## 1

#### Interp and violation – 1ACs must use the three-tier process to justify the plan – they haven’t

Reid-Brinkley 8 [SHANARA ROSE REID-BRINKLEY- “THE HARSH REALITIES OF “ACTING BLACK”: HOW AFRICAN-AMERICAN POLICY DEBATERS NEGOTIATE REPRESENTATION THROUGH RACIAL PERFORMANCE AND STYLE” Under the Direction of CHRISTINE HAROLD <https://getd.libs.uga.edu/pdfs/reid-brinkley_shanara_r_200805_phd.pdf> 2008] VHS AI

The process of signifyin’ engaged in by the Louisville debaters is not simply designed to critique the use of traditional evidence. As Green argues, their goal is to “challenge the relationship between social power and knowledge.”57 In other words, those with social power within the debate community are able to produce and determine “legitimate” knowledge. These legitimating practices usually function to maintain the dominance of normative knowledgemaking practices, while crowding out or directly excluding alternative knowledge-making 83 practices. The Louisville “framework looks to the people who are oppressed by current constructions of power.”58 Jones and Green offer an alternative framework for drawing claims in debate speeches, they refer to it as a three-tier process: A way in which you can validate our claims, is through the three-tier process. And we talk about personal experience, organic intellectuals, and academic intellectuals. Let me give you an analogy. If you place an elephant in the room and send in three blind folded people into the room, and each of them are touching a different part of the elephant. And they come back outside and you ask each different person they gone have a different idea about what they was talking about. But, if you let those people converse and bring those three different people together then you can achieve a greater truth.59 Jones argues that without the three tier process debate claims are based on singular perspectives that privilege those with institutional and economic power. The Louisville debaters do not reject traditional evidence per se, instead they seek to augment or supplement what counts as evidence with other forms of knowledge produced outside of academia. As Green notes in the doubleocto-finals at CEDA Nationals, “Knowledge surrounds me in the streets, through my peers, through personal experiences, and everyday wars that I fight with my mind.”60 The thee-tier process: personal experience, organic intellectuals, and traditional evidence, provides a method of argumentation that taps into diverse forms of knowledge-making practices. With the Louisville method, personal experience and organic intellectuals are placed on par with traditional forms of evidence. While the Louisville debaters see the benefit of academic research, they are also critically aware of the normative practices that exclude racial and ethnic minorities from policy-oriented discussions because of their lack of training and expertise. Such exclusions 84 prevent radical solutions to racism, classism, sexism, and homophobia from being more permanently addressed. According to Green: bell hooks talks about how when we rely solely on one perspective to make our claims, radical liberatory theory becomes rootless. That’s the reason why we use a three-tiered process. That’s why we use alternative forms of discourse such as hip hop. That’s also how we use traditional evidence and our personal narratives so you don’t get just one perspective claiming to be the right way. Because it becomes a more meaningful and educational view as far as how we achieve our education.61 The use of hip hop and personal experience function as a check against the homogenizing function of academic and expert discourse. Note the reference to bell hooks. Green argues that without alternative perspectives, “radical libratory theory becomes rootless.” The term rootless seems to refer to a lack of grounded-ness in the material circumstances that academics or experts study. In other words, academics and experts by definition represent an intellectual population with a level of objective distance from that which they study. For the Louisville debaters, this distance is problematic as it prevents the development of a social politic that is rooted in the community of those most greatly affected by the status of oppression.

#### Vote for limits – there are an infinite amount of potential plans so you cherry-pick affs with no neg ground and I must prep all affs while they prep one which pigeonholes me to generics but there is a limited amount of ways bodies could affirm.

#### TVA – defend your advocacy but focus on the way the politics you defend are influenced by your identity but they cannot solve their impacts before they control the levers of power

## 2

#### Interp – if a debater defends a framework that relies on wellbeing, they must specify their theory of the good in their first speech.

#### There’s no consensus – makes the round irresolvable since the judge can’t weigh between 8 different theories of the good that o/w since it’s a side constraint on decision making.

