# T - Framework

#### Interpretation: The affirmative may only garner offense through banning appropriation of space by private entities - proving that private appropriation is good should be enough to vote negative.

#### ‘Resolved’ denotes a proposal to be enacted by law.

Words and Phrases 64 (Permanent Edition)

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### Resolved” before a colon reflects a legislative forum

AOS ’04 (5-12, “# 12, Punctuation – The Colon and Semicolon”, http://usawocc.army.mil/IMI/wg12.htm)

The colon introduces the following: a. A list, but only after "as follows," "the following," or a noun for which the list is an appositive: Each scout will carry the following: (colon) meals for three days, a survival knife, and his sleeping bag. The company had four new officers: (colon) Bill Smith, Frank Tucker, Peter Fillmore, and Oliver Lewis. b. A long quotation (one or more paragraphs): In The Killer Angels Michael Shaara wrote: (colon) You may find it a different story from the one you learned in school. There have been many versions of that battle [Gettysburg] and that war [the Civil War]. (The quote continues for two more paragraphs.) c. A formal quotation or question: The President declared: (colon) "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." The question is: (colon) what can we do about it? d. A second independent clause which explains the first: Potter's motive is clear: (colon) he wants the assignment. e. After the introduction of a business letter: Dear Sirs: (colon) Dear Madam: (colon) f. The details following an announcement For sale: (colon) large lakeside cabin with dock g. A *formal* resolution, after the word "resolved:" Resolved: (colon) That this council petition the mayor.

#### Net benefits

#### Competitive equity – non-topical advocacies monopolize ground and allow the aff to unilaterally determine neg positions – it creates a competitive incentive to give the neg the worst ground.

#### Reciprocity - Debate is only reciprocal if the aff is constrained by the res since the neg is constrained by the aff – otherwise there’s infinite affs which destroys limits. Failing to affirm the resolution destroys constraints on debate and makes effective deliberation impossible

#### Link turns exclusion – small schools and debaters with fewer resources won’t have any hope of keeping up with the incredibly high number of affs. A limit on the number of affs equalizes the playing field

### Voters

#### Fairness comes first and is an intrinsic good---debate is a game and requires effective competition between the aff and the neg. Competitive merit inevitably matters to people and education and praxis is not the end all be all because strategy always asserts itself.

#### Comes before substance---deciding any other argument in this debate cannot be disentangled from my inability to prepare for it---any argument you think they’re winning is a link, not a reason to vote for them

#### Topicality is not violence, but rather a critique of their refusal to open their protest strategy to testing – I don’t have the power to impose a norm, only to persuade you that my methodology is best – every debate requires a winner and loser, so voting negative doesn’t reject them from debate, it just says they should make a better argument next time

#### No RVIs – they shouldn’t get to win for intentionally violating the rules of debate, giving them a competitive advantage from the moment pairings come out.

#### Prefer competing interpretation – reasonability is arbitrary and invites judges intervention as to what is reasonable.

# CP

#### PIC – do the aff without doing the topic

#### you can solve ableism without doing the topic which solves the aff AND the da

#### you need to challenge all forms of ableism – including that in debate which affirming the topic can never solve

# Framing

**The role of the ballot is to vote for the better debater. That’s the reason we should up to debate in the first place. This doesn’t justify ableism because you can still address ableism through being the better debater.**

**The standard is maximizing expected well-being.**

1. **Prefer because value requires us to be alive in the future. We can’t address ableism if we’re all dead.**

Bostrom 12 [Nick Bostrom. Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford. “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy (2012)]

These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate.¶ Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving — and ideally improving — our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value. To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

#### Util has degrees of wrongness – so we can actually judge between different things but one person’s experiences with ableism is no more/less important than another

# Case

#### Weigh da v. aff

#### Debate is ableist

#### Inclusion is good but there are better methods that don’t out people as disabled

### Presumption

#### Truth is only truth first in some instances

#### We can always question reasoning – both sides do that

#### Not presuming all statements are false – just some such as the resolution

#### Counterinterp: Neg can test aff role of the ballot if the aff ROB skews the strategy of the neg

#### Solves back strat skew

#### Pic solves back ableist space

#### Inclusion is good but you don’t need to do the aff

#### SS solves non-T b) you’re not Non-T

#### Disabled fairness is a voter but including topic education is better

#### TVA solves – should be intersectional – if we’re only talking about disability within the topic we can’t truly understand disability for Black people; disabled folks

1. ROB can’t come before theory if the ROB is a theoretical question 2. If theory doesn’t come first, we can’t properly call out people who undermine accessibility in debate

Don’t DTD because there’s no warrant

# DA

#### Noble materials such as platinum are necessary for future survival, yet they are of limited abundance and require a lot of resources to extract on earth, while are abundant on asteroids.

