### 1NC – Colt Peacemaker

#### Interp – the aff must explicitly delineate a comprehensive role of the ballot and how the round plays out under it in the form of a text in the 1AC. To clarify, they must –

#### - Clarify how offense links to it, e.g. address the pre-fiat vs post-fiat distinction

#### - Clarify whether theory is relevant under it

#### - Clarify how to weigh between competing advocacies, e.g. if the ballot is determined by the flow

#### Violation – there’s no text in the 1AC

#### Standards –

#### 1] Engagement – if I don’t know how the role of the ballot functions, it’s impossible for me to engage the aff, since knowing what counts as offense for me is a prerequisite to being able to make meaningful arguments that clash with yours.

#### 2] Strategy Skew – you make formulating a strategy impossible since I don’t know what links to your evaluative mechanism. My interp means we know what a legitimate neg advocacy is, otherwise you can make up reasons mine doesn’t link to the role of the ballot in the next speech.

#### Fairness – a) evaluation – you presume their arguments false absent proof that they weren’t made abusively b) debate’s a game and thus requires rules to constrain the game otherwise no one would play Drop the debater – a) Deters future abuse, b) Rectifies time loss, c) DTA encourages baiting – Debaters could fill their cases w/ abusive args, baiting theory and then just drop the argument in the next speech and go for undercovered substance

#### Competing interps – a) It fosters the best norms through encouraging the fairest rule b) Reasonability collapses by debating the brightline

#### No RVIs – a) Illogical – you shouldn’t win for proving that you’re fair or edication because it’s a prima facie burden – logic outweighs because it determines what args count as valid b) It incentivizes you to bait theory and win off a scripted CI c) people will be scared to read theory against good theory debaters and will never be able to check abuse

### 1NC – Counter-Solvency Advocate

#### Interp – if the aff defends anything other than the entire resolution then they must provide a linked article or a card by an author who explicitly advocates against the 1AC advocacy. Violation – Standards – 1] Limits – there are infinite things you could defend outside the exact text of the resolution which pushes you to the limits of contestable arguments, even if your interp of the topic is better, the only way to verify if it’s substantively fair is proof of counter-arguments.

#### 2] Shiftiness – having a counter-solvency advocate helps us conceptualize what their advocacy is and how it’s implemented. Intentionally ambiguous affirmatives we don’t know much about can’t spike out of DA’s and CP’s if they have an advocate that delineates these things.

#### 3] Research – forces the aff to go to the other side of the library and contest their own view points, as well as encouraging in depth-research about their own position.

#### Fairness because debate’s a game and education because it’s the only portable skill from debate.

#### Skip

#### skip Drop the debater – a) Deters future abuse, b) Rectifies time loss, c) DTA encourages baiting – Debaters could fill their cases w/ abusive args, baiting theory and then just drop the argument in the next speech and go for undercovered substance

#### Competing interps – a) It fosters the best norms through encouraging the fairest rule b) Reasonability collapses by debating the brightline

#### No RVIs – a) Illogical – you shouldn’t win for proving that you’re fair or edication because it’s a prima facie burden – logic outweighs  because it determines what args count as valid b) It incentivizes you to bait theory and win off a scripted CI c) people will be scared to read theory against good theory debaters and will never be able to check abuse

### 1NC – Kant NC

#### The meta ethic is practical reason.

#### 1] Is-ought gap – empiricism can only observe what is since that’s the only thing in our perception, not what ought to be, but it’s impossible to derive an ought from descriptive premises which requires a priori premises to form morality.

#### 2] Empirical uncertainty– evil demon could deceive us, dreaming, simulation, and inability to know other’s experiences makes empiricism an unreliable basis for universal ethics.

#### 3] Infallibility – practical reason is the only unescapable authority because to ask why we should be reasoners is to concede authority to reason since the question itself uses reason – anything else is nonbinding and arbitrary.

