1- combo shell

Interp: Debaters must not read no contestation of aff paradigm issues if one of those paradigm issues says evaluate the debate after the 1ac, and no neg meta theory

Violation - on the doc & i nailed down the violation

A- infinite abuse– will always lose to the 1ac, no way to check the abuse

B- Clash– kills clash cuz no incentive to debate

DTD - fairness first- skews objective evaluation

CIs reasonability arb

No RVI – baiting, illogical, clash

#### **2- Off - NC**

#### **The burden of the affirmative is to prove that space appropriation by private entities is unjust— This is the text of the resolution and regardless of the plan text our roles are verified**

#### 

#### **The resolution is a maxim, if something is just it must be always just and if something is unjust it must be always unjust**

#### **Prefer —**

#### **1] Limits a) any other interp allows the affirmative to prove space appropriation is unjust in a hyper-specific instance exploding limits b) your one instance is outweighed by infinite instances in which space appropriation is just**

#### **2] Contradictions negate because they prove the resolution has exceptions**

#### **3] Absent binding justice claims exceptions allow people to escape obligations by creating hyper specific instances– ie; I could claim it is unjust to steal unless it is for Jeremiah Cohn**

#### **4] Negation theory— the negs role is to test the aff from many different angles— any interpretation of the topic that puts burden of proof on the neg flips this**

#### **5] The resolution is in passive voice— it asks us to test the truth of the resolution in a vacuum not present any change to real-world policy**

Negate—

#### **1] Justice starts culturally— proven by different laws and social norms in varying countries— the rez might be true for US space companies but not Russian ones, or a country not yet created— so it is impossible to affirm as a maxim**

#### **2] The appropriation of space cannot be unjust— space is infinitely expanding and thus there is no problem with allocation**

**SEP 21** <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/justice/> //cohn

First, it shows that justice has to do with how individual people are treated (‘to *each* his due’). **Issues of justice arise in circumstances in which people can advance claims – to freedom, opportunities, resources, and so forth – that are potentially conflicting, and we appeal to justice to resolve such conflicts by determining what each person is properly entitled to have.** In contrast, where people’s interests converge, and the decision to be taken is about the best way to pursue some common purpose – think of a government official having to decide how much food to stockpile as insurance against some future emergency – justice gives way to other values. In other cases, **there may be no reason to appeal to justice because resources are so plentiful that we do not need to worry about allotting shares to individuals.** Hume pointed out that in a hypothetical state of abundance where ‘every individual finds himself fully provided with whatever his most voracious appetites can want’, ‘the cautious, jealous virtue of justice would never once have been dreamed of’ (Hume, *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*, pp. 183–4). Hume also believed – and philosophical controversy on this point persists until today – that justice has no place in close personal relationships, such as the family, where (it is alleged) each identifies with the others’ interests so strongly that there is no need and no reason for anyone to make claims of personal entitlement. (See Sandel 1982 for a defence of this view; for a critique, see Okin 1989. See also the entry on feminist perspectives on reproduction and the family).

#### **3] Private entities can only make morally neutral actions— the unjust actor is a person at the organization— at worst this is a plan flaw because you cannot condemn the actors that cause the harms of the AC**

**Palmer 21** Palmer, Bruce. (2021). What Is an Unjust Act?. 10.13140/RG.2.2.26191.61604 //cohn

**Justice and injustice** share an important quality that many have recognized: They **are both socially defined and require at least two people**.2 Without actors and victims, neither occurs. Justice and injustice, however, can and often do refer to society-wide standards. **Not so with an unjust act.** **There is no society-wide unjust act.** All societies in some senses can be called unjust.3 Whole groups can be treated unjustly, but only as individuals and only by individuals. **Societies do not act unjustly, people do**. Racism can be said to be the cause or result of injustice, but it is not an unjust act**.** Slavery is a relationship, not an unjust act, although it can be called an unjust relationship. Slavery and racism are, however, created and maintained by unjust acts. **Sometimes it is said that a company, organization, or other entity has acted unjustly. Such a thing does not happen.** **None of these can be either an unjust actor or a victim. They cannot choose or have choice taken from them.** **They cannot be incarcerated or enslaved. They cannot be the victims of hate crimes.**  Companies in the United States do have the legal status of persons for some functions, and for ease of reference they are often referred to as if they were persons, but they are not. **When one of these entities is accused of being an unjust actor**, **it means that a person, or a number of them, acted unjustly in the name of the organization.** **Finding which particular person or persons ordered an unjust act might be impossible and the entity might be penalized for an unjust act, but the actor is always a person**

#### **4] x specific thing to the aff – ie it is just to have satellites that clean up debris**

#### **5] The rez doesn’t specify humanity— an infinite universe guarantees that there will be an infinite number of alien societies where space appropriation is just.**