# Eliminatory Determinism NC

#### I negate:

#### To eliminate is defined as to completely get [rid](https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/rid) of something[[1]](#footnote-1). This means you vote neg since the resolution is a universal, insofar as it doesn’t specify which fossil fuels subsidies are eliminated, and its impossible for the US to eliminate the fossil fuel subsidies of another country. However, I contend that even partial elimination is impossible.

#### First, according to the first law of thermodynamics[[2]](#footnote-2)

[First Law of Thermodynamics](https://www2.estrellamountain.edu/faculty/farabee/biobk/BioBookglossF.html#first%20law%20of%20thermodynamics%20(co): Energy can be changed from one form to another, but it cannot be created or destroyed. The total amount of energy and matter in the Universe remains constant, merely changing from one form to another. The First Law of Thermodynamics (Conservation) states that energy is always conserved, it cannot be created or destroyed. In essence, energy can be converted from one form into another. [Click here for another page (developed by Dr. John Pratte, Clayton State Univ., GA) covering thermodynamics.](http://science.clayton.edu/pratte/jmp7.html)

#### This negates since:

#### 1] You haven’t eliminated subsidies you have just changed their form, but they are still the same object.

#### 2] Something cannot come from nothing, which means that everything must have a cause. This disproves free will since because our actions cannot cause themselves in anyway, so they must be decided by prior states of the world. Determinism negates since A) the act of giving fossil fuel subsidies is predetermined and we cant change that and B) it denies the moral value of obligations, since subjects can’t be culpable for things outside of their control.

#### 3] Disproves util since its impossible to create new pleasure or get rid of pain.

#### Second, the universe is infinite.

Jesse Emspak, contributing writer for Live Science, Space.com and Toms Guide. He focuses on physics, human health and general science. Jesse has a Master of Arts from the University of California, Berkeley School of Journalism, and a Bachelor of Arts from the University of Rochester Does the Universe Have an Edge?, June 02, 2016, <https://www.livescience.com/33646-universe-edge.html> ///AHS PB

Scientists now know the universe is expanding, at an ever-increasing rate. So if it's ballooning, what is it growing into? In other words, what is beyond the known universe? Defining this "beyond the universe" would imply that the universe has an edge. And that's where things get tricky, because scientists aren't certain if such a drop-off exists. The answer depends on how one views the question. Cliff-hanger One form of the question asks, "Could you go somewhere that you could look 'beyond' the universe," the way one might peer beyond a cliff edge or look out a window to see the outside of a building? The answer to that query is "probably not." One reason involves the "cosmological principle," said Robert McNees, an associate professor of physics at Loyola University Chicago. The cosmological principle states that the distribution of matter in any part of the universe looks roughly the same as in any other part, regardless what direction you look in; in scientists' terms, the universe is isotropic. The cosmological principle is, in part, a consequence of the idea that the [laws of physics](https://www.livescience.com/50776-thermodynamics.html) are the same everywhere. "There's lots of local variation — stars, galaxies, clusters, etc. — but averaged over big chunks of space, no place is really that different than anywhere else," McNees told Live Science in an email The implication though, is that there is no "edge"; there is no place to go where the universe just ends and one could look in some direction and see what's beyond it. One analogy often used to describe this edgeless universe is the surface of a balloon. An ant on such a surface can walk in any direction and it would look like the surface was "unbounded" — that is, the ant might come back to where it started but there would be no end to the journey. So even though the surface of a balloon is a finite number of square units, there's no edge to it, no boundary (since you can go forever in any one direction). In addition, there's no "center," so there's no preferred point on the balloon's spherical surface. The universe is a three-dimensional version of the balloon's skin. Ballooning universe But how can the universe be expanding if there is no end or edge to it? Using the balloon analogy again, if one were to add more air to the balloon, the ant would observe other things on the balloon's surface getting farther away. And the greater the distance between the ant and some object, the faster that object would be receding. But no matter where the ant skittered, the speed at which those objects were receding would follow the same relations — if the ant came up with an equation describing how fast the farthest objects were receding, it would work the same way anywhere on the balloon's surface. However, balloons, when blown up, are expanding into a three-dimensional space. The problem is that this doesn't apply to the universe. By definition, the universe contains everything, so there is no "outside." Physicist Stephen Hawking has often said that the whole question makes no sense, because if the universe came from nothing and brought everything into existence, then asking what lies beyond the universe is like asking what is north of the North Pole. [[The Big Bang to Civilization: 10 Amazing Origin Events](https://www.livescience.com/49958-theory-no-big-bang.html)] Dr. Katie Mack, a theoretical astrophysicist at the University of Melbourne in Australia, told Live Science that it might be more useful to think of the universe as getting less dense, rather than expanding. That is, the concentration of matter in the universe is decreasing as the universe expands, she said. That's because galaxies aren't moving away from each other through space — it's space itself that is getting bigger. So any aliens in the galaxies that humans see would all come to the same conclusion that Earthlings do: Everything else is moving away in all directions, and the local galaxy is at rest. Because space is expanding, it's possible for the galaxies to appear as if they are moving faster than light, without [violating relativity](https://www.livescience.com/53857-5d-black-holes-break-general-relativity.html) — which says that nothing can go faster than light in a vacuum. The actual size of the observable universe is 46 billion light-years in any direction, even though the universe began only 13.8 billion years ago, Mack said. But that still sets a limit on the size of the universe humans can see, called the observable universe. Anything outside of that radius of 46 billion light-years is not visible to Earthlings, and it never will be. That's because the distances between objects in the universe keep getting bigger at a rate that's faster than the light beams can get to Earth. And on top of that, the rate of expansion has not been uniform. For a brief fraction of a second after [the Big Bang](http://www.space.com/52-the-expanding-universe-from-the-big-bang-to-today.html), there was a period of accelerated expansion called inflation, during which the universe grew at a much faster pace than it is growing now. Whole regions of space will never be observable from Earth for that reason. Mack noted that assuming inflation happened, the universe is actually 1023 times bigger than the 46 billion light-years humans can see. So if there is an edge to the universe, it's so far away Earthlings can't see it, and never will.

