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### 1st off

#### Equality via rationality and self-ownership implies autonomy, thus, the standard is consistency with a system of self-ownership. Feser ND

Edward Feser (Pasadena City College), xx-xx-xxxx, "Nozick, Robert," Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, <https://iep.utm.edu/nozick/>, //hzheng

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.

#### Prefer: performativity – debating my framework presumes that you own yourself to argue which concedes the validity of my framework, also means it’s inescapable because escaping it entails contradiction

#### Negate – this implies justice justifies acquisition of outer space because it doesn’t interfere with anyone. Murray ND

* Justice is built on autonomy – if people are not coerced, they can do whatever they want
* Murray contextualizes this to property acquisition (which can be applied to space) – going to space and acquiring property there is okay so long as it does not involve theft, coercion, or fraud

Dale Murray (University of Wisconsin), xx-xx-xxxx, "Nozick, Robert: Political Philosophy," Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, <https://iep.utm.edu/noz-poli/>, //hzheng

The Three Principles of Justice Nozick argued that there are three principles of just distribution. These principles make up the basic framework of his entitlement theory. The first is the principle of just acquisition. Under this principle, individuals may acquire any property they wish just so long as it is previously unowned and is not taken by theft, coercion or fraud. The second is the principle of just transfer whereby property may be exchanged just so long as the transfer is not executed (again) by theft, force or fraud. These two principles constitute the legitimate means of acquiring and transferring goods. All valid transactions come from repeated actions on these two principles. While Nozick did not explicitly define what is now known as his third principle, he described its function. This third principle – just rectification – works, as the name suggests, to rectify violations of the first two principles. What actions on these three principles reflect is what Nozick calls a “historical” theory of justice. He thought there was no way, simply by looking at the patterns of distribution that we could tell whether or not these distributions of goods are just. Nozick emphasized that we have to know exactly how the distribution came about. If somewhere in the chain of transactions theft, coercion or fraud occurred, then we could safely say that the property involved is unjustly held. The three principles of just distribution thereby regulate proper property acquisition and exchange.

### 2nd Off

#### Interpretation: The aff may not defend implementation.

#### “Is” is defined as:

Merriam Webster, No Date, "Definition of IS," Merriam Webster, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/is

present tense third-person singular of BE

#### Merriam-Webster ND

#### “Be” is defined as:

Merriam Webster, No Date, "Definition of BE," Merriam Webster, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/be

to have a specified qualification or characterization

#### Merriam-Webster ND

#### Is-ought fallacy – “is” is descriptive, not prescriptive. Cohon 18

Rachel Cohon (Her fields of interest are ethics, the philosophy of action, and the history of ethics. She is the author of Hume's Morality: Feeling and Fabrication (Oxford University Press, 2008), a book reinterpreting Hume's meta-ethics and virtue ethics. She has also written a number of articles on Hume's moral and political philosophy and theory of the passions, and on systematic topics related to normative reasons for action. She edited a volume of articles on Hume's ethics, Hume: Moral and Political Philosophy (2001), and wrote the entry on Hume's moral and political philosophy in the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. She is also interested in applied ethics and wrote the article on ethical issues pertaining to disability for the Encyclopedia of Bioethics (2003). She teaches graduate courses in moral theory, including such topics as consequentialism vs. deontology vs. virtue ethics, moral realism, the normativity of ethics, and eighteenth century moral philosophy), 8-20-2018, "Hume's Moral Philosophy (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy/Fall 2018 Edition)," Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosphy, <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2018/entries/hume-moral/>, //hzheng

