### Overview

We’ll go on the t shell

Interpretation: if a debaters camera is functional, they must either have their camera on or be unmuted during prep time

The violation is that they had BOTH their camera off AND their mic off during prep time

Standards That incentivizes cheating – debaters turn off their cameras and get help from their team – I can barely 1v1 debaters much less 1v20 them even if no abuse happened in the round, it’s a good norm to have

That kills fairness because I can’t compete against a whole school prepping at the same time – that causes people to quit the activity

They conceded 1ar theory is competing interps only so you don’t buy their reasonability claims –

1. Its nonverifiable if they were just “doing their work”
2. Again, Even if they didn’t, because competing interps only, its not a question of whether or not abuse happened in round -

At worst, you can just vote on the T shell because they conceded that you evaluate the debate after the 1ar – theres too much time skew coming from the 1nc so just having the

That’s nonverifiable

On the card

### 1

Interpretation: if a debaters camera is functional, they must either have their camera on or be unmuted during prep time

Standards: cheating – that incentivizes debaters to get prewritten responses from people sitting in their room – supercharges the offense bc its impossible to do a 1v10 against Harvard Westlake

Voters is fairness – affirming is already harder and if they are abusive like this it makes it impossible

Cross apply the DTD and no RVIs paradigm issues from the 1ac underview

### 2

**Interpretation: the negative debater may not read a conditional PIC**

**– strat skew – PICs pigeonhole the aff into advocating what the PIC excludes, killing aff ground that’s leveraged on Ks and DAs and forces a strat that uses minimal 1AC ground – the fact that they can kick the PIC means they skew my strat bc I could never leverage majority of 1AC offense, putting me at a disadvantage on substance. Also key to clash – doesn’t allow me to leverage case to clash with neg. That outweighs – 1AC is the starting point for aff ground as it’s the longest time to generate offense. Fairness is a voter – key to determine the better debater and education is a voter it’s the reason schools fund debate.**

**Drop the debater – time allocation is skewed**

### Case

**First**

**Practical reason exists because we’re the cause of our actions. We can mandate whether to act on certain inclinations – they act as proposals and reason decides –**

**Extend the B point – asking why reason exists concedes the necessity to provide a reason – therefore conceding the authority of it. Any justification to vote on prefer framework collapses to reason – they must answer the question of why which asks for an a priori answer.**

**Extend the C point - debating in this round forces reason in terms of evaluating arguments and having the authority to decide what to read/any form of impact calc.**

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative. Prefer additionally:

**Prefer our framing  
Extend consequeunces fail and the TJF**

**That affirms – privatization is bad because it’s a unilateral will that forces people to act in a specific way**

They conceded multiple paradigm issues in the round which are going to make u sign ur ballot right now – no carded evidence in the 1nc, evaluate after the 1ar and indexicals – we’ll get onto that on the underview

### PIC

It doesn’t negate

Solvency deficit – all appropriation is privatization and that’s still bad

They concede that consequences fail so theres no NB to the PIC

DA

### Framing

#### Practical reason constrains everything:

#### [1] Postulation – reason is a prior question to evaluation of ethics since anything else collapses on itself as we can infinitely question our foundations otherwise but raising the question of reason proves itself valuable as it necessitates reason.

#### [2] Epistemology – rational deliberation of educational concepts is necessary to interpret other arguments since it’s a prerequisite to interpreting epistemological concepts and it’s the terminal impact of debate as education is the only portable impact.

#### [3] Procedure – reason is a side constraint on debate since otherwise we can’t refute – responding to this concedes the authority of reason since you’re reasoning via logical deliberation.

#### Freedom follows:

#### [1] 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.

#### [2] Freedom implies our actions occur after practical deliberation if it were retrospective, then we could claim that any and all events that happened before we decided to do something were part of our free action which is incoherent.

