### 1

#### Interpretation: Affirmatives must, if they read an empirical study, must have an explicit methodology delineated in under the citation or a general note before or after the card- I’ve inserted a list for what the method must include

* Sample Size
* Explanation of how the study was done
* Potential formulas or trends line equations if derived
* Location of the study
* Qualifications of the individuals conducting the study

#### Violation: Shah ev

#### Prefer-

#### 1] Evidence ethics and infinite abuse- They can endlessly lie and spin the methodology of the study the way they like in the 1AR so that they win every evidence debate. Judges can’t check its out of their jurisdiction to sift through articles of empirical studies. Speccing solves since it prevents you from lying and grants us the ability to contest it in the 1NC. Evidence ethics is an independent voting issue since it questions your ability to trust the evidence they have read prior to evaluation.

#### DTD – it’s key to norm set and deter future abuse

#### Competing interps – Reasonability means that they don’t have to answer my shells which creates a 7-6 time skew, and it causes judge intervention

#### No RVIs – A - Forcing the 1NC to go all in on the shell kills substance education and neg strat which outweighs on timeframe, B - discourages checking real abuse which outweighs on norm-setting and constituvisim C - Encourages baiting – outweighs because if the shell is frivolous, they can beat it quickly D – its illogical for you to win for proving you were fair – outweighs since logic is a litmus test for other arguments E- No RVI’s with a Brightline of us still engaging substance and applies to aprioris as well- friv theory and substance education BC we still engage with the aff F- No time skew since both sides have 13-13 each to win the shell.

### 2

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement – anything else moots 7 minutes of the nc – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that a world is better than another before you adopt it.

#### They justify substantive skews since there will always be a more correct side of the issue but we compensate for flaws in the lit.

#### Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – T/F binary is descriptive and technical.

#### a priori’s 1st – even worlds framing requires ethics that begin from a priori principles like reason or pleasure so we control the internal link to functional debates.

#### The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true which means it’s constitutive and jurisdictional. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I’ve met my burden.

#### Permissibility and presumption negate

#### 1] Obligations- the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove an obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation

#### 2] Falsity- Statements are more often false than true because proving one part of the statement false disproves the entire statement. Presuming all statements are true creates contradictions which would be ethically bankrupt.

#### 3] Negating is harder – A] Aff gets first and last speech which control the direction of the debate B] Affirmatives can strategically uplayer in the 1ar giving them a 7-6 time skew advantage, splitting the 2nr C] They get infinite prep time

#### 4] Affirmation theory- Affirming requires unconditionally maintaining an obligation

Affirm [is to]: maintain as true.

That’s Dictionary.com- “affirm” https://www.dictionary.com/browse/affirm

### 4

#### Absolutionist theories where we can’t question the state pave the way for genocidal actions – Hobbes himself was used to justify social Darwinism.

Dvorsky 13**:** Dvorsky, George [Contributing Editor, Gizmodo] “How the pseudoscience of Social Darwinism nearly destroyed humanity.” *Gizmodo.* September 2013. RP