Hume famously closes the section of the Treatise that argues against moral rationalism by observing that other systems of moral philosophy, proceeding in the ordinary way of reasoning, at some point make an unremarked transition from premises whose parts are linked only by “is” to conclusions whose parts are linked by “ought” (expressing a new relation) — a deduction that seems to Hume “altogether inconceivable” (T3.1.1.27). Attention to this transition would “subvert all the vulgar systems of morality, and let us see, that the distinction of vice and virtue is not founded merely on the relations of objects, nor is perceiv’d by reason” (ibid.). Few passages in Hume’s work have generated more interpretive controversy. According to the dominant twentieth-century interpretation, Hume says here that no ought-judgment may be correctly inferred from a set of premises expressed only in terms of ‘is,’ and the vulgar systems of morality commit this logical fallacy. This is usually thought to mean something much more general: that no ethical or indeed evaluative conclusion whatsoever may be validly inferred from any set of purely factual premises. A number of present-day philosophers, including R. M. Hare, endorse this putative thesis of logic, calling it “Hume’s Law.” (As Francis Snare observes, on this reading Hume must simply assume that no purely factual propositions are themselves evaluative, as he does not argue for this.) Some interpreters think Hume commits himself here to a non-propositional or noncognitivist view of moral judgment — the view that moral judgments do not state facts and are not truth-evaluable. (If Hume has already used the famous argument about the motivational influence of morals to establish noncognitivism, then the is/ought paragraph may merely draw out a trivial consequence of it. If moral evaluations are merely expressions of feeling without propositional content, then of course they cannot be inferred from any propositional premises.) Some see the paragraph as denying ethical realism, excluding values from the domain of facts. Other interpreters — the more cognitivist ones — see the paragraph about ‘is’ and ‘ought’ as doing none of the above. Some read it as simply providing further support for Hume’s extensive argument that moral properties are not discernible by demonstrative reason, leaving open whether ethical evaluations may be conclusions of cogent probable arguments. Others interpret it as making a point about the original discovery of virtue and vice, which must involve the use of sentiment. On this view, one cannot make the initial discovery of moral properties by inference from nonmoral premises using reason alone; rather, one requires some input from sentiment. It is not simply by reasoning from the abstract and causal relations one has discovered that one comes to have the ideas of virtue and vice; one must respond to such information with feelings of approval and disapproval. Note that on this reading it is compatible with the is/ought paragraph that once a person has the moral concepts as the result of prior experience of the moral sentiments, he or she may reach some particular moral conclusions by inference from causal, factual premises (stated in terms of ‘is’) about the effects of character traits on the sentiments of observers. They point out that Hume himself makes such inferences frequently in his writings.

#### Violation: They defend implementation

#### Standards:

#### 1] Phil Ed – not defending implementation forces them to study abstract relations of justice rather than only util

#### 2] Strategy – forces the 1NC to adapt and read non-LARP arguments – thinking on your feet is good because it forces argument generation which is more adaptable and portable than reciting facts

#### Voters:

#### 1] Phil Ed is a voter – it’s the only type of education we get specifically from LD which outweighs on specifity and portability

#### 2] Semantics are a voter

#### A] Truth claims have lexical priority – it doesn’t matter if something is more fair or educational if it’s not the debate we’re supposed to be having

#### B] We hijack fairness first – semantics determine stable ground for the res which means it’s the most predictable

#### C] Performativity – rejecting semantics requires using semantical speech

#### Drop the debater – otherwise aff can shift out of their plan text and aff condo is incoherent because the neg reacts to a stable anchoring point

#### No RVIs

#### A] Logic – you shouldn’t win for proving you’re fair

#### B] Baiting – people will bait theory to win the RVI

#### Competing Interps over Reasonability – reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention which moots the point of debating, and reasonability with a brightline collapses to CI because we debate about what brightline is the best

### 3rd Off

#### NASA’s stuck in low orbit but the space race lets it extend further. Julie 12-9

Alyssa Julie, 12-9-2021, "How the private space race is allowing NASA to explore new frontiers ," Global News, <https://globalnews.ca/news/8408558/how-the-private-space-race-is-allowing-nasa-to-explore-new-frontiers/>, //hzheng

