## 1

#### A] Interpretation: the aff may not say 1ar theory is legit, drop the debater, competing interps, and highest layer.

#### B] Violation: the underview spikes.

#### C] Standards:

[1] Strat skew—all of these paradigm issues in conjunction make it impossible for the neg to win because reading a frivolous 1AR shell with no counter-interp offense wins the round on the spot. Their interp incentivizes the aff to read a 1AR shell with marginal offense because it is a no-risk issue sufficient to win them the round that the neg can’t generate offense against under competing interps. Aff theory first makes it the highest layer, so winning it wins the round.

[2] Topic ed—the opportunity to win the round within a minute of the 1AR incentivizes debaters to uplayer rather than responding to the NC, killing topic discussion and education.

Voter—vote on fairness – debate is a competitive activity governed by rules. You can’t evaluate who did better debating if the round is structurally skewed, so fairness is a gateway to substantivabe debate. Drop the debater a) to set a precedent for the best norms of debate b) to deter future abuse. Use competing interps because 1] what is reasonably fair is arbitrary 2] reasonability encourages debaters to get away with increasingly unfair strategies through defense on theory. Meta theory outweighs – this precedes all aff theory since I am indicting the way that theory shell can be evaluated in the first place. And, don’t vote on the RVI on 1n meta theory 1] chills debates on norming since the 1ar and 2ar have 1 extra minute to weigh and collapse 2] causes baiting by writing long aff underviews

## 2

#### 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

## 3

#### Interpretation: neither debater may claim intrinsic theoretical offense off of their side being harder to debate.. to clarify, aff flex and neg flex args are terrible for debate. 1. Clash – side bias standards they incentivize debaters to just read generic side bias impact turns instead of engaging the nuances of theory standards on the line-by-line or reading paradigm issues. Side bias is also a very small part of theory debate – pretty much in almost any case, the abuse can be easily outweighed by any other standard weighing, meaning the aff encourages a bad pedagogical model. This leads to less developed norms being set since debaters are less likely to actually consider the specificities of an abuse story – leads to worse long-term norming  2.  Arg quality – side bias debaters are always blippy bc they rely on cherry-picked analytics with limited statistical range and struggle to control for valiable, or 1-line analytics, which inherently leads to dropped blips all over the flow which are unweighable usually. This also kills resolvability – it’s nearly impossible to compare muddled side bias debates.

#### Vote on:

#### Education – education is the greatest impact of debate because debate is an activity created in the name of helping to teach students about policymaking and philosophy

## Case

#### Kant entails freedom:

#### [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.

#### Negate:

#### 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.