#### **Morality must be internally motivating because we must internalize and care about external claims for them to drive action, which means external motivation collapses.**

**Joyce 01 [Joyce, Richard – Professor of Philosophy at Victoria University of Wellington. The Myth of Morality. pp. 109-110. 2001.** [**https://tonysss.files.wordpress.com/2012/04/the-myth-of-morality.pdf**](https://tonysss.files.wordpress.com/2012/04/the-myth-of-morality.pdf)**.]**

How could an external reason fulfill the condition quoted above? Let us first see how an internal reason does. **Suppose I am thirsty, but unbeknownst to me the cup of coffee** I am (reasonably) reaching for **contains poison**. **I have an internal reason not to drink, in that I have a desire not to poisoned, and refraining from drinking helps satisfy that desire**. Because of my ignorance, of course, the reason explains nothing about my actions – but it could. If I were to be granted true beliefs on the matter, then I would refrain from drinking, and the reason would explain that inaction. This explanation would presumably be a matter of psychological causation: the belief that the coffee was poisoned coupled with the desire not to be poisoned causes my act of refraining.2 (This is not to say that these two states automatically result in that action – I may be irrational and drink the poison anyway.) Back to the external reason**. Suppose it were claimed**, instead, **that I have a reason to refrain from drinking the coffee because it is tapu and must not be touched**. **This reason claim will be urged regardless of what I may say about my indifference to tapu**, **or** my citing of nihilistic desires to tempt the hand of fate. **Regardless of my desires** (it is claimed) I ought not drink – **I have a reason not to drink**. **But how could that reason ever explain any action of mine**? Could the external reason even explain my refraining from drinking? Clearly, **in order to explain it the external reason must have some causally efficacious role among the antecedents of the action** (in this case, an omission) – **I must have**, in some manner, **“internalized” it**. **The only possibility**, it would seem, **consistent with its** being an **external reason**, **is that I believe the external reason claim**: I believe that the coffee is tapu. There’s no doubting that such a belief can play a role in explaining actions – including my refraining from drinking the coffee. **The question is whether the belief alone can produce action, to which the correct answer is “No.”** A very familiar and eminently sensible view says that **in order to explain an action the belief must couple with desires** (such that those same desires had in the absence of the belief would not have resulted in the action). And this seems correct: **if I believe that the coffee is tapu but really just don’t care about that, then I will not refrain from drinking it.** So **in order for the belief to explain action it must couple with desiderative elements** – but in that case **the putative external reason collapses into an internal one**.3 We started out discussing normative reasons, but, if we follow Williams, the argument quickly becomes one about motivating reasons, and about the Humean conception of action in general. In short, if Hume is correct that action requires belief and desire operating together, then an external reason could never explain an action, for even if the subject believes the reason claim, action will ensue only if certain desires are present.

**Additionally, agents can only be motivated their own desires, a) Opacity: We can’t see into other people’s minds which means their desires and motivation can’t have influence on our motivation. b) People are self interested, if they weren’t nothing bad would ever happen because everyone would just be selfless all the time. c) Desires are infinite and incommunicable.**

**Contracts solve this because people agree to certain constraints to better promote their self interest. People agree to channel their desires and in doing so, establish a set of moral agreements.**

**Gauthier 86** Gauthier, David P. *Morals by Agreement*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1986. Print. // ICW NW

**Moral principles are introduced as the objects of** full **voluntary** ex ante a**greement among** rational **persons.** Such agreement is hypothetical, in supposing a pre-moral context for the adoption of moral rules and practices. But the **parties to agreement are real,** determinate individuals, **distinguished by their capacities, situations, and concerns.** In so far as **[Since] they** would **agree to constraints on their choices, restraining their pursuit of their own interests, they acknowledge a distinction between what they may and may not do.**  As rational persons understanding the structure of their interaction, **they recognize** for mutual constraint, and so for **a moral dimension in their affairs.**

**Thus, the standard is consistency with contractarian principles of mutual restraint, this is when people agree to constrain their actions for their own self-interest. To clarify, obligations arise from restraints we place on ourselves by entering contracts.**

**1. Consent: We agree to contracts which means they are the most motivational. Anything else is arbitrary and externally imposed, meaning we can just ignore it and not care about it. This outweighs because there’s no point to morality if it’s just arbitrary and easily ignored.**

