## NC

#### Permissibility Negates –

#### [1] Semantics – [Just](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/just) implies acting or being in conformity with what is morally upright or good, therefore if the resolution is permissible and therefore not unjust it acts according to what is morally upright and flows negative. That applies to presumption as well because [Unjust](https://www.dictionary.com/browse/unjust) means lacking in justice so the affirmative must actively prove that there exists a deficit in Justice.

#### [2] Logic – Propositions require positive justification before being accepted, otherwise one would be forced to accept the validity of logically contradictory propositions regarding subjects one knows nothing about, i.e if one knew nothing about P one would have to presume that both the “P” and “~P” are true.

#### [3] Shiftiness – Permissibility ground encourages the aff to load up with triggers and the 1ar controls the direction of the round which means they can moot all my offense, I need permissibility in the 2n to compensate.

#### Moral responsibility necessitates free will

#### van Inwagen [van Inwagen, Peter. “An Essay on Free Will.” Published 1983] //ReNSU SF

The answer to this question is a philosophical commonplace. **If we do not have free will**, then **there is no such thing as moral responsibility**. This proposition, one might think, certainly deserves to be a commonplace. **If someone charges you with, say, lying, and if you can convince him that it was simply not within your power not to lie, then it would seem that you have done all that is necessary to absolve yourself of responsibility for lying**. Your accuser cannot say, "I concede it was not within your power not to lie; none the less you ought not to have lied". Ought, as the saying goes, implies can. (Of course, it is unlikely that anyone would believe you if you said that it was not within your power not to lie, but that is not the point.) Similarly, if someone charges you with not having done something he maintains you ought to have done, he must withdraw his charge if you can convince him that you couldn't have done it. If, for example, he charges you with not having spoken up when a word might have saved Jones's reputation, he must withdraw his charge if you can convince him that you were bound and gagged while Jones was being maligned. (These simple facts are actually a bit too simple. An agent may have been unable to perform a certain act at a certain time, but—owing to his abilities with respect to acts that were or might have been performed at earlier times—he may once have been able so to arrange matters that he would have been able to perform that act at that time. For example, I may have been unable to contribute to a certain charity yesterday because I was locked in a bank vault that can't be opened from the inside. But if it should transpire that I had shut myself into the vault in order to avoid the representatives of the charity, few people would regard my having been locked in the vault as providing me with an adequate excuse for not contributing. The reason is easy to see: though there may be a sense in which it is true that I couldn't have contributed to the charity, there was none the less a time-- before I shut myself in—at which I could so have arranged matters that I should have been able to contribute to it when the time to do so rolled round. In the sequel, I shall ignore the possibility of cases like the "bank vault" case in order to avoid unnecessary detail in the statement of my argument.) It would seem to follow from these considerations that without free will there is no moral responsibility: if moral responsibility exists, then someone is morally responsible for something he has done or for something he has Ieft undone; **to be morally responsible for some act or failure to act is at least to be able to have acted otherwise**, whatever else it may involve; **to be able to have acted otherwise is to have free will. Therefore, if moral responsibility exists, someone has free will. Therefore, if no one has free will, moral responsibility does not exist.**

#### Free will doesn’t exist –

#### [1] Eternalism is true – Events do not solely exist in the present but instead exist with the past and future as one continuous spectrum meaning all our future actions already exist

Ryan Scott Ryan, Doctor of Philosophy in Religion from Baylor University and post doc fellow at Baylor, A Short Argument for Eternalism, 2013, <http://www.scholardarity.com/?page_id=3845> //NSU SF

