### 1

#### Interpretation – Debaters must disclose all constructive positions in cite boxes on the 2021-22 NDCA LD wiki. If cites don’t work, they should disclose entry titles as a summary of their position. To clarify – instead of having no entry title, this can be either the author of your position, the description of the plan text, or framework text.

#### Violation – Check ScreenshotsGraphical user interface, text, email Description automatically generated

#### 1] Wiki rules and accessibility – inclusion is a voter because you can’t debate if you can’t participate

**Wiki Admin** [Administrator, "NDCA LD 2021-2022," No Publication, [https://hsld.debatecoaches.org/Main //](https://hsld.debatecoaches.org/Main%20//) JB]

When possible, **complete citations** should be **provided**. If citations are **not available, basic information** about the arguments made is still very helpful. For affirmatives, a **summary of** the **plan and advantages** as well as information about **major** 2AC **add-ons** or responses would be appreciated. For negatives, information about the arguments made in the **1NC** as well as information about the **2NR strategies** that the team has settled upon are ideal.

It is our hope that squads will **contribute all of the information** that they gather about other teams' arguments. **Hoarding intelligence** to gain a strategic advantage **undermines** the overall **quality of** the **information available** to all squads and is **antithetical** to the spirit of **clash** inherent in contest round debating. **Democratizing** the **process** of intelligence gathering distributes the burden onto a much greater number of people, enabling **students and teachers** to spend more time **generating** and discussing **arguments** and **less time chasing** down **citations**.

#### 2] Wiki also warns you before you disclose which means no reasonability

A screenshot of a cell phone

Description automatically generated

#### I’ll preempt “wiki doesn’t work” – 1] The interp solves, yes the wiki sometimes doesn’t post wikify versions but you can still post a summary of arguments which is what the wiki asks you to do 2] Asking doesn’t solve because it’s a question of the norm you posit and some people don’t know you 3] Verifiability flows neg – you know they didn’t disclose but you don’t know if they’re lying. Either way, most debaters follow my interp which means risk of offense negates.

#### 3] Preround Prep – prep becomes atrocious when you make people sift through 20 word docs to figure out which links you’re reading and which impacts to prep. Also key for inclusion since disadvantaged people have computers more prone to lag and even 3 or 4 can crash the program for them—outweighs accessibility is a multiplier for their impacts. Disclosing in cite boxes or a summary as the title of your posititon solves—people can quickly get a summary of your position and go to open source if they need more information

### 2

#### Interpretation: Cards disclosed by debaters on the NDCA LD wiki must provide sources and citations for all evidence cited in the speech that the evidence was read.

#### Violation: Screenshots in doc – its from their blake round 5

Graphical user interface, text, application

Description automatically generated

#### 1] Evidence ethics- 2 internal links a] It’s impossible to verify whether or not their evidence was fabricated because there’s no direct link to their evidence. We don’t know what page the highlighted section is on or how we can even get to their evidence otherwise b] spreads the message to novices and other varsity debaters that its okay to not cite your evidence which is a terrible practice – supercharged by the fact that you are a competitor at the Harvard round robin – that’s a voter since it is an academic d-rule to not cheat which outweighs because of sequencing – it questions my ability to engage with their arguments

#### 2] Inclusion- Them not providing direct links to sources crowds out small school debaters since not providing sci-hub or pdf links that get you access to pay-walled articles put them at a disadvantage from the very beginning

#### 

### 3

#### The meta-ethic is procedural moral realism.

#### This entails that moral facts stem from procedures while substantive realism holds that moral truths exist independently of that in the empirical world. Prefer procedural realism –

#### [1] Collapses – the only way to verify whether something is a moral fact is by using procedures to warrant it.

#### [2] Uncertainty – our experiences are inaccessible to others which allows people to say they don’t experience the same, however a priori principles are universally applied to all agents.

#### [3] Is/Ought Gap – we can only perceive what is, not what ought to be. It’s impossible to derive an ought statement from descriptive facts about the world, necessitating a priori premises.

#### Practical Reason is that procedure. To ask for why we should be reasoners concedes its authority since it uses reason – anything else is nonbinding and arbitrary. That hijacks their framework since you need reason to evaluate any relevant consequences.

#### Moral law must be universal—our judgements can’t only apply to ourselves any more than 2+2=4 can be true only for me – any non-universalizable norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends. Reject Extinction outweighs- aggregation is nonsensical since a] it impedes on one persons ends for another and b] assumes everyone values the same thing.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative.

#### Prefer –

#### [1] Performativity—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.

#### [2] All other frameworks collapse—non-Kantian theories source obligations in extrinsically good objects, but that presupposes the goodness of the rational will.

#### [3] TJFs and they outweigh since it precludes engagement on the framework layer – prefer for Resource disparities- Our framework ensures big squads don’t have a comparative advantage since debates become about quality of arguments rather than quantity - their model crowds out small schools because they have to prep for every unique advantage under each aff, every counterplan, and every disad with carded responses to each of them

#### No new 1AR framework justifications – Anything else kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement off a lack of it in the 1AC – It also justifies overloading the 2NR with new arguments.