#### Reason requires that maxims we act upon must be universalizable – any reasoner would know that two plus two equals four because there is no a priori distinction between agents so norms must be universally valid.

#### And willing an action that violates the freedom of others is a contradiction – if I decide to kill someone, that action is not universalizable because that would justify other people killing me too.

#### Thus, the standard is respecting freedom. 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.

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

#### 3] TJFs and they outweigh since it precludes engagement on the framework layer – prefer for Resource disparities- Our framework ensures big squads don’t have a comparative advantage since debates become about quality of arguments rather than quantity - their model crowds out small schools because they have to prep for every unique advantage under each aff, every counterplan, and every disad with carded responses to each of them

#### Acquisition of property can never be unjust – to create rights violations, there must already be an owner of the property being violated, but that presupposes its appropriation by another entity.

Feser 1, (Edward Feser, 1-1-2005, accessed on 12-15-2021, Cambridge University Press, "THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN UNJUST INITIAL ACQUISITION | Social Philosophy and Policy | Cambridge Core", Edward C. Feser is an American philosopher. He is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at Pasadena City College in Pasadena, California. [https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)[brackets](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)%5bbrackets) for gen lang]//phs st

There is a serious difficulty with this criticism of Nozick, however. It is just this: There is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition of resources; therefore, there is no case to be made for redistributive taxation on the basis of alleged injustices in initial acquisition. This is, to be sure, a bold claim. Moreover, in making it, I contradict not only Nozick’s critics, but Nozick himself, who clearly thinks it is at least possible for there to be injustices in acquisition, whether or not there have in fact been any (or, more realistically, whether or not there have been enough such injustices to justify continual redistributive taxation for the purposes of rectifying them). But here is a case where Nozick has, I think, been too generous to the other side. Rather than attempt —unsatisfactorily, in the view of his critics—to meet the challenge to show that initial acquisition has not in general been unjust, he ought instead to have insisted that there is no such challenge to be met in the first place. Giving what I shall call “the basic argument” for this audacious claim will be the task of Section II of this essay. The argument is, I think, compelling, but by itself it leaves unexplained some widespread intu- itions to the effect that certain specific instances of initial acquisition are unjust and call forth as their remedy the application of a Lockean proviso, or are otherwise problematic. (A “Lockean proviso,” of course, is one that forbids initial acquisitions of resources when these acquisitions do not leave “enough and as good” in common for others.) Thus, Section III focuses on various considerations that tend to show how those intuitions are best explained in a way consistent with the argument of Section II. Section IV completes the task of accounting for the intuitions in question by considering how the thesis of self-ownership itself bears on the acqui- sition and use of property. Section V shows how the results of the previ- ous sections add up to a more satisfying defense of Nozickian property rights than the one given by Nozick himself, and considers some of the implications of this revised conception of initial acquisition for our under- standing of Nozick’s principles of transfer and rectification. II. The Basic Argument The reason there is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition of resources is that there is no such thing as either a just or an unjust initial acquisition of resources. The concept of justice, that is to say, simply does not apply to initial acquisition. It applies only after initial acquisition has already taken place. In particular, it applies only to transfers of property (and derivatively, to the rectification of injustices in transfer). This, it seems to me, is a clear implication of the assumption (rightly) made by Nozick that external resources are initially unowned. Consider the following example. Suppose an individual A seeks to acquire some previously unowned resource R. For it to be the case that A commits an injustice in acquiring R, it would also have to be the case that there is some individual B (or perhaps a group of individuals) against whom A commits the injustice. But for B to have been wronged by A’s acquisi- tion of R, B would have to have had a rightful claim over R, a right to R. By hypothesis, however, B did not have a right to R, because no one had a right to it—it was unowned, after all. So B was not wronged and could not have been. In fact, the very first person who could conceivably be wronged by anyone’s use of R would be, not B, but A himself, since A is the first one to own R. Such a wrong would in the nature of the case be an injustice in transfer—in unjustly taking from A what is rightfully his—not in initial acquisition. The same thing, by extension, will be true of all unowned resources: it is only after some- one has initially acquired them that anyone could unjustly come to possess them, via unjust transfer. It is impossible, then, for there to be any injustices in initial acquisition.7

