
# You Can Run, But You Can’t Hide K

## A. Link

#### [Link] The aff hasn’t disclosed prep they’ve read at this tournament – they last updated their Wiki at the Berkely tournament two months ago

#### Screen shots



## B. Impacts

#### 1. [Rury & Rife] First, OPPORTUNITY HOARDING: they have full access to everything I’ve read because I’ve disclosed it, but I have NO idea what they’ve read. And they can’t say it was just my choice to disclose – they’re benefiting from it, which is EXCLUSIVE CAPITALISM.

**Rury & Rife:** Rury, John L. [Professor of Education and History, University of Kansas], and Aaron Tyler Rife [Assistant Professor, Wichita State University]. “Race, Schools, and Opportunity Hoarding: Evidence From a Post-War American Metropolis.” *History of Education*, *Journal of the History of Education Society*, Vol. 47, Issue 1, 2018. CH

**Opportunity hoarding was originally articulated and defined by sociologist Charles Tilly. In his words, it represents a mechanism of social inequality that ‘operates when members of a categorically bounded network acquire access to a resource that is valuable, renewable, subject to monopoly, supportive of network activities, and enhanced by the network’s modus operandi’.4** 4 Charles Tilly, Durable Inequality (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 10. View all notes **Such a resource could** be an occupational designation, a residential area, an educational credential, a lifestyle classification, or other categories that **convey distinction, exclude other groups and are subject to conditions described above. Consequently, the concept of opportunity hoarding is applicable to a range of social settings and circumstances, contributing advantages to members of both elites and non-elites who can restrict access to resources and opportunities to eligible participants.** Tilly employs the term somewhat differently from others, however, and distinctions in its definition and use are important.

**TURNS CASE – THEIR PERFORMANCE ACTIVELY PROPS UP STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE/UNDERMINES LIBERATION STRATEGIES [OR: alternate link to framework]. INDEPENDENT REASON TO DROP THEM –** they’re not consistent with their own framework, and they don’t get to weigh substance against the K, since I question their ability to read it in the first place.

#### 2. [Nails] Second, CRITICAL CONTESTATION – they never have to withstand the best objections to their aff/offs if no one can do research against them in advance.

**Nails:** Nails, Jacob. [Former Policy Debater, Georgia State University] “A Defense of Disclosure (Including Third-Party Disclosure).” NSD Update, 2013. CH

I fall squarely on the side of disclosure. I find that **the largest advantage of widespread disclosure is the educational value it provides.** First, **disclosure streamlines research. Rather than every team and every lone wolf researching completely in the dark, the wiki provides a public body of knowledge that everyone can contribute to and build off of.** Students can look through the different studies on the topic and choose the best ones on an informed basis without the prohibitively large burden of personally surveying all of the literature. **The best arguments are identified and replicated, which is a natural result of an open marketplace of ideas. Quality of evidence increases across the board. In theory,** the increased quality of information **could trade off with quantity**. If debaters could just look to the wiki for evidence, it might remove the competitive incentive to do one’s own research. **Empirically**, however**, the opposite has been true.** In fact, a second advantage of **disclosure is that it motivates research.** Debaters cannot expect to make it a whole topic with the same stock AC – **that is, unless they are continually updating and frontlining it.** Likewise, **debaters with access to their opponents’ cases can do more targeted and specific research. Students can go to a new level of depth, researching not just the pros and cons of the topic but the specific authors, arguments, and adovcacies employed by other debaters.** The incentive to cut author-specific indicts is low if there’s little guarantee that the author will ever be cited in a round but high if one knows that specific schools are using that author in rounds. In this way, disclosure increases incentive to research by altering a student’s cost-benefit analysis so that the time spent researching is more valuable, i.e. more likely to produce useful evidence because it is more directed. In any case, if publicly accessible evidence jeopardized research, backfiles and briefs would have done LD in a long time ago. Lastly, and to my mind most significantly, **disclosure weeds out anti-educational arguments. I have in mind the sort of theory spikes and underdeveloped analytics whose strategic value comes only from the fact that the time to think of and enunciate responses to them takes longer than the time spent making the arguments themselves. If these arguments were made on a level playing field where each side had equal time to craft answers, they would seldom win rounds, which is a testimony to the real world applicability (or lack thereof) of such strategies.** A model in which arguments have to withstand close scrutiny to win rounds creates incentive to find the best arguments on the topic rather than the shadiest. Having transitioned from LD to policy where disclosure is more universal, I can say that **debates are more substantive, developed, and responsive when both sides know what they’re getting into prior to the round**. The educational benefits of disclosure alone aren’t likely to convince the fairness-outweighs-education crowd, but I’ve learned over the course of many theory debates that most of that crowd has a very warped and confusing conception of fairness. **Debaters who produce better research are more deserving of a win. Debaters who can make smart arguments and defend them from criticism should win out over debaters who hide behind obfuscation.** That so many rounds these days are resolved on frivolous theory and dropped, single-sentence blips suggests that wins are not going to the “better debaters” in any meaningful sense of the term. The structure of LD in the status quo doesn’t incentivize better debating.

