## 1

#### Interpretation: Debaters must not read theoretical justifications for their framework. To clarify, TJFs are bad

#### Violation: they read predictability and topic ed to justify their fw

#### [1]Phil-ed: kills phil ed by forcing a theory debate in framework when we are supposed to be learning about and debating philosophy. That’s an indepedant voter and controls the internal link to other voters because we need a concept of noramtivity to even care about fairness or education.

#### [2]Strat skew: TJFs force me to win on both theory and framework to win framework while you may only debate one, extending the other. Kills fairness since I have to engage on different layers with minimal time.

#### [3] Logic – theoertical justifications are bad bc regardless of whether or not the fw is philosopohically coherent tjfs ensure we apply illogical args for debates which kills education because its bad to learn about untrue things and fairness because disregarding rules of logic make it so that we’re unable to come up with argumentation – independently logic outweighs because it’s a litmus test for what counts as an argument in the first place

## 2

#### Permissibility and presumption negate – (a) the resolution indicates the aff has to prove an obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation (b) Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false. This means you negate if there is no offense because the resolution is probably false.

#### Morality must be grounded in a priori truth to guide action, otherwise everyone would have different ethical codes and follow different rules. And, truth exists independent of human experience since certain things can be self-proving, i.e. a triangle has three sides. This is the difference between a priori and a posteriori. Things that are true by observation are just true by a matter of chance. For example, the cat may be on the mat, but we can also conceive of a world in which the cat is not on the mat. In contrast, we can’t conceive of a world in which a triangle does not have three sides since it is tautologically true. Reject a posteriori truth since they are just arbitrary states of being, not constitutive of ethics.

#### Also:

#### [1] Uncertainty – our experiences are inaccessible to others which allows people to say they don’t experience the same, however a priori principles are universally applied to all agents.

#### [2] Bindingness – I can keep asking “why should I follow this” which results in relatvism since obligations are predicated on ignorantly accepting rules. Only reason solves since asking “why reason?” requires reason which concedes its authority and equally proves agency as constitutive.

#### And, a priori truth has to apply to everyone: (a) absent universal ethics, morality becomes arbitrary and fails to guide action, which means that ethics is rendered useless, (b) it’s a tautological contradiction any non-universal norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends, which also means universalizability acts as a side constraint on all other frameworks.

**Siyar 99** Jamsheed Aiam Siyar: Kant’s Conception of Practical Reason. Tufts University, 1999**:**

Now, **when I represent my end as to be done, I represent it as binding me to certain courses of action**, precluding other actions, etc. **Thus, my ends function as constraints for me in that they determine what I can** or must **do** (at least if I am to be consistent). I may of course give up an end such as that of eating ice cream at a future point; yet while I have the end, I must see myself as bound to do what is necessary to realize it.35 Thus, I must represent my ends as constraints that I have adopted, constraints that structure the possible space of choice and action for me. Further, given that my end is rationally determined, I take it to be generally recognizable that my end functions as a rationally determined constraint. That is, I take it that other subjects can also recognize my end as an objective constraint, for I take it that they as well as myself can cognize its determining grounds—the source of its objective worth—through the exercise of reason. Indeed, **in representing an end, I** in effect **demand recognition for it from other subjects: since the end functions as an objective though self-imposed constraint for me**, I must demand that this constraint be recognized as such. The thought here is simply that **if I am committed to some end,** e.g. my ice cream eating policy, I must act in certain ways to realize it. In this context, **I cannot be indifferent to the** attitudes and **actions of others, for these may either help or hinder my pursuit of my end. Hence, if I am** in fact **committed to realizing my end,** i.e. if I represent an end at all, **I must demand that the worth of my end**, its status as to be done, **be recognized by others.**

#### Freedom follows

#### [1] Its impossible to will a violation of freedom, since it necessarily entails a violation of your own freedom thus violating your will.

#### [2] We could not hold agents responsible for their actions if we did not assume them to have the freedom to control their actions for themselves.

