### 1

#### Interpretation – the aff may not defend that the appropriation of outer space by a certain set of private entities is unjust.

#### Entities is a generic bare plural

Nebel 20 [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs. He writes a lot of this stuff lol – duh.] “Indefinite Singular Generics in Debate” Victory Briefs, 19 August 2020. no url AG

I agree that if “a democracy” in the resolution just meant “one or more democracy,” then a country-specific affirmative could be topical. But, as I will explain in this topic analysis, that isn’t what “a democracy” means in the resolution. To see why, we first need to back up a bit and review (or learn) the idea of generic generalizations.

The most common way of expressing a generic in English is through a *bare plural*. A bare plural is a plural noun phrase, like “dogs” and “cats,” that lacks an overt determiner. (A determiner is a word that tells us which or how many: determiners include quantifier words like “all,” “some,” and “most,” demonstratives like “this” and “those,” posses- sives like “mine” and “its,” and so on.) LD resolutions often contain bare plurals, and that is the most common clue to their genericity.

We have already seen some examples of generics that are not bare plurals: “A whale is a mammal,” “A beaver builds dams,” and “The woolly mammoth is extinct.” The first two examples use indefinite singulars—singular nouns preceded by the indefinite article “a”—and the third is a definite singular since it is preceded by the definite article “the.” Generics can also be expressed with bare singulars (“Syrup is viscous”) and even verbs (as we’ll see later on). The resolution’s “a democracy” is an indefinite singular, and so it very well might be—and, as we’ll soon see, is—generic.

But it is also important to keep in mind that, just as not all generics are bare plurals, not all bare plurals are generic. “Dogs are barking” is true as long as some dogs are barking. Bare plurals can be used in particular ways to express existential statements. The key question for any given debate resolution that contains a bare plural is whether that occurrence of the bare plural is generic or existential.

The same is true of indefinite singulars. As debaters will be quick to point out, some uses of the indefinite singular really do mean “some” or “one or more”: “A cat is on the mat” is clearly not a generic generalization about cats; it’s true as long as some cat is on the mat. The question is whether the indefinite singular “a democracy” is existential or generic in the resolution.

Now, my own view is that, if we understand the difference between existential and generic statements, and if we approach the question impartially, without any invest- ment in one side of the debate, we can almost always just tell which reading is correct just by thinking about it. It is clear that “In a democracy, voting ought to be compul- sory” doesn’t mean “There is one or more democracy in which voting ought to be com- pulsory.” I don’t think a fancy argument should be required to show this any more than a fancy argument should be required to show that “A duck doesn’t lay eggs” is a generic—a false one because ducks do lay eggs, even though some ducks (namely males) don’t. And if a debater contests this by insisting that “a democracy” is existen- tial, the judge should be willing to resolve competing claims by, well, judging—that is, by using her judgment. Contesting a claim by insisting on its negation or demanding justification doesn’t put any obligation on the judge to be neutral about it. (Otherwise the negative could make every debate irresolvable by just insisting on the negation of every statement in the affirmative speeches.) Even if the insistence is backed by some sort of argument, we can reasonably reject an argument if we know its conclusion to be false, even if we are not in a position to know exactly where the argument goes wrong. Particularly in matters of logic and language, speakers have more direct knowledge of particular cases (e.g., that some specific inference is invalid or some specific sentence is infelicitious) than of the underlying explanations.

But that is just my view, and not every judge agrees with me, so it will be helpful to consider some arguments for the conclusion that we already know to be true: that, even if the United States is a democracy and ought to have compulsory voting, that doesn’t suffice to show that, in a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory—in other words, that “a democracy” in the resolution is generic, not existential.

Second, existential uses of the indefinite, such as “A cat is on the mat,” are upward- entailing.3 This means that if you replace the noun with a more general one, such as “An animal is on the mat,” the sentence will still be true. So let’s do that with “a democracy.” Does the resolution entail “In a society, voting ought to be compulsory”? Intuitively not, because you could think that voting ought to be compulsory in democracies but not in other sorts of societies. This suggests that “a democracy” in the resolution is not existential.