#### This negates since:

#### 1] Even if you eliminate subsidies on this earth, they will exist on infinite other earths.

#### 2] Infinite Universe takes out free will since no choice we make is unique, since we will always make the opposite choice in a different universe.

#### 3] Actions have no moral value under util, since they don’t effect the total quantity of pain or pleasure in the universe.

#### 4] Means its impossible to calculate consequences since there is an infinite probability of everything happening.

#### 

#### Third, time is not a linear progression but instead everything exists at the same moment, with the past, present, and future as one.

Scott Ryan, Doctor of Philosophy in Religion from Baylor University and post doc fellow at Baylor, A Short Argument for Eternalism, 2013, <http://www.scholardarity.com/?page_id=3845> ///AHS PB

Consider two such moments, for example my eating of a peanut butter sandwich for lunch yesterday and my recollection of that experience today. It seems unproblematic to say that the first moment of experience temporally precedes the second. There seems to be a real relation between the two such that the first comes before the second and the second comes after the first. The question for the non-eternalist is whether that temporal relation really obtains. If “before” and “after” are not real relations, relations that in fact obtain between two objectively existing moments of consciousness, then it seems that time is unreal and eternalism follows trivially. But if they do obtain, then the non-eternalist faces a worse difficulty. For if all that is ever real is the present moment, then there is never a time at which both moments of experience exist, and so at least one of the relata always fails to exist. Granting that my eating of the peanut butter sandwich yesterday does not exist now, if there is no sense in which it exists timelessly, then it simply isn’t “there” to be in a relation of “coming before” to the moment of my recollection. If past and present never coexist in any eternal sense whatsoever, then it should be simply meaningless to say that one comes “before” the other; the past simply fails to exist, and therefore can’t be “related” to anything. A non-eternalist might reply to this argument by saying that the past does continue to exist, but only as past—that when the Moving Finger, having writ, moves on, each moment acquires a quality of “pastness” that differentiates it from the present moment without making it fall out of existence altogether. I think this will not do, primarily for the reason Sprigge makes clear in his essay. My experience of eating a peanut butter sandwich has a certain quality of presentness that is simply part and parcel of the experience; without that quality the experience would not be what it is/was, and indeed would arguably not be an “experience” at all. (Sprigge’s own example, which has the advantage of great vividness, is a toothache.) If that moment of experience is not eternally “there” with that very quality of presentness, then it is no longer available as a temporal relatum, and when I say that the experience of eating the sandwich comes “before” my recollection of it, I am referring not to the experience itself (which no longer exists qua experience) but to its ghost. Surely this is not what we mean to say when we say one experience precedes another; the view that began by apparently cleaving to common sense in the end departs from it egregiously.

#### This negates since:

#### 1] Fossil Fuel subsidies exist in the past and future, so getting rid of them in the present is meaningless.

#### 2] All of our future actions already exist in time making free will meaningless, since every choice we make has already occurred.

#### 3] The fact that every action has already occurred, means nothing we do will change in the amount of pleasure that exists.
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