Sun et al. 20 (Sun, Daoyuan, Dong, Longjun., Shu, W., & Li, Xibing (School of Resources and Safety Engineering, Central South University, Changsha, China), 3-2-2020, “Exploration: safe and clean mining on Earth and asteroids. Journal of Cleaner Production,” <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S095965262030946X> Accessed 7-13-21)

Some types of mineral resources are obligatory for an evolving future society, which have great differences in their abundances on Earth and asteroids (e.g., Elvis, 2014). For example, platinum, a noble metal with its total reserve of only about 14,000 tons on Earth, has been widely used in the fields of medicine (e.g., Barefoot, 2001), materials engineering and chemical engineering (e.g., Dong et al., 2015), while most of the platinum has been contained in the ultra-deep deposits as it has large density in the early stage of Earth formation (e.g., Holzheid et al., 2000). With the exhaustion of the limited platinum contained in the surface of Earth, we have to consume more energy and resources to extract the ultra-deep platinum. Hence, there is no doubt that the safe and clean extraction of the deep platinum will be an extremely difficult issue by utilizing current mining techniques and equipment. Meanwhile, it can be expected that the output of platinum on Earth will be scarce as its total reserve is short (Dong et al., 2015). However, the platinum is abundant in other asteroids such as the asteroid 2011 UW158, which was worth 5.4 trillion USD for the platinum that it contained (Gary, 2016). According to the surveys funded by NASA’s Near Earth Object (NEO) Observations Program, the total number of discovered near-Earth asteroids (NEAs) reached to 15,000 up to 13 October 2016 (NASA, 2016). As of January 2018, there were over 18,000 known NEOs, with an average discovery rate about 40 per week (NASA, 2018). Many of NEAs contain high concentrations of platinum group metals (PGMs) such as platinum, rhodium, iridium, and palladium, which are similar to the asteroid 2011 UW158 and can be classified as Metallic Asteroids (Blair, 2000). It can be inferred that the deposits of PGMs on the identified NEAs may exceed the total amount of that found on Earth. Evidently, offmining on asteroids provides new ways for the future society to access the rare and noble metals on Earth.

#### Asteroid mining enables solar power satellites – which solves climate change

**Taylor 19** Chris Taylor is a veteran journalist. Previously senior news writer for Time.com a year later. In 2000, he was named San Francisco bureau chief for Time magazine. He has served as senior editor for Business 2.0, West Coast editor for Fortune Small Business and West Coast web editor for Fast Company. Chris is a graduate of Merton College, Oxford and the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism. "How asteroid mining will save the Earth — and mint trillionaires." Mashable, 2019, mashable.com/feature/asteroid-mining-space-economy. [Quality Control]

The mission is essential, Joyce declares, to save Earth from its **major problems**. First of all, the fictional billionaire wheels in a fictional Nobel economist to demonstrate the actual truth that the entire global economy is sitting on a **mountain of debt**. It has to keep growing or it will **implode**, so we might as well take the majority of the **industrial growth off-world where it can’t do any more harm to the biosphere.**

Secondly, there’s the **climate change fix**. Suarez sees asteroid mining as the only way we’re going to build **solar power satellites.** Which, as you probably know, is a form of uninterrupted solar power collection that is theoretically more effective, inch for inch, than any solar panels on Earth at high noon, but operating 24/7. (In space, basically, **it’s always double high noon).**

The power collected is beamed back to large receptors on Earth with large, low-power microwaves, which researchers think will be harmless enough to let humans and animals pass through the beam. A space solar power array like the one China is said to be working on could reliably supply 2,000 gigawatts — or **over 1,000 times more power than the largest solar farm currently in existence.**

“We're looking at a 20-year window to **completely replace** human civilization's **power infrastructure,**” Suarez told me, citing the report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change on the coming catastrophe. Solar satellite technology “has existed since the 1970s. What we were missing is **millions of tons of construction materials** in orbit. **Asteroid mining can place it there.”**

The Earth-centric early 21st century can’t really wrap its brain around this, but the idea is not to bring all that building material and precious metals down into our gravity well. Far better to create a whole new commodities exchange in space. You mine the useful stuff of asteroids both near to Earth and far, thousands of them taking less energy to reach than the moon. That’s something else we’re still grasping, how relatively easy it is to ship stuff in zero-G environments.