**TURNS CASE –** if their method is good, that’s ALL THE MORE REASON they should disclose it and modify it to withstand well-researched objections.

## C. Implication

#### [Implication] REJECT THEIR PERFORMANCE AND DROP THE DEBATER – they should lose for performatively contradicting their benefits AND for making debate less educational. A loss at least creates a risk that they’ll disclose in the future – that’s worth it if it improves the quality of in-round education.

# Ownership

### Framework

#### [Value] I negate and value Justice, meaning policies that respect people’s due.

#### [Ripstein] As agents capable of making choices, people deserve equal freedom. People can use property and negative liberty to set their own ends, so long as they don’t violate others’ ends.

**Ripstein:** Ripstein, Arthur. [Kantian Philosopher] "Beyond the Harm Principle," 2006. KK

All of the standard objections to the idea of equal freedom conceive of freedom as a person’s ability to achieve his or her purposes unhindered by others. This understanding of freedom, described as “negative liberty” in Isaiah Berlin’s essay “Two Concepts of Liberty,” characterizes any intentional actions or regulations that prevent a person from achieving his or her purposes as hindrances to freedom. Some critics have questioned the special significance of the actions of others in limiting freedom on this account – lack of resources, or internal obstacles may frustrate your purposes just as much as my deliberate actions. **The** difficulty for the **idea of equal freedom** is different. It **comes from** the role of **successful attainment of your purposes** in this conception of freedom**.** If our purposes come into conflict, so too must our freedom. Any purpose, whether my private purpose of crossing your yard, or that state’s public purpose of coordinating traffic flow, can come in to conflict with some person’s ability to get what he or she wants. The closest such a conception of freedom can come to an idea of equal freedom is some distributive system that would be likely to equalize people’s chances of success.23 The sovereignty principle conceives of freedom differently, in terms of the mutual independence of persons from each other. Such freedom cannot be defined, let alone secured, if it depends on the particular purposes that different people happen to have, because part of the reason freedom is important is that it allows each person to decide what purposes to pursue. Instead, **equal freedom is understood as each person’s ability to set** and pursue his or **her own purposes, consistent with** the **freedom of others to do the same.** Each person's entitlement to decide how their powers will be used precludes prohibiting many of the setbacks people suffer as effects of other people’s non- dominating conduct. **People** always **exercise their powers in a particular context,** but that context is **normally the result of other people's exercises of their own freedom.** To protect me against the harms that I suffer as you go about your legitimate business, perhaps because you set a bad example for others, or deprive me of their custom, would be inconsistent with your freedom, because it would require you to use your powers in the way that most suited my wishes or vulnerabilities. You do not dominate me if you fail to provide me with a suitable context in which to pursue my favoured purposes. To the contrary, I would dominate you if I could call upon the law to force you to provide me with my preferred context for those purposes. That would just be requiring you to act on my behalf, to advance purposes I had set. That is, it would empower me to use force to turn you into my means. Refusing to provide me with a favourable context to exercise my powers is an exercise of your freedom, not a violation of mine, however mean spirited you may be about that refusal.31