Following the publication of Darwin’s On the Origin of Species in 1860, many political theorists and opportunistic politicians applied his findings to human society. In the 20th century, these ideas were put into practice — and it nearly destroyed us. Here’s why Social Darwinism was one of the worst ideas ever. Charles Darwin’s theory of natural selection was unlike any that had preceded it, the shockwaves of which are still being felt today. Even Copernicus’s terribly upsetting notion — that the Earth revolves around the Sun — only mildly perturbed our sense of the universe and our place within it. The same could be said about Newton’s clockwork physics and Einstein’s relativistic interpretation of the cosmos. These axiomatic shifts certainly changed the way Western society looked at itself, but not to the degree that Darwinian natural selection did. Indeed, Darwin’s dangerous idea penetrated deeply into a hypersensitive realm that had stubbornly languished beyond human understanding: The origin of life. Darwin’s theory served not merely as an explainer for life on Earth — it was also a veritable God killer. What’s more, it “reduced” humanity to the level of animals, forever disrupting the [Judeo-Christian](http://io9.com/does-the-new-pope-believe-in-evolution-453874239) notion that humanity existed in an exalted place between God and the natural world. Humanity, it was suddenly realized, was not privy to the whims of God, but rather to the laws of nature. Moreover, the human species wasn’t static. For the 19th Century intelligentsia, this further reinforced burgeoning notions of materialism, the sense of social change and progress, and the inexorable struggle for survival. **Feeding off earlier notions posited by the likes of Thomas Hobbes (who argued that the original state of nature is nasty, brutish, and short), Thomas Malthus (whose theories on human population growth served as a kind of proto-sociobiology) Auguste Comte (a positivist), and Jean-Baptiste Lamarck (who presented an earlier, but inaccurate, theory of evolution), many thinkers began to apply Darwinian notions to human individuals, society, and races. In the absence of God, went the argument, humanity needed to act to ensure its fitness and ongoing survival. Darwin’s thesis seemed to provide a blueprint on how this could be done. And thus began the transference of Darwinian theories from animal species to social groups and races — a development that would lead to catastrophic results. As a term, “Social Darwinism” was used sparingly in the 19th Century; it was only popularized in the United States in 1944 by historian Richard Hofstadter. And indeed, it’s a term that casts a wide net, encompassing several different areas as it pertains to the extension of Darwinism to the social realm. Indeed, its wide interpretation led thinkers to a number of different conclusions, including the reinforcement of individualism and minimalist government, theories about racial and societal “hygiene” and** [**eugenics**](http://io9.com/5925024/why-eugenics-will-always-fail)**, notions of racial superiority and the justified use of force, and the idea that the human species could be moulded by the state**. Part of the problem is that Darwin’s theory arrived at a dangerous time — a time when Western cultural and scientific sensibilities were not entirely ready for it; it was an idea ahead of its time, and by consequence, was misappropriated to realms into which it didn’t belong. The acceptance of Social Darwinism was not only a symptom of an emerging and overly enthusiastic scientism, but also the result of poorly developed conceptions surrounding race, ethnicity, and biological diversity. It appeared during a time of deeply embedded and unquestioned racism, where the conditions of under-developed nations and poverty-stricken visible minorities were attributed to racial inferiority. It was also driven by a [fallacy](http://io9.com/5974468/the-most-common-cognitive-biases-that-prevent-you-from-being-rational) that exists to this very day, namely the Naturalistic Fallacy. Social Darwinism was often justified on account of evolution being a “natural” process — a very dangerous proposition, to be sure. The human brain is capable of 1016 processes per second, which makes it far more powerful than any… During the latter half of the 19th century, Darwin’s biological ideas began to influence not just political theorists, but politicians as well. His theory — which described the process of variation and selection, the struggle for existence, and the need for adaptation and improvement — were applied to human society, primarily to reinforce and rationalize aspects of competition and struggle. It was also used to justify political control by a minority (e.g. imperialism and colonialism) and the capitalistic system itself. What’s more, because Darwinism was (and still is) often misunderstood to imply an evolutionary trajectory, evolution was also equated with social progress. The chief advocates of Social Darwinism during the 19th century included Herbert Spencer and William Graham Sumner. Interestingly, Spencer’s highly influential work, Progress: Its Law and Cause, was released three years before the publication of Darwin's On the Origin of Species, while his First Principles was printed in 1860. So while Spencer was not immediately influenced by Charles Darwin, the subsequent popularization and legitimization of his ideas were most certainly a direct consequence. Both Spencer and Sumner asserted the value of the struggle for life which resulted in improvement, a natural consequence of the “survival of the fittest” doctrine. This early form of Social Darwinism had a distinctive laissez-faire character to it, whose supporters advocated for an individualist order of society. Herbert Spencer in particular was an ardent individualist. He firmly believed that the functions of the state should be limited to protection, and that no restrictions should be placed on commerce, and no provision made for social welfare or education. This individualism was a clear consequence of his application of evolutionary biology to social relationships. All existence, Spencer argued, grew through a series of transformations from the simple to the complex by successive variations. He saw civilization as an ongoing process in which humans adjusted to an increasingly complex world. This evolutionary process, in the absence of interference, led inevitably to social improvement — an idea that now resonates with modern libertarians. He also saw the poor as being biologically “unfit.” Public efforts to help them, be it through legislation, charity, and social reconstruction, were undesirable because it might allow them to mature and pass on their weakness. He suggested that the whole thrust of nature was to get rid of the inefficient in order to make room for the superior. The way he looked at it, if they