### 1NC – Space Col DA

#### Private sector innovation in the commercial space industry is high now.

**Smith 18** [Matthew Smith, 6-11-2018, "Commercialized Space and You," Science in the News, https://sitn.hms.harvard.edu/flash/2018/commercialized-space-and-you/]//DDPT

Step aside, NASA. The 20th century model of space exploration is running out of fuel, and private companies are now leading the race for human expansion across the galaxy. Elon Musk, Richard Branson, and Jeff Bezos are three of the billionaires leading this extraterrestrial adventure with their respective companies, SpaceX, Virgin Galactic, and Blue Origin. Bezos, the founder of Amazon and currently the wealthiest person in the world, has a vision of sending autonomous rovers to the Moon and helping to eventually create a Moon Village. He has explained that collaborations with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and other government agencies are encouraged and appreciated, but are no longer essential to achieve his goal. [Musk](https://www.geekwire.com/2018/jeff-bezos-blue-origin-space-venture-go-moon-settlements/), who co-founded Tesla, has already launched nine rockets within the first five months of 2018, one of which was the most powerful private spacecraft [ever sent into orbit](http://sitn.hms.harvard.edu/flash/2018/spacex-launches-falcon-heavy-rocket-successfully/). Looking forward, SpaceX aims to complete its first manned mission to Mars in 2024, almost a decade earlier than NASA’s projections. Even the current US president is encouraging this shift to private companies driving [innovation in space](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-switch/wp/2018/02/11/the-trump-administration-wants-to-turn-the-international-space-station-into-a-commercially-run-venture/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.d2c1eccab4ca). With almost [$1 billion](https://www.forbes.com/sites/alexknapp/2018/04/10/nearly-1-billion-was-invested-in-space-startups-in-1q2018-new-report-says/#5fdd019b285c) invested in space-focused startups in the first quarter of 2018, the commercialized space industry shows no sign of slowing down.

#### Private space appropriation is uniquely key to ensuring ongoing innovation towards space exploration and colonization.

**Cheng 20** [Dean Cheng, 09-16-2020, "Outer Space and Private Property," Heritage Foundation, https://www.heritage.org/space-policy/commentary/outer-space-and-private-property]//DDPT

Fully 53 years after the Outer Space Treaty, however, this has begun to change. The success of SpaceX, Blue Origin, Virgin Galactic, and other private companies has led to what has been termed Space 2.0.

The Obama administration’s decision to rely on commercial space-launch services to resupply the International Space Station opened the door to expanding private enterprise’s role in space.

The innovation exhibited in the various Falcon launches, including the ability to reuse the booster rockets, has seen a significant drop in the cost of placing payloads into orbit. As a result, a real opportunity exists for companies to begin thinking about how to use space not simply to improve terrestrial operations, but to make money from space and its physical resources.

The uncertainty associated with private property rights, however, has had a constraining effect on the ability to exploit space more extensively. Companies are unlikely to be willing to risk capital and assets if they are not sure that they will be able to profit from their investments.

#### The private sector is the key internal link to space exploration and colonization.

**Sharma 9/7** [Maanas Sharma, 9-7-2021, "The Space Review: The privatized frontier: the ethical implications and role of private companies in space exploration," The Space Review, https://www.thespacereview.com/article/4238/1]//DDPT

In recent years, private companies have taken on a larger role in the space exploration system. With lower costs and faster production times, they have displaced some functions of government space agencies. Though many have levied criticism against privatized space exploration, it also allows room for more altruistic actions by government space agencies and the benefits from increased space exploration as a whole. Thus, we should encourage this development, as the process is net ethical in the end. Especially if performed in conjunction with adequate government action on the topic, private space exploration can overcome possible shortcomings in its risky and capitalistic nature and ensure a positive contribution to the general public on Earth.

