## Prag (Norms)

#### The Meta-Ethic is Moral Pluralism; Clashing viewpoints does not require the

#### exclusion of one over another but instead the acceptance that both can be valuable ethical tools. Prefer

#### 1] There are infinite worlds, the aff 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.**

#### 2] Dogmatism Paradox

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)

#### Negative arguments presuppose the aff being true since they begin with a descriptive premise about the affirmative such as the aff does x, and then justify why x is bad. However, if the aff does not have truth value, that entails the descriptive premise would also not have truth value, which is contradictory.

#### 3] Empirics- Quantum superposition proves different ethics can exist simultaneously.

MIT ’19 (Emerging Technology from the arXiv archive page; Covers latest ideas from blog post about arXiv; 03/12/2019; “Emerging Technology from the arXiv archive page”; <https://www.technologyreview.com/2019/03/12/136684/a-quantum-experiment-suggests-theres-no-such-thing-as-objective-reality/>; *MIT Technology Review*; accessed: 11/19/2020; MohulA)

Back in 1961, the Nobel Prize–winning physicist Eugene Wigner outlined a thought experiment that demonstrated one of the lesser-known paradoxes of quantum mechanics. The experiment shows how the strange nature of the universe allows two observers—say, Wigner and Wigner’s friend—to experience different realities. Since then, physicists have used the “Wigner’s Friend” thought experiment to explore the nature of measurement and to argue over whether objective facts can exist. That’s important because scientists carry out experiments to establish objective facts. But if they experience different realities, the argument goes, how can they agree on what these facts might be? That’s provided some entertaining fodder for after-dinner conversation, but Wigner’s thought experiment has never been more than that—just a thought experiment. Last year, however, physicists noticed that recent advances in quantum technologies have made it possible to reproduce the Wigner’s Friend test in a real experiment. In other words, it ought to be possible to create different realities and compare them in the lab to find out whether they can be reconciled. And today, Massimiliano Proietti at Heriot-Watt University in Edinburgh and a few colleagues say they have performed this experiment for the first time: they have created different realities and compared them. Their conclusion is that Wigner was correct—these realities can be made irreconcilable so that it is impossible to agree on objective facts about an experiment. Wigner’s original thought experiment is straightforward in principle. It begins with a single polarized photon that, when measured, can have either a horizontal polarization or a vertical polarization. But before the measurement, according to the laws of quantum mechanics, the photon exists in both polarization states at the same time—a so-called superposition. Wigner imagined a friend in a different lab measuring the state of this photon and storing the result, while Wigner observed from afar. Wigner has no information about his friend’s measurement and so is forced to assume that the photon and the measurement of it are in a superposition of all possible outcomes of the experiment. Wigner can even perform an experiment to determine whether this superposition exists or not. This is a kind of interference experiment showing that the photon and the measurement are indeed in a superposition. From Wigner’s point of view, this is a “fact”—the superposition exists. And this fact suggests that a measurement cannot have taken place. But this is in stark contrast to the point of view of the friend, who has indeed measured the photon’s polarization and recorded it. The friend can even call Wigner and say the measurement has been done (provided the outcome is not revealed). So the two realities are at odds with each other. “This calls into question the objective status of the facts established by the two observers,” say Proietti and co. That’s the theory, but last year Caslav Brukner, at the University of Vienna in Austria, came up with a way to re-create the Wigner’s Friend experiment in the lab by means of techniques involving the entanglement of many particles at the same time. The breakthrough that Proietti and co have made is to carry this out. “In a state-of-the-art 6-photon experiment, we realize this extended Wigner’s friend scenario,” they say. They use these six entangled photons to create two alternate realities—one representing Wigner and one representing Wigner’s friend. Wigner’s friend measures the polarization of a photon and stores the result. Wigner then performs an interference measurement to determine if the measurement and the photon are in a superposition. The experiment produces an unambiguous result. It turns out that both realities can coexist even though they produce irreconcilable outcomes, just as Wigner predicted. That raises some fascinating questions that are forcing physicists to reconsider the nature of reality. The idea that observers can ultimately reconcile their measurements of some kind of fundamental reality is based on several assumptions. The first is that universal facts actually exist and that observers can agree on them. But there are other assumptions too. One is that observers have the freedom to make whatever observations they want. And another is that the choices one observer makes do not influence the choices other observers make—an assumption that physicists call locality. If there is an objective reality that everyone can agree on, then these assumptions all hold. But Proietti and co’s result suggests that objective reality does not exist. In other words, the experiment suggests that one or more of the assumptions—the idea that there is a reality we can agree on, the idea that we have freedom of choice, or the idea of locality—must be wrong. Of course, there is another way out for those hanging on to the conventional view of reality. This is that there is some other loophole that the experimenters have overlooked. Indeed, physicists have tried to close loopholes in similar experiments for years, although they concede that it may never be possible to close them all. Nevertheless, the work has important implications for the work of scientists. “The scientific method relies on facts, established through repeated measurements and agreed upon universally, independently of who observed them,” say Proietti and co. And yet in the same paper, they undermine this idea, perhaps fatally. The next step is to go further: to construct experiments creating increasingly bizarre alternate realities that cannot be reconciled. Where this will take us is anybody’s guess. But Wigner, and his friend, would surely not be surprised.