CDC 18 [“Well-Being Concepts”. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. October 31, 2018. Accessed 10/29/21. <https://www.cdc.gov/hrqol/wellbeing.htm#three> //Xu]

There is no consensus around a single definition of well-being, but there is general agreement that at minimum, well-being includes the presence of positive emotions and moods (e.g., contentment, happiness), the absence of negative emotions (e.g., depression, anxiety), satisfaction with life, fulfillment and positive functioning.4, 33-35 In simple terms, well-being can be described as judging life positively and feeling good.36, 37 For public health purposes, physical well-being (e.g., feeling very healthy and full of energy) is also viewed as critical to overall well-being. Researchers from different disciplines have examined different aspects of well-being that include the following4, 34, 38, 39, 41-46: Physical well-being. Economic well-being. Social well-being. Development and activity. Emotional well-being. Psychological well-being. Life satisfaction. Domain specific satisfaction. Engaging activities and work. How is well-being measured? Because well-being is subjective, it is typically measured with self-reports.40 The use of self-reported measures is fundamentally different from using objective measures (e.g., household income, unemployment levels, neighborhood crime) often used to assess well-being. The use of both objective and subjective measures, when available, are desirable for public policy purposes.5 There are many well-being instruments available that measure self-reported well-being in different ways, depending on whether one measures well-being as a clinical outcome, a population health outcome, for cost-effectiveness studies, or for other purposes. For example, well-being measures can be psychometrically-based or utility-based. Psychometrically-based measures are based on the relationship between, and strength among, multiple items that are intended to measure one or more domains of well-being. Utility-based measures are based on an individual or group’s preference for a particular state, and are typically anchored between 0 (death) to 1 (optimum health). Some studies support use of single items (e.g., global life satisfaction) to measure well-being parsimoniously. Peer reports, observational methods, physiological methods, experience sampling methods, ecological momentary assessment, and other methods are used by psychologists to measure different aspects of well-being.42

#### Violation – they didn’t

#### Prefer –

#### 1. Shiftiness – They can shift out of my turns based on whatever theory of the good they operate under due to the nature of a vague standard. Especially true because the warrants for their standard could justify different versions of consequentialism as coming first and I wouldn’t know until the 2NR which gives them access to multiple contingent standards.

#### 2. Strat – I lose 7 minutes of time during the NC to generate a strategy because I don't know what turns or strategy I can go for during the 1N absent which proves CX doesn’t check since it would occur after the skew.

#### WSpec isn’t regressive or arbitrary – it’s a key component of philosophical discussion and allows for key comparison between different ethical lens of the world

#### CI – a) brightlines are arbitrary and self-serving which doesn’t set good norms b) it collapses since weighing between brightlines rely on offense defense

#### No RVIs – A - Forcing the 1NC to go all in on the shell kills substance education and neg strat which outweighs on timeframe,

#### Neg gets drop the debater – a) Prep skew –they can frontline every shell to be efficient at DAs to deflate theory b) 1AR Flex – you can moot all 6 min of my offense and restart the debate on unpredictable layers while kicking the arguments

#### 1NC theory first - 1] Abuse was self-inflicted- They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy

## 3

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

#### 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; logically reasoned 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.)
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#### Unjust means unjust adjective US /ʌnˈdʒʌst/ **not morally right; not fair**: New laws will protect employees against unjust dismissals. (Definition of unjust from the Cambridge Academic Content Dictionary © Cambridge University Press)

That’s Cambridge Dictionary ND [“Meaning of unjust in English” Cambridge Dictionary, [https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/unjust]](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/unjust%5d)

#### Violation: They cannot defend hypothetical implementation and use the state – or they are Extra-T

#### Voter for limits and ground - imprecisely includes thousands of affs that expand appropriation and deprives us of the public regs counterplan - makes it impossible to be neg

#### Grammar - very idea of a topic rests on the assumption that words have stable meanings and relationships - precision internal link turns every piece of aff offense

#### Phil Ed – creates better ethical subjectivity and critical thinking that o/ws on uniqueness to LD.

#### TVA: Read a phil aff that affirms that private appropriation is unjust

## 4

#### Permissibility is irrelevant on this topic since there is no action to be obligated to

#### Presumption negates –

#### A] If we deny the truth of the aff then you negate – textuality

#### B] resolved in the resolution denotes certainty which means if they aren’t determined and uncertain then you can’t affirm

#### The litmus test for ethics is certainty and non-arbitrariness – blurry guidelines for ethics allows agents to inconsistently understand morality or arbitrarily opt out which renders ethics useless since it can’t serve as a guide to action.

