# 1NC R2 TOC

### 1NC – Theory

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must define what constitutes a reduction of appropriation of outer space by private entities in a delineated next in the 1AC

#### Violation: They didn’t

#### 1] Stable advocacy - Reduce can mean anything and there is no normal means – from removing one satellite or paying a fine or being prohibited from appropriating at all – they can redefine in the 1AR to wriggle out of DA’s which kills high quality engagement and becomes two ships passing in the night, every single DA, case turn, process CP is dependent on banning appropriation by a significant amount and the 1AR can easily stand up and no link.

#### This shell is not regressive or beyond the resolution – you added reduce to your plan text, its your onus to define it.

#### Fairness is a voter debate is a competitive activity that requires objective evaluation

#### Neg theory is DTD - 1ARs control the direction of the debate because it determines what the 2NR has to go for – DTD allows us some leeway in the round by having some control in the direction

#### Competing interps – Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation – it also collapses since brightlines operate on an offense-defense paradigm

#### No RVIs – A – Going all in on theory kills substance education which outweighs on timeframe B - Discourages checking real abuse which outweighs on norm-setting C – Encourages theory baiting – outweighs because if the shell is frivolous, they can beat it quickly D – its illogical for you to win for proving you were fair – outweighs since logic is a litmus test for other arguments E - Kills norm setting since debaters can never admit they’re wrong – outweighs since norm setting is the constitutive purpose of theory

DTA on 1AR shells

Reasonability on 1AR shells

RVI on 1AR shells

1NC theory outweighs—A] Lexicality B] Sequencing

### 1NC – Theory
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### 1NC – T

#### Interpretation: Affirmatives must not defend the implementation of an action.

#### Resolved in context of the resolution is a statement of value.

UPitt n.d. – University Of Pittsburgh Communications Services Webteam, copyright 2015-21, "Basic Definitions," Department of Communication , <https://www.comm.pitt.edu/basic-definitions> CHO

Affirmative/Pro. The side that “affirms” the resolution (is “pro” the issue). For example, the affirmative side in a debate using the resolution of policy, Resolved: The United States federal government should implement a poverty reduction program for its citizens, would advocate for federal government implementation of a poverty reduction program. Argument. A statement, or claim, followed by a justification, or warrant. Justifications are responses to challenges, often linked by the word “because.” Example: The sun helps people, because the sun activates photosynthesis in plants, which produce oxygen so people can breathe. Constructive Speech. The first speeches in a debate, where the debaters “construct” their cases by presenting initial positions and arguments. Cross-examination. Question and answer sessions between debaters. Debate. A deliberative exercise characterized by formal procedures of argumentation, involving a set resolution to be debated, distinct times for debaters to speak, and a regulated order of speeches given. Evidence. Supporting materials for arguments. Standards for evidence are field-specific. Evidence can range from personal testimony, statistical evidence, research findings, to other published sources. Quotations drawn from journals, books, newspapers, and other audio-visuals sources are rather common. Negative/Con. The side that “negates” the resolution (is “con” the issue). For example, the negative side in a debate using the resolution of fact, Resolved: Global warming threatens agricultural production, would argue that global warming does not threaten agricultural production. Preparation Time. Debates often necessitate time between speeches for students to gather their thoughts and consider their opponent's arguments. This preparation is generally a set period of time and can be used at any time by either side at the conclusion of a speech. Rebuttal Speech. The last speeches in a debate, where debaters summarize arguments and draw conclusions about the debate. Resolution. A specific statement or question up for debate. Resolutions usually appear as statements of policy, fact or value. Statement of policy. Involves an actor (local, national, or global) with power to decide a course of action. For example, Resolved: The United States federal government should implement a poverty reduction program for its citizens. Statement of fact. Involves a dispute about empirical phenomenon. For example, Resolved: Global warming threatens agricultural production. Statement of value. Involves conflicting moral dilemmas. For example, Resolved: The death penalty is a justified method of punishment. Topic. A general issue to debate. Topics could be “The Civil War,” “genetic engineering,” or “Great Books.”

#### “Is” is a linking verb – no implementation since it’s a description.

GM n.d. – “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.)