#### 4] Affirm because either the neg 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

#### 5] Decision Making Paradox- in order to judge we need a decision-making procedure to determine it is a good decision. But to chose a decision-making procedure requires another meta level decision making procedure leading to infinite regress so just vote aff to break the paradox.

#### 6] Liar’s Paradox – the resolution is always true

**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.”

#### **Only an agonistic deliberative model accepts ongoing confrontation as legitimate rather than oppositional.** Thus, the standard is promoting agonistic deliberation.

#### 7] GCB- I am the greatest conceivable being so vote for me because I am infinitely good. To prove this, I will make them contest the aff and say they are not under my control. This means disobeying me would be infinitely bad and I am saying to vote affirmative.

#### Negating affirms because it assumes that the 1ac is a statement that is worthy of contestation which means are arguments are legitimate.

#### Additionally prefer

#### 1] Performativity- Responding to our framework concedes the validity of agonism since that in and of itself is a process of contestation that agonism would say is valuable and necessary for spaces like debate to function.

#### 2] TJFS-

#### A] Inclusion – Agonism definitionally is a procedural for allowing almost any argumentation in the debate space which controls the internal link to inclusion which is an impact multiplier

#### B] Resource Disparities- Discursive frameworks ensure big squads don’t have a comparative advantage since debates become about quality of arguments rather than quantity and require a higher level of analytic thinking that small schools have.

#### 3] Rule Following Paradox- There is nothing inherent to a rule that tells us how we ought to follow it, regardless of how correct the rule is. Only deliberation accounts for the diversity of interpretations of our norms.

#### **4]** Resolves Skepticism-

#### a) Discussion between many bodies means that moral uncertainty can be deliberated and resolved.

#### b) Truth only makes sense in groups of people so only they can prescribe action

#### If I win any argument on the flow that consists of a claim and warrant vote aff, time crunched 1AR can’t sit on multiple arguments because the 6 minute 2nr will always outspread us, singular claims and warrant’s key to reciprocal engagement and clash.

#### Vote aff to endorse San Mateo’s debate team, we’re way too small and me breaking would facilitate more kids to join which allows smaller schools to get involved in debate which ow on longevity bc its an impact that preserves the activity as a whole.

### 1AC – Offense

#### The negative and I affirm the resolution Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust. CX checks all spec interps.

#### Resolved is defined as[[1]](#footnote-1) firm in purpose or intent; determined and I’m determined.

#### Affirm means to express agreement[[2]](#footnote-2) and you already know I do.

#### 1] The appropriation of space by private entities isn’t value neutral but is sutured in a discourse of the cosmic elite and unequal IR.

Stockwell 20 [Samuel Stockwell (Research Project Manager, the Annenberg Institute at Brown University). “Legal ‘Black Holes’ in Outer Space: The Regulation of Private Space Companies”. E-International Relations. Jul 20 2020. Accessed 12/7/21. <https://www.e-ir.info/2020/07/20/legal-black-holes-in-outer-space-the-regulation-of-private-space-companies/> //Xu]