#### Thus, the meta-ethic is practical reason.

#### 1] Empirical Uncertainty – only intrinsic and a priori truths like 1+1=2 are certain for agents – relying on the empirics is incoherent because different agents have different interpretations of history, have access contrasting forms of information, or rely on inconsistent methods for calculation but practical reason is universal and applies to all agents

#### 2] Causal Determinism – the physical world removes culpability from the agent – one only does an action because of an antecedent cause or stimulus but isn’t a result of their will – only the a priori world assumes a rational and free agent not subject to physical side constraints.

#### 3] Action Theory – any action can be broken down into an infinite number of sub-actions. Without an account of what an action is, it’s impossible to ask questions about which actions are good. Practical reason solves – the intent to follow through on a maxim unites subactions into a full actions.

#### That justifies universal laws of morality.

#### 1] Principle of Equality – there’s no distinction between practical reasoners – its incoherent to claim that 1+1=2 just for me.

#### 2] Particularism justifies treating agents differently and not valuing their moral worth – justifies any norm which fails as a guide to action.

#### Thus, the standard is *consistency with universalizable maxims* – actions are ethical insofar as willing it doesn’t infringe on the ability to will it.

#### Prefer –

#### [1] Performativity – when you enter debate, you presume that you will be free to set and pursue ends in the round because of a system of reciprocally enforced constraints.

#### [2] TJFs and they outweigh since it precludes engagement on the framework layer – Prefer non extinction intent based frameworks

#### For Resource disparities- 1] 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

#### 2] Predictability – every individual engages within freedom and twhen going to school or using public infrastructure which means it’s the one political engagement everyone is aware of.

#### Negate -

#### 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] The right to humanity as our own person necessitates property – infringing on someone else’s body is unethical and not universalizable

**General Law 15** General Law. "Poverty and Property in Kant’s System of Rights |." *https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/*, 30 Oct. 2015, lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/. Accessed 7 Apr. 2022.