#### Moral law follows – it stems uniquely from reason and not from empiricism. That outweighs – a) if morality were based on things like desires then it would be imposed on us from the outside and we could not be said to be free b) anything else is non-binding and arbitrary since empiricism is always subject to change, i.e. my hair is brown is a true statement but it could be false in a week c) an evil demon could deceive us or we could be dreaming which proves the only viable metric to guide action begins a priori d) past experiences have no effect on causality or internal link to continuity, i.e. raining yesterday doesn’t mean rain today.

#### Duty of right is impossible in state of nature:

#### [1] Ethical disagreements are inevitable because individuals have different areas of self-interest and desire. Only a non-arbitrary shared authority that can resolve disputes of interpretation resolves this problem.

#### [2] Claims to freedom and property are solely to peer discretion since empirical features of compliance are temporal and nonbinding – only the unification of will solves.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the categorical imperative. Prefer additionally:

#### [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. Thus, it is logically incoherent to justify a standard without first willing that we can pursue ends free from others.

#### [2] Weighing practices is incoherent because it relies on an assessment of ends, which relies on a further assessment. A practice that negates is not contradictory to a practice that affirms, and thus proving my end affirms is sufficient. So, proving the converse of the resolution is not sufficient to disprove the resolution’s truth.

#### [3] Ethical frameworks are topicality interpretations of the word ought so they must be theoretically justified. Prefer on resource disparities—focusing on evidence and statistics privileges debaters with the most preround prep excluding lone-wolfs who lack huge evidence files. A debater under my framework can easily be won without any prep since minimal evidence is required. That controls the internal link to other voters because a pre-req to debating is access to the activity.

**[4] Consequences fail: [A] They only judge actions after they occur, which fails action guidance [B] Every action has infinite stemming consequences, because every consequence can cause another consequence. Probability doesn’t solve because 1) Probability is improvable, as it relies on inductive knowledge, but induction from past events can’t lead to deduction of future events and 2) Probability assumes causation, we can’t assume every act was actually the cause of tangible outcomes [C] Every action is infinitely divisible, only intents unify action because we intend the end point of an action – but consequences cannot determine what step of action is moral or not. [D] You can’t aggregate consequences, happiness and sadness are immutable – ten headaches don’t make a migraine**

**[5] Indexicals: There are an infinite number of ethical frameworks so its impossible to affirm under all of them – just proving that we affirm under our framework is sufficient to win.**

### Advocacy

#### Thus we affirm resolved - The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

#### Private entities are non-governmental.

Dunk 11 – Frans G. von der Dunk, 2011, [“The Origins of Authorisation: Article VI of the Outer Space Treaty and International Space Law,” University of Nebraska] Justin

4. Interpreting Article VI of the Outer Space Treaty One main novel feature of Article VI stood out with reference to the role of private enterprise in this context. Contrary to the version of the concept applicable under general international law, where “direct state responsibility” only pertained to acts somehow directly attributable to a state and states could only be addressed for acts by private actors under “indirect,” “due care”/“due diligence” responsibility,18 Article VI made no difference as to whether the activities at issue were the state’s own (“whether such activities are carried on by governmental agencies” . . .) or those of private actors (. . . “or by non-governmental entities”). The interests of the Soviet Union in ensuring that, whomever would actually conduct a certain space activity, some state or other could be held responsible for its compliance with applicable rules of space law to that extent had prevailed. However, the general acceptance of Article VI as cornerstone of the Outer Space Treaty unfortunately was far from the end of the story. Partly, this was the consequence of key principles being left undefined.