The US government’s support for private space companies is also likely to lead to the reinforcement of Earth-bound wealth inequalities in space. Many NewSpace actors frame their long-term ambitions in space with strong anthropogenic undertones, by offering the salvation of the human race from impending extinction through off-world colonial developments (Kearnes & Dooren: 2017: 182). Yet, this type of discourse disguises the highly exclusive nature of these missions. Whilst they seem to suggest that there is a stake for ordinary citizens in the vast space frontier, the reality is that these self-described space pioneers are a member of a narrow ‘cosmic elite’ – “founders of Amazon.com, Microsoft, Pay Pal… and a smattering of games designers and hotel magnates” (Parker, 2009: 91). Indeed, private space enterprises have themselves suggested that they have no obligation to share mineral resources extracted in space with the global community (Klinger, 2017: 208). This is reflected in the speeches of individuals such as Nathan Ingraham, a senior editor at the tech site EngadAsteroid mining, who claimed that asteroid mining was “how [America is] going to move into space and develop the next Vegas Strip” (Shaer, 2016: 50). Such comments highlight a form of what Beery (2016) defines as ‘scalar politics’. In similar ways to the ‘scaling’ of unequal international relations that has constituted our relationship with outer space under the guise of the ‘global commons’ (Beery, 2016: 99), private companies – through their anthropogenic discourse – are scaling existing Earth-bound wealth inequalities and social relations into space by siphoning off extra-terrestrial resources. By constructing their endeavours in ways that appeal to the common good, NewSpace actors are therefore concealing the reality of how commercial resource extraction serves the exclusive interests of their private shareholders at the expense of the vast majority of the global population.

#### 2] Appropriation intrinsically guts deliberative procedures since it denies the owner’s permission for property rights, blocking one possible experience/form of communication from other groups since it guts communal approaches

Oxford. Lexico. Appropriation. https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/appropriation

the action of taking something for one's own use, typically without the owner's permission.

#### Neg a priori’s affirm – denying the assumptions of a statement proves it valid – the aff is a set of conditionals since the offense being true relies on the framework. if the aff 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. Aff apriori’s outweigh, prove the

#### Inserting definitions

#### The

Lexico. Oxford Dictionary. The. <https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/the>

Used to refer to a person, place, or thing that is unique.

#### Of

Lexico. Oxford Dictionary. Of. https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/of

6Following a noun derived from or related to a verb. 6.1Followed by a noun expressing the subject of the verb underlying the first noun. ‘the arrival of the police’

#### Outer space

Lexico. Oxford Dictionary. Outer Space. https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/outer\_space

The physical universe beyond the earth's atmosphere.

#### By

Lexico. Oxford Dictionary. By. https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/by

Identifying the agent performing an action.

#### Private entities

Law Insider. Private entity definition. <https://www.lawinsider.com/dictionary/private-entity>

Private entity means any natural person, corporation, general partnership, limited liability company, limited partnership, joint venture, business trust, public benefit corporation, nonprofit entity, or other business entity.

#### Is

Merriam Webster. Is. Definition of Is. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/is>

present tense third-person singular of BE dialectal present tense first-person and third-person singular of BE dialectal present tense plural of BE

#### Unjust

Lexico. Oxford Dictionary. Unjust. https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/just

not based on or behaving according to what is morally right and fair.

### 1AC – UV

#### Treat each theoretical argument as drop the debater – they have the ability to meet them but chose not to and its key to normset

#### 1] 1AR theory is legit – anything else means infinite incentivized NC abuse– drop the debater 1AR is too short to make up for the time trade-off for drop the argument, competing interps, 2NR reasonability dumps are devastating–– no RVIs or 2NR theory paradigm issues– 6 min 2NRs brute force the 1ar prevents checking abuse. Eval 1AR theory debate as the 1AR timer ends, prevents the 2NR from dumping on 1ar abuse stories for 5 minutes, which deters checking abusive debaters.

#### 2] No 2NR “I meet” arguments, skews time, anything else incentivizes 50 blippy I meets which can’t be covered in 3 min, also means reject 2NR procedural paradigm issue dumps since the 2AR would sift through

#### 3] No new 2n arguments, weighing, and paradigm issues. a) overloads the 2AR with a massive clarification burden b) it becomes impossible to check NC abuse if you can dump paradigm issues for 5 min

#### 4] Check all neg interps in CX –

#### 1) avoids infinite regress due to links and interps

#### 2) norms – you’d do the same with TFW for a violation

#### 5] No neg OCIs

#### a) you can up-layer spikes for 7 minutes that I have to answer before I even have access to theory offense, also means they only get one unconditional route to the ballot

#### b) inf neg abuse since you would just read 7 mins of auto-negate arguments, so just auto affirm

#### 6] No neg meta theory –NC and 2N outweighs singular 1AR, up-layering ac theory means we never get to the best norm. Reject any reason why an aff spike is bad since they claim aff theory is unfair, that’s structurally wrong. Reject reasons why neg theory should come first if they are structurally ahead. No grouping arguments by their warrants, leads to less contextual theory norm interpretations and devolve to aff/neg is harder debates

#### 7] No overview arguments to aff arguments – they can up-layer all aff arguments for 7 minutes while the 1ar doesn’t have that strategic option because 1NCs are varied, so just evaluate the debate as the 1AC ends.