#### Off- Earth mining reduces emissions.

Dallas, et al. 19 (Dallas, J.A. (Australian Centre for Space Engineering Research, School of Minerals and Energy Resources Engineering, Sydney, Australia) et al. November 2, 2019, "Mining beyond earth for sustainable development: Will humanity benefit from resource extraction in outer space?," *Acta Astronautica*, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0094576519313839>. Accessed 7-12-21)

Off-Earth mining has been hailed by some as the answer to many of the environmental issues associated with mining on Earth (e.g., MacWhorter, 2015), based on the idea that much of the mining that is carried out on Earth 2 could instead be done in space in a bid to reduce pressure on Earth’s environment. In a preliminary study comparing the greenhouse gas emissions resulting from mining platinum (Pt) on Earth compared to asteroids, Hein et al. (2018) found that mining Pt in space produced considerably less greenhouse gas emissions relative to Earth-based mining. However, this study compared greenhouse gas emissions resulting from 1 kg of mined Pt, and did not compare the impact on other areas of the environment. If asteroids were to supply Earth with all, or even most of the demand for Pt, the assumption can be made that this would require a number of space vehicles carrying materials required for mining infrastructure. While the greenhouse gas emissions associated with space launches may be relatively less than Pt mining on Earth, the cumulative impact of frequent space launches on other areas of the environment is likely to be considerable. Numerous studies have documented the environmental impact of space launches (e.g., Madsen, 1981; Malkin, 1978; Murray et al., 2013; NASA, 1983; Nauryzbaev et al., 2005; Ross et al., 2010), and of particular concern when discussing cumulative launches is depletion of the stratospheric ozone layer. Space rocket launches are the only source of ozone depleting substances deposited directly into Earth’s ozone layer, causing concern that an increase in the frequency of launches could have dire consequences for the ozone layer (Ross et al., 2009). Aside from global environmental concerns, both Earth-based mining and space launches impact the local environment, with both being associated with emissions to soil, air, and water. However, the scale of emissions from mining is much greater than those associated with space launches, and this would likely remain the case even with a large increase in the frequency of space launches. While more work is needed to quantify the local environmental impact of the Earth-based mining as well as the space launches associated with off-Earth mining, preliminary evidence suggests that space launches result in environmental impacts of a much smaller magnitude (e.g., Hein et al., 2018). MacWhorter (2015) suggests that the environmental benefits to Earth of moving mining for resources used on Earth to other celestial bodies will be so large that off-Earth mining should be incentivized through a legal framework that grants property rights in extracted minerals on a “first-in-time, first-in-right” basis

#### Emissions lead to extinction.

Spratt and Dunlop 19, David Spratt [Research Director for Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration, Melbourne, and co-author of Climate Code Red: The case for emergency action] & Ian Dunlop [member of the Club of Rome. Formerly an international oil, gas and coal industry executive, chairman of the Australian Coal Association, chief executive of the Australian Institute of Company Directors, and chair of the Australian Greenhouse Office Experts Group on Emissions Trading 1998-2000], “Existential climate-related security risk: A scenario approach,” Breakthrough - National Centre for Climate Restoration, May 2019, pg. 8-10, beckert. Brackets in original text