Kant’s account of property in the Doctrine of Right features a conceptual progression that starts from the innate right to freedom and culminates in the establishment of property as an institution of positive law.[24](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn24) Kant exhibits the phases of this progression as implicit in the relationship of free persons under the conditions of human existence. Because property is consistent with the freedom of all, it is rightly secured and protected by the law’s coercive powers. This progression has three phases, which Kant presents from a variety of standpoints as befits their structural importance. Sometimes he describes these phases in terms of the categories of modality (the possibility, the actuality, and the necessity of possessing objects).[25](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn25) Sometimes, he refers to them as divisions of justice (*iustitia tutatrix, iustitia commutativa, iustitia distributiva*).[26](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn26) Sometimes he refers to the division of duties that accompanies the divisions of justice.[27](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn27) Sometimes he refers to these phases in terms of form and matter.[28](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn28) Sometimes he calls them different variations of right (what is intrinsically right, what is rightful, what is laid down as right)[29](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn29) or different kinds of laws of justice (*lex iusti, lex iuridica, lex iustitiae*).[30](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn30) However the phases are referred to, the progression through them exhibits a dialectical structure of argument.[31](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn31) In the first phase Kant starts with the universal principle of Right, which mandates the coexistence of one person’s action with another’s freedom under a universal law, and notes the juridical relationship analytically contained within that principle. This juridical relationship does not include property in external things, but it does encompass certain “authorizations” such as equality and non-dependence,[32](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn32) which are normative attributes implicit within the universal principle of Right and therefore ascribable to the parties at this phase. In the second phase he extends this initial argument on the ground that having something external as one’s own, although not analytically contained in the universal principle of Right marks a connection to external things that matches the capacity for choice characteristic of self-determining action. This extension, however, is problematic, because although ownership of external things is now permissible, it is not yet put into effect under conditions consonant with the authorizations articulated in the first phase. The second phase, accordingly, is merely provisional. The problems it raises are resolved at the third phase, where the conditions of acquisition take a form that is fully consistent with what was analytically contained in the universal principle of Right. As Kant puts it with unfortunate opacity when he lists the threefold division of duties, the duties of the third phase “involve the derivation of the [duties of the second phase] from the principle of the [duties of the first phase] by subsumption.”[33](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn33) Although presented in a sequence, these three phases are conceptual, not temporal. Kant is not offering a philosophical reconstruction of the historical evolution of property. Rather, the three phases represent aspects that together are constitutive of property in the juridical relationships of free persons (e.g., that external things can be acquired through acts of will, that property does not require actual possession, that property rights are enforceable, and so on), but presented in an ordering that purports to show property’s normative necessity within a system of rights. The three phases comprise an articulated unity: each phase proceeds with its distinct mode of argumentation (the first is analytic, the second is synthetic, the third works by subsumption), but the account of property stands or falls on the totality of the three phases taken together. Kant himself presents property as absent at the first phase and as problematic at the second. If these phases were considered independently, the argument would not get off the ground or would collapse as soon as it did so. Nor does the third phase stand alone either; its role is to incorporate what is necessary to reconcile the second phase to what is analytically contained in the first one. The result is that the institutions of public law that emerge at the third phase determine and guarantee the property entitlements that are the product of the second phase in a way that expresses the normative significance of the principle of right that initiated the first phase. The first phase features the innate right to freedom. The innate right to freedom consists in the independence of one’s actions from constraint by the actions of another, insofar as such independence is consistent with the freedom of everyone else.[34](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn34) This right stands in an analytic relationship with the universal principle of Right, which requires that one person’s action be able to coexist with the freedom of everyone under a universal law. Formulating freedom as an innate right adds nothing to what the universal principle already contains; it merely isolates a constituent element of, and represents what is already involved in thinking about, that principle. The innate right is “the only original right belonging to every man by virtue of his humanity.”[35](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn35) This right is innate because every person has it simply by virtue of his or her existence. Similarly, it is original because it arises independently of any act that would establish it. Because my innate right is not mine by virtue of some act of acquisition, it is what is internally mine, in contrast to what is externally mine, which must always be acquired.[36](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn36) What is internally mine is my freedom[37](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn37)—that is, my capacity to act in the execution of the purposes I form as a self-determining being. For human beings the paradigmatic manifestation of what is internally mine is the body, the physical organism through which the person expresses his or her freedom as a self-determining being.[38](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn38) By mandating actions that can coexist with the freedom of all, the universal principle of Right signals its application to the actions of self-determining agents. In the case of human beings, self-determining activity takes place through the body. Because the body is an “inseparable unity of members in a person,”[39](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn39) interference with any part of another’s body is a wrong against that person’s freedom. This right with respect to one’s own body is innate. It arises not through the performance of an act of acquisition (indeed, no such act is conceivable because the body itself is what would have to perform it), but simply by virtue of one’s being born. Thus, the body is the primary locus of what Kant calls the “right of humanity in our own person.”[40](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn40) The occupation by a person’s body of a particular space is an exercise of this right: “All men are originally (i.e., prior to any act of choice that establishes a right) in a possession of land that is in conformity with right, that is, they have a right to be wherever nature or chance (apart from their will) has placed them.”[41](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn41) Given the finitude of the earth’s surface, the occupation of space carries with it the possibility of persons coming into contact with one another.[42](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn42) Such contacts are governed by the universal principle of Right. Because no one can interfere with the body of anyone else, a person who occupies a particular space excludes all other persons from that space. In this phase, where one’s only right is the innate right of humanity in one’s own person, property as the entitlement to something distinct from the person’s body does not exist. Of course, a person may come into physical possession of some external object. I might (to use Kant’s examples)[43](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn43) hold an apple or lie on the earth. But someone who wrested the apple away from me or pushed me off the land on which I was lying would be wronging me with respect to my body, not my property. By disturbing the disposition of my fingers as they grasped the apple or of my physical frame as it rested on the earth, the wrongdoer would be acting inconsistently with my innate right to occupy a particular space, rather than infringing a right that I have in the apple or in the resting place as such. The interference would be with what is internally, not externally, mine. Property goes beyond innate right by treating the person as entitled to an external thing even when it is not in the person’s physical possession. Innate right prohibits another’s interference with an external thing only insofar as such interference would simultaneously be an interference with my body as something internally mine. Property, in contrast, entails treating the thing as externally mine, so that the apple I was holding remains mine even when I set it down, and similarly the land upon which I was lying remains mine even when I have moved elsewhere. Under a property regime anyone who interferes with what is mine wrongs me despite the fact that my body is not immediately affected. The extension of the scope of rights to include what is externally mine is the second phase of Kant’s account of property. Kant introduces what he calls “the postulate of practical reason with regard to rights,” under which “it is possible to have any external object of my choice as mine.”[44](https://lawexplores.com/poverty-and-property-in-kants-system-of-rights/ch08_footnote.html#ch08fn44)