#### 8] Aff theory first – proportionally outweighs, it’s a much larger strategic loss because 1min is ¼ of the 1AR vs 1/7 of the 1N which means there’s more abuse, every reason affirming is harder is a reason to only evaluate aff theory since negs shouldn’t get another layer

#### 9] Affirming is harder –

#### 1] predictability, affs are in the dark to the reactive NC,

#### 2] larger rebuttal times that uplayer the short 1ar/2ar,

#### 3] NC reactivity means they can uplayer and restart the round

#### 4] Ground, they have access to more positions due to generic backfiles and bidirectional shells.

#### Presumption and permissibility affirm since if we’re equal on the flow, I debated better. Theoretical warrants outweigh – more predictable since they depend on the structure of LD.

#### No neg weighing they exacerbate existing skews.

#### No neg args – aff autowins help spread the message that affirming is unfair so people will change LD rules to be more structurally fair

#### 10] Allow new 2ar responses to nc arguments but not new 2n responses

#### a) reciprocity - the NC has 7 minutes of rebuttal time while I only have 4 minutes, the 2ar makes it 7-7.

#### b) Time skew – the 2n can overload the aff with args and makes the 2a impossible – so don’t eval the 2NR

#### 11] Reject 1NC answers to our theory spikes since they would moot 6 minutes of theory offense, negatives must answer every warrant in the underview instead of reasons our norms are bad, otherwise they functionally concede a theory shell

#### 12] Theory or K indicts on spikes is drop the arg a] my theory paradigms are simply presented models for debate b] its key to reciprocity since one line shouldn’t warrant the death penalty

#### 13] All neg interps are counter interps since the aff takes an implicit stance on every issue which means you need an rvi to become offensive. You should accept all aff interps and assume I meet neg theory since the aff speaks in the dark and I have to take a stance on something, you can at least react and adapt.

#### 14] Neg theory functions under reasonability with a brightline of whole res : A) otherwise the aff always justifies a violation, leading to infinite abuse B) the neg can pick the weakest part of the AC and collapse to 6mins on risk of offense. The resolution is the only thing the aff knows before my first speech, so I o/w on predictability. And, Evaluate neg shells under text of the interp as the 6 minute 2n allows the neg to always avoid I-meets with by collapsing to spirit of the interp and recontextualizing the shell, leading to infinite abuse.

#### 15] If I win one layer, vote aff

#### a) they have 7 minutes to uplayer and nullify my offense

#### b) forces engagement with the aff since they have to defend all arguments which means they read better ones.

#### 16] Accept aff interps and definitions a) causes regress since we can infinitely debate what something means but the aff speaks first which means they should define it

#### b) moots 6 mins of the aff if you alter our basis for argumentation

#### 17] No neg procedural dumps, justifies them reading 2 minutes of layering analytics without substantively engaging in abuse stories which is uniquely bad because they could dump in the long 6 min 2NR.

#### 18] Reject no 1AR theory hedges, short 4 minute 1AR needs to get through a giant dump of blippy analytics to call out abuse greenlighting abusive strategies, not bidirectional since 1N can always straight ref in 7 min

#### 19] Every 1NC answer must have an explicit counterinerp text for each theory spike, can’t just answer with defense, they have to have a counter norm on each analytic, its incentivizes people to defend counter-interps which creates nuanced engagement

#### 20] No new 2NR responses to any of our AC spikes, incentivizes lazy 1NC debating that gets away with reinventing the wheel in the 2NR after a 1AR strategic pivot which OW on reversibility since new 2AR extrapolations are uncomfortable to vote on. Spikes on bottom are better we get through substance debate faster and we signal UV at the top.

#### 21] Reject combo shells, 1] we won’t ever see the combination of their abuse story so no norming,

#### 2] we get better theoretical testing into which combination of norms are incoherent and can come to conclusions better

#### 22] No NC violations or theory, bidirectional shells makes neg shells impossible to meet, which means give infinite 1ar flex

#### 23] Negatives can’t trigger permissibility or presumption on aff spikes, creates repetitive and stale debates where the same 4 arguments are 13 minutes of speech time

#### 24] If the negative reads a framework with offense then they must provide 1AR offense to straight ref, key to predictability and clash, no you violate args, 1NCs have reactivity and the aff was disclosed, which means you should be ready to debate

1. http://www.dictionary.com/browse/resolved [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. http://www.dictionary.com/browse/affirm [↑](#footnote-ref-2)