**He adds:**

**In the case of property,** even if “abstinence” is the rule that makes up the practice, **the harm principle demands a positive case** be made **to show that enforcing it is the only way to protect the practice.** Rules always prohibit their own violation – that is what makes them rules – and rules that make up a practice will “call for” enforcement even in cases where the institution is not in danger. **Whenever the rationale for enforcing the rules of chess** or baseball, **it is not that otherwise chess** or baseball **would be vulnerable to collapse.**16 The most that can be said about games and other purely conventional practices is that making the rules and prohibiting their violation comes down to the same thing. **We do not need to look to the effects of violations**, either in particular or in general, in order **to recognize that the rules create the game by prohibiting their violation.** This is not the place to examine the idea that institutions such as property are best analyzed on the model of a conventional game. The problem is that there seem to be only two ways of understanding this idea, and neither of them is consistent with the harm principle. One says that the rules must be enforced on pain of collapse of the practice. But that just reintroduces the distinction between harm and wrongdoing that created the difficulty about our example. If a class of violations are harmless to the practice, the harm principle provides no rationale for prohibiting them. The other model says that the rules make up the practice. It makes no reference to the concept of harm, because it makes no reference to the effects of violations. The harm principle appears to have no way of engaging with the idea of a valuable social practice, and so cannot use it to explain why harmless wrongs should be prohibited.17

#### [Criterion] My criterion is Protecting a System of Equal Freedom. Protecting a System of Equal Freedom means giving all people the ability to pursue their own ends. In other words, my right to swing my fist ends when it hits someone else’s face. Under this standard, the negative burden is to show that private space appropriation *alone* does not violate equal freedom. Conversely, the affirmative burden is to show that private space appropriation *alone* violates equal freedom.

## Thesis/Contention

#### [Thesis] My thesis and sole contention is that since asserting ownership over something does not, by itself, harm others, the process of appropriation can’t be considered unjust.

#### [Hayase & Ura] The mere process of owning something isn’t the same as using it, it doesn’t justify violating equal freedom.

**Hayase & Ura:** Hayase, Kohji [Graduate School of Integrated Arts and Sciences, Hiroshima University, Hiroshima, Japan] and Mitsuhiro Ura. [Faculty of Psychology, Otemon University, Osaka, Japan], “Ownership or Taking Action: Which Is More Important for Happiness?” May 2015. https://www.scirp.org/pdf/PSYCH\_2015051309482001.pdf AC

Forty years ago, John Lennon sang, “Imagine no possessions, I wonder if you can”. The concept of possession itself is interesting to consider, and investigate, and debate (Curchin, 2007). A recent report explained happiness and well-being as agential flourishing (Raibley, 2012). **Possession (ownership) and taking action are concepts that contrast with each other, since the former represents stasis or little movement, and the latter is dynamic and movement itself.** Thus, we have arrived at a significant question, psychologically and philosophically: Which is more important to achieve happiness, ownership (possession) or taking action? There is little research about the preference for ownership or taking action in relation to happiness. In this paper, we examine the happiness that people feel from possession or ownership in comparison to the happiness they achieve as a result of taking action. The purpose of this paper is to investigate Japanese people’s preference for ownership (possession) or taking action, to evaluate the correlations of this preference with gender, age, level of education, and annual income, and to discuss reasons for people’s preference.

