**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** [**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***

**The standard is consistency with the categorical imperative. This is the idea that maxims must be universalizable without contradiction.**

**The meta ethics is practical reason, the ability to set and pursue ends, because practical reason is inescapable, since its constitutive of action and escaping practical reason is an action. This means practical reason is the most binding and determines morality.**

**Practical reason shows us morality must respect the equality of individuals.**

**1.** **All individuals are agents with practical reason. Even if people have different capacities for setting and pursuing ends, practical reason is still binding since every agent has some sort of action, even if this just means thinking etc. Because all people are agents it means there can’t be any morally relevant distinction between people.**

**This means when you say something is obligatory you’re saying all practical reasoners have that obligation because you can’t arbitrarily exclude someone from ethics. Additionally,**

**a) It doesn’t make sense to say something’s a rule for you but not others, I.e. 2+2=4 to me but not other people.**

**b) Anything else means ethics is non binding since if certain people are in certain positions they don't have to follow rules, you can just put yourself in those positions whenever you don’t want to follow rules.**

**And, things can’t be both true and false.**

**Gahringer, Robert. “Moral law.” *Ethics,* Vol. 63, No. 4, July 1953, pp. 300-304. // (N8)**

**“Within any deductive system the basic principle of criticism is self-consistency. To show a deductive system inconsistent is to disqualify it. If it is asked why be consistent, it will be answered that it is a basic condition of having a system. And if we ask why this, it will be answered that [Without this] a system would not be an intelligible unity in any other way. The demand for consistency rests ultimately on intelligibility; it is a condition of intelligibility. Consistency may appear as a principle of the bare absence of contradiction, and this may be only a matter of the independence of elements. But consistency may go much deeper. If someone suggests that we dispose of the principles of consistency, we can ask the consistency of such a suggestion. If the principle of consistency is the condition of intelligibility, the denial of it (which must be an intelligible denial) denies in principle what it assumes: it is *transcendentally inconsistent.* The proposal to abandon the principle of consistency (the law of noncontradiction) cannot be made within any system, since every system presupposes it; and it cannot be made outside, since every proposal assumes it. This is, of course, a material consideration belonging to logic in the larger sense.”**

**Thus our actions must be able to be universalized because all people are equal, and still be possible when universalized since an action can’t be possible and not possible, I.e. an action must still be possible to take when everyone takes that action.**

**This is a side constraint: even if you prove some other ethical theory is good, it can’t provide obligations  that lead to contradictions because it can’t say everyone is obligated to do something and not do something.**

**Prefer additionally:**

**1. Regress: Any framework allows you to infinitely ask why, only my framework stops the regress because once you get to the point of practical reason, questioning it doesn’t make sense, since to question practical reason concedes its validity.**

**2. Performativity: We need freedom to make any arguments in debate, this means answers to my framework prove it true because you exercise your practical reason to try and contest it.**

**3. People are unconditionally valuable given that they can place value on**

**other things. E.g. a water bottle has no feelings about other objects, but we**

**have the ability to say things like murder is bad, and freedom is good. This**

**means we are unconditionally valuable because we’re the source of value, and**

**as a result shouldn’t be used as a means to an end.**

**Consequences Fail**

**1. We can’t predict the future which means we can’t predict the consequences of an action since things can happen during our actions that cause a completely different consequence.**

**2. Normativity: If people are held responsible for things they didn’t intend it means they have no control over their actions being immoral. This outweighs because people will give up on morality if they’re blamed for things they didn’t do.**

**3. Calculation freezes action: We have to calculate the results of every action yet calculation is itself an action, which means once we calculate we just keeping adding actions to calculate, and just spend our entire life calculating.**

**4. Trust Paradox: Consequentialism obligates changes in actions on a case by case basis which means every action is subject to calculation and thus people act sporadically, meaning we can’t predict what others will do. But consequentialism necessitates that we can make predictions which means it’s paradoxical and impossible to use.**

**Contention 1) The categorical imperative justifies the “right to be somewhere”. What this means is people have a right to go anywhere on the earth or space they want and privatization of locations violates this right.**

**​​**

**Huber**, Jakob. "Cosmopolitanism for Earth Dwellers: Kant on the Right to Be Somewhere." Kantian Review, 20**17**, eprints.lse.ac.uk/69536/1/Huber\_Cosmopolitanism%20for%20Earth%20dwellers\_author\_2017%20LSERO.pdf. Accessed 16 Dec. 2021.