weren’t fit enough to live, they would die — and it was probably for the better. Spencer wrote: Other evils, no less serious, are entailed by legislative actions and by actions of individuals, single and combined, which overlook or disregard a kindred biological truth. Beside an habitual neglect of the fact that the quality of a society is physically lowered by the artificial preservation of its feeblest members, there is an habitual neglect of the fact that the quality of a society is lowered morally and intellectually, by the artificial preservation of those who are least able to take care of themselves.” Similarly, Cesare Lombroso, an Italian physician, [argued in 1876](http://www.marxist.com/science-old/marxismanddarwinism.html) that born criminals were essentially proto-humans — a throw-back in evolution. Similar sentiments were also used to justify slavery in the United States. These ideas would go on to influence the eugenics movement, an early 20th century initiative designed to prevent those deemed too unworthy to pass their deleterious genes to the next generation, lest the overall health of human society be compromised. Additionally, the burgeoning Social Darwinism of the time would go on to influence such politicians as Otto von Bismarck, Joseph Chamberlain, and Theodore Roosevelt. It was often used in the political arena to justify eugenic or racial differences, imperialist expansion, colonialism, and war. These politicians, whether they did so opportunistically or sincerely, used these sentiments to stress competitive relationships and struggles between nations and groups in order to ensure the survival of the physically and mentally worthiest people. And to further the cause of their nation. **Without question, the most infamous application of Social Darwinism was in Nazi Germany.** By the early 20th century, the pseudoscientific generalities of Social Darwinism remained popular in Europe — and it spoke to those advocating for racial purity. Indeed, Social Darwinism served to heighten race consciousness to a greater degree; anti-semitism during this time was justified on biological grounds. Historian Alan Cassels writes: Above above all, German Volkish cultists excoriated Jews as “a pestilence and a cholera” which threatened to pollute the race. To accomplish this corruption, Jewish males were supposed to lust perpetually after Aryan women. A logical recommendation to be drawn from this view was the destruction of German Jewry in order to preserve the purity of the German race — a proposal made by some fanatics before 1914 and ultimately implemented by the Nazis. Using such thinking, Jews could then be persecuted not for their actions or beliefs, but simply for who they were. Adolf Hitler further articulated these beliefs in the first volume of Mein Kampf. He essentially saw the world as one gigantic struggle among the races — a struggle that would ultimately be won by the strongest. And therein lay one of the most nefarious ideas to take root in modern politics — the notion that force could always be justified in this context, with no room for ethics, law, or humanitarian scruples. The acceptance of Social Darwinism by the Nazis goes a long way in explaining the intense brutality meted out during the Second World War. It not only motivated them to unite the Teutonic peoples, but to decimate races altogether, and to claim other lands as the conquerors of more primitive races — including the Slavs who Hitler described as being subhuman, a race suitable for both colonization and, eventually, annihilation (Hitler’s Hunger Plan, which was never put into practice on account of stubborn Soviet resistance, called for the deliberate starvation of tens of millions of Slavs in preparation for the colonization of Ukraine and parts of Russia). So severe, was Naziism, that its political opponents deemed it an existential risk. It had to be wiped out lest its tentacles spread to all corners of the Earth, spawning a culture-crushing and science-stifling Dark Age. The resulting war — the first to feature apocalyptic [weapons](http://io9.com/11-jaw-dropping-weapons-from-world-war-ii-you-probably-511010752) — was the greatest human-instigated disaster to befall our civilization. The Second World War witnessed the introduction of hundreds of cutting-edge and often bizarre…But fascists weren’t the only totalitarians to be influenced by Darwin. The misapplication of biology to politics was also committed by the communists. Karl Marx read On the Origin of Species and absolutely loved it. Not only did it speak to his materialist sensibilities, it also affirmed his theory of class struggle — an agenda that was put into full force by Joseph Stalin during the Great Terror period, a time when millions of people were murdered by the Soviet apparatus as a means of self-colonization. Marx wrote: Darwin’s work is most important and suits my purpose in that it provides a basis in natural science for the historical class struggle...Despite all shortcomings, it is here that, for the first time, ‘teleology’ in natural science is not only dealt a mortal blow but its rational meaning is empirically explained. What’s more, it also affirmed in Marx’s mind that humanity is a work in progress. It supported his conception of the utopian New Man — [the next iteration of the human species](http://io9.com/no-china-is-not-conducting-a-giant-eugenics-project-512749419). But rather than have it come about through the haphazard processes of natural selection, it could be enforced through state imposition. Sadly, Darwin never intended for this to happen. For the most part, he limited the theory to the biological realm (though he did delve into speculative sociology in his later work, The Descent of Man). But like so many things in life, it takes only a few people to ruin it for everybody else. To this day, Darwinism has its detractors, including Creationists who wrongly blame Darwin and his theory for the travesties committed last century. Quite obviously, equating natural selection — a remarkably potent theory that’s accepted wholeheartedly by any serious biologist — with the ills of Social Darwinism is a tragic mistake. The science is still science, while Social Darwinism, with its gratuitous generalizations and misreadings of how natural selection works (e.g. it completely fails to account for group selection theories and the rise of such characteristics as empathy) will forever remain in the realm of pseudoscience. What’s more, the application of Darwinian processes to human morality is about as facile an exercise as it gets. **As a moral maxim, “survival of the fittest” is as unenlightened as it gets. If anything, the general tendency of human society is remove itself as far away from possible to this process. If anything, Social Darwinism is anathema to civilized society. And the fact that it nearly destroyed us should serve as a potent lesson**.