Consider two such moments, for example my eating of a peanut butter sandwich for lunch yesterday and my recollection of that experience today. It seems unproblematic to say that the first moment of experience temporally precedes the second. There seems to be a real relation between the two such that the first comes before the second and the second comes after the first. The question for the non-eternalist is whether that temporal relation really obtains. If “before” and “after” are not real relations, relations that in fact obtain between two objectively existing moments of consciousness, then it seems that time is unreal and eternalism follows trivially. But if they do obtain, then the non-eternalist faces a worse difficulty. For if all that is ever real is the present moment, then there is never a time at which both moments of experience exist, and so at least one of the relata always fails to exist. Granting that my eating of the peanut butter sandwich yesterday does not exist now, if there is no sense in which it exists timelessly, then it simply isn’t “there” to be in a relation of “coming before” to the moment of my recollection. If past and present never coexist in any eternal sense whatsoever, then it should be simply meaningless to say that one comes “before” the other; the past simply fails to exist, and therefore can’t be “related” to anything. A non-eternalist might reply to this argument by saying that the past does continue to exist, but only as past—that when the Moving Finger, having writ, moves on, each moment acquires a quality of “pastness” that differentiates it from the present moment without making it fall out of existence altogether. I think this will not do, primarily for the reason Sprigge makes clear in his essay. My experience of eating a peanut butter sandwich has a certain quality of presentness that is simply part and parcel of the experience; without that quality the experience would not be what it is/was, and indeed would arguably not be an “experience” at all. (Sprigge’s own example, which has the advantage of great vividness, is a toothache.) If that moment of experience is not eternally “there” with that very quality of presentness, then it is no longer available as a temporal relatum, and when I say that the experience of eating the sandwich comes “before” my recollection of it, I am referring not to the experience itself (which no longer exists qua experience) but to its ghost. Surely this is not what we mean to say when we say one experience precedes another; the view that began by apparently cleaving to common sense in the end departs from it egregiously. Unless some version of eternalism is true, then, we cannot even meaningfully say that one moment of experience precedes or follows another. That seems to be a pretty big problem for non-eternalists.

#### [2] Molecular neurology proves free will is fictitious

#### Coyne 12 Jerry Coyne, [Professor in the Department of Ecology and Evolution at The [University of Chicago](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Organizations/Schools/University+of+Chicago)], “Why You Don’t Really Have Free Will,” *USAToday*, January 1st, 2012 <https://www.ethicalpsychology.com/2013/12/why-you-dont-really-have-free-will.html?m=1> //NSU SF

The first is simple: **we are biological** creatures, **collections of molecules that must obey the laws of physics**. **All the success of science rests on the regularity of those laws, which determine the behavior of every molecule in the universe.** Those molecules, of course, also make up your brain — the organ that does the "choosing." And **the neurons and molecules in your brain are the product of both your genes and your environment,** an environment including the other people we deal with. Memories, for example, are nothing more than structural and chemical changes in your brain cells. Everything that you think, say, or **do, must come down to molecules and physics.** True "**free will**," then, **would require us to somehow step outside of our brain's structure and modify how it works**. Science hasn't shown any way we can do this because "**we" are simply constructs of our brain.** We can't impose a nebulous "will" on the inputs to our brain that can affect its output of decisions and actions, any more than a programmed computer can somehow reach inside itself and change its program.

#### [3] Time Relativity theory means events are pre-determined

#### Kiekeben 96 ©1996, 2000 Franz Kiekeben Relativistic Determinism <http://www.franzkiekeben.com/relativistic.html> //NSU SF

**The relativity of simultaneity implies that the future is determined** (in a non-causal sense) in **the following way. Let us say that** you at this moment are **event A**. That **is, your present self — what you are doing**,thinking**, [and] observing**, and so on**,** at this moment — is A. **Let's also say that there is an observer traveling in a very fast spaceship, who** at this very moment (**from your frame of reference**) **is event B. Now for** B, that is, for **the spaceship traveler at this moment, there is an event C which, from B's perspective, lies in the past.** The interesting thing is that **it is possible** for C to be an event which, **from A's perspective,** [**that**] is still in the future [and]. That is, **C hasn't happened yet** as far as you're concerned. Nonetheless, **there is someone right now** (again, from your perspective) **who regards C as having already occurred.** And if that is the case, then how can C be avoidable? **If an event which is in your future is in someone else's past**, and that someone else is in your present (or even in your past!), **then it is inevitable that the event will take place.** Event C must come about, no matter what. And this scenario can in principle apply to any future event. **Thus, all** future **events are determined.** The above argument seems to me unquestionably valid. The only way an indeterminist can reject it, I believe, is by rejecting the relativity of simultaneity. **Since special relativity has been experimentally confirmed many times, rejecting it** may seem **[is]** all but **impossible.** But it is not. One must make a distinction between a theory's experimental results and its correct interpretation. It is possible that the observable confirmations of relativity are compatible with a different theory that reintroduces absolute simultaneity. In fact, the basic equations of special relativity were first arrived at while assuming absolute space and time (and thus absolute simultaneity). Given our present knowledge, however, I believe it is more reasonable to accept relativistic determinism than it is to reject it.