We need to take a closer look at the more immediate context in which this passage occurs. The preceding paragraph provides a first hint why Kant would talk about something like a right to a place on earth in the context of his discussion of rightful acquisition. There he asserts that ‘first acquisition of a thing can only be acquisition of land’ (DoR 6: 261). This claim is no less puzzling. Is he saying that I need to own the land in order to possess something that is placed on it? That would be odd – while there may be a sense in which stable enjoyment of my property right in my car may depend on my ability to park it on a ground that I have secure access to, my ownership right in itself cannot be contingent on that. Yet, note that Kant is not talking here about ownership in the sense of private property (something which I can claim as mine regardless of whether I am physically connected to it) at all, but about mere physical possession or occupation. Consequently, he is not referring to land in the sense of a fenced-in plot of territory – described as ‘residence (sedes), a chosen and therefore an acquired lasting possession’ – but merely as ‘habitable ground’ (DoR 6: 261). I want to suggest that what Kant is doing here is reflecting on the circumstances of embodied agency. An embodied agent I take to be a morally accountable corporeal being capable 4 of acting in time and space. As beings of that kind, **humans inevitably make a particular kind of seizure: the piece of land that they take up in virtue of the very fact that they are spatially extended. Without a place on earth, we couldn’t act and hold others morally accountable for their actions,** let alone claim objects as ‘ours’. Cases like that of refugees or stateless persons illustrate how failing to have one’s place on earth secured, and hence being vulnerable to the arbitrary choices of others, essentially deprives humans of their moral agency (Ypi 2014: 294-5, Flikschuh 2000: 156-7). So **it is the very nature of human existence that entails that people’s relationship to the land precedes their relationship to other external things.** This gives us a sense why reflection on the circumstances of human agency might lead to something like the idea of a right to be somewhere. And it also provides a possible explanation for the right’s puzzling position in the text: Kant can be read to regress from reflections on the possibility of property rights to the more fundamental condition of raising anything like a claim to an object as ‘ours’ in the first place: being acknowledged a place on earth is a necessary presupposition of claiming rights in things. Yet, reading on from the pertinent passage, the picture gets more complicated. Kant goes on to introduce another fundamental material factor – besides our own embodiment – that conditions human existence: the earth’s spherical surface. The finitude of the globe, he explains unites all places on its surface, for if its surface were an unbounded plane, people could be so dispersed on it that they would not come into any community with one another, and community would not then be a necessary result of their existence on the earth. – The possession by all human beings on the earth which 5 precedes any acts of theirs that would establish rights (as constituted by nature itself) is an original possession in common... (DoR 6: 262) **Humans do not act in empty space, Kant reminds us here, but on the earth’s spherical surface. This makes it impossible for them to get out of each other’s ways** once and for all.5 Instead they stand, from the beginning, in a relation of ‘possible physical interaction’ (DoR 6: 352) with everyone else globally: where and how we pursue our ends necessarily impacts where and how others can do so. This leaves Kant in a puzzling situation: on the one hand, there is a sense in which original acquisition of land is, qua unavoidability, ‘blameless’: unlike any other acquisition, acquisition of a place on earth occurs without individual act or fault but merely by virtue of one’s physical entrance into the world (cf. Flikschuh 2000: 157). **We just are the kinds of beings that, in virtue of pursuing projects and holding each other morally accountable within time and space, need to be somewhere. On the other hand, while entering the world itself is not something we choose to do, the very fact that we enter the world with the capacity for choice and action has normative implications:** it implies that ‘the choice of one is unavoidably opposed by nature to that of another’ (DoR 6: 267). And what it is to be an embodied agent – not just a physical entity taking up space – is to be able to grasp, and account for, the normative implications of this fact**. Kant resolves this dilemma**, I want to claim, by attaching strings to the right to be somewhere, namely, **to conceive of our own legitimate possession of a place as a ‘possession in common’** (DoR 6: 262) with all others. To think of the earth’s surface as possessed in common, that is to say, is an a priori necessary condition of the unavoidable act of first acquisition in virtue of one’s coming into the world as an embodied agent. While we have a right to be somewhere (otherwise we could not act), 6 we also need to take into account that the piece of space we take up at every particular point in time cannot be taken up by any other person. And given that, as Kant explains elsewhere, **‘originally no one had more right than another to be on a place on the earth’** (PP 8: 358), **we can do so only by thinking of the earth’s surface as commonly owned.** Kant thus employs the idea of original common possession of the earth in order to visually express what it means to exist as an embodied moral agent, together with other such agents, within limited space, namely, to acknowledge that the corollary of one’s own right to be somewhere is one’s acknowledgement of others’ equal right.

