### 1

#### Interpretation—the aff must disclose the plan text, framework, and advantage area 30 minutes before the round. To clarify, disclosure can occur on the wiki or over message.

#### Violation—they didn’t – screenshots prove.

A screenshot of a phone

Description automatically generated with medium confidence

#### Vote neg for prep and clash—two internal links—a) neg prep—4 minutes of prep is not enough to put together a coherent 1nc or update generics—30 minutes is necessary to learn a little about the affirmative and piece together what 1nc positions apply and cut and research their applications to the affirmative b) aff quality—plan text disclosure discourages cheap shot affs. If the aff isn’t inherent or easily defeated by 20 minutes of research, it should lose—this will answer the 1ar’s claim about innovation—with 30 minutes of prep, there’s still an incentive to find a new strategic, well justified aff, but no incentive to cut a horrible, incoherent aff that the neg can’t check against the broader literature.

#### Voter:

#### Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

#### Drop the debater – a) they have a 7-6 rebuttal advantage and the 2ar to make args I can’t respond to, b) it deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

#### Use competing interps – a) reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter, b) collapses to competing interps – we justify 2 brightlines under an offense defense paradigm just like 2 interps.

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms, c) chilling effect – forces you to split your 2AR so you can’t collapse and misconstrue the 2NR, d) topic ed – prevents 1AR blipstorm scripts and allows us to get back to substance after resolving theory

### 2

#### Presumption and permissibility negates – a) statements are more often false than true since I can prove something false in infinite ways b) real world policies require positive justification before being adopted c) the aff has to prove an obligation which means lack of that obligation negates d) winning the nc proves since otherwise we’d be blindly deceived when skeptical e) to negate[[1]](#footnote-1) means to deny the truth of which means if the aff is false you vote neg f) permissibility can’t affirm since then anything would be ok which would justify racism – we should be safe and do nothing.

#### Moral skep – justice requires us to act immediately since waiting in the face of injustice is itself an injustice. However, we need to be fully informed to avoid formulating a rule incorrectly and unjustly, so obligations are internally contradictory.

**Derrida et al 2002** Jacques Derrida was an French philosopher best known for developing a form of semiotic analysis known as deconstruction, which he discussed in numerous texts, and developed in the context of phenomenology. He is one of the major figures associated with post-structuralism and postmodern philosophy [“Acts of Religion” https://books.google.com/books?id=c\_kgAmFbvP0C&pg=PA255&lpg=PA255&dq=%22Even+if+time+and+prudence,+the+patience+of+knowledge+and+the+mastery+of+conditions+were+hypothetically+unlimited%22&source=bl&ots=PorjbB\_lFL&sig=ACfU3U2cEUeelL1I8dtLAuHyWNDFo7n5Tw&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjir4SE5czoAhUvg3IEHaV5CGMQ6AEwAHoECAsQJw#v=onepage&q=%22Even%20if%20time%20and%20prudence%2C%20the%20patience%20of%20knowledge%20and%20the%20mastery%20of%20conditions%20were%20hypothetically%20unlimited%22&f=false]//Mberhe

But justice**,** however unpresentable it may be, doesn't wait.· It is that which must not wait.To be direct, simple and brief, let us say this: a just decision is always required immediately**, "right away**." It cannot furnish itself withinfinite information and the unlimited knowledge of conditions,rules or hypothetical imperativesthat could justify it. And even if it didhave all that at its disposal, even if it did give itself the time, all the time and all the necessary facts about the matter, the moment of decision, as such, always remains a finite moment of urgencyand precipitation, since it must not be the consequence or the effectof this theoretical or historical knowledge, of this reflection or this deliberation, **s**ince it always marks the interruption of the juridico- or ethico- or politico-cognitive deliberation that precedes it**,** that must precede it. The instant of decision is a madness, says Kierkegaard. This is particularly true of the instant of the just decision that must rend time and defy dialectics. It is a madness. Even if time and prudence, the patience of knowledge and the mastery of conditions were hypothetically unlimited, the decision would be structurally finite, however late it came, decision of urgency and precipitation, acting in the night of non-knowledge and non-rule

### 3

#### No 1ar theory – [a] 7-6, 2-1 skew proves its always skewed to the aff, [b] resolvability double bind – either the judge has to intervene to decide whether the 2ar’s answers to the 2nr’s Counter interp are sufficient or they auto accept every answer, and you auto win. Intervention ow since it takes the round out of the debaters’ hands.