#### It applies to this topic – a] entities is an existential bare plural bc it has no determiner b] The sentence “The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust” does not imply “the appropriation of outer space by private and public entities is unjust”

#### Violation – they spec []

#### Standards

#### 1] Limits – they can spec infinite different entities like spaceX, etc.. - that’s supercharged by the ability to spec combinations of types of entities. This takes out functional limits – it’s impossible for me to research every possible combination of entities, governments, and appropriation.

#### 2] TVA solves – just read your aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff – we don’t stop them from reading new FWs, mechanisms or advantages. PICs aren’t aff offense – a] it’s ridiculous to say that neg potential abuse justifies the aff being non-T b] There’s only a small number of pics on this topic c] PICs incentivize them to write better affs that can generate solvency deficits to PICs

### 2

#### Interpretation: debaters must disclose the aff prior to the deadline for the coin flip 30 min before the round.

#### Violation: they didn’t until after the flip – they asked me before and I told them though.
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#### Vote negative for reciprocity – they have a huge strategic edge if they know what my aff is before the flip but I don’t know what theirs is which hurts strat because it determines what side debaters flip and we are left to guess a side. They’ll say text works better but they contacted me on email and didn’t send the aff via text.

#### Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

#### Drop the debater – a) they have a 7-6 rebuttal advantage and the 2ar to make args I can’t respond to, b) it deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

#### Use competing interps – a) reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter, b) collapses to competing interps – we justify 2 brightlines under an offense defense paradigm just like 2 interps

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms, c) chilling effect – incentivizes you to read an abuse AC and go for the RVI, d) topic ed – prevents 1AR blipstorm scripts and allows us to get back to substance after resolving theory

#### Evaluate theory about the aff advocacy first – a) norms – we only have a couple months to set topic norms but can set 1AR theory norms anytime, b) magnitude – the aff advocacy affects a larger portion of the debate since it determines every speech after it and pre round neg prep

#### They can’t weigh the case—lack of preround prep means their truth claims are untested which you should presume false—they’re also only winning case because we couldn’t engage with it

### 3

#### Permissibility and presumption negate – [a] the resolution indicates the aff has to prove an obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation [b] Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false. This means you negate if there is no offense because the resolution is probably false.

#### The metaethic is practical reason. Prefer:

#### [1] Regress – Ethical theories must have a basis. We can always ask why we should follow the basis of a theory, so they aren’t morally binding because they don’t have a starting point. Practical reason solves – When we ask why we should follow reason, we demand a reason, which concedes to the authority of reason itself, so it’s the only thing we can follow

#### [2] Action Theory – Every action can be broken down to infinite amounts of movements, i.e. me moving my arm can be broken down to the infinite moments of every state my arm is in. Only reason can unify these movements because we use practical reason to achieve our goals, means all actions collapse to reason

#### Practical reason means we all have a unified perspective: What can be justified to me can be justified to everyone who is a practical reasoner. If I can conclude that 2+2 is 4, then I understand not only that I know 2+2 is 4, but that everyone around me can arrive at the same conclusion. These things are temporally consistent: I know that me adding two numbers now and taking that sum will not result in me adding the same two numbers in the future and getting a different sum. Our unified perspective does not change but rather stays consistent.

#### But, willing an action that violates the freedom of others is a contradiction: If I decide to kill someone, that action is not universalizable because that would justify other people killing me too. If I die, I cannot exercise my freedom to kill someone else. This is a contradiction: I both justify extending my freedom to kill others and limiting my own freedom.

#### Prefer the standard: [a] freedom is the key to the process of justification of arguments. Willing that we should abide by their ethical theory presupposes that we own ourselves in the first place. Thus, it is logically incoherent to justify the neg arguments/standard without first willing that we can pursue ends free from others [b] Induction is circular because it relies on the assumption that nature will hold uniform and we could only reach that conclusion through inductive reasoning based on observation of past events – takes out their offense and framing since it’s predicated on past experiences [c] resource disparities—a focus on evidence and statistics privileges debaters with the most preround prep which excludes lone-wolfs who lack huge evidence files. A debate under my framework can easily be won without any prep since only analytical arguments are required. That controls the internal link to other voters because a pre-req to debating is access to the activity and comes first since framework is just a T debate about the word ought which up layers substantive justifications.