#### [4] Even if determinism is false, indeterminism denies freedom

#### McGinn [Colin McGinn. British philosopher. He has held teaching posts and professorships at University College London, the University of Oxford, Rutgers University and the University of Miami, Problems in Philosophy: The Limits of Inquiry. London: Wiley, 1993. P. 80,. BRACKETED FOR CLARITY] //SHS ZS

The argument is exceedingly familiar, and runs as follows. **Either determinism is true or it is not**. **If it is true**, then **all our chosen actions are uniquely necessitated by prior states of the world**., just like every other event. **But then it cannot be the case that we could [not] have acted otherwise**, since this would require a possibility determinism rules out. **Once the initial conditions are set and the laws fixed, causality excludes genuine freedom**. **On the other hand, if indeterminism is true**, then, though things could have happened otherwise, **it is not the case that we could [not] have chosen otherwise**, **since a merely random event is no kind of free choice**. **That some events** occur causelessly, or **are** not **subject to** law, or only to **probabilistic law, is not sufficient for those events to be free choices**. Thus one horn of the dilemma represents choices as predetermined happenings in a predictable causal sequence, while the other construes them as inexplicable lurches to which the universe is randomly prone. **Neither alternative supplies** what **the notion of free will** requires,, and no other alternative suggests itself. **Therefore freedom is not possible in any kind of possible world.** The concept contains the seeds of its own destruction.

#### Thus, agents aren’t morally responsible for their actions. That negates:

#### [1] Private companies are moral agents – if the appropriation of outer space is not the responsibility of any agent and is merely a fact of the universe then it is not ‘unjust’ as no one is responsible for its moral issues. Being unjust requires violating what is morally right but in a deterministic world nothing can be right nor wrong as agents aren’t responsible for their actions

#### [2] Auto-Negate – The appropriation of outter space is already a fact of the world so given determinism the aff cannot change it as it would violate the laws of physics. That means that even if they win that it would be good the aff is impossible.

## DA

#### The economy is recovering but unstable

World Bank 21’ – World Bank, The World Bank Group is one of the world’s largest sources of funding and knowledge for developing countries. Its five institutions share a commitment to reducing poverty, increasing shared prosperity, and promoting sustainable development, “The Global Economy: on Track for Strong but Uneven Growth as COVID-19 Still Weighs”, World Bank Group, June 8th, 2021, [https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2021/06/08/the-global-economy-on-track-for-strong-but-uneven-growth-as-covid-19-still-weighs] Accessed 12/12/21 AHS//AP

Uncertain Outlook The June forecast assumes that advanced economies will achieve widespread vaccination of their populations and effectively contain the pandemic by the end of the year. Major emerging market and developing economies are anticipated to substantially reduce new cases. However, the outlook is subject to considerable uncertainty. A more persistent pandemic, a wave of corporate bankruptcies, financial stress, or even social unrest could derail the recovery. At the same time, more rapid success in stamping out COVID-19 and greater spillovers from advanced economy growth could generate more vigorous global growth. Even so, the pandemic is expected to have caused serious setbacks to development gains. Although per capita income growth is projected to be 4.9% among emerging market and developing economies this year, it is forecast to be essentially flat in low-income countries. Per capita income lost in 2020 will not be fully recouped by 2022 in about two-thirds of emerging market and developing economies, including three-quarters of fragile and conflict-affected low-income countries. By the end of this year, about 100 million people are expected to have fallen back into extreme poverty. These adverse impacts have been felt hardest by the most vulnerable groups – women, children, and unskilled and informal workers.

