**1**

**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://www.merriam webster.com/dictionary/negate, http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate, htt p://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate, http://www.oxforddictionaries.co m/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**

**2**

**People own their own bodies and as a result have rights to use their bodies.**

**Feser,** Edward. "Robert Nozick." *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, iep.utm.edu/nozick/. Accessed 12  June 2021. ICW NW

Nozick takes his position to follow from a basic moral principle associated with Immanuel Kant and enshrined in Kant’s second formulation of his famous Categorical Imperative:  “Act so that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of another, always as an end and never as a means only.” The idea here is that **a human  being, as a rational agent endowed with self-awareness, free will, and the possibility  of formulating a plan of life, has an inherent dignity and cannot** properly **be treated as a  mere *thing*, or *used* against his will** as an instrument or resource in the way an inanimate object might be. In line with this, Nozick also  describes individual human beings as *self-owners* (though it isn’t clear whether he regards this as a restatement of Kant’s principle, a consequence of it, or an entirely independent

idea). The thesis of self-ownership, a notion that goes back in political philosophy at least to John Locke, is just the claim that **individuals own  themselves – their bodies, talents and abilities, labor, and by extension the** fruits or **products of their exercise of their talents, abilities and labor.** They have all the prerogatives with respect to  themselves that a slaveholder claims with respect to his slaves. But the thesis of self-ownership would in fact rule out slavery as illegitimate, since each individual, as a self-owner,  cannot properly be owned by anyone else. (Indeed, many libertarians would argue that unless one accepts the thesis of self-ownership, one has no way of explaining *why* slavery is  evil. After all, it cannot be merely because slaveholders often treat their slaves badly, since a kind-hearted slaveholder would still be a slaveholder, and thus morally blameworthy,  for that. The reason slavery is immoral must be because it involves a kind of stealing – the stealing of a person from himself.) But **if individuals are**

**inviolable ends-in-themselves** (as Kant describes them) **and self-owners, it follows**, Nozick says, **that they  have certain *rights*, in particular** (and here again following Locke) **rights to their lives, liberty, and the fruits of their labor. To own something,** after all, just **is to have a right to it,** or, more accurately, to  possess the bundle of rights – **rights to possess something, to dispose of it, to determine what may be  done with it,** etc. – that constitute ownership; and **thus to own oneself is to have such rights to the  various elements that make up one’s self. These rights function, Nozick says, as *side constraints* on the actions of others; they set limits on how others may, morally  speaking, treat a person.** So, for example, **since you** own yourself, and thus **have a right to yourself,  others are constrained morally not to kill or maim you** (since this would involve destroying or damaging your

property), or to kidnap you or forcibly remove one of your bodily organs for transplantation in someone else (since this would involve stealing your property). They are also  constrained not to force you against your will to work for another’s purposes, even if those purposes are good ones. For **if you own yourself, it  follows that you have a right to determine whether and how you will use your self owned body and its powers,** e.g. either to work or to refrain from working.

**Thus, the state ought not interfere with people since that would violate their  rights.**

**Feser 2,** Edward. "Robert Nozick." *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, iep.utm.edu/nozick/. Accessed  12 June 2021.

So far this all might seem fairly uncontroversial. But what follows from it, in Nozick’s view, is the surprising and radical conclusion that ***taxation*,** of the redistributive  sort in which modern states engage in order to fund the various programs of the bureaucratic welfare state, **is morally illegitimate. It amounts  to a kind of *forced labor*, for the state so structures the tax system that any time you  labor at all, a certain amount of your labor time – the amount that produces the  wealth taken away from you forcibly via taxation – is time you involuntarily work,  in effect, for the state.** Indeed, such taxation amounts to partial *slavery*, for in giving every citizen an entitlement to certain benefits (welfare, social

security, or whatever), the state in effect gives them an entitlement, a *right*, to a part of the proceeds of your labor, which produces the taxes that fund the benefits; every citizen,  that is, becomes in such a system *a partial owner of you* (since they have a partial property right in part of you, i.e. in your labor). But **this is** flatly **inconsistent with the principle of self-ownership.**

The various programs of the modern liberal welfare state are thus immoral, not only because they are inefficient and incompetently administered, but because they make slaves of  the citizens of such a state. Indeed, **the only sort of state that can be morally justified is** what Nozick calls **a  *minimal state*** or “night-watchman” state, **a government which protects individuals**, via police and military forces, **from force, fraud, and theft, and administers courts of law, but does nothing else.** In  particular, **such a state cannot regulate what citizens eat, drink, or smoke** (**since this would  interfere with their right to use their self-owned bodies as they see fit), cannot  control what they publish or read** (since this would interfere with their right to use the property they’ve acquired with their self-owned labor  – e.g. printing presses and paper – as they wish), cannot administer mandatory social insurance schemes or public education (since this would interfere with citizens’ rights to use  the fruits of their labor as they desire, in that some citizens might decide that they would rather put their money into private education and private retirement plans), and cannot  regulate economic life in general via minimum wage and rent control laws and the like (since such actions are not only economically suspect – tending to produce bad unintended  consequences like unemployment and housing shortages – but violate citizens’ rights to charge whatever they want to for the use of their own property).