#### Offense

#### 1] Libertarianism mandates a market-oriented approach to space—that negates

Broker 20 [(Tyler, work has been published in the Gonzaga Law Review, the Albany Law Review and the University of Memphis Law Review.) “Space Law Can Only Be Libertarian Minded,” Above the Law, 1-14-20, <https://abovethelaw.com/2020/01/space-law-can-only-be-libertarian-minded/>] TDI

The impact on human daily life from a transition to the virtually unlimited resource reality of space cannot be overstated. However, when it comes to the law, a minimalist, dare I say libertarian, approach appears as the only applicable system. In the words of NASA, “2020 promises to be a big year for space exploration.” Yet, as Rand Simberg points out in Reason magazine, it is actually private American investment that is currently moving space exploration to “a pace unseen since the 1960s.” According to Simberg, due to this increase in private investment “We are now on the verge of getting affordable private access to orbit for large masses of payload and people.” The impact of that type of affordable travel into space might sound sensational to some, but in reality the benefits that space can offer are far greater than any benefit currently attributed to any major policy proposal being discussed at the national level. The sheer amount of resources available within our current reach/capabilities simply speaks for itself. However, although those new realities will, as Simberg says, “bring to the fore a lot of ideological issues that up to now were just theoretical,” I believe it will also eliminate many economic and legal distinctions we currently utilize today. For example, the sheer number of resources we can already obtain in space means that in the rapidly near future, the distinction between a nonpublic good or a public good will be rendered meaningless. In other words, because the resources available within our solar system exist in such quantities, all goods will become nonrivalrous in their consumption and nonexcludable in their distribution. This would mean government engagement in the public provision of a nonpublic good, even at the trivial level, or what Kevin Williamson defines as socialism, is rendered meaningless or impossible. In fact, in space, I fail to see how any government could even try to legally compel collectivism in the way Simberg fears. Similar to many economic distinctions, however, it appears that many laws, both the good and the bad, will also be rendered meaningless as soon as we begin to utilize the resources within our solar system. For example, if every human being is given access to the resources that allows them to replicate anything anyone else has, or replace anything “taken” from them instantly, what would be the point of theft laws? If you had virtually infinite space in which you can build what we would now call luxurious livable quarters, all without exploiting human labor or fragile Earth ecosystems when you do it, what sense would most property, employment, or commercial law make? Again, this is not a pipe dream, no matter how much our population grows for the next several millennia, the amount of resources within our solar system can sustain such an existence for every human being. Rather than panicking about the future, we should try embracing it, or at least meaningfully preparing for it. Currently, the Outer Space Treaty, or as some call it “the Magna Carta of Space,” is silent on the issue of whether private individuals or corporate entities can own territory in space. Regardless of whether governments allow it, however, private citizens are currently obtaining the ability to travel there, and if human history is any indicator, private homesteading will follow, flag or no flag. We Americans know this is how a Wild West starts, where most regulation becomes the impractical pipe dream. But again, this would be a Wild West where the exploitation of human labor and fragile Earth ecosystem makes no economic sense, where every single human can be granted access to resources that even the wealthiest among us now would envy, and where innovation and imagination become the only things we would recognize as currency. Only a libertarian-type system, that guarantees basic individual rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness could be valued and therefore human fidelity to a set of laws made possible, in such an existence.

#### 2] Property rights in space can be consistent with international law

Simberg 12 [(Rand, MSE in technical management from West Coast University, recognized as an expert in space transportation by the Office of Technology Assessment) “Homesteading the Final Frontier A Practical Proposal for Securing Property Rights in Space,” Competitive Enterprise Institute, April 2012, <https://cei.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/Rand-Simberg-Homesteading-the-Final-Frontier.pdf>] TDI

But is it true that any recognition of off-planet property claims is de facto a violation of the Outer Space Treaty? Not necessarily. For instance, one could argue that the existence of the Moon Treaty is in and of itself a refutation of the notion that the Outer Space Treaty outlaws private property in space, or else there would be no need for another treaty that essentially explicitly does so. And there is at least one potential loophole that could be exploited by appropriately worded legislation. There are two key assumptions in the legal argument used by opponents of off-planet property claims: 1) that the recognition by a government would only recognize claims by its own citizens; and 2) that it would defend them by force. That need not necessarily be so. Under the treaty, it would in fact be possible for a government, or group of governments, to recognize the property claims of anyone who met specified conditions, regardless of their citizenship or nationality. Such cooperation would obviate the need for physical force to defend claims. The argument that the treaty permits individual property rights was actually made from the very beginning. In 1969, two years after the treaty went into force, the late distinguished space-law professor, Stephen Gorove, noted that under it, “[A]n individual acting on his own behalf or on behalf of another individual or a private association or an international organization could lawfully appropriate any part of outer space, including the [M]oon and other celestial bodies.”32 This clearly provides support for the concept of individual claims off planet under Article II.

#### 3] Space appropriation and exploration originates from private companies such as Space X and Blue Origin. Preventing such is a restriction on the ability of companies to set and pursue their ends and these companies gain contracts with the government for projects which turns promise breaking offense.

### 4

#### The standard is consistency with the logical consequence of the resolution. Prefer this –

#### 1. Text – Oxford Dictionary defines ought as “used to indicate something that is probable.”

<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought> //Massa

#### Ought is “used to express logical consequence” as defined by Merriam-Webster

(<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought>) //Massa

#### 2. Debatability – a) my interp means debates focus on empirics about squo trends rather than irresolvable abstract principles that’ve been argued for years b) Moral oughts cannot guide action due to the is/ought fallacy – we cannot derive moral obligations from what happens in the real world

#### 3. Neg definition choice – Anything else kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement on a lack of your definition.

#### Their inherency proves the aff won’t happen. Either a) the aff is non-inherent and you vote neg on presumption or b) It is and it isn’t going to happen.