#### DTD - ~1~ Reversibility: once oppressive rhetoric is used it cannot be taken back

#### ~2~ Norm setting: we are part of a larger debate community with extensive norms – letting bad discourse run rampant kills that

#### ~3~ Competition: debate is an educational competition with no place for offensive rhetoric – that kills any access encourages students to quit.

#### ~4~ Testing: You can't evaluate the affirmative outside of its justifications which shape our evaluation of it relative to other alternatives

### 5

#### Interpretation: All arguments concerning fairness or education that the negative could violate must be read first in the AC.

#### Violation: preemptive

#### Prefer-

#### 1] Strat Skew – Their interp means time spent developing a substantive strategy becomes completely nullified because they’re read after substance. The neg should have to know what they have to meet before planning a strategy. That outweighs since it questions if we can access other standards.

#### 2] Topic education – Negatives are able to plan a strategy that meets your spikes so debaters can have a clean substance debate which outweighs on time frame since there’s only 2 months to debate the topic

### 6

#### Negate –

#### A private entity is “There are a few groups that can be considered a private entity in the business world. A partnership, corporation, individual, nonprofit organization, company, or any organized group that is not government-affiliated can be considered a private entity.”

That’s QT Company 20 [“What Are Private Entities?”. Quest Trust Company (custodian of self-directed IRAs located in Houston, Austin, and Dallas, Texas with clients Nationwide. Quest Trust Company, is the leading provider of self-directed retirement account administration services. Quest Trust Company has been in business since 2003 with over $2 Billion in assets under management. As a neutral party, Quest Trust Company does not offer any investments and therefore has no conflicts of interest with what our clients want to do with their IRAs). September 28, 2020. Accessed 12/17/21. <https://www.questtrustcompany.com/2020/09/28/what-are-private-entities/> //Xu]

#### Doesn’t exist with outer space appropriation –

FRANKOWSKI 17 [Paweł FRANKOWSKI (Assistant Professor at the Chair of International Relations and Foreign Policy, Institute of Political Science and International Relations of the Jagiellonian University). “OUTER SPACE AND PRIVATE COMPANIES: CONSEQUENCES FOR GLOBAL SECURITY”. Politeja. No. 50/5, GLOBAL AND REGIONAL SECURITY CHALLENGES (2017), pp. 131-148 (18 pages). Accessed 12/17/21. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26564288?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents> //Xu]

