# NC

## 1

#### The meta-ethic is consistency with practical reason.

#### [1] Regress – we can always ask why we should follow a theory, because we don’t have a starting point. Practical reason solves – When we ask why we should follow reason, we demand a reason, which concedes to the authority of reason itself, so we have a starting point

#### [2] Action Theory – every action can be broken down to infinite amounts of movements, only reason can unify these movements because we use it to achieve our goals, means all actions collapse to reason.

#### [3] Use apriori knowledge

#### [A] Representations of space – we can only access our experiences if we can interpret the space around us, but that requires the a priori. Thinking of the absence of space is impossible – we can think of empty space but never the lack of space itself. Imagining space through a priori thoughts is the only way we can even begin to have a conception of experience.

#### [B] Uncertainty – every person has different experiences so we can’t have a unified perspective on what is good if we each have different conceptions of it – even if we can roughly aggregate it’s not enough because there’ll always be a case when it fails so the framework o/w on probability.

#### [4] Freedom follows

#### [A] We have a unified perspective – If I say that 2+2=4, I understand not only that I know that 2+2=4, but that everyone around can arrive at the same conclusion too because they create practical syllogisms to justify their conclusion. But, willing a maxim that violates the freedom of others is a contradiction.

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

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

#### Impact calc –

#### Consequences fail –

#### A) Induction Fails – You only know induction works because past experiences have told you it has, but that is in itself a form of induction, so you use induction to prove induction – that’s circular

#### B) Butterfly Effect – Every action has an infinite number of consequences that stem from it – me picking up a pen could cause nuclear war in one hundred years

#### C) Aggregation fails – everyone has different feelings of pain and pleasure which makes it impossible to measure

#### D) Culpability – any consequence can lead to another consequence so it’s impossible to assign obligations since you can’t pinpoint an actor that causes a consequence

#### Prefer additionally –

#### 1] Yes act omission distinction

#### A] infinite regress – holding agents accountable for failing to act means every agent is almost always morally wrong – there’s an infinite amount of bad actions anyone could be preventing at any one time

#### B] illogical – we intuitively don’t hold Switzerland as culpable for WWII as Nazi Germany

#### 2] Performativity—you participating in round requires that you are free to make your own arguments

### Offense

#### Injustice requires someone wronged, but initial acquisition doesn’t violate any entity’s right to set an end– therefore, private appropriation of outer space cannot be unjust, Feser 05:

Edward Feser, [Associate Professor of Philosophy at Pasadena City College] “THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN UNJUST INITIAL ACQUISITION,” 2005 //LHP AV

The reason **there is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition** of resources is that there is no such thing as either a just or an unjust initial acquisition of resources. The concept of **justice**, that is to say, simply **does not apply** to initial acquisition. **It applies only after initial acquisition has already taken place**. In particular, it applies only to transfers of property (and derivatively, to the rectification of injustices in transfer). This, it seems to me, is a clear implication of the assumption (rightly) made by Nozick that **external resources are initially unowned**. Consider the following example. **Suppose** **an individual** **A seeks to acquire some previously unowned resource R**. **For it to be** the case that A commits an **injustice** in acquiring R, it would also have to be the case that **there is some individual** **B** (or perhaps a group of individuals) **against whom A commits the injustice**. **But for B to have been wronged** by A’s acquisi- tion of R, **B would have to have had a rightful claim over R,** **a right to R**. By hypothesis, **however**, **B did not have a right to R, because no one had a right to it—it was unowned, after all**. So B was not wronged and could not have been. In fact, **the very first person who could conceivably be wronged by anyone’s use of R would be, not B, but A himself, since A is the first one to own R**. Such a wrong would in the nature of the case be an injustice in transfer—in unjustly taking from A what is rightfully his—not in initial acquisition. **The same thing, by extension, will be true of all unowned resources: it is only after some- one has initially acquired them that anyone could unjustly come to possess them, via unjust transfer**. It is impossible, then, for there to be any injustices in initial acquisition.7

#### Freedom 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.

## 2

#### Interp: Debaters must not defend implementation of the resolution.

#### 1] the wording of the res isnt a question of the hypothetical implementation of the plan it’s a descriptive claim of justice, which implies the burden of the aff is to defend the truth of the res in general which justifies our interpretation of debate.

Webster ND Definition of IS," Merriam Webster, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/is> IS

is Definition of is (Entry 1 of 4) present tense third-person singular of BE dialectal present tense first-person and third-perso singular of BE dialectal present tense plural of BE

#### “BE” is a linking verb, not an action verb so implementation is incoherent

Grammar Monster ND "Linking Verbs," Grammar Monster, <https://www.grammar-monster.com/glossary/linking_verbs.htm> CHO

What Are Linking Verbs? (with Examples) A linking verb is used to re-identify or to describe its subject. A linking verb is called a linking verb because it links the subject to a subject complement (see graphic below). Infographic Explaining Linking Verb A linking verb tells us what the subject is, not what the subject is doing. Easy Examples of Linking Verbs In each example, the linking verb is highlighted and the subject is bold. Alan is a vampire. (Here, the subject is re-identified as a vampire.) Alan is thirsty. (Here, the subject is described as thirsty.)

#### 2] No actor means no action

#### Violation: They defend implementation cx checks

#### Standards:

#### Precision—anything else lets them arbitrarily redefine words in the rez which explodes limits, lets big teams create affs of the week which kills stable neg ground

#### Extra t—they straight up are defending a policy action that is separate from the rez, explodes limits A] they can go anywhere outside of the the rez—means we have to prep out literally everything B] they can spike out CP’s and DA’s which kills neg ground—that’s a voter

#### TVA—use the advantage to prove the resolution is descriptively unjust, you don’t need to implement to implicate the advantage as a reason to affirm.

#### Voters:

#### 1] Semantics come first

#### A] We hijack fairness first – semantics determine stable ground for the res which means it’s the most predictable, since it’s the only stasis point of the rez

#### B] jurisdiction you can only vote on topical affs

#### 2] Fairness first—debate is a game if its not fair people wont play

#### 3] T is DTD a] the argument is the aff, means the debate cant start b] DTD sets norms

#### 4] Competing interps a] reasonability is arbitrary and requires judge intervention b] competing interps is a race to the top C] the brightline is being semantically topical—it’s a yes/no question

#### 5] no RVI a] incentives theory baiting which is justified abuse b] illogical—you don’t get a cookie for being fair

#### 6] T before theory a] they have 4 years to set their norm we have 2 months b] any NC abuse was necessary to check 1AC abuse

# Case