**They add:**

On the other hand, there is little research about the preference for ownership (possession) or taking action in relation to happiness. One reason could be the difficulty in differentiating the terms “taking action”, and “experience”. **One possible difference between the terms action and experience might be that people valued taking action for its achievement value, in addition to its experiential value (Nozick, 1974) . According to Webster’s New World Dictionary, action is the doing of something and/or state of being in motion or of working, whereas experience is the act of living through an event or events; personal involvement in or observation of events as they occur. These meanings are similar in Japanese. Taking action might have broader meaning beyond its experiential value (i.e., experiencing an event or events), such as work or achievement of value, and/or volunteering and making charitable contributions. Moreover, happiness from taking action is to some extent different from happiness from experience or experiential purchase, in accordance with the distinction between episodic happiness and well-being (Raibley, 2012) , since experience or experiential purchase is related or connected to an episode, an event, or events.** We investigated the preference for ownership (possession) or taking action, in relation to hap- piness, considering that the term taking action included the term experience. We think that ownership is not only related to purchasing behavior, but also related to the monopolization of materials, which is close to being selfish. Psychological study of monopolization materials (Why do some people like to monopolize materials instead of freely transferring them to others?) is a very important and useful topic for the psychology of happiness and/or peace. When we look deeply into the question of ownership, we can find very broad and meaningful aspects in ownership, as like as in taking action. We think that taking action and ownership are also comparable in their broad meanings. Then, we carried out the research about the preference for ownership (possession) or taking action in relation to happiness.

#### [Nelson & Block] And private property appropriation respects a system of equal freedom.

**Nelson & Block write in the context of space appropriation:** Nelson, Peter Lothian [Professional engineer], and Walter E. Block [American Austrian School economist]. *Space Capitalism: How Humans Will Colonize Planets, Moons, and Asteroids*. Switzerland: Palgrave MacMillan, 2018. CH

In sharp contrast, each and every transaction that occurs under laissezfaire capitalism can boast volunteerism. When A purchases a pen from B for $1, they both agreed to the transaction. It was unanimous. And the same goes for all other commercial interactions, whether buying or selling, trading or bartering, lending or borrowing, or saving and investing. **Thus, if property remains in the private sector, there is no violation of any just law as there is with public property.** How can **property rights be established**? From the libertarian perspective, this is accomplished **through homesteading.** How does this work? The general rule is simple.8 **One mixes his labor with the land, by planting a field or harvesting trees; a man captures and domesticates an animal, or kills one for food. Then, he becomes the owner of the resource owners establishes just title.** So, if one man grows corn, and another milks a cow, and then they barter, the farmer owns the milk, even though he did not produce it, as does the rancher the corn, ditto. But, both can trace titles to what they now own to initial homesteading and voluntary interaction. The problem with so-called government ownership is that no politician, no bureaucrat, ever homesteaded or freely traded anything.9 Instead, the king, or the congress, simply declared control over certain territories. But this is on a par with everything else done by this institution. There is no justification, merely the fraudulent claim: “Might makes right.” We therefore conclude that private property, the very basis of the free enterprise system, is justified. Commons What of unowned property not controlled by either government or private individuals? The ethical status of the commons depends upon exactly how and why this occurs. The short answer is, if property is unowned because it is sub-marginal, then all is well. **If, on the other hand, this status arises because the state refuses to allow private parties to homestead virgin territory and take ownership over it, then this is contrary to the libertarian ethos. The unowned property itself, of course, is not to blame; it is inanimate. The fault lies with the institution that refuses to allow homesteading and settlement on it.** Why is some land sub-marginal? This is because it does not pay to settle on it. The terrain is too rough, or too far away from civilization to be economical, or too dangerous, or for any other reason unsuitable for habitation by any but the heartiest and most adventurous persons and even then, only temporarily.

Since affirming denies rights without any wrongdoing from private entities, it violates the criterion and justice.