As mentioned earlier, when some space assets and services, like telecommunication services, from the very beginning of space exploration, have been in private hands, for other sector like space imagery or synchronizing services it was not an easy path. However, strategies geared towards more private involvement are intrinsically similar to strategies and justifications in other public services. John Donahue referring to the privatization of public services argues that the political choice between public and private services basically has two dimensions. The first concerns finance, and focuses on the questions whether or not individuals should pay for services individually, or maybe the same services should be provided by the state, with funds raised from taxation. Apart from financing, the second dimension focuses on performance, flexibility, and ability to adapt to changing circumstances. In general, this dimension should be analysed if services should be delivered from governmental level or provided by nonstate entity, with lesser attachment to procedures, red tape and managerial style of governing.4 Nevertheless, privatization of security and military services follows a slightly different logic, because after private companies acquired contracts to provide security services, provisions of such services will be still financed by public money. Therefore individuals’ rights, transferred to the state, who is main security provider, have been shifted back to private entities, able and willing to provide such services. Already it should be obvious that the main source of income for private space industry are public actors, and space companies hardly can find other clients. For example 66% of European space industry is coming from public sector,5 and only in 2015 European companies provided goods worth as much as 534 mln EUR for military customers EUR.6

#### 1] the[[3]](#footnote-3) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but appropriation isn’t a disease

#### 2] appropriation[[4]](#footnote-4) is “a sum of money or total of assets devoted to a special purpose” but the rez doesn’t spec a purpose.

#### 3] of[[5]](#footnote-5) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time

#### Negate Additionally

#### 1] Paradox of tolerance- to be completely open to the aff we must exclude perspectives that wouldn’t be open to it which makes complete tolerance impossible.

#### 2] Decision Making Paradox- We need a decision-making procedure to enact the aff, but to choose a procedure requires another meta level decision-making procedure and so forth leading to infinite regress.

#### 3] Grain Paradox- One grain falling makes no sound, but a thousand grains make a sound. A thousand nothings cannot make something which means the physical world is paradoxical.

#### 4] Bonini’s Paradox- As a model of a complex system becomes more complete, it becomes less understandable and vice versa; therefore, no model can be useful.

#### 6] The rules of logic claim that the only time a statement is invalid is if the antecedent is true, but the consequent is false.

SEP [Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.] “An Introduction to Philosophy.” Stanford University. <https://web.stanford.edu/~bobonich/dictionary/dictionary.html> TG Massa

Conditional statement: an “if p, then q” compound statement (ex. If I throw this ball into the air, it will come down); p is called the antecedent, and q is the consequent. A conditional asserts that if its antecedent is true, its consequent is also true; any conditional with a true antecedent and a false consequent must be false.  For any other combination of true and false antecedents and consequents, the conditional statement is true.

#### If the neg is winning, they get the ballot is a tacit ballot conditional which means denying the premise proves the conclusion that I should get the ballot.

#### 7] Dogmatism Paradox – disregard the 1AR

Sorensen Sorensen, Roy, Professor of Philosophy at Washington University in St. Louis. "Epistemic Paradoxes.” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. 21 June 2006. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/epistemic-paradoxes/>. PeteZ

Saul Kripke’s ruminations on the surprise test paradox led him to a paradox about dogmatism. He lectured on both paradoxes at Cambridge University to the Moral Sciences Club in 1972. (A descendent of this lecture now appears as Kripke 2011). Gilbert Harman transmitted Kripke’s new paradox as follows:

If I know that h is true, I know that any evidence against h is evidence against something that is true; I know that such evidence is misleading. But I should disregard evidence that I know is misleading. So, once I know that h is true, I am in a position to disregard any future evidence that seems to tell against h. (1973, 148)

#### 8] Vote neg because it’s simple – evaluating responses to this is complicated so don’t

Baker 04’ [Baker, Alan, 10-29-2004, "Simplicity (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)," <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/simplicity/>]