**This impacts back to my framework because to violate someone’s right to be somewhere isn’t universalizable since if no one had a right to be anywhere no one would be able to act, i.e. it would be impossible to violate someone else's right to be somewhere. This means “private appropriation” is bad, because claiming exclusive right to land goes against the common ownership which is key to a right to be somewhere. This right also applies to space because people need to act and thus, need a right to take up space, in outer space.**

**Contention 2) Privatizing outer space is immoral because it uses aliens as a means to an end.**

**Aliens are real, science and overwhelming probability prove.**

**Shostak 14** (Seth Shostak, Ph.D. in astrophysics from the California Institute of Technology and senior researcher at the SETI and Lord Martin Rees the president of Britain’s Royal Society and astronomer to the Queen of England being cited by News.com, FEBRUARY 12th 2014, <http://www.news.com.au/technology/science/seti-scientist-predicts-alien-civilisation-will-be-detected-within-25-years-because-there-are-so-many-habitable-planets-out-there/story-fnjwlcze-1226824408842>, “SETI scientist predicts alien civilisation will be detected within 25 years — because there are so many habitable planets out there”, AB)

A TOP scientist with SETI — the Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence — is so convinced **we’re on the brink of finding ET** he’s even named a date by which first contact will have been achieved. And science is abuzz with excitement that possible confirmation of alien life — though not of intelligence — could come as early as this year. According to Seth Shostak, we’ll be phoning ET by 2040. And the address could be as close as next door — astronomically speaking. “I think we’ll find E.T. within two dozen years,” he told the 2014 NASA Innovative Advanced Concepts symposium at Stanford University. He says it’s a game of cards. So far **the search for extraterrestrial civilisations** has only focused on a few thousand star systems. As new technology continues to come online, that **search will** have **spread to encompass more than a million star systems by 2040.** Based on current calculations on the likelihood of intelligent life out there, **searching that number of stars produces high-odds of success.** His enthusiasm is also drawn from the staggering number of planets discovered in the past decade by new equipment such as the Kepler space telescope. A good number of these planets are within the “goldilocks zone” — an orbital distance from the parent star where liquid water can form. Eleven such planets have recently been assessed to be circling Alpha Centauri B — our Sun’s nearest neighbour at 4.3 light years away. “The bottom line is, like **one in five stars has at least one planet where life might spring up,**” he said. “That’s a fantastically large percentage. **That means in our galaxy, there’s** on the order of **tens of billions of Earth-like worlds.”** Shostak hopes that by focusing Earth’s radio-telescopes on stars known to hold planets which are prime contenders for life, we’ll hear the so-far elusive radio evidence of advanced civilisations sooner. Recent breakthroughs in pattern-analysis software will also improve the chances of recognising a signal from an alien intelligence once we find it. Astronomers have become convinced life is likely to be far more abundant than we have previously suspected. New research suggests habitable planets likely emerged shortly after the Big Bang, potentially producing civilisations billions of years older than our own. And in the early years of the universe, one study suggests the “leftover” heat of the Big Bang would have helped produce[d] a far greater range of habitable planets.Even the definition of “goldilocks zone” is being challenged, with the likelihood that frozen Earth-sized planets can produce and support life beneath their ice crusts becoming broadly accepted. Alpha Centauri B is again a top contender, with computer models suggesting it [Alpha Centauri B] has at least five planets with a “very high” potential for photosynthetic (plant-like) life. But with the excitement comes a problem we’re only beginning to grapple with: How do we recognise an ET when we spot one? “They could be staring us in the face and we just don’t recognise them,” the president of Britain’s Royal Society and astronomer to the Queen of England Lord Martin Rees said recently. “The problem is that we’re looking for something very much like us, assuming that they at least have something like the same mathematics and technology.” A study publishing in Acta Astronautica this month tackles just this problem. Not only is alien biology likely to be immensely different to our own, so too is their intellect, the study argues. “I suspect **there could be life and intelligence out there in forms we can’t conceive. Just as a chimpanzee can’t understand quantum theory, it could be there as aspects of reality that are beyond the capacity of our brains,”** Lord Rees said.. But it could all be blue-sky talk. SETI continues to struggle to raise enough cash to keep it searching the skies and needs to find new donors. A SETI project designed to point an array of 350 radio dishes skyward from northern California has so far seen only 42 funded.

