# NC

#### Ethics must begin a priori and the meta-ethic is bindingness.

#### [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 skep since obligations are predicated on ignorantly accepting rules. Only reason solves since asking “why reason?” requires reason which is self-justified.

#### That means we must universally will maxims— any non-universalizable norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends.

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

#### Prefer –

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

#### [2] Theory – Frameworks are topicality interps of the word ought so they should be theoretically justified. Prefer on resource disparities—a focus on evidence and statistics privileges debaters with the most preround prep which excludes lone-wolfs who lack huge evidence files. A debate under my framework can easily be won without any prep since huge evidence files aren’t required.

#### [3] No 1AR Framework: It moots 7 minutes of the 1NC and exacerbates the AFF infinite prep time so I should be able to compensate by choosing. They justify substantive skews by shifting frame of offense.

#### Negate:

#### [1] A model of freedom mandates a market-oriented approach to space—that negates
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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] Banning private space appropriation inhibits the sale and use of spacecraft and fuel- that’s a form of restricting the free economic choices of individuals
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#### Order grows from market forces. But where do market forces come from? They are the result of human action. Individuals select ends and act to achieve them by adopting suitable means. Since means are scarce and ends are abundant, individuals economize in order to accomplish more rather than less. And they always seek to exchange lower values for higher values (as they see them) and never the other way around. In a world of scarcity, tradeoffs are unavoidable, so one aims to trade up rather than down. (One’s trading partner does the same.) The result of this, along with other features of human action, and the world at large is what we call market forces. But really, it is just men and women acting rationally in the world.

# theory

#### Interpretation: If the affirmative defends anything other than whole res, then they must disclose the plan text, solvency advocate, role of the ballot and standard of the aff they are reading 30 minutes before round or at release of pairings.

#### Violation: screenshot provided

Graphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generated

#### Vote Neg:

#### [1] Limits: the number of cases you can read is endless: you can read any role of the ballot and standard, plus you get to specify whatever you want in the resolution. Disclosing text checks back since it ensures that I can have a reasonable basis for preparation.

#### Impacts:

#### a] Education: they pigeonhole the neg into generics like Nebel every single round. That leads to shallow repetitive debates: in a world where I have half an hour to look at the solvency advocate, I can think out a case-specific strategy, cut some case answers, and read your articles to understand the warrants more thoroughly, which leads to more nuanced, in-depth debates.

#### b] Fairness: Unbroken plans are unpredictable, so the neg has to prep every possible aff whereas the aff only drills their one aff, creating a massive prep skew. Turns aff flex, even if affirming is harder, you shouldn’t be able to eliminate 99 percent of neg prep. My interp is key to me having any shot at engaging

#### [2] Argument quality: plan text and framing disclosure discourages cheap shot aff’s with frings authors and shoddy solvency or something dumb like I-law or GCB. If the aff is easily defeated by 20 minutes of research, the case should lose. They had a month to prep – the neg is entitled to some research time to make sure the AFF coherent framing and strong offense. Otherwise bad AFF’s can win on purely surprise factor, which is a bad model b/c it encourages finding the most fringe surprising case possible instead of a well researched and defensible aff.

#### Fairness is a voter: all argumentation assumes it’ll be evaluated fairly

#### Education is a voter: it’s the only portable impact to debate

#### Drop the debater [1] to deter future AC abuse [2] because my strat was already completely skewed by the one abusive practice

#### Competing interps because reasonability invites a race to the bottom where debaters set lower brightlines to defend abuse

#### No RVIs – [A] Illogical – fairness is a burden – they can’t win for following the rules. [B] Incentivizes good theory debaters to run abusive strategies, bait theory, and win off the RVI **[C**] Chilling effect—chills theory because I’ll be scared that they’ll win off the RVI