With respect to question (ii), there is an important distinction to be made between two sorts of simplicity principle. Occam's Razor may be formulated as an epistemic principle: if theory T is simpler than theory T\*, then it is rational (other things being equal) to believe T rather than T\*. Or it may be formulated as a methodological principle: if T is simpler than T\* then it is rational to adopt T as one's working theory for scientific purposes. These two conceptions of Occam's Razor require different sorts of justification in answer to question (iii). In analyzing simplicity, it can be difficult to keep its two facets—elegance and parsimony—apart. Principles such as Occam's Razor are frequently stated in a way which is ambiguous between the two notions, for example, “Don't multiply postulations beyond necessity.” Here it is unclear whether ‘postulation’ refers to the entities being postulated, or the hypotheses which are doing the postulating, or both. The first reading corresponds to parsimony, the second to elegance. Examples of both sorts of simplicity principle can be found in the quotations given earlier in this section.

#### 9] Negate because either the aff is true meaning its bad for us to clash w/ it because it turns us into Fake News people OR it’s not meaning it’s a lie that you can’t vote on for ethics

#### 10] There are infinite worlds, the neg is logical in one which is sufficient.

**Vaidman 2** Vaidman, Lev, 3-24-2002, "Many-Worlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)," No Publication, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/qm-manyworlds/>

-MWI: Multiple Worlds Interpretation

**The reason for adopting the MWI is that it avoids the collapse of the quantum wave.** (Other non-collapse theories are not better than MWI for various reasons, e.g., nonlocality of Bohmian mechanics; and the disadvantage of all of them is that they have some additional structure.) **The collapse postulate is a physical law that differs from all known physics in two aspects: it is genuinely random and it involves some kind of action at a distance**. According to the collapse postulate the outcome of a **quantum experiment is not determined by the initial conditions** of the Universe prior to the experiment: **only the probabilities are governed by the initial state**. Moreover, Bell 1964 has shown that there cannot be a compatible local-variables theory that will make deterministic predictions**. There is no experimental evidence in favor of collapse and against the MWI.**

#### 11] Liar’s Paradox – the resolution is always false

**Camus** [Albert Camus (existentialist). “The Myth of Sisyphus.” Penguin Books. 1975(originally published 1942). Accessed 12/11/19. Pg 22. Copy on hand. Houston Memorial DX]

The mind’s first step is to distinguish what is true from what is false. However, as soon as thought reflects on itself, what it first discovers is a contradiction. Useless to strive to be convincing in this case. Over the centuries no one has furnished a clearer and more elegant demonstration of the business than Aristotle: “The often ridiculed consequence of these opinions is that they destroy themselves. For by asserting that all is true we assert the truth of the contrary assertion and consequently the falsity of our own thesis (for the contrary assertion does not admit that it can be true). And if one says that all is false, that assertion is itself false. If we declare that solely the assertion opposed to ours is false or else that solely ours is not false, we are nevertheless forced to admit an infinite number of true or false judgments. For the one who expresses a true assertion proclaims simultaneously that it is true, and so on ad infinitum.”

### 7

#### The meta-ethic is procedural moral realism.

#### This entails that moral facts stem from procedures while substantive realism holds that moral truths exist independently of that in the empirical world. Prefer-

#### Collapses – the only way to verify whether something is a moral fact is by using procedures to warrant it.

#### Practical Reason is that procedure. To ask for why we should be reasoners concedes its authority since it uses reason

#### Interpretation: Affirmative teams must not read new offense in the 1AR related to a new FW, recontextualize or weigh aff arguments under a different FW, or turn the 1nc FW.

#### 1] Phil Clash and Time Skew- anything else allows them to concede all our framework interactions and just go for 4 minutes of turns against our NC

#### 2] Skew- They have an inherent advantage on the contention debate since they get 2ar spin so they can easily sway judge psychology in contention debates that don’t err towards one side but planks solve all their offense.

#### 3] Depth o/w Breadth- prevents the debate from being split over two issues i.e. the framework and substance which outweighs since in depth testing is necessary to refine ideas while vague debates result in inept clash.