The implications of commercial space exploration have been thrust into the limelight with the successes and failures of billionaire Elon Musk’s company SpaceX. While private companies are not new to space exploration, their prominence in American space exploration efforts has increased rapidly in recent years, fueled by technological innovations, reductions in cost, and readily available funding from government and private sources.[1] In May 2020, SpaceX brought American astronauts to space from American soil for the first time in almost 10 years.[2] Recognizing the greatly reduced costs of space exploration in private companies, NASA’s budget has shifted to significantly relying on private companies.[3] However, private space companies are unique from government space agencies in the way they experience unique sets of market pressures that influence their decision-making process. Hence, the expansion of private control in the space sector turns into a multifaceted contestation of its ethicality.

The most obvious ethical concern is the loss of human life. Critics contend that companies must answer to their shareholders and justify their profits. This contributes to a larger overall psyche that prioritizes cost and speed above all else, resulting in significantly increased risks.[4] However, the possible increase in mishaps is largely overstated. Companies recognize the need for safety aboard their expeditions themselves.[5] After all, the potential backlash from a mishap could destroy the company’s reputation and significantly harm their prospects. According to Dr. Nayef Al-Rodhan, Head of the Geneva Centre for Security Policy’s Geopolitics and Global Futures Programme, “because there were no alternatives to government space programs, accidents were seen to some degree as par for the course… By comparison, private companies actually have a far more difficult set of issues to face in the case of a mishap. In a worst case scenario, a private company could make an easy scapegoat.” [6]

Another large ethical concern is the prominence capitalism may have in the future of private space exploration and the impacts thereof. The growth of private space companies in recent years has been closely intertwined with capitalism. Companies have largely focused on the most profitable projects, such as space travel and the business of space.[7] Many companies are funded by individual billionaires, such as dearMoon, SpaceX’s upcoming mission to the Moon.[8] Congress has also passed multiple acts for the purpose of reducing regulations on private space companies and securing private access to space. From this, many immediately jump to the conclusion that capitalism in space will recreate the same conditions in outer space that plague Earth today, especially with the increasing push to create a “space-for-space” economy, such as space tourism and new technologies to mine the Moon and asteroids. Critics, such as Jordan Pearson of VICE, believe that promises of “virtually unlimited resources” are only for the rich, and will perpetuate the growing wealth inequality that plagues the world today.[9]

However, others contend that just because private space exploration has some capitalist elements, it is by no means an embodiment of unrestricted capitalism. A healthy balance of restricted capitalism—for example, private space companies working through contracts with government agencies or independently under monitoring and regulation by national and international agreements—will avoid the pitfalls that capitalist colonialism faced down here on Earth. Even those who are generally against excessive government regulation should see the benefits of them in space. Lacking any consensus on definitions and rights in space will create undue competition between corporations as well as governments that will harm everyone rather than helping anyone. To create a conducive environment for new space-for-space exploration, one without confrontation but with protection for corporate astronauts, infrastructure, and other interests, governments must create key policies such as a framework for property rights on asteroids, the Moon, and Mars.[7,10]

Another key matter to note is restricted capitalism in space “could also be our salvation.”[11] Private space exploration could reap increased access to resources and other benefits that can be used to solve the very problems on Earth that critics of capitalism identify. Since governments offset some of their projects to private companies, government agencies can focus on altruistic projects that otherwise would not fit in the budget before and do not have the immediate commercial use that private companies look for. Scott Hubbard, an adjunct professor of aeronautics and astronautics at Stanford University, discusses how “this strategy allows the space agency to continue ‘exploring the fringe where there really is no business case’” but still has important impacts on people down on Earth.[12]