#### Exemptions destroy the coercive power of legal regimes – causes circumvention across the board.

Hickman and Dolman 2 – John and Everett, 2002, Associate professor in the Department of Government and International Studies at Berry College in Mt. Berry, [“Resurrecting the Space Age: A State–Centered Commentary on the Outer Space Regime,” Volume 21 Number 1, <https://doi.org/10.1080/014959302317350855>] Elmer Recut Justin

Thus a state party need merely announce its intention to withdraw and then wait one year. Withdrawal of a single state party to the treaty, however, would not necessarily terminate the treaty between the other state parties. Yet, the decision of an important state not to be bound by a regime–creating treaty obviously endangers the entire treaty. The decision of the United States or China to withdraw from the OST would have far greater implications for the survival of the international space regime than the same decision by Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, or Papua New Guinea—the equality of states under international law remains nothing more than a useful  ction. For the OST to remain good international law, it must be accepted as such by the major space faring states of the 21st Century: the United States, Russia, the European Union, Japan, and China. One defection from the regime by a member of this group would no doubt lead to its effective collapse, as the remaining space faring states are unlikely to use the kind of coercion necessary to enforce the regime. A more likely response to such a defection is a scramble to make similar claims to sovereignty, based on historical precedent and effective occupation. Similar rushes to stake claims for territory sovereignty in other celestial bodies might follow.

### Offense

#### [1] Privatization is bad

#### [a] The OST prevents state-based sovereignty claims in space. But it does not clearly restrict corporations and even if it does it may imminently be changed. This means that regions could be under the exclusive control of corporations, while no government has authority.

Ward 19 Peter Ward (Peter Ward studied journalism at the University of Sheffield before moving to Dubai, where he reported on the energy sector. After three years in the Middle East, he earned his master’s degree in business journalism from the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism. His work has appeared in GQ, Bloomberg Buisnessweek, The Economist, and Newsweek. He lives in New York City.) “The unintended consequences of privatising space,” ScienceFocus (Online version of BBC Science Focus Magazine). Nov. 6th, 2019. <https://www.sciencefocus.com/space/the-unintended-consequences-of-privatising-space/> SJMS

Imagine a colony on [the Moon](https://www.sciencefocus.com/tag/the-moon/) or [Mars](https://www.sciencefocus.com/space/mars-facts-figures-fun-questions-red-planet/) run by a corporation. That one company would control everything the colonists need to survive, from the water to the oxygen to the food. That’s a dangerous amount of power for any company, but it’s a very real scenario. So what stops a major corporation landing on the Moon and setting up a colony? One very old document. [The Outer Space Treaty](http://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/spacelaw/treaties/outerspacetreaty.html) was signed in 1967 by all of the major space-faring nations, and explicitly states nobody can go to another planet or the Moon and claim that territory for their own. It’s a very important document, but it’s flawed. For one thing, the private space sector wasn’t around when the treaty was written so it’s not clear how some of the rules would be applied to private companies. And secondly, given the ambitions of many countries and corporations, there’s no way it’s going to last much longer. Anyone with a plan to land on the Moon or Mars and stay there is going to run into the Outer Space Treaty, and the smart money is on the wealthy and powerful winning out against an old loophole-ridden document. Politicians such as Ted Cruz in the United States have [already called for changes](https://spacenews.com/cruz-interested-in-updating-outer-space-treaty-to-support-commercial-space-activities/) to be made to the treaty, and given the increasing amounts of money private space companies spend on lobbying in the United States, more such attempts will follow. It’s imperative that the space community as a whole takes this issue on to ensure the needs of all, and not just the private sector, are taken into account should any alterations be made. The further we look into the future of humans in space, the more reality resembles science fiction. That’s why it’s difficult to make people take the issues which could potentially arise seriously. But now is the time to consider the problems that could arise from a commercially-led space race, and take the necessary small steps now to avoid potentially disastrous consequences in the future.

#### [b] That’s an instance of a unilateral will governing individuals while universal decision making is absent. This is an unjust state which violates people’s freedoms and violates the categorical imperative.