#### Violation: They cannot defend hypothetical implementation and use the state – or they are Extra-T

#### Voter for limits and ground – imprecisely includes thousands of affs that expand appropriation and deprives us of the public regs counterplan – makes it impossible to be neg

#### Grammar – very idea of a topic rests on the assumption that words have stable meanings and relationships – precision internal link turns every piece of aff offense and judges don’t have the jurisdiction to vote on an aff that violates pre tournament rules.

#### Phil Ed – creates better ethical subjectivity and critical thinking that o/ws on uniqueness to LD. Switch to policy and read the PTD aff on the water topic – solves all your offense

#### TVA: Read a phil aff that affirms that private appropriation is unjust

### 1NC – NC

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement – anything else moots 7 minutes of the nc – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that a world is better than another before you adopt it.

#### They justify substantive skews since there will always be a more correct side of the issue but we compensate for flaws in the lit.

#### Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – T/F binary is descriptive and technical.

#### a priori's 1st – even worlds framing requires ethics that begin from a priori principles like reason or pleasure so we control the internal link to functional debates.

#### The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – five dictionaries define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm as to prove true which means it's constitutive and jurisdictional. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I've met my burden.

#### Permissibility is irrelevant on this topic since there is no action to be obligated to. Presumption negates – A] If we deny the truth of the aff then you negate – textuality B] resolved in the resolution denotes certainty which means if they aren’t determined and uncertain then you can’t affirm

#### 1] Obligations- the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove an obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation

#### 2] Falsity- Statements are more often false than true because proving one part of the statement false disproves the entire statement. Presuming all statements are true creates contradictions which would be ethically bankrupt.

#### 3] Negating is harder – A] Aff gets first and last speech which control the direction of the debate B] Affirmatives can strategically uplayer in the 1ar giving them a 7-6 time skew advantage, splitting the 2nr C] They get infinite prep time

#### 1] Decision Making Paradox- We need a decision-making procedure to enact the aff, but to choose a procedure requires another meta level decision-making procedure and so forth leading to infinite regress.

#### 2] The Place Paradox- if everything exists in a place, that place must have a place that it exists in and so forth. Therefore, identifying ought statements is impossible since it assumes the space-time continuum.

#### 3] Grain Paradox- One grain falling makes no sound, but a thousand grains make a sound. A thousand nothings cannot make something which means the physical world is paradoxical.

#### 4] Arrows Paradox- If time is divided into 0-duration slices, no motion is happening in each of them, so taking them all as a whole, motion is impossible.

#### 5] Bonini’s Paradox- As a model of a complex system becomes more complete, it becomes less understandable and vice versa; therefore, no model can be useful.

#### 6] 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 neg and say they are not under my control.

#### 7] the[[1]](#footnote-1) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but appropriation isn’t a disease

#### 8] of[[2]](#footnote-2) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time

#### 9] private[[3]](#footnote-3) describes “belonging to or for the use of one particular person or group of people only” and an entity[[4]](#footnote-4) is “independent, separate, or self-contained existence”

### 1NC – NC

#### The meta-ethic is procedural moral realism.

#### This entails that moral facts stem from procedures while substantive realism holds that moral truths exist independently of that in the empirical world. Prefer procedural realism –

#### [1] Collapses – the only way to verify whether something is a moral fact is by using procedures to warrant it.

#### [2] 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.

#### [3] Is/Ought Gap – we can only perceive what is, not what ought to be. It’s impossible to derive an ought statement from descriptive facts about the world, necessitating a priori premises.

#### Practical Reason is that procedure. To ask for why we should be reasoners concedes its authority since it uses reason – anything else is nonbinding and arbitrary. That hijacks their framework since you need reason to evaluate any relevant consequences.

#### Moral law must be universal—our judgements can’t only apply to ourselves any more than 2+2=4 can be true only for me – any non-universalizable norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends. Reject Extinction outweighs- aggregation is nonsensical since a] it impedes on one persons ends for another and b] assumes everyone values the same thing.

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

#### Prefer –

#### [1] Performativity—freedom is the key to the process of justification of arguments. Willing that we should abide by their ethical theory presupposes that we own ourselves in the first place.