**2. Anything else leads to infinite regress, because you can infinitely ask why we should follow morality. Contracts solve because you actively put yourself into them. If you ask why you did that, you already have an answer because there is some reason you put yourself into them, that you found valid, since it made you take action. This outweighs because if we’re always doubting ethics it can’t guide action.**

**3. Them contesting my framework concedes it’s validity since contracts were fundamental to any of their cards. For example, your authors needed publishing liscenses, and your empirical studies needed permits.**

**4. Us debating requires us to consent to contracts. We had to sign a consent form to be here and accept tabrooms terms of service. This means them being here concedes to my framework.**

**5. My framework is inescapable. We willingly enter contracts which means the authority telling us to obey them is ourselves. This means they’re inescapable because to question yourself would require you to listen to your own arguments. This outweighs because there’s no point to ethics if we can just escape it and never think about it.**

**6. Even if they win their framework it procedurally collapses to mine, because my framework is the process by which we create obligations. Even if they win util we need contracts to channel our pain and pleasure and best promote pleasure.**

**Contention 1)**

**The Outer Space Treaty declares that space cannot be used by private entities. Chouhan:**

*https://deliverypdf.ssrn.com/delivery.php?ID=825123001111124079092069029031126002121019058093035031103092107005118001000023114091019024039057118017026011015084123096106093037075086051088088077023120125028067118038093060003120084096121005124127113088024023089026068124115127073018082028086086006009&EXT=pdf&INDEX=TRUE*

**Article I of OST declares Outer-Space including celestial bodies to be a ’province of mankind’** thereby denoting a common ownership or res-communes status to it. **Further Article I also provides that the use of the outer-space should be done for the benefit of all countries but at the same time it also provides** in the second Para of article I **that Outer Space will be free to use by all states ‘on a basis of equality’ and ‘in accordance with international law’.** The intention of **the provision is to provide access to use and explore outer-space to all countries freely and in accordance with the international law. This essentially means that one cannot exclude others from using or explore any part of the celestial body or outer-space. Right to exclude and Right to use are the most important element of ownership and possession but Article I** essentially **negates such rights in outer space**. **Article II further declares that outer space including celestial body cannot be appropriated by use, claim of sovereignty or occupation etc.** Article VIII states that the ownership and control of the object sent to space lies with the launching/owner of the object, and similar treatment will be provided to the object landed or constructed on a celestial body. Thus, it can be assumed that OST only provide ownership rights in outer-space for only the object sent from earth or constructed in outer-space through human interaction. It is interesting to note that OST specifically talk about states and their obligation but what about private entities, are they free from any obligation in space from the OST treaty? The answer should be a resounding no, **as even the activities of private entities can be** said to be **governed by OST by virtue of Article VI which provides that the state will be responsible for activities carried out by national or even nongovernmental agencies and puts an obligation upon the state to perform activities in conformity with the provisions of OST, it also puts a responsibility upon the state to regulate the activities of nongovernmental entities in accordance with the treaty provisions by providing authorization and continued supervision. So a corporate entity cannot on itself go into outer space and mine asteroid thus appropriating space resource without a specific authorization from the state, but the state cannot give such an authorization as such an act will go against the OST provisions.** The ‘Moon Agreement’ further reiterates under Article IV that Moon, including other celestial bodies, shall be the province of all 26 mankind and exploration and use of such bodies should be for the benefit and interest of all countries. The most important Article in moon 27 agreement, from the perspective of space ownership is article XI which provides that moon’s resources is a common heritage of mankind, and cannot be appropriated. Para 3 of Article XI specifically forbids any 28 property rights to a state or non-state entities over surface, subsurface, or any part thereof or natural resources in place of a moon or other celestial bodies. Para 5 of Article XI further puts obligation on the state parties to establish an international regime for the purpose of exploitation of space resources based on the principle of equitable sharing of benefits derived from those resources with special consideration to developing countries. However, it’s important to note that ‘Moon Agreement’ has 29 been rejected by most of the major space faring nation and some jurists consider it a failed treaty but nonetheless important from an international law perspective.30 Similarly, the principle that use of Outer-space should be for the benefit and interest of all mankind, that outer-space cannot be appropriated and its free for use and exploration by all states on basis of equality finds mentions in the UN resolution proclaiming ‘Declaration of Legal Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space’.31 **Considering** **the** above **legal provisions,** it is safe to assume that **private ownership of space or its resources is forbidden under the International Space Law framework. The question of private property in space under International Law also doesn’t exist as there is no sovereign in space and without a state granting title to the private entities, such rights are impossible to exist for want of enforcement.** However, even if 33 private property rights don’t exist but technically certain other ancillary rights can exist, and one of the important one is the ‘Right to Use’ by virtue of Article I of OST. Article I provide the right of access and use 34 to all states with a condition that it’s use is erga omnes. It can be argued that, the use of the statement ‘for the benefit of mankind’ in OST is vague, but still it has acquired the characteristics of peremptory norm under International law. So, **private entities can ‘use’ resources in outer space if authorised by the national governments provided that such use is for the ‘benefit of the mankind’ and for ‘peaceful purpose’, but it cannot extend to appropriation of resources as it will be** tantamount to **exclusion, which will go against the principle of free access to all.**