#### Thus, the standard is respecting freedom.

#### Initial acquisition of property can never be unjust – to create rights violations, there must already be an owner of the property being violated, but that presupposes its appropriation by another entity.

Feser, (Edward Feser, 1-1-2005, accessed on 12-15-2021, Cambridge University Press, "THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN UNJUST INITIAL ACQUISITION | Social Philosophy and Policy | Cambridge Core", Edward C. Feser is an American philosopher. He is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at Pasadena City College in Pasadena, California. [https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)[brackets](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)%5bbrackets) for gen lang]//phs st

There is a serious difficulty with this criticism of Nozick, however. It is just this: There is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition of resources; therefore, there is no case to be made for redistributive taxation on the basis of alleged injustices in initial acquisition. This is, to be sure, a bold claim. Moreover, in making it, I contradict not only Nozick’s critics, but Nozick himself, who clearly thinks it is at least possible for there to be injustices in acquisition, whether or not there have in fact been any (or, more realistically, whether or not there have been enough such injustices to justify continual redistributive taxation for the purposes of rectifying them). But here is a case where Nozick has, I think, been too generous to the other side. Rather than attempt —unsatisfactorily, in the view of his critics—to meet the challenge to show that initial acquisition has not in general been unjust, he ought instead to have insisted that there is no such challenge to be met in the first place. Giving what I shall call “the basic argument” for this audacious claim will be the task of Section II of this essay. The argument is, I think, compelling, but by itself it leaves unexplained some widespread intu- itions to the effect that certain specific instances of initial acquisition are unjust and call forth as their remedy the application of a Lockean proviso, or are otherwise problematic. (A “Lockean proviso,” of course, is one that forbids initial acquisitions of resources when these acquisitions do not leave “enough and as good” in common for others.) Thus, Section III focuses on various considerations that tend to show how those intuitions are best explained in a way consistent with the argument of Section II. Section IV completes the task of accounting for the intuitions in question by considering how the thesis of self-ownership itself bears on the acqui- sition and use of property. Section V shows how the results of the previ- ous sections add up to a more satisfying defense of Nozickian property rights than the one given by Nozick himself, and considers some of the implications of this revised conception of initial acquisition for our under- standing of Nozick’s principles of transfer and rectification. II. The Basic Argument The reason there is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition of resources is that there is no such thing as either a just or an unjust initial acquisition of resources. The concept of justice, that is to say, simply does not apply to initial acquisition. It applies only after initial acquisition has already taken place. In particular, it applies only to transfers of property (and derivatively, to the rectification of injustices in transfer). This, it seems to me, is a clear implication of the assumption (rightly) made by Nozick that external resources are initially unowned. Consider the following example. Suppose an individual A seeks to acquire some previously unowned resource R. For it to be the case that A commits an injustice in acquiring R, it would also have to be the case that there is some individual B (or perhaps a group of individuals) against whom A commits the injustice. But for B to have been wronged by A’s acquisi- tion of R, B would have to have had a rightful claim over R, a right to R. By hypothesis, however, B did not have a right to R, because no one had a right to it—it was unowned, after all. So B was not wronged and could not have been. In fact, the very first person who could conceivably be wronged by anyone’s use of R would be, not B, but A himself, since A is the first one to own R. Such a wrong would in the nature of the case be an injustice in transfer—in unjustly taking from A what is rightfully his—not in initial acquisition. The same thing, by extension, will be true of all unowned resources: it is only after some- one has initially acquired them that anyone could unjustly come to possess them, via unjust transfer. It is impossible, then, for there to be any injustices in initial acquisition.7

### Util

#### [1] Induction – the past is not reliable to predict the future – we can’t use induction to prove induction – that would be circular.

#### [2] There is no bright line to where consequences end. Ends will always trigger more ends – any brightline is arbitrary and self-serving for their position.