Cordelli 16 Chiara Cordelli [Chiara Cordelli is an associate professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Chicago. Her main areas of research are social and political philosophy, with a particular focus on theories of distributive justice, political legitimacy, normative defenses of the state, and the public/private distinction in liberal theory. She is the author of The Privatized State (Princeton University Press, 2020), which was awarded the 2021 ECPR political theory prize for best first book in political theory. She is also the co-editor of, and a contributor to, Philanthropy in Democratic Societies (University of Chicago Press, 2016). -- [cordelli@uchicago.edu](mailto:cordelli@uchicago.edu)] “WHAT IS WRONG WITH PRIVATIZATION?”, University of Chicago, Political Science & the College, https://www.law.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/What-is-Wrong-With-Privatization\_UCB.pdf

The intrinsic wrong of privatization, I will suggest, rather consists in the creation of an institutional arrangement that, by its very constitution, denies those who are subject to it equal freedom. I understand freedom as an interpersonal relationship of reciprocal independence. To be free is not to be subordinated to another person’s unilateral will. By building on an analytical reconstruction of Kant’s Doctrine of Right, I will argue that current forms of privatization reproduce (to a different degree) within a civil condition the very same defects that Kant attributes to the state of nature, or to a pre-civil condition, thereby making a rightful condition of reciprocal independence impossible. Importantly, this is so even if private actors are publicly authorized through contract and subject to regulations, and even if they are committed to reason in accordance with the public good. The reason for this, as I will explain, derives from the fact that private agents are constitutionally incapable of acting omnilaterally, even if their actions are omnilaterally authorized by government through some delegation mechanism, e.g. a voluntary contract. Omnilateralness, I will suggest, must be understood as a function of 1) rightful judgment and 2) unity. \

### Underview

#### [1] Permissibility and presumption affirm: [A] Negating an obligation requires proving a prohibition – they prohibit the aff action. [B] If agents had to reflect on every action they take and justify why it was a good one we would never be able to take an action because we would have to justify actions that are morally neutral ie drinking water is not morally right or wrong but if I had to justify my action every time I decided upon a course of action I would never be able to make decisions. [C] if I told you my name was Eric you would believe me

**[2] Aff gets 1AR theory and RVIs – otherwise the neg can be infinitely abusive and there’s no way to check against this**

**1AR theory is drop the debater, competing interps, and the highest layer of the round – [A] the 1ARs too short to be able to rectify abuse and adequately cover substance which justifies evaluating the debate after the 1AR to alleviate time skew, [B] the 2NR has 6 minutes to win a shell and beat back mine, while the 2AR has 3 minutes and must heg their bets on something**

#### If I win one layer, vote aff a) they have 7 minutes to uplayer and nullify my offense b) forces engagement with the aff since they have to defend all arguments which means they read better ones. All neg interps are counter interps since the aff takes an implicit stance on every issue which means you need an RVI to become offensive. No RVIs because aff speeches are too short to develop offense that’s not no risk.

#### No 2NR paradigm issues, theory, or RVIs because a) It becomes impossible to check NC abuse if you can dump on reasons the shell doesn't matter in the 2n. and b) they have 6 minutes to go for them whereas I only have a 3 minute 2AR to respond so I get crushed on time skew.

#### No new 2NR responses – it leads to infinite sandbagging and avoids clash since they have 6 minutes – also infinite abuse since the short 1AR is premised off 1NC concessions.

#### [3] Affirming is harder – link turns all neg theory arguments and means we get a permutation against anything because we can’t sufficiently respond A] Neg is reactive – they tailor the 1NC before the round to exploit the aff’s weakness. Not reciprocal – affs enter the round unaware. Also means no neg weighing – it supercharges the abuse since they can collapse in the 2NR and outweigh any turns I make. B] Aff extends twice – takes valuable time from already most time-pressed speeches. That means reject neg fairness concerns – the aff is structurally skewed from the start so they have no excuse – responding to this assumes you get neg fairness which is your fault because you introduced the contradiction so you still vote aff. C] 1AR is split between multiple layers while the 2NR goes for one thing – we get destroyed on time skew.

#### 5] Aff framework choice-anything else moots 7 mins of the 1AC since I premised my engagement on the framing

#### Reject 1NC carded responses its infinitely regressive – I have to read carded responses to them and they have to read carded responses to me and so on but we cant read new carded responses in the 1nr and 2ar so just stop the debate early