**This impacts back to my framework because it means appropriating out space takes what already belongs to aliens. This is non universalizable without contradiction because aliens have the ability to set and pursue ends so stealing from them treats them as a means to an end. This isn’t universalizable since if everyone is treated as a means to an end, you don’t have freedom to treat others as a means to an end in the first place.**

**Contention 3) Private appropriation isn’t universalizable without contradiction because by definition it is only done by a select group. If all people privately appropriated outer space it would be publicly appropriated since everyone owns it. But that leads to a contradiction since it would be both publicly and privately owned which is impossible.**

**Underview**

**1.** **Presumption affirms. A) we presume things true until proven otherwise, I.e. you believed me when I said my name was Nate. 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.**

**2.** **Permissibility affirms, a) the aff has to prove the resolution inconsistent with the correct moral rules, if no moral system provides obligations it can’t be consistent with one.**

**3.** **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.**

**4.** **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**

**5.** **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.**

**6.** **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.**

**7.** **The negative must not contest the affirmative framework if the affirmative framework is Kant. Standard:**

**1. Time Skew: When the neg can just outframe the aff it moots the 6 minute AC since my aff links back to my framework creating a 7 to 13 timeskew.**

**2. I have to read my AC in the dark and don’t know what the neg will be but you can cherrypick your specific framework to perfectly clash with the aff’s theory of philosophy, which means the neg always has a massive advantage on the framework debate.**

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

**Predictability:**

**I have to defend the resolution i.e. I’m predictable because you know what aff I’m going to read but you could read infinite advocacies that have competition with infinite parts of the aff.**

**9. 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.**

[**https://www.dictionary.com/browse/resolve#:~:text=to%20come%20to%20a%20definite,(usually%20followed%20by%20into**](https://www.dictionary.com/browse/resolve#:~:text=to%20come%20to%20a%20definite,(usually%20followed%20by%20into)**).**

**10.** **Physics shows there are infinite universes. Main:**

Main quotes Green.[Douglas Main(Senior writer) quotes Brian Greene(professor of physics and mathematics at Columbia University).  “THERE MAY BE INFINITE UNIVERSES—AND INFINITE VERSIONS OF YOU.” News Week. 7/9/15. Accessed 12/20/19.<https://www.newsweek.com/there-may-be-infinite-universes-and-infinite-versions-you-351675//> Houston Memorial SC]// (N8)

In another universe you might have become the president of Micronesia. Or a pauper, subsisting on ketchup. Perhaps a different version of you already read this—in which case, read it again, for the first time. All crazy ideas, but all completely plausible given the idea that **there may be**, in fact, **multiple universes. Infinite, even.** I recently sat down with physicist and best-selling author John Green at the 2015 Curiosity Retreat, a weeklong conference featuring scientists and other speakers in southwest Colorado, to talk about string theory, infinite worlds and cosmic bread loaves. Let's cut to the chase. Are there multiple universes?  I don't know. But I will say that to me it's provocative at the very least that so many pathways in science naturally bump up against the notion of other universes. **Cosmology**—the science of trying to understanding how our universe began—**suggests our universe may not be unique**, or the only one.  **String theory also suggests the possibility of other universes. Quantum physics does too.** That doesn't mean it's right, but means it's worthy of attention. You study string theory. What exactly is it?  The basic idea is that the most basic element of a matter is a little vibrating filament, rather than a dot [as is the case in quantum physics or quantum mechanics, which studies the behavior of tiny, subatomic particles]. That move from the old idea of a dot to a new idea of a filament allows us to meld the laws of the large, which are described by the theory of general relativity, with the laws of the small,

or quantum mechanics. ake the origin of our universe, the Big Bang. **There's reason to believe [the big bang]** that **wasn't a onetime event, that there were many Big Bangs each giving rise to many universes.** On the other hand you've got quantum mechanics, which describes the universe being probabilistic, the electron being over here or over there. When you measure the electron, you find it in one location, but what happened to the other possibility? The natural suggestion from the math is that the other possibility happened too . In popular conceptions, many people think of multiple universes with us in it. Are they infinite, and would they contain copies of ourselves, but living in different circumstances? Yeah, in many incarnations of the idea there are ultimately infinite universes. This would also include other copies of ourselves, although that's a little bit of a [anthropocentric] way of thinking about it.

**Infinite universes means the resolution is true because infinite universes means infinite possibilities.**