Indeed, this idea is a particularly powerful one when considering the ideal future of private companies in space exploration. Though there is no one set way governments will interact with companies, the consensus is that they must radically reimagine their main purpose as the role of private space exploration continues to grow. As governments utilize services from private space companies, “[i]nstead of being bogged down by the routine application of old research, NASA can prioritize their limited budget to work more on research of other unknowns and development of new long-term space travel technologies.”[13] According to the Council on Foreign Relations, such technologies have far-reaching benefits on Earth as well. Past developments obviously include communications satellites, by themselves a massive benefit to society, but also “refinements in artificial hearts; improved mammograms; and laser eye surgery… thermoelectric coolers for microchips; high-temperature lubricants; and a means for mass-producing carbon nanotubes, a material with significant engineering potential; [and h]ousehold products.”[2] Agencies like NASA are the only actors able to pursue the next game-changing missions, “where the profit motive is not as evident and where the barriers to entry are still too high for the private sector to really make a compelling business case.”[8] These technologies have revolutionized millions, if not billions, of lives, demonstrating the remarkable benefits of space exploration. It follows then that it is net ethical to prioritize these benefits.

This report concludes that the private sector, indeed, has a prominent role to play in the future of space exploration. Further, though private space exploration does bring the potential of increased danger and the colonization of space, these concerns can be effectively mitigated. Namely, strong government frameworks—particularly international ones—will minimize possible sources of ethical violations and ensure an optimal private sector role in space. This also allows government agencies to complete significantly more difficult, innovative projects which have transformative benefits for life on Earth.

#### Space exploration solves extinction and endless resource wars.

Collins 10 [Patrick Collins, professor of economics at Azabu University in Japan, and a Collaborating Researcher with the Institute for Space & Astronautical Science, as well as adviser to a number of companies, Adriano V. Autino is President of the Space Renaissance International; Manager, CEO/CTO, Systems Engineering Consultant / Trainer at Andromeda Systems Engineering LLC; and Supplier of methodological tools and consultancy at Intermarine S.p.A, Acta Astronautica, Volume 66, Issues 11–12, June–July 2010, “What the growth of a space tourism industry could contribute to employment, economic growth, environmental protection, education, culture and world peace”, Pages 1553–1562]

7. World peace and preservation of human civilisation

The major source of social friction, including international friction, has surely always been unequal access to resources. People fight to control the valuable resources on and under the land, and in and under the sea. The natural resources of Earth are limited in quantity, and economically accessible resources even more so. As the population grows, and demand grows for a higher material standard of living, industrial activity grows exponentially. The threat of resources becoming scarce has led to the concept of “Resource Wars”. Having begun long ago with wars to control the gold and diamonds of Africa and South America, and oil in the Middle East, the current phase is at centre stage of world events today [37]. A particular danger of “resource wars” is that, if the general public can be persuaded to support them, they may become impossible to stop as resources become increasingly scarce. Many commentators have noted the similarity of the language of US and UK government advocates of “war on terror” to the language of the novel “1984” which describes a dystopian future of endless, fraudulent war in which citizens are reduced to slaves.

7.1. Expansion into near-Earth space is the only alternative to endless “resource wars”

As an alternative to the “resource wars” already devastating many countries today, opening access to the unlimited resources of near-Earth space could clearly facilitate world peace and security. The US National Security Space Office, at the start of its report on the potential of space-based solar power (SSP) published in early 2007, stated: “Expanding human populations and declining natural resources are potential sources of local and strategic conflict in the 21st Century, and many see energy as the foremost threat to national security” [38]. The report ended by encouraging urgent research on the feasibility of SSP: “Considering the timescales that are involved, and the exponential growth of population and resource pressures within that same strategic period, it is imperative that this work for “drilling up” vs. drilling down for energy security begins immediately” [38].

Although the use of extra-terrestrial resources on a substantial scale may still be some decades away, it is important to recognise that simply acknowledging its feasibility using known technology is the surest way of ending the threat of resource wars. That is, if it is assumed that the resources available for human use are limited to those on Earth, then it can be argued that resource wars are inescapable [22] and [37]. If, by contrast, it is assