**The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who links the most contention level offense to the winning normatively justified framework. Prefer:**

**1. Constitutivism: This is the way the event of LD was designed as distinct from other events, i.e. why we have frameworks. Proven by the fact that if no one reads a role of the ballot, but it was a Kant AC v a Util NC you would evaluate the round by seeing who has the most offense to the winning framework. This non uniques benefits to other role of the ballots because we can get them in policy debate or outside of the round.**

**2. Phil Ed: My role of the ballot emphasizes the importance of philosophy and normatively justifying our philosophical beliefs. It also gives us the benefit of *comparing* different theories.**

**3. Inclusion: My role of the ballot lets you read whatever framework you want and by extension talk about whatever impacts you want, you just have to justify your framework and compare it to mine. Any other role of the ballot arbitrarily excludes my offense which moots the AC.**

**4. Voting on another role of the ballot collapses to mine because by voting neg for something like “they won the role of the ballot debate and linked the most offense back to it” concedes my structure of debate that we should vote for whoever links offense to a winning system of framing.**

**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,**

**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.**

**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.**

**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.**

**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.**

**This outweighs under other frameworks.**

**a) If someone already exists on land it is unconditionally immoral to take it. I.e. it is a violent mindset to say “well yeah someone else lived here but I took it for innovation which is more important.”**

**b) Ownership is a side constraint on justification, even if it is pragmatic for me to take a piece of land, I am not *justified* in claiming property rights to it. E.g. It might be pragmatic for me to take my neighbor's backyard because it has valuable minerals key to the economy but I can’t then say I am justified to that land.**

**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:**

**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.**

**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.** **A framework of consistency with international law affirms.**

**Chouhan**, Karan Singh. "Privatization of Outer-Space and Ownership: ISA as a Model of Regulation for Resource Exploitation." *SSRN*, May 20**21**, papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3832673. Accessed 6 Feb. 2022.

**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 22 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 23 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 25 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 32 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.36