**Interpretation: affirmative teams must not read new offense in the 1ar related to a new fw, weigh aff arguments under our fw, recontextualize aff arguments under a different fw,**

**1] Phil Clash and Time Skew- anything else allows them to concede all our framework interactions and just go for 4 minutes of turns against our NC which o/w since phil is the only thing unique to LD Debate and time is the only quantifiable metric of abuse**

**2] Skew- They have an inherent advantage on the contention debate since they get 2ar spin so they can easily sway judge psychology in contention debates that don’t err towards one side.**

## 5

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement – anything else moots 7 minutes of the nc – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that a world is better than another before you adopt it.

#### They justify substantive skews since there will always be a more correct side of the issue but we compensate for flaws in the lit.

#### Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – T/F binary is descriptive and technical.

#### a priori’s 1st – even worlds framing requires ethics that begin from a priori principles like reason or pleasure so we control the internal link to functional debates.

#### The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true which means it’s constitutive and jurisdictional. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I’ve met my burden.

#### Negate –

#### A private entity is “There are a few groups that can be considered a private entity in the business world. A partnership, corporation, individual, nonprofit organization, company, or any organized group that is not government-affiliated can be considered a private entity.”

That’s QT Company 20 [“What Are Private Entities?”. Quest Trust Company (custodian of self-directed IRAs located in Houston, Austin, and Dallas, Texas with clients Nationwide. Quest Trust Company, is the leading provider of self-directed retirement account administration services. Quest Trust Company has been in business since 2003 with over $2 Billion in assets under management. As a neutral party, Quest Trust Company does not offer any investments and therefore has no conflicts of interest with what our clients want to do with their IRAs). September 28, 2020. Accessed 12/17/21. <https://www.questtrustcompany.com/2020/09/28/what-are-private-entities/> //Xu]

#### Doesn’t exist with outer space appropriation –

FRANKOWSKI 17 [Paweł FRANKOWSKI (Assistant Professor at the Chair of International Relations and Foreign Policy, Institute of Political Science and International Relations of the Jagiellonian University). “OUTER SPACE AND PRIVATE COMPANIES: CONSEQUENCES FOR GLOBAL SECURITY”. Politeja. No. 50/5, GLOBAL AND REGIONAL SECURITY CHALLENGES (2017), pp. 131-148 (18 pages). Accessed 12/17/21. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26564288?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents> //Xu]

As mentioned earlier, when some space assets and services, like telecommunication services, from the very beginning of space exploration, have been in private hands, for other sector like space imagery or synchronizing services it was not an easy path. However, strategies geared towards more private involvement are intrinsically similar to strategies and justifications in other public services. John Donahue referring to the privatization of public services argues that the political choice between public and private services basically has two dimensions. The first concerns finance, and focuses on the questions whether or not individuals should pay for services individually, or maybe the same services should be provided by the state, with funds raised from taxation. Apart from financing, the second dimension focuses on performance, flexibility, and ability to adapt to changing circumstances. In general, this dimension should be analysed if services should be delivered from governmental level or provided by nonstate entity, with lesser attachment to procedures, red tape and managerial style of governing.4 Nevertheless, privatization of security and military services follows a slightly different logic, because after private companies acquired contracts to provide security services, provisions of such services will be still financed by public money. Therefore individuals’ rights, transferred to the state, who is main security provider, have been shifted back to private entities, able and willing to provide such services. Already it should be obvious that the main source of income for private space industry are public actors, and space companies hardly can find other clients. For example 66% of European space industry is coming from public sector,5 and only in 2015 European companies provided goods worth as much as 534 mln EUR for military customers EUR.6

#### 1] the[[3]](#footnote-3) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but appropriation isn’t a disease

#### 2] appropriation[[4]](#footnote-4) is “a sum of money or total of assets devoted to a special purpose” but the rez doesn’t spec a purpose.