**Underview**

1. **Presumption affirms. A) we presume things true until proven otherwise, I.e. you believed me when I said my name was Spencer. B) It’s impossible to presume things false because then we presume that presumption is false but that also leads to a falsity, and it’s infinitely regressive.**

**The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best proves the truth or falsity of the Resolution; the affirmative must prove it true and the negative must prove it false. Prefer:**

**A) Text: Five dictionaries define negate as to deny the truth of and affirm as to prove true which means the sole judge obligation is to vote on the resolution’s truth or falsity. Constitutivism outweighs because you don’t have the jurisdiction not to truth test. Jurisdiction is a meta constraint since every argument you make concedes the authority of the judge fulfilling their jurisdiction to vote aff if they affirm better and neg the contrary**

**B) Logic: Any counter role of the ballot collapses to truth testing because every property assumes truth of the property i.e. if I say, “I am awake” it is the same as “it is true that I am awake” which means they are also a question of truth claims because it’s inherent.**

**C) Ground: Any offense can function under truth testing whereas your specific role of the ballot excludes all strategies but yours. This is bad for education because me engaging in a debate I know nothing about doesn’t help anyone.**

**D) Truth Testing is a prerequisite to other role of the ballots because without truth we’re operating off of lies which is what fuels propaganda and oppression.**

1. **Resolved is defined as to come to a definite or earnest decision about in the past tense, therefore the resolution’s already determined to be true and you auto affirm.**
2. **I get 1ar theory because otherwise the neg can be infinitely abusive which outweighs everything because that makes it impossible for the aff to win.**
3. **Paradigm Issues: Drop the debater a) to deter future abuse, b) if I prove abuse it means substance has already been skewed. No RVIs, a) debaters don’t win for just being fair or educational, b) it would encourage good theory debaters to be abusive so they can bait theory and win off an RVI. Competing interps because a) reasonability is arbitrary and requires judge intervention b) it encourages getting as close to the brightline as possible and**
4. **Fairness is a voter because the ballot makes debate a game and without fairness you’re voting for the better cheater not the better debater.**
5. **No 2N theory because that allows the neg to just go for 6 minutes of new game over issues which is impossible for a 3 minute 2ar to deal with.**
6. **The negative must not contest the affirmative framework if the affirmative reads Gauthier. Standard:**

**Time Skew: When the neg can just outframe the aff it moots the 6 minute AC since my aff link back to my framework, creating a 7 to 13 skew. Time Skew controls the internal link to everything because I can’t do things like clash if I have no time to do so.**

1. **Interpretation: The negative must defend the status quo. Standard:**

**Predictability: There are infinite parts of my aff for the neg to create competition with which makes it impossible to have prep for them. I.e. I can’t prep out every k alt, word pic, process counterplan etc. on every sentence of aff. Predictability controls the internal link to ground and strategy because we can’t do either if we have no prep.**

*1* [*http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate*](http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate)*,* [*http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate,*](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate,)[*http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate,*](http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate,) [*http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate,*](http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate,) [*http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate*](http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate)

*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*

[*https://www.dictionary.com/browse/resolved*](https://www.dictionary.com/browse/resolved)