# Cap-&-Trade CP

## A. Text

#### [Trapp 1] Instead of banning private space appropriation [OR: affirming], states should set up a cap-and-trade system. This entails:

**A] imposing a global limit on allowable space debris;**

**B] regularly recalculating that limit; and**

**C] creating a database to track all space objects.**

**Trapp 1:** Trapp, Timothy Justin. [J.D., University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign School of Law; tax associate] “Taking Up Space By Any Other Means: Coming to Terms with the Nonappropriation Article of the Outer Space Treaty.” *University of Illinois Law Review*, Vol. 2013, No. 4, August 2013. https://www.illinoislawreview.org/wp-content/ilr-content/articles/2013/4/Trapp.pdf JP/CH

**To effectively combat** the **space debris** problem**, a cap-and-trade system should be set up** that will both be effective and withstand scrutiny under the nonappropriation article of the Outer Space Treaty**. As such, an international regulatory agency should be created to serve two functions: first,** the agency should **impose an international limit to** the addition of **debris and** should then **apportion** these **allowances to nations based on their current use of space. The total allowable debris addition should be recalculated yearly based on the state of the space environment**, and individual allowances should also be recalculated annually to account for changes in the abilities and needs of different nations**.** Second, the agency should allot specific LEO area orbital trajectories, such as the ITU allots GEO orbital slots.294 Though this will be more difficult than allocating GEO slots, since those slots appear stationary while LEO orbital paths are constantly in motion, it can be done. **First, an international electronic database should be produced which tracks** the current location of **all space objects registered in the Space Object Registry, which should include all spacecraft** launched into space**.** It should also record, to the greatest extent possible, the location and trajectory of any debris. **This database should be updated daily** to represent the most accurate portrayal of the location and trajectory of space objects by the nations responsible for those space objects**.** Second, this database should be used to calculate predictions of where spacecraft will be in the future, and LEO orbital slots should be defined both in time and space, as opposed to being defined purely by location. This may seem difficult, but it is actually made quite simple by the use of computers. Though these calculations will become less accurate over longer periods of time, the constant updating of the database will allow these predictions to be constantly updated as well, so that they will be accurate for at least the immediate future. When a nation applies for a trajectory slot, the agency should only allocate that slot if it can be entered into and sustained for a certain amount of time without requiring a trajectory modification of any other spacecraft. **With a workable allocation system in place, the agency should be in conformity with the nonappropriation article of the Outer Space Treaty.** To ensure this, it is important that, in allocating slots, both the interests of current space-faring nations, as well as those without the capability to get into space, are provided for. To do so, the agency should only allow actual physical entry into trajectory slots to those who comport with the cap-and-trade regime, while allowing claims to such slots to all nations, on bases similar to those of the ITU.299 This will ensure that this agency will not run into some of the problems that the ITU did when it began.300 In doing this, the agency will be comporting to the ideal that space be preserved for all mankind. **Furthermore, since the purpose of the agency would be to mitigate the debris problem, its purpose would be ensuring future access to space**. This, in connection to the fact that this is an international agency responding proportionately to an international problem,301 will allow the agency to withstand scrutiny under the nonappropriation article of the Outer Space Treaty.302

## B. Competition

#### [Competition] It’s mutually exclusive – private entities can still appropriate outer space under the CP, but can’t under the aff – makes perms impossible.

## C. Solvency

#### [Trapp 2] WE SOLVE 100% OF THE AFF – the CP follows the Outer Space Treaty’s ban on state appropriation, but doesn’t let private entities pollute.

**Trapp 2:** Trapp, Timothy Justin. [J.D., University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign School of Law; tax associate] “Taking Up Space By Any Other Means: Coming to Terms with the Nonappropriation Article of the Outer Space Treaty.” *University of Illinois Law Review*, Vol. 2013, No. 4, August 2013. https://www.illinoislawreview.org/wp-content/ilr-content/articles/2013/4/Trapp.pdf JP/CH