#### 3] of[[5]](#footnote-5) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time

## 6

#### Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is very aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to

#### RVIs on 1AR theory – 1AR being able to spend 20 seconds on a shell and still win forces the 2N to allocate at least 2:30 on the shell which means RVIs check back time skew

#### No new 1ar theory paradigm issues- A] New 1ar paradigms moot any 1NC theoretical offense B] introducing them in the aff allows for them to be more rigorously tested

## Case

#### On 1a – could be tortugn by demon no reason we now its true

#### On 1b – consqwune aren’t intrinc causes domino effect like the ac il chains

#### On 2a – masacaist objection

#### On 2b – a] misunderstands kant freedom is just an pario good because it nonunveiebalbel b] cant weigh under util

#### On 3a – a] justifies slvery b] excludes people who don’t fele pain and pleasure like people w CIP

#### Group lexicla pre req and extinction ows – a] morally repugnant b] freezes action c] Consequences haven’t happened yet so we can’t predict accurately enough for it to be the basis of a moral action D]

#### AT macaksill 18 – a] kant solve redcitnoaoism comes down to agents and being able to reason b] Consequences are infinitely regressive because they cause infinite other consequences, meaning that there’s no bright line for when consequences end so infinite pain and pleasure cancel each other out.

#### AT degress of wrongness – a] kant solves we can weigh between perfect and imperfect duties b] proves util not prescriptive since it relies on those consequnes in the first place to condemn instead of writ large application of ethics c

#### AT no calc indicts – a] they say empirically denied is wrong govs mess up all the time Iraq war proves

#### The best estimate is there are 210 million current alien civilizations

Lichfield 16 – Gideon Lichfield, Editor-in-Chief of MIT Technology Review, Senior Editor at Quartz, Fellow at the Data & Society Research Institute, MSc in the Philosophy of Science from the London School of Economics and Political Science, BSc in Physics and Philosophy from the University of Bristol, Former Adjunct Professor in the Global Journalism Program at New York University, “There Have Probably Been Trillions Of Alien Civilizations, And Yet We May Still Never See One”, Quartz, 6-11, <https://qz.com/704687/there-have-probably-been-trillions-of-alien-civilizations-and-yet-we-may-still-never-see-one/>

[Paper internally quoted is by Adam Frank, Professor of Physics and Astronomy at the University of Rochester and Woodruff Sullivan, Professor of Astronomy and Astrobiology at the University of Washington]

Sorry, everybody. We’re just not that special.

In more than five decades of scanning the heavens, the search for extraterrestrial intelligence (SETI) has found no sign of alien life. Yet now two American astronomers, in the scientific equivalent of a back-of-the-envelope calculation, are estimating that over the course of its history the universe has seen at least half a trillion technologically advanced species.

The paper in Astrobiology by Adam Frank and Woodruff Sullivan notes that, in just the last few years, we’ve gained a much clearer sense of how hospitable the universe is to life. NASA’s Kepler space telescope has identified thousands of planets in our neighborhood of the galaxy, along with their sizes and distances from their stars. From there it’s fairly easy to guess how many may hold liquid water, which is probably essential for complex life. In our Milky Way galaxy alone there are, by this estimate, some 60 billion such “habitable” planets, write Frank and Sullivan.

The big remaining unknown is how many of these planets give rise to the kinds of lifeforms that build advanced technology (if nuclear weapons and Oculus Rifts can be called “advanced”). Since Earth is the only one we know of, the guesses vary wildly, but one such civilization per 10 billion habitable planets is generally considered “highly pessimistic,” wrote Frank in the New York Times yesterday (paywall). In astronomy-speak, this means the figure could be 10, 100 or even 1,000 times too low.