**Thus, the standard is consistency with libertarianism. This is the idea that the  only moral state is one that protects people’s rights but is *never* morally  justified in coercing its citizens. Prefer:**

**1. Culpability: If people didn’t freely will an action they can’t be said to be  responsible for it because they couldn’t have done otherwise. I.e. if I’m forced  to slap a person, no one would say I’m culpable because I had no choice in the  matter. This means ethics can’t exist without freedom because we wouldn’t be  able to assign agents culpability.**

**2. Freedom is a prerequisite to the use of other frameworks, because if we  can’t choose our actions we can’t make them consistent with the aff  framework. This means I hijack the aff framework because even if they win  it's true, we have to have freedom to pursue it in the first place.**

**Contention 1)**

**Private entities should have the freedom to appropriate outer space.**

**It's impossible for appropriation, or initial acquisition of property to be  unjust, because if property was previously unowned injustice is not being  committed against anyone.**

**Feser 3,** (Edward Feser, 1-1-2005, accessed on 12-15-2021, Cambridge University Press, "THERE IS  NO SUCH THING AS AN UNJUST INITIAL ACQUISITION | Social Philosophy and Policy | Cambridge  Core", Edward C. Feser is an American philosopher. He is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at  Pasadena City College in Pasadena, California. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial

acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)[brackets for gen lang]//phs st // ICW NW

There is a serious difficulty with this criticism of Nozick, however. It is just this: **There is no such thing as an unjust initial  acquisition of resources;** therefore, there is no case to be made for redistributive taxation on the basis of alleged injustices in initial acquisition. This is,  to be sure, a bold claim. Moreover, in making it, I contradict not only Nozick’s critics, but Nozick himself, who clearly thinks it is at least possible for there to be injustices in  acquisition, whether or not there have in fact been any (or, more realistically, whether or not there have been enough such injustices to justify continual redistributive taxation for  the purposes of rectifying them). But here is a case where Nozick has, I think, been too generous to the other side. Rather than attempt —unsatisfactorily, in the view of his  critics—to meet the challenge to show that initial acquisition has not in general been unjust, he ought instead to have insisted that there is no such challenge to be met in the first  place. Giving what I shall call “the basic argument” for this audacious claim will be the task of Section II of this essay. The argument is, I think, compelling, but by itself it leaves  unexplained some widespread intu- itions to the effect that certain specific instances of initial acquisition are unjust and call forth as their remedy the application of a Lockean  proviso, or are otherwise problematic. (A “Lockean proviso,” of course, is one that forbids initial acquisitions of resources when these acquisitions do not leave “enough and as  good” in common for others.) Thus, Section III focuses on various considerations that tend to show how those intuitions are best explained in a way consistent with the argument  of Section II. Section IV completes the task of accounting for the intuitions in question by considering how the thesis of self-ownership itself bears on the acqui- sition and use of  property. Section V shows how the results of the previ- ous sections add up to a more satisfying defense of Nozickian property rights than the one given by Nozick himself, and  considers some of the implications of this revised conception of initial acquisition for our under- standing of Nozick’s principles of transfer and rectification. II. The Basic  Argument **The reason there is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition of resources is  that there is no such thing as either a just or an unjust initial acquisition of  resources. The concept of justice, that is to say, simply does not apply to initial  acquisition. It applies only after initial acquisition has already taken place.** In particular, it  applies only to transfers of property (and derivatively, to the rectification of injustices in transfer). This, it seems to me, is a clear implication of the assumption (rightly) made by  Nozick that e**xternal resources are initially unowned.** Consider the following example.**Suppose an  individual A seeks to acquire some previously unowned resource R. For it to be the  case that A commits an injustice in acquiring R, it would also have to be the case  that there is some individual B** (or perhaps a group of individuals) **against whom A commits the  injustice. But for B to have been wronged by A’s acquisi- tion of R, B would have to  have had a rightful claim over R**, a right to R. By hypothesis, **however, B did not have a right to R,  because no one had a right to it—it was unowned**, after all. So B was not wronged and could not have been. In fact, the  very first person who could conceivably be wronged by anyone’s use of R would be, not B, but A himself, since A is the first one to own R. Such a wrong would in the nature of

the case be an injustice in transfer—in unjustly taking from A what is rightfully his—not in initial acquisition. **The same thing, by extension,  will be true of all unowned resources: it is only after some- one has initially acquired  them that anyone could unjustly come to possess them,** via unjust transfer. **It is impossible,  then, for there to be any injustices in initial acquisition.7**

**This impacts back to my framework because it means a) the appropriation of  property no one owns, i.e. outer space is not unjust under libertarianism and  b) means interference with this permissible action is coercive.**

**Contention 2)**

**Space exploration and appropriation are inevitable; it's just a question of  whether it will be public or private. Public appropriation of outer space is  unjust because it requires taxation.**

**Taxation is unjust under libertarianism.**

**Feser 4,** Edward. "Robert Nozick." *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, iep.utm.edu/nozick/. Accessed  12 June 2021.