Space debris poses a threat to future open access to the space environment. Without some sort of action, the problem will continue to escalate, putting at risk the sustainability of the space around our planet. **An international regulatory authority that operated under the U.N. to institute a cap-and-trade regulation system and to allocate LEO orbital trajectories is the best way to curb** the **space debris** problem **while staying within the** mandate of the **nonappropriation article of the O**uter **S**pace **T**reaty**. The allotment of trajectories would ensure that everyone has fair access to the resource, as well as facilitate the reduction of** space **debris caused by collision.**3 **A cap-and-trade system would make sure that the proliferation of further debris is curbed, as well as incentivize actors to contribute to cleaning up the space resource. Since such an agency would operate under** the authority of **the U.N.,** it would be of an international character, similar to the ITU. Moreover, since the purpose of the regulation would be to curb the space debris problem, **it would fall directly in line with the principle of ensuring continued access to the space resource for all mankind.308 Finally, since the regulation would benefit** those **nations currently acting in space as well as those who will explore space in the future, without unduly favoring one or the other as some have claimed the ITU allocation procedures have done, it** i**s a proportional response to an international concern. Thus, the suggested system represents the best way to handle the debris problem without effecting a prohibited appropriation of space.**

## **Case**

#### [Duren] PRIVATE ENTITIES HELP THE ENVIRONMENT – Carbon Mapper’s nonprofit program will map out emissions to help fight climate change.

**Duren:** Duren, Riley. [Research Scientist at the University of Arizona and an Engineering Fellow at NASA’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory.] "In Partnership with UArizona, New Nonprofit to Launch Satellite Program to Track Greenhouse Gas Emissions" *UArizona.* April 15, 2021. TB

**In a first-of-its-kind coalition to accelerate climate change action**, and with help from UArizona researchers, **a** new **nonprofit organization called Carbon Mapper is launching a program to improve scientific understanding of global methane and carbon dioxide emissions**. Carbon Mapper, a new nonprofit organization partnering with the University of Arizona, today announced a groundbreaking program **to help improve understanding of and accelerate reductions in global methane and carbon dioxide emissions.** The **Carbon Mapper** consortium also **announced plans to deploy a satellite constellation to pinpoint, quantify and track methane and carbon dioxide emissions.** "This decade represents an all-hands-on-deck moment for humanity **to make critical progress in addressing climate change**," said Riley Duren, research scientist in the UArizona Office of Research, Innovation and Impact and CEO of Carbon Mapper. "**Our mission is to** help **fill gaps in the emerging global ecosystem of methane and CO2 monitoring systems by delivering data that's timely, actionable and accessible for science-based decision making**." **Current approaches to measuring** methane and carbon dioxide **emissions** at the scale of individual facilities – particularly intermittent activity – **present challenges, especially in terms of transparency, accuracy, scalability and cost.** **Carbon Mapper** – which also is **partnering with** the state of California, **NASA**'s Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Planet, Arizona State University, High Tide Foundation and RMI – **will help overcome these technological barriers and enable accelerated action by making publicly available high emitting methane and carbon dioxide sources quickly and persistently visible** at the facility level. The data collected by the Carbon Mapper constellation of satellites will provide more complete, precise and timely measurement of methane and carbon dioxide source level emissions as well as more than 25 other environmental indicators. **Through the** Carbon Mapper-**UArizona partnership**, Duren and other UArizona **researchers offer scientific leadership** of the methane and carbon dioxide emissions data delivery **including developing new algorithms** and analytic frameworks **for testing** them with an ongoing research program. "Time is of the essence when it comes to understanding and mitigating methane and CO2 emissions," said Senior Vice President for Research and Innovation Elizabeth "Betsy" Cantwell. "Partnering with **Carbon Mapper will give** University of Arizona **researchers the tools needed to** not only see emissions hot spots, but to **understand their causes and develop actionable plans** for reducing or eliminating these sources." **Carbon Mapper, in collaboration with its public and private partners, is developing the satellite constellation** in three phases. The initial study phase, now complete, included two years of preliminary engineering development and manufacturing. **The first phase is underway and includes development of the first two satellites** by Planet and JPL, **scheduled for launch in 2023**, accompanying data processing platforms, and ongoing cooperative methane mitigation pilot projects using aircraft in California and other U.S. states. P;’