#### The private space sector is key to economic stability

Clark 20’ – Suzanne P. Clark, Suzanne P. Clark is president of the US Chamber of Commerce, “Space is our new economic frontier. The US can't afford to lose out”, CNN Business, March 2nd, 2020, [https://www.cnn.com/2020/03/02/perspectives/space-economic-frontier/index.html] Accessed 12/12/21 AHS//AP

The future of our economy depends on the vigorous pursuit of space exploration. And with NASA leading the way, the potential for growth — like space itself — has no limits. Since NASA's launch, American space exploration has always been a bipartisan venture. It was President Kennedy who announced our goal of going to the moon, but it was President Nixon who brought that goal to fruition. Reaching the next milestone in interplanetary travel requires a commitment from our leaders that spans political parties and administrations. And with a new space race getting underway — one that could prove even more consequential than the last — NASA needs bipartisan support from Congress today more than ever. Space is the most promising industry to arise since the birth of the tech sector, with growth projected to skyrocket in the coming years led by companies such as Boeing andNorthropGrumman,and new entrants, such as Virgin Galactic, SpaceX and Blue Origin. [According to US Chamber of Commerce economists](https://www.uschamber.com/series/above-the-fold/the-space-economy-industry-takes), the industry will be worth at least $1.5 trillion by 2040. While no one can fully grasp what our economy will look like 20 years from now, one thing is certain: the private sector space industry will transform how societies across the globe live, communicate and do business. In fact, it already has. Nearly every company depends on space-enabled technologies for day-to-day operations — whether they use satellite communications, remote sensing or location-based services. Businesses across multiple sectors are leveraging these and other technologies to stake their claim in this new economic frontier. Pharmaceutical companies such as Merck and Sanofi, for example, are conducting experiments in low-Earth orbit [aboard the International Space Station](https://www.issnationallab.org/research-on-the-iss/areas-of-research/life-sciences/) to evaluate the potential advantages of microgravity in developing new drug treatments that will help people live longer, healthier lives. Companies, such as Bigelow, are committed to making [off-Earth habitation](https://www.cnn.com/2016/05/05/tech/way-up-there-where-will-we-live-space/index.html) a reality. Even retailers are getting in on the action, with companies like Target [funding research](https://www.iss-casis.org/cottonsustainabilitychallenge/) on the International Space Station to produce more sustainable forms of cotton. Lunar colonies, asteroid mining and interplanetary travel — once the stuff of science fiction — could become a reality. But for any of that to happen, we need sustained and meaningful action from members of Congress. They can start by meeting the president's request for NASA funding. Included in the White House budget is [$12.4 billion](https://www.cnn.com/2020/02/10/tech/nasa-budget-moon-landing-artemis-scn/index.html) specifically for lunar explorationthat would include landing systems, continued development of the Space Launch System (SLS) and theOrion crew module. These spacecraft will allow us to shuttle people and equipment to the moon and back. They will take us not only beyond Earth's orbit but also into the next phase of commercial space development. Most importantly, they will ensure that the United States continues to outpace competitors like China and Russia in the space race. Our country must be the vanguard in exploring these new economic frontiers. Planting the American flag in the private sector space industry will help create the jobs of the future and allow the United States to lead the formation of best practices that will govern the industry for decades to come. Some might ask if returning to the moon is worth the expense. The answer is undeniably yes. Providing NASA with the resources it needs to succeed is a small investment that will yield tremendous dividends over time. To start, it would help secure American commercial dominance in a fast-growing industry. It also would be a catalyst for innovation and scientific discovery, with salutary effects that would benefit the entire economy. Just consider the [groundbreaking innovations](https://www.nasa.gov/sites/default/files/80660main_ApolloFS.pdf) that resulted from the Apollo program — from CAT scans and computer microchips to miniature cameras and cordless tools. These and myriad other inventions all had their origins in NASA research labs to expand human productivity in microgravity from the earliest era of Project Mercury to today's ISS. Now just imagine what new technologies we could discover by channeling our intellectual and economic resources into a return trip to the moon or even Mars. Will any of this be easy? No — and that's the point. More than 50 years ago, [we chose to go to the moon](https://er.jsc.nasa.gov/seh/ricetalk.htm) not because it was easy but because it was hard. And today, we choose to go back — and to venture even further into the beyond — because doing so will usher in a new era of American innovation.