#### [2] All other frameworks collapse—non-Kantian theories source obligations in extrinsically good objects, but that presupposes the goodness of the rational will.

#### [3] TJFs and they outweigh since it precludes engagement on the framework layer – Prefer non extinction intent based frameworks

#### For Resource disparities- 1] Our framework ensures big squads don’t have a comparative advantage since debates become about quality of arguments rather than quantity - their model crowds out small schools because they have to prep for every unique advantage under each aff, every counterplan, and every disad with carded responses to each of them

#### 2] Predictability – every individual engages within freedom and twhen going to school or using public infrastructure which means it’s the one political engagement everyone is aware of.

#### 3] Political Education – politicians have to understand the categorical imperative and the process of deontology in order to know what powers they have and what they have to provide citizens. E.g. german governments prove

#### 4] Resolvability – other debates create a mess of weighing and link turns, but using Kant is easily resolvable because it becomes a question of whether or not it violates

#### 5] Freedom is the key to the process of justification of arguments. Willing that we should abide by their ethical theory presupposes that we own ourselves in the first place.

#### No new 1AR framework justifications – Anything else kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement off a lack of it in the 1AC – It also justifies overloading the 2NR with new arguments.

#### Negate

#### Acquisition of property can never be unjust – rights violations presupposes somethings appropriation by another entity.

Feser 1, (Edward Feser, 1-1-2005, accessed on 12-15-2021, Cambridge University Press, "THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN UNJUST INITIAL ACQUISITION | Social Philosophy and Policy | Cambridge Core", Edward C. Feser is an American philosopher. He is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at Pasadena City College in Pasadena, California. [https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)[brackets](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)%5bbrackets) for gen lang]//phs st

There is a serious difficulty with this criticism of Nozick, however. It is just this: There is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition of resources; therefore, there is no case to be made for redistributive taxation on the basis of alleged injustices in initial acquisition. This is, to be sure, a bold claim. Moreover, in making it, I contradict not only Nozick’s critics, but Nozick himself, who clearly thinks it is at least possible for there to be injustices in acquisition, whether or not there have in fact been any (or, more realistically, whether or not there have been enough such injustices to justify continual redistributive taxation for the purposes of rectifying them). But here is a case where Nozick has, I think, been too generous to the other side. Rather than attempt —unsatisfactorily, in the view of his critics—to meet the challenge to show that initial acquisition has not in general been unjust, he ought instead to have insisted that there is no such challenge to be met in the first place. Giving what I shall call “the basic argument” for this audacious claim will be the task of Section II of this essay. The argument is, I think, compelling, but by itself it leaves unexplained some widespread intu- itions to the effect that certain specific instances of initial acquisition are unjust and call forth as their remedy the application of a Lockean proviso, or are otherwise problematic. (A “Lockean proviso,” of course, is one that forbids initial acquisitions of resources when these acquisitions do not leave “enough and as good” in common for others.) Thus, Section III focuses on various considerations that tend to show how those intuitions are best explained in a way consistent with the argument of Section II. Section IV completes the task of accounting for the intuitions in question by considering how the thesis of self-ownership itself bears on the acqui- sition and use of property. Section V shows how the results of the previ- ous sections add up to a more satisfying defense of Nozickian property rights than the one given by Nozick himself, and considers some of the implications of this revised conception of initial acquisition for our under- standing of Nozick’s principles of transfer and rectification. II. The Basic Argument 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

#### Interpretation: Affirmative teams must not read new offense in the 1AR related to a new FW, recontextualize or weigh aff arguments under a different FW, or turn the 1nc FW.

#### 1] Phil Clash and Time Skew- anything else allows them to concede all our framework interactions and just go for 4 minutes of turns against our NC which o/w since phil is the only thing unique to LD Debate and time is the only quantifiable metric of abuse

#### 2] Skew- They have an inherent advantage on the contention debate since they get 2ar spin so they can easily sway judge psychology in contention debates that don’t err towards one side.

#### 3] Depth o/w Breadth- prevents the debate from being split over two issues i.e. the framework and substance which outweighs since in depth testing is necessary to refine ideas while vague debates result in inept clash.

#### 4] Planks Solves- because if the topic doesn’t actually negate you can put defense on the contention level.
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