So far this all might seem fairly uncontroversial. But what follows from it, in Nozick’s view, is the surprising and radical conclusion that ***taxation*,** of the redistributive  sort in which modern states engage in order to fund the various programs of the bureaucratic welfare state, **is morally illegitimate. It amounts  to a kind of *forced labor*, for the state so structures the tax system that any time you  labor at all, a certain amount of your labor time – the amount that produces the  wealth taken away from you forcibly via taxation – is time you involuntarily work,  in effect, for the state.** Indeed, such taxation amounts to partial *slavery*, for in giving every citizen an entitlement to certain benefits (welfare, social

security, or whatever), the state in effect gives them an entitlement, a *right*, to a part of the proceeds of your labor, which produces the taxes that fund the benefits; every citizen,  that is, becomes in such a system *a partial owner of you* (since they have a partial property right in part of you, i.e. in your labor). But **this is** flatly **inconsistent with the principle of self-ownership.**

The various programs of the modern liberal welfare state are thus immoral, not only because they are inefficient and incompetently administered, but because they make slaves of  the citizens of such a state. Indeed, the only sort of state that can be morally justified is what Nozick calls a *minimal state* or “night-watchman” state, a government which protects  individuals, via police and military forces, from force, fraud, and theft, and administers courts of law, but does nothing else. In particular, such a state cannot regulate what citizens  eat, drink, or smoke (since this would interfere with their right to use their self-owned bodies as they see fit), cannot control what they publish or read (since this would interfere  with their right to use the property they’ve acquired with their self-owned labor – e.g. printing presses and paper – as they wish), cannot administer mandatory social insurance  schemes or public education (since this would interfere with citizens’ rights to use the fruits of their labor as they desire, in that some citizens might decide that they would rather  put their money into private education and private retirement plans), and cannot regulate economic life in general via minimum wage and rent control laws and the like (since such  actions are not only economically suspect – tending to produce bad unintended consequences like unemployment and housing shortages – but violate citizens’ rights to charge  whatever they want to for the use of their own property).

**3**

**Interpretation: Debaters must include a url to the source of their evidence in  the citation of their cards.**

**Violation: Most of the cards in the aff don’t have a url.**

**Standards:**

**1. Evidence Ethics:**

**a) Providing a source is a key part of a citation. I.e. you have to give  credit to the original author and prove where you got it from.  b) When there’s no url we can’t check if its misrepresented, you could  literally just write whatever you want and we have no way of verifying  it. They clearly have some online source because its carded word for  word, which means you had to copy paste from somewhere.**

**Evidence Ethics o/w:**

**a) It has real world portable implications, i.e. if you misrepresent  things you get kicked out of school.**

**b) It outweighs on magnitude since it’s communally accepted that  evidence ethics violations are bad**

**c) Outweighs on intent to commit abuse. There is no net benefit to not  citing evidence properly.**

**2. Clash: I should be able to access the source you’re reading from, otherwise  you get to read the whole article and I only get to read the part that may or  may not be from the original source.**

**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.  Drop the debater:**

**a) To deter future abuse.**

**b) Drop the argument incentivizes abuse because it takes longer to check  abuse than to commit it.**

**c) If the round has already been skewed you can’t fairly evaluate  substance.**

**Competing Interps:**

**a) Reasonability is arbitrary and requires judge intervention.  b) Reasonability leads to infinite abuse because you can shift the bright  line to justify anything.**

**c) Reasonability collapses because you have to use an offense defense  paradigm to determine to use it.**

**No RVIs**

**a) Leads to infinite abuse because you can just sit on a shell for 4 minutes  and auto win.**

**b) You don’t win for just being fair or educational.**

**c) Incentivizes debaters to be as abusive as possible to bait theory and win  off the RVI, and since checking multiple abusive things requires  multiple shells so I’d have to win both and split the 2N.**

**4**

**Interpretation: The affirmative must garner offense only from private  appropriation of outer space being unjust. To clarify you may not garner  offense from method offense.**

**Violation: They fiat luxury communism happens in outer space as part of  the aff.**

**Standards:**

**Limits: When you get to tack on other actions after private appropriation  being bad it allows literally infinite affs. I.e. you can say “stop**

**appropriating space AND [insert anything]”. This kills neg prep because  there are literally infinite affs. Especially true since you can just  cherrypick the best method to tack on afterwards which I already won’t  be able to predict.**