#### [3] Any action is permissible since util doesn’t condemn actions, but end states – there’s always a possibility an action can be justified

#### [4] Aggregation is nonsensical – two headaches don’t equal a migraine. They’ll say it’s a question of death count but no your theory must be comprehensive and apply to all situations otherwise anything is permissible when it doesn’t apply.

#### [5] Retroactive – you justify action after it occurs which means you cannot guide action or justify an obligation.

#### [6] Desirability is circular - you define morality based off what is desirable, yet you only know what’s is desirable off of what is moral. Reject circular fwks since they’re logically invalid which means we can therefore justify anything

### AT Instrospection

#### [1] Not normative – just says we feel pleasure.

#### [2] Masochism disproves – they like pain and dislike pleasure -- proves that its impossible to find one particular definition of the good to aggregate.

#### [3] Unreliable: We only introspect our own experiences which means we can’t come to conclusions about other people.

#### [4] Its impossible for us to verify if other’s feel pain as well and if they do how much they feel, this makes trying to calculate under introspection impossible.

### AT Bostrom

#### [1] This increases moral uncertainty--there's always a RISK of extinction, meaning under Bostrom's logic, we keep pushing off moral discussion and never try to resolve the questions we have about ethics.

#### [2] No warrant why more time reduces moral uncertainty--we've been debating ethics and religion for thousands of years, and have only had MORE theories and disagreements arise.

#### [3] Fallacy of origin--just because we need to be alive to find out moral truths doesn't mean stopping extinction is morally bad.

#### [4] Conflates prefiat discussions of which ethical theory to use with the post-fiat evaluation of the resolution under one specific framework.

#### [5] Bostrom also thinks the universe is infinite and there are an infinite amount of people, so it's impossible for EVERYONE to go extinct (because infinity is infinite), meaning we'll always have some way to arrive at moral certainty.

### Case

#### The advantage has zero literature which is why we are forced to analytics and generics – if we win any of the arguments vote neg on presumption cuz there is zero risk.

YOU SHOUILD BE WORRIED ABOUT VOTING AFF ON THIS CASE, IN THE TWO SCENARIOS THEY READ, THE WORDS SPACE ARE MENTIONED A MERE TOTAL OF 4 TIMES IN THEIR ACTUAL EVIDENCE

### AT: Solvency

**AT: Zoria 7/26**

1] Ukraine's already legalized private investment and exploration - they're strong in space already which tanks uniqueness on scenario 1!!!

2] All the companies they cite have nothing to do with Ukraine so 0 uniqueness

3] Ur card concedes progress only possible because private investment and corporations can appropriate space

4] Their warrants are contingent on US-UK partnerships with Ukraine which are a] not affected by the plan, and b] gone because of Ukraine-Russia tensions

**AT: Antonink 8/7**

1] Their card concedes that Ukraine's not a threat - literally says: **"Ukraine’s main customer — the government — hasn’t yet signed any big contracts with private space companies."**

### AT: Scenario 1

**AT: Fuhrman 6/30**

1] They messed themselves over on uniqueness - the first line of their cards verbatim says: "North Korea’s ability to make such substantial progress in the development of its ballistic missile capabilities – particularly with regards to its long-range missiles – is likely the result of a number of factors, including simply the progress that can be expected to emerge from sustained and dedicated efforts"

2] Multiple alt causes - their warrant for NoKo Ukraine nuclear benefits is about USSR nuclear experts and tech which are massive alt thumpers

3] their ev is talking about old USSR tech for nuclear weapons now used IN STATE SATELLITES which means the risk of solvency is 0 for the aff cuz Ukraine will just sell these LIMITED parts to NoKo anyways

### AT Scenario 2:

**AT: Detsch 6/16**

1] China won't touch Ukraine with Russia up in there

2] This card is not about space - the only mention of space is regarding aerospace which is about airplanes and such. That means banning appropriation doesn't do anything cuz China can still steal Ukraine tech. EVEN if this card was about space, China can still just steal Ukraine tech after banning appropriation cuz the card is about them stealing from the government.