#### Moral law must be universal—our judgements can’t only apply to ourselves any more than 2+2=4 can be true only for me

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative.

#### Prefer –

#### [1] Performativity—freedom is the key to the process of justification of arguments. Willing that we should abide by their ethical theory presupposes that we own ourselves in the first place.

#### Offense

#### 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.

### Case

#### Reject 1AR theory and voting issues- A] 7-6 time skew means it’s endlessly aff biased B] I don’t have a 3nr which allows for endless extrapolation C] 1AR theory is skewed to the aff because they have a 2ar judge psychology warrant.

#### Infinite abuse claims are wrong- A] Spikes solve-you can just preempt paradigms in the 1AC B] Functional limits- 1nc is only 7 minutes long

#### 1NC theory first - 1] Abuse was self-inflicted- They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] Norming- We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea since the shell was read earlier. Norming outweighs A] Constutivism- It’s the constitutive purpose of theory debating B] Sequencing- it’s a pre-requisite to actualizing any other voter like fairness or education 3] It was introduced first so it comes lexically prior 4] All the reasons why 1AR theory is skewed towards the aff should be evaluated as a reason why 1NC theory comes first and is the highest layer because I can’t engage in substance otherwise.

#### Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is very aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to– reasonability checks 2AR sandbagging by preventing really abusive 1NCs while still giving the 2N a chance.

#### DTA on 1AR shells - They can blow up a blippy 20 second shell to 3 min of the 2AR while I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention and means 1AR theory is irresolvable so you shouldn’t stake the round on it.

#### RVIs on 1AR theory – 1AR being able to spend 20 seconds on a shell and still win forces the 2N to allocate at least 2:30 on the shell which means RVIs check back time skew – ows on quantifiability

#### No new 1ar theory paradigm issues- A] the 1NC has already occurred with current paradigm issues in mind so new 1ar paradigms moot any theoretical offense B] introducing them in the aff allows for them to be more rigorously tested which o/w’s on time frame since we can set higher quality norms.

#### Evaluate 1AR Voting issues after the 2NR- It’s key to reciprocity since it means we both get 1 speech each instead of them getting a 2ar to blow them up

#### Their warrants for RVIs are silly- timeskew is taken out by a 7-6 rebuttal skew and 2ar persuasion, reciprocity makes no sense because T is a form of theory.

#### Don’t give them new weighing- 2ar persuasion means judges hack because they don’t want to evaluate a messy theory debate and 1ar theory is not the highest layer because 1nc abuse is reactive to 1ac abuse.

### Hobbes

#### I’ll answer p and p stuff here

#### 1] on the hidden thing- permissibility isn’t always aff ground because it could be ur fwk that triggers it

#### 2] We don’t default true- only very few things like your name

#### 3] that’s better than to presume horrible things are good

#### 4] lack of aff offense means you default to the squo

#### 5] If it’s not permissible to do P then you negate- this argument is incoherent because it could apply both ways and you can just c/a all the arguments we made

#### 6] shah 19 doesn’t mean judges should hack in round to allieviate biases- that would kill fairness and discourage people from doing debate.

#### Opacity is wrong- people can communicate orally, and through written mediums

#### Baillie does not warrant Hobbes- we can still use a Kantian fw and altruism also exists

#### This Ripstein ev has no warrant- it’s just the liar’s paradox which negates and I’m literally talking without any sovereign over me which disproves this.

#### Polzer and wright is just a poll about how objective people think statements are but opinions don’t determine truth

#### Irresolvability is empirically denied- we’ve come to consensus before

#### Rule following is possible under Kant as well- also empirically proven by govt’s without a sovereign in the squo.

#### State of nature stuff is independently consequentialist because you’re looking at the outcomes of people without a sovereign.

#### Don’t need to answer a bunch of this

#### You are conflating the judge’s moral power and the moral power of a sovereign in the context of a resolution

#### Understanding social contracts does not mean we have to use Hobbes

#### Kant is also a phil fw takes that out

Kant is ideal theory
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