### Safety

#### [1] Turn: Multinational companies deescalate conflict between nations

Kaesar 20 - Joe Kaeser, Chairman of the Supervisory Board, Siemens Energy, World Economic Forum, January 9th, 2020 “What can companies do to de-escalate the US-China trade war?” [https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/01/companies-deescalate-us-china-trade-war/] Accessed 1/30/22 SAO

So, what can multinational companies do to prevent a decoupling of China and the US? The answer is co-opetition: cooperate and compete – with a clear stance and eyes wide open. For cooperation to work, all parties involved must benefit. Win-win is the watchword. And this is critical in a world that is more connected than ever before. That’s what we at Siemens advocated at our first Belt and Road International Summit in Beijing in June of 2018. The response was overwhelming. Over 1,200 representatives from over 30 countries took part. If the BRI becomes a zero-sum game, international support will wane and ultimately projects will fail. **To be able to compete, a company must** lead in innovation and invest in training, education, and infrastructure; it must **adopt best practices** and meet highest governance standards; and it must serve society wherever it does business. Whether friend, enemy, or frenemy, no one is interested in a second-rate company. In 1985, Siemens was the first multinational company to sign a cooperation agreement with the Chinese government. **The agreement resulted in an unprecedented transfer of technology and knowledge**. It went far beyond the sale of products. It called for founding joint ventures and providing local training and education. Just 10 years later, Siemens operated 30 joint ventures in China. Today, the company generates annual revenue of about €8 billion in China and employs more than 33,000 people. It’s one of the largest foreign-invested companies in China, with interests in 89 local companies. Both China and Siemens have benefited enormously from co-opetition. And that is how multinational companies can and should prevent decoupling in the future.

#### [2] Turn: Property rights are key to incentivizing clean up

Werner 18 - Debra Werner, Space News, April 23, 2018 “Debris removal missions face technical, legal and financial hurdles” [https://spacenews.com/debris-removal-missions-face-technical-legal-and-financial-hurdles/] Accessed 1/11/22 SAO

Once those missions show active debris removal is possible, active debris removal ventures will face their biggest challenge: raising money for the ventures. Nobody has a clear idea how much active debris removal should cost, said Luc Piguet, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne scientific adviser. A series of commercial missions in the next few years will shed light on the cost of debris removal and reveal government and commercial demand for the service. “In today’s world, it is not enough to say, ‘I will do something because it advances technology and cleans something up,’” Innocenti said. “You also have to demonstrate a business link.” ESA member states agreed that e.Deorbit, the agency’s initiative to capture the defunct Envisat, was “a fantastic mission” and they would like to fund it, Innocenti said. “The problem comes when you have to prioritize with respect to a launcher, Earth observation, telecommunications support, science and all the rest. It’s a question of priority. If it had the commercial return, that would change the priority.”

#### [3] Turn: Property rights key identify who owns debris and hold them responsible for clean up

Muñoz-Patchen 18 - Chelsea Muñoz-Patchen, Chicago Journal of International Law, 8-16-2018 “Regulating the Space Commons: Treating Space Debris as Abandoned Property in Violation of the Outer Space Treaty” [https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1741&context=cjil] Accessed 1/11/22 SAO

Despite Strahilevitz’s general view that chattel property can be unilaterally abandoned, he recognizes an exception for property without subjective or market value. 101 In practice, the abandonment of this type of property is often regulated and would not be categorized as unilateral abandonment.102 To be unilaterally abandoned, no other party can be the recipient of transferred property.103 For this reason, it is not unilateral abandonment when someone disposes of trash in a receptacle managed by a private or public disposal service.104 Property without subjective or market value—like trash, pollution, or, as this Comment argues, space debris—imposes costs on society if it is unilaterally abandoned.105 Because of this, the abandonment of trash and other unwanted goods is regulated to either prevent unilateral abandonment or force abandoners to bear the costs of cleaning up.106 The state may fine a litterer, demand that someone trying to dump larger property properly sell or dispose of it, or arrange for public trash disposal and contract with property owners to dispose of their trash for a fee.107 Governments also regulate pollution to prevent its release and require remediation by owners.108 The treatment of this type of debris also aligns with Professor Eduardo Peñalver’s view that unilateral abandonment is not the legal norm.109 Contrary to the general regime described by Strahilevitz, Peñalver argues that the common law is generally suspicious of abandonment and that the non-abandonment of land operates such that chattel abandonment is almost never unilateral; rather, it is bilateral because someone owns the land on which the property is abandoned.110 Thus, chattels can only be abandoned if the landowner consents. Otherwise, the law seeks to punish those who abandon rubbish, and both private and public disposal services are used (at a cost) to remedy the problem.111 In space there is no private land because it has been established as a commons.