#### Drop the argument on 1ar theory – they can initiate offensive drop the debater theory in the aff and in the 1ar while no judge would vote on 2n theory on severance.

#### If they win they get 1ar theory only one 1AR shell – [a] strat skew – multiple 1ar shells incentivize a bunch of short 1ar shells so that the 2nr can’t answer all of them in depth since we only have like 1 minute on each shell and then they get to collapse to whatever we undercovered for 3 minutes giving them a massive time advantage on the theory debate, [b] reciprocity – I only read 1 shell and its irrecipricol for you to read more than one since you would then get more ballot implications than me.

## Case

### UV

#### New 2NR responses to AC spikes, trix, and theory arguments: a) forcing the neg to answer every warrant in every spike and trick in the NC means massive amounts of time of the 1NC is lost and not spent generating offense which means every round gets wasted on theory and I’m super behind.

#### Neg theory comes lexically prior – a) any abuse is in response to an abusive aff which means it’s just self-imposed, and complying with my interp would solve the abuse on theirs, b) lack of 2N theory means they have 10min to my 7 to make theory args, c) 2AR persuasive spin is sufficient to beat back any skew since 2Ns on theory inevitably way undercover substance

### Theory

### Contention

#### 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] Property rights in space can be consistent with international law

Simberg 12 [(Rand, MSE in technical management from West Coast University, recognized as an expert in space transportation by the Office of Technology Assessment) “Homesteading the Final Frontier A Practical Proposal for Securing Property Rights in Space,” Competitive Enterprise Institute, April 2012, <https://cei.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/Rand-Simberg-Homesteading-the-Final-Frontier.pdf>] TDI

But is it true that any recognition of off-planet property claims is de facto a violation of the Outer Space Treaty? Not necessarily. For instance, one could argue that the existence of the Moon Treaty is in and of itself a refutation of the notion that the Outer Space Treaty outlaws private property in space, or else there would be no need for another treaty that essentially explicitly does so. And there is at least one potential loophole that could be exploited by appropriately worded legislation. There are two key assumptions in the legal argument used by opponents of off-planet property claims: 1) that the recognition by a government would only recognize claims by its own citizens; and 2) that it would defend them by force. That need not necessarily be so. Under the treaty, it would in fact be possible for a government, or group of governments, to recognize the property claims of anyone who met specified conditions, regardless of their citizenship or nationality. Such cooperation would obviate the need for physical force to defend claims. The argument that the treaty permits individual property rights was actually made from the very beginning. In 1969, two years after the treaty went into force, the late distinguished space-law professor, Stephen Gorove, noted that under it, “[A]n individual acting on his own behalf or on behalf of another individual or a private association or an international organization could lawfully appropriate any part of outer space, including the [M]oon and other celestial bodies.”32 This clearly provides support for the concept of individual claims off planet under Article II.

#### 3] Space appropriation and exploration originates from private companies such as Space X and Blue Origin. Preventing such is a restriction on the ability of companies to set and pursue their ends

#### Green – [a] aff doesn’t solve as it allows for the possibility of public sector or nations to fund space exploration or colonization projects. [b] no reason why appropriation of outer space is an example of interfering with their ends which they have no evidence for.

#### Contradiction in Conception – not logical because it reaches its end when everyone does leave space.

#### No Property Rights – simberg ev answers the a point and we can rationally conceptualize owing property in space e.g. musk trying to establish space colonies.

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)