**And the universality of freedom justifies a libertarian state.**

**OTTESON 9 brackets in original** James R. Otteson (professor of philosophy and economics at Yeshiva University) “Kantian Individualism and Political Libertarianism” The Independent Review, v. 13, n. 3, Winter 2009

In a crucial passage in Metaphysics of Morals, Kant writes that the “Universal Principle of Right” is **“‘[e]very action which by itself or by its maxim enables the freedom of each individual’s will to co-exist with the freedom of everyone else** in accordance with a universal law is right.’” He concludes, “Thus the universal law of right is as follows: let your external actions be such that the free application of your will can co-exist with the freedom of everyone in accordance with a universal law” (1991, 133, emphasis in original).5 This stipulation **becomes** for Kant **the grounding justification for the existence of a state**, its raison d’être, and **the reason we leave the state of nature is to secure this sphere of maximum freedom compatible with the same freedom of all others**. **Because this freedom must be complete**, in the sense of being **as full as possible** given the existence of other persons who demand similar freedom, it entails that **the state may**—indeed, must—**secure this condition** of freedom, **but undertake to do nothing else because any other** state **activities would compromise the very autonomy the state seeks to defend**. Kant’s position thus outlines and implies a political philosophy that is broadly libertarian; that is, it endorses a state constructed with the sole aim of protecting its citizens against invasions of their liberty. For Kant, **individuals create a state to protect their moral agency, and** in doing so **they consent to coercion only insofar as it is required to prevent themselves** or others **from impinging on** their own or **others’ agency**. In his argument, individuals cannot rationally consent to a state that instructs them in morals, coerces virtuous behavior, commands them to trade or not, directs their pursuit of happiness, or forcibly requires them to provide for their own or others’ pursuits of happiness. And except in cases of punishment for wrongdoing,6 this severe limitation on the scope of the state’s authority must always be respected: “The rights of man must be held sacred, however great a sacrifice the ruling power may have to make. There can be no half measures here; it is no use devising hybrid solutions such as a pragmatically conditioned right halfway between right and utility. For all politics must bend the knee before right, although politics may hope in return to arrive, however slowly, at a stage of lasting brilliance” (Perpetual Peace, 1991, 125). The implication is that a Kantian state protects against invasions of freedom and does nothing else; in the absence of invasions or threats of invasions, it is inactive.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with with a libertarian state of non-interference.

### Offense

#### I negate: resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

#### 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.

#### 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.

## Case

### debris

#### Debris removal projects happening now

Sean Ainley, 20 [Sean Ainley. “Looking to the Stars for the Silver Lining”. 4-8-2020. Astroscale. https://astroscale.com/looking-to-the-stars-for-the-silver-lining/. Accessed 7-25-2021] ab

The spread of COVID-19 has been a troubling welcome to the new decade. However, if there is a potential silver lining to recent events, it may be that this is a timely reminder of how as a species, we are all intrinsically linked. We breathe the same air, share the same ecosystem and inhabit the same fragile planet that is the one and only home to all known living creatures. The degree to which the spread of this virus has shaped our day-to-day lives perhaps highlights that, as humanity, we cannot take tomorrow for granted. A bright future is not a guarantee, but instead must be something that we strive for, by recognising the issues we collectively face, and putting in place the hard work and determination to do what is right for ourselves, those around us, and the generations yet to come. Astroscale was founded on the ideal of working to address an environmental issue which similarly has the potential to affect us all – the accumulation of human-made debris in our orbital environment. As we have become more reliant on satellites for nearly every aspect of our daily lives, the orbits in which these resources reside have become increasingly contaminated and dangerous. In the past, the technologies necessary for removing orbital debris either did not exist, were not adequately supported, or were prohibitively expensive to implement. Although those challenges still remain, the technologies are improving to the level where real and positive progress toward sustainability can be achieved. Furthermore, there is a collective recognition among government legislators and private business leaders that a shift in policy is essential to solve this problem. We are collectively reaching the point where we can, almost literally, reach toward the stars and take the steps necessary to pursue a sustainable tomorrow. Astroscale continues to firmly believe in this vision and has established teams across the globe to address this challenge. Our End-of-Life Services by Astroscale-demonstration (ELSA-d) mission, which is going through final testing in Japan, is on schedule to launch later this year. This will mark a huge first step forward, demonstrating unassisted rendezvous and docking of objects in space. In the UK, the Astroscale team has been working to evolve and further progress the technology from ELSA-d to develop commercially viable solutions to remove failed satellites and other orbital debris. Finally, Astroscale’s US office has been pursuing the solutions necessary to develop a market that can be a path to orbital environmental sustainability. Together, our global Astroscale teams are working collaboratively to solve the technical, policy and business challenges of debris removal, and moving society toward the global goal of responsible use of the orbital environment. Although the next few months will continue to offer uncertainty as we find solutions for this global pandemic, Astroscale believes that great endeavours can be achieved through the vision, hard work, and application of the same spirit that has moved humankind forward over past millennia. Let’s continue to look toward space as a silver lining during challenging times, and resolve to do what is necessary to build a brighter tomorrow, by taking the steps that we can, today.