Using that “pessimistic” proportion, and other numbers from Frank and Sullivan’s paper, I calculated how many alien civilizations should have emerged within various subregions of the universe during its history:

Table

Description automatically generated with medium confidence

Remember, 420 billion intelligent civilizations is the “pessimistic” estimate. But sadly—or happily, depending on your view of aliens—it doesn’t make us any less alone.

Though Frank and Sullivan wisely avoid putting a number on how many alien species are knocking around right now, we can do our own back-of-the-envelope reckoning. A crucial unknown factor is how long a technologically advanced civilization lasts before either going extinct or blasting itself back to the stone age. Judging by the past century of human history, even a thousand years might be optimistic. But let’s be really optimistic and call it a million years. That’s the average lifespan of a mammalian species that doesn’t invent the means of its own destruction.

I’m also going to assume that, though the universe is 13.8 billion years old, advanced species didn’t begin to appear until a couple of billion years ago. It took most of the universe’s history to form the kinds of planets, rich in heavier elements, on which creatures like us could evolve.

So if there have been 420 billion civilizations in the past 2 billion years, each one lasting a million years, then on average, about 210 million of them have existed simultaneously at any given moment.

Update: Seth Shostak, senior astronomer at the SETI Institute, has responded to this article saying that “many have guessed” that one in a million habitable worlds would produce advanced intelligence, rather than one in 10 billion. If so, and sticking to the other assumptions, there’d a good chance of at least one other civilization in our own galaxy existing at the same time as ours, meaning it would much closer, and thus more plausibly detectable.

#### Alien lives should be valued as equal to humans---anything else is arbitrary and a logic of devaluation that is at the root of violence

Packer 7 – Joe Packer, then MA in Communication from Wake Forest University, now PhD in Communication from the University of Pittsburgh and Professor of Communication at Central Michigan University, Alien Life in Search of Acknowledgment, p. 62-63

Once we hold alien interests as equal to our own we can begin to revaluate areas previously believed to hold no relevance to life beyond this planet. A diverse group of scholars including Richard Posner, Senior Lecturer in Law at the University of Chicago, Nick Bostrom, philosophy professor at Oxford University, John Leslie philosophy professor at Guelph University and Martin Rees, Britain’s Astronomer Royal, have written on the emerging technologies that threaten life beyond the planet Earth. Particle accelerators labs are colliding matter together, reaching energies that have not been seen since the Big Bang. These experiments threaten a phase transition that would create a bubble of altered space that would expand at the speed of light killing all life in its path. Nanotechnology and other machines may soon reach the ability to self replicate. A mistake in design or programming could unleash an endless quantity of machines converting all matter in the universe into copies of themselves. Despite detailing the potential of these technologies to destroy the entire universe, Posner, Bostrom, Leslie, and Ree’s only mention of alien life in their works is in reference to the threat aliens post to humanity. The rhetorical construction of otherness only in terms of the threats it poses, but never in terms of the threat one poses to it, has been at the center of humanity’s history of genocide, colonization, and environmental destruction. Although humanity certainly has its own interests in reducing the threat of these technologies evaluating them without taking into account the danger they pose to alien life is neither appropriate nor just. It is not appropriate because framing the issue only in terms of human interests will result in priorities designed to minimize the risks and maximize the benefits to humanity, not all life. Even if humanity dealt with the threats effectively without referencing their obligation to aliens, Posner, Bostrom, Leslie, and Ree’s rhetoric would not be “just,” because it arbitrarily declares other life forms unworthy of consideration. A framework of acknowledgement would allow humanity to address the risks of these new technologies, while being cognizant of humanity’s obligations to other life within the universe. Applying the lens of acknowledgment to the issue of existential threats moves the problem from one of self destruction to universal genocide. This may be the most dramatic example of how refusing to extend acknowledgment to potential alien life can mask humanity’s obligations to life beyond this planet.

1. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Dictionary.com – maintain as true, Merriam Webster – to say that something is true, Vocabulary.com – to affirm something is to confirm that it is true, Oxford dictionaries – accept the validity of, Thefreedictionary – assert to be true* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <https://www.google.com/search?q=the+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=the+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i64j69i61j69i60l2.1976j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <https://www.google.com/search?q=appropriation+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=appr&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i57j69i59l2j69i60l3.1218j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. <https://www.google.com/search?q=of+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=of+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i61l3.1473j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-5)