2020–2030: Policy-makers fail to act on evidence that the current ​Paris Agreement path — in which global human-caused greenhouse emissions do not peak until 2030 — will lock in at least 3°C of warming. The case for a global, climate-emergency mobilisation of labour and resources to build a zero-emission economy and carbon drawdown in order to have a realistic chance of keeping warming well below 2°C is politely ignored. As projected by Xu and Ramanathan, by 2030 carbon dioxide levels have reached 437 parts per million — which is unprecedented in the last 20 million years — and warming reaches 1.6°C.18 2030–2050: Emissions peak in 2030, and start to fall consistent with an 80 percent reduction in fossil-fuel energy intensity by 2100 compared to 2010 energy intensity. This leads to warming of 2.4°C by 2050, consistent with the Xu and Ramanathan “baseline-fast” scenario.19 However, another 0.6°C of warming occurs — taking the total to 3°C by 2050 — due to the activation of a number of carbon-cycle feedbacks and higher levels of ice albedo and cloud feedbacks than current models assume. [It should be noted that this is far from an extreme scenario: the low-probability, high-impact warming (five percent probability) can exceed 3.5–4°C by 2050 in the Xu and Ramanathan scheme.] 2050: By 2050, there is broad scientific acceptance that system tipping-points for the West Antarctic Ice Sheet and a sea-ice-free Arctic summer were passed well before 1.5°C of warming, for the Greenland Ice Sheet well before 2°C, and for widespread permafrost loss and large-scale Amazon drought and dieback by 2.5°C. The “hothouse Earth” scenario has been realised, and Earth is headed for another degree or more of warming, especially since human greenhouse emissions are still significant.20 While sea levels have risen 0.5 metres by 2050, the increase may be 2–3 metres by 2100, and it is understood from historical analogues that seas may eventually rise by more than 25 metres. Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and 55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of lethal heat conditions, beyond the threshold of human survivability. The destabilisation of the Jet Stream has very significantly affected the intensity and geographical distribution of the Asian and West African monsoons and, together with the further slowing of the Gulf Stream, is impinging on life support systems in Europe. North America suffers from devastating weather extremes including wildfires, heatwaves, drought and inundation. The summer monsoons in China have failed, and water flows into the great rivers of Asia are severely reduced by the loss of more than one-third of the Himalayan ice sheet. Glacial loss reaches 70 percent in the Andes, and rainfall in Mexico and central America falls by half. Semi-permanent El Nino conditions prevail. Aridification emerges over more than 30 percent of the world’s land surface. Desertification is severe in southern Africa, the southern Mediterranean, west Asia, the Middle East, inland Australia and across the south-western United States. Impacts: A number of ecosystems collapse, including coral reef systems, the Amazon rainforest and in the Arctic. Some poorer nations and regions, which lack capacity to provide artificially-cooled environments for their populations, become unviable. Deadly heat conditions persist for more than 100 days per year in West Africa, tropical South America, the Middle East and South-East Asia, contributing to more than a billion people being displaced from the tropical zone. Water availability decreases sharply in the most affected regions at lower latitudes (dry tropics and subtropics), affecting about two billion people worldwide. Agriculture becomes nonviable in the dry subtropics. Most regions in the world see a significant drop in food production and increasing numbers of extreme weather events, including heat waves, floods and storms. Food production is inadequate to feed the global population and food prices skyrocket, as a consequence of a one-fifth decline in crop yields, a decline in the nutrition content of food crops, a catastrophic decline in insect populations, desertification, monsoon failure and chronic water shortages, and conditions too hot for human habitation in significant food-growing regions. The lower reaches of the agriculturally-important river deltas such as the Mekong, Ganges and Nile are inundated, and significant sectors of some of the world’s most populous cities — including Chennai, Mumbai, Jakarta, Guangzhou, Tianjin, Hong Kong, Ho Chi Minh City, Shanghai, Lagos, Bangkok and Manila — are abandoned. Some small islands become uninhabitable. Ten percent of Bangladesh is inundated, displacing 15 million people. Even for 2°C of warming, more than a billion people may need to be relocated and In high-end scenarios, the scale of destruction is beyond our capacity to model, with a high likelihood of human civilisation coming to an end.21 National security consequences: For pragmatic reasons associated with providing only a sketch of this scenario, we take the conclusion of the ​Age of Consequences ‘Severe’ 3°C scenario developed by a group of senior US national-security figures in 2007 as appropriate for our scenario too: Massive nonlinear events in the global environment give rise to ​massive nonlinear societal events.​ In this scenario, nations around the world will be ​overwhelmed by the scale of change and pernicious challenges, such as pandemic disease. The internal cohesion of nations will be under great stress, including in the United States, both as a result of a dramatic rise in migration and changes in agricultural patterns and water availability. The flooding of coastal communities around the world, especially in the Netherlands, the United States, South Asia, and China, has the potential to challenge regional and even national identities.​ Armed conflict between nations over resources, such as the Nile and its tributaries, is likely and nuclear war is possible. The social consequences range from increased religious fervor to ​outright chaos.​ In this scenario, climate change provokes ​a permanent shift in the relationship of humankind to nature​’.22 (emphasis added) DISCUSSION This scenario provides a glimpse into a world of “outright chaos” on a path to the end of human civilisation and modern society as we have known it, in which the challenges to global security are simply overwhelming and political panic becomes the norm. Yet the world is currently completely unprepared to envisage, and even less deal with, the consequences of catastrophic climate change.23 What can be done to avoid such a probable but catastrophic future? It is clear from our preliminary scenario that dramatic action is required this decade if the “hothouse Earth” scenario is to be avoided. To reduce this risk and protect human civilisation, a massive global mobilisation of resources is needed in the coming decade to build a zero-emissions industrial system and set in train the restoration of a safe climate. This would be akin in scale to the World War II emergency mobilisation. There is an increasing awareness that such a response is now necessary. Prof. Kevin Anderson makes the case for a Marshall Plan-style construction of zero-carbon-dioxide energy supply and major electrification to build a zero-carbon industrial strategy by “a shift in productive capacity of society akin to that in World War II”.24 Others have warned that “only a drastic, economy-wide makeover within the next decade, consistent with limiting warming to 1.5°C”, would avoid the transition of the Earth System to the Pliocene-like conditions that prevailed 3-3.3 million years ago, when temperatures were ~3°C and sea levels 25 metres higher.25 It should be noted here that the 1.5° goal is not safe for a number of Earth System elements, including Arctic sea-ice, West Antarctica and coral reefs.