://www.yourdictionary.com/dialectical> Cho

The **definition of dialectical** is a discussion that includes logical reasoning and dialogue, or something having the sounds, vocabulary and grammar of a specific way of speaking. An **example of something dialectical is a Lincoln Douglass style of debate,** **where both parties argue a point in a logical order**. Of, or pertaining to dialectic; **logic**ally **reason**ed through the **exchange of opposing ideas.**

#### **“BE” is a linking verb, not an action verb so implementation is incoherent**

**Grammar Monster ND** "Linking Verbs," Grammar Monster, <https://www.grammar-monster.com/glossary/linking_verbs.htm> CHO

What Are Linking Verbs? (with Examples) **A linking verb** is used to re-identify or to **describe its subject**. A linking verb is called a linking verb because it links the subject to a subject complement (see graphic below). Infographic Explaining Linking Verb A linking verb tells us what the subject is, not what the subject is doing. Easy Examples of Linking Verbs In each example, the linking verb is highlighted and the subject is bold. **Alan is a vampire.** (Here, the **subject is re-identified as a vampire.)** Alan is thirsty. (Here, the subject is described as thirsty.)

#### **Violation: They defend “private entities” as the actor**