In February, NASA will launch the first un-crewed test flight of its Orion spacecraft and SLS rocket as it prepares to send astronauts back to the moon. Artemis I is the first in a series of increasingly complex missions to take place over the next few years. It will be followed by a second crewed test flight and a third flight that will land astronauts on the moon’s south-pole. NASA expects that will be in 2025, at the earliest. The agency says partnerships with private companies like SpaceX will build the lunar lander to ferry astronauts to the moon’s surface, making the Artemis program possible. The private space race has allowed NASA, and agencies like it, to turn their attention from Earth’s lower orbit and start planning for future missions, like Artemis. And as the agency plans to send astronauts to new frontiers, it is encouraging private industry to establish a greater presence in lower-Earth orbit — by collaborating with the private sector on a new space station. The International Space Station is now more than 20 years old, approved for use until 2024, with a likely extension only until the end of 2028 or 2030. NASA’s office of audits released a report at the start of December detailing the “costly repairs” to the orbiting laboratory that have been needed over time. It said maintenance and system upgrades to the ISS increased to approximately $169 billion in 2020. On Dec. 3, NASA announced three U.S. Companies that would receive over $400 million in government funding to develop commercial space stations — Jeff Bezos’ Blue Origin, Nanoracks and Northrop Grumman. Misty Snopkowski, Program Executive for the commercial LEO development program at NASA, says commercial stations, like the one’s these three companies are developing, will help the agency travel deeper into space. “We’re trying to go deeper into space and we can give this very well understood environment in LEO to commercial entities — for them to start establishing that LEO economy,” she says, adding that instead of owner and operator of a new space station, NASA would be one of many customers using the orbiting laboratory. With less of its funding tied up in the International Space Station, the agency will be free to throw more cash at deep space exploration, Snopkowski says. But there is still research that needs to be done in order to make these frontier missions possible. She says the agency has approximately 200 long-term experiments, most of which study the impact of space travel on the human body. The agency needs that work to continue after the International Space Station is decommissioned. “Those types of research, human research, [have] long lead times,” she explains. Such research not only helps further NASA’s ambitions in space, it is also helps us tackle big challenges on Earth, says York University astrophysicist Jesse Rogerson. “Going to the moon and going to Mars is going to push our understanding of how to do agriculture,” he says, as an example of how research in space can help us improve conditions on Earth. “Because we can’t do a permanent settlement on the moon or Mars without ‘living off the land.’ So pushing that science to the very edge so that we can grow something on Mars would inevitably help us do better on Earth.” Canadian astronaut Jeremy Hansen, who acts as CAPCOM at the Canadian Space Agency while he awaits his first flight assignment, says his agency is also involved in discussions about a future commercial space station. In addition to freeing-up funding for future deep space travel, he says such a partnership could reveal new ways to save money on research. “The space agency, we expect, will always be doing research in orbit. But the model on how we do that could change, could create more opportunities and could allow us to do more for less money,” he says. Hansen adds that collaborating with private industry will create more opportunities for astronauts to explore space, a boon for the Canadian Space Agency, whose astronauts have had to wait years to go to space as they wait for a seat to open on a mission. One upcoming mission Canada is taking part in will be Artemis II, the crewed test of the Orion spacecraft that will eventually transport astronauts to the moon. The private space race will also create more opportunities for scientists and astronomers hoping to conduct research in space, Rogerson adds.

#### We need to get off the rock – diversification ensures isolated populations prevent extinction and bolsters tech that mitigates existential threats. Reuter 12-9

Timothy Reuter (Head of Aerospace and Drones, World Economic Forum), 12-9-2021, "Why the human race must become a multiplanetary species," World Economic Forum, <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2021/12/humans-multiplanetary-species/>, //hzheng