#### **Space debris being solved now by magnets**

Katie Hunt 21 [Katie Hunt, Cnn. . “Mission to clean up space junk with magnets set for launch ”. 4-1-2021. CNN. [https://www.cnn.com/2021/03/19/business/space-junk-mission-astroscale-scn/index.html. Accessed 7-25-2021](https://www.cnn.com/2021/03/19/business/space-junk-mission-astroscale-scn/index.html.%20Accessed%207-25-2021)]

It's invisible in the night sky, but above us there is a cloud of more than 9,000 tons of space junk -- equivalent to the weight of 720 school buses. This debris is composed of parts of old satellites as well as entire defunct satellites and rocket bodies. The debris poses risks to the International Space Station and threatens things we take for granted on Earth -- weather forecasting, GPS and telecommunications. It's a problem that's getting worse with more and more satellites being launched each year by ventures like Elon Musk's SpaceX. A demonstration mission to test new technology developed by the company Astroscale to clean up space debris is set to launch in the early hours of Saturday from the Baikonur Cosmodrome in Kazakhstan. A Soyuz 2 rocket will launch a 175-kilogram spacecraft with a satellite attached into space. The spacecraft and the 17-kilogram satellite -- the debris to be cleaned up -- will separate and then perform a high-stakes game of cat and mouse over the next few months. Why we don&#39;t know exactly what happened during a near-collision in space Why we don't know exactly what happened during a near-collision in space Astroscale will test the spacecraft's ability to snatch a satellite and bring it down toward the Earth's atmosphere, where it will burn up. It will do this in a series of different maneuvers, with the mission expected to end in September or October of this year. As part of the mission, the company will test whether the spacecraft can catch and dock with the satellite as it tumbles through space at up to 17,500 miles per hour -- several times faster than the speed of a bullet. The tests rely on a magnetic docking plate to latch onto the satellite. Astroscale said it hopes all new satellites being launched will ultimately have this docking plate, allowing them to be safely removed at the end of their life span. What's more, Astroscale said it had already signed a deal with internet satellite company OneWeb. "Now is the time to take the threat of debris seriously by committing to debris removal programs and preparing satellites for future removal at their end of life," said John Auburn, managing director of Astroscale UK and group chief commercial officer. "Avoiding catastrophic collisions will help to protect the space ecosystem and ensure all orbits can continue to thrive sustainably for generations to come." Astroscale is headquartered in Japan but the mission is being controlled from the United Kingdom.

**Two implications to the shvedsky card – 1] debris currently being solved by magnets takes out any inherency of the plan since its harms are already being solved for 2] tons of space junk comes from “old satellites and rockets” – means aff has no solvency otherwise bc most debris comes from non-mining activities.**

**Probability – 0.1% chance of a collision.**

**Salter 16** [(Alexander William, Economics Professor at Texas Tech) “SPACE DEBRIS: A LAW AND ECONOMICS ANALYSIS OF THE ORBITAL COMMONS” 19 STAN. TECH. L. REV. 221 \*numbers replaced with English words] TDI

The probability of a collision is currently low. Bradley and Wein estimate that the maximum probability in LEO of a collision over the lifetime of a spacecraft remains below one in one thousand, conditional on continued compliance with NASA’s deorbiting guidelines.3 However, the possibility of a future “snowballing” effect, whereby debris collides with other objects, further congesting orbit space, remains a significant concern.4 Levin and Carroll estimate the average immediate destruction of wealth created by a collision to be approximately $30 million, with an additional $200 million in damages to all currently existing space assets from the debris created by the initial collision.5 The expected value of destroyed wealth because of collisions, currently small because of the low probability of a collision, can quickly become significant if future collisions result in runaway debris growth.

### Ozone