### Get off the Rock

#### [1] NU: NASA and other countries still have plans for space colonization, diversion of resources happens anyway

#### [2] NU: This still happens without appropriation. Starlink is made for services, proves that billionaires don’t need property rights specifically to appropriate

#### [3] Turn: Asteroid mining – even when resources are sent back to earth – is more environmentally sustainable than earth mining.

Hein 18, (Andreas M. Hein, PhD, Associate Professor at the University of Luxembourg), 10-10-2018, "Exploring Potential Environmental Benefits of Asteroid Mining," arXiv, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.04749> PM

Abstract Asteroid mining has been proposed as an approach to complement Earth-based supplies of rare earth metals and supplying resources in space, such as water. Existing research on asteroid mining has mainly looked into its economic viability, technological feasibility, cartography of asteroids, and legal aspects. More recently, potential environmental benefits for asteroid mining have been considered. However, no quantitative estimate of these benefits has been given. This paper attempts to determine if and under which conditions asteroid mining would have environmental benefits, compared to either Earth-based mining or launching equipment and resources into space. We focus on two cases: Water supply to cis-lunar orbit and platinum mining. First, we conduct a state-of-the-art of current environmental life cycle assessment for the space domain and platinum mining. Second, a first order environmental life cycle assessment is conducted, including goal and scope definition, inventory analysis, and impact assessment. We compare water supply to cis-lunar orbit with and without asteroid mining and go on to compare terrestrial with space-based platinum mining. The results indicate that asteroid water mining would have environmental benefits, as soon as the amount of water supplied via mining is larger than the mass of the spacecraft used for mining. For platinum mining, we find that by comparing the operations phase of terrestrial and space mining, space mining would have a lower environmental impact, if the spacecraft is able to return between 0.3 to 7% of its mass in platinum to Earth, assuming 100% primary platinum or 100% secondary platinum, respectively. For future work, we propose a more detailed analysis, based on a more precise inventory and a larger system boundary, including the production of the launcher and spacecraft. Keywords: asteroid mining, environmental life cycle analysis, ecological impact, sustainability, rare earth metals, platinum 1. Introduction Mining asteroids, and in particular mining Near Earth Asteroids (NEAs) has been frequently proposed as a source of resources for space and terrestrial applications [1]–[3]. Two broad categories of resources can be distinguished: volatiles and metals. Ross [4] identifies a variety of applications for these resources such as construction, life support systems, and propellant. Volatiles such as water are of particular interest for inspace applications, due to their abundance in carbonaceous (C-type) asteroids and their relative ease of extraction. For example, Calla et al. [5] explore the technological and economic viability of supplying water from NEAs to cis-lunar orbit. Regarding the supply of resources for terrestrial applications, only resources with a high market value are interesting, due to the high transportation cost. Hence, expensive metals such as rare earth metals and in particular the subgroup of platinum group metals have been the subject of asteroid mining studies [6]. The supply of platinum group metals is crucial for many terrestrial “green technologies” such as fuel cells and catalyzers [7]–[10]. However, there are two major concerns regarding platinum group metals. First, current supplies of platinum group metals are dominated by only a few countries, namely, South Africa, Russia, and Canada, which introduces political uncertainties into the supply chain [11]. The second concern is regarding the environmental impact of mining platinum group metals. Mines tend to go deeper and deeper, as resources in upper layers are depleted, which increases already high greenhouse gas emissions (currently ~40,000t CO2 per ton of platinum) [11], [12]. Mitigating these issues has led to initiatives for recycling rare Earth metals and investigating substitutes [13]–[15]. In addition, the local environment is severely impacted due to the use of hazardous substances during the extraction process [11]. Despite the potential environmental benefits of asteroid mining, either by reducing the number of launches into space or moving terrestrial industries into space, no dedicated studies for exploring these benefits has been conducted to the authors’ knowledge. Existing research on asteroid mining has mainly looked into its economic viability [2], [6], [16], [17], technological feasibility [2], [18]–[23], cartography of asteroids [24], [25], and legal aspects [26]–[28].