Supporters of space exploration sometimes suggest that sending robotic probes to the remote corners of the solar system and beyond can teach us what we need to know about the universe at less cost and risk than sending people. Yet, for the safety of our descendants and to reach humanity’s full potential, we must become a multiplanetary species. Humans have a one in six chance of going extinct this century according to Oxford Philosopher Toby Ord. In his book, The Precipice: Existential Risk and the Future of Humanity, Dr Ord lays out a variety of long-tail risks that are both existential and very difficult to mitigate. These include nature-based risks like asteroids, large-scale volcanic eruptions and stellar explosions. Although we can track many of these phenomena, we do not have the technology (nor are we likely to develop it anytime soon) to prevent large eruptions or redirect large asteroids. Initial efforts to nudge space objects are just beginning. This is to say nothing of the human-created risks of nuclear war or bioweapons intentionally or unintentionally released on the public, a scenario made easier to imagine by the current pandemic. As long as humanity is grouped together on a single planet there will always be a possibility that all of us can be killed at once. It is equivalent to having everyone in a single building: there is always a risk greater than zero of a collapse or fire that kills everyone. By establishing, at first, small outposts and eventually larger scale settlements on other planets, the risk of our species being destroyed is significantly curtailed. On a more positive note, human habitation in a greater variety of settings will radically expedite science and commerce. While we currently have small-scale experimentation with manufacturing items in micro and zero gravity on the International Space Station, the potential for us to set up large-scale industry in different physics requires us to have a presence on other celestial locations. Large-scale settlements of people are hubs of innovation and human flourishing. Just think of how many more discoveries and marvels could be created by 80 billion people in the future instead of today’s 8 billion. Our current planet has a limited carrying capacity but our solar system can accommodate many more people than any single planet can. Just as cultural and geographic variety contributes to the richness of our current society, further expanding the diversity of human settings would continue to expand the creativity of our species. Space travel itself has already been an incredible inspiration to numerous scientists, engineers and artists with many people citing seeing the moon landing as one of the most formative events of their lives. The technologies we develop on our way to becoming a multiplanetary species will also benefit us here on earth. Today, satellites are used to monitor carbon and other greenhouse gas emissions to give us a better picture of the causes of global warming and promote accountability. In her first speech devoted to space, US Vice-President Kalama Harris said: “I truly believe space activity is climate action.” In a recent report, the World Economic Forum's Global Future Council on Space laid out the many ways satellite data is being used to address climate change and suggests feeding data from space-based assets into an “Earth Operations Centre” to provide a real-time picture of activities and phenomena that contribute to warming. Less well known are the many other technologies developed on our way to space but used in our daily lives. The CMOS sensor was first invented at NASA’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory in the 1990s. No one could have predicted that this technology would eventually be part of all our phones, enabling high-quality digital images and affecting everything from how we document human rights abuses to how we present ourselves to potential mates on dating apps.

### 4th Off

#### Permissibility negates:

#### 1] In order to prove the truth of the resolution, the Aff must prove obligation bc ought implies obligation, not permissibility.

#### 2] If we prove it is permissible for the action, then it’s not obligatory so that still negates

#### 3] Their examples like drinking water are amoral actions and irrelevant to morality so you can ignore them.

#### Presumption negates:

#### 1] There are infinitely more ways to prove something false then true—so, epistemically the neg is more likely

#### 2] Presuming all statements are true creates contradictions which are ethically bankrupt.

#### 3] Presuming Neg doesn’t mean you presume the warrants for presumption are false—it means that if the Aff can’t prove a reason to depart from the status quo, you should negate.

#### 4] The burden is on the Aff to prove why x action ought to occur—if you don’t have a definitive reason, negate. Both in the scientific and philosophical communities, it is convention that the burden of proof is on the aff—if I say unicorns exist, I have to prove it or else you assume they don’t

#### 5] Telling someone your name is different from a resolution—it’s a simple point and answer question but a resolution takes time to figure the answer to—harm, inherency, and solvency are necessary to prove truth/falsity of a resolution, not just proving one little thing.

#### 6] We presume things false unless they are proven true- that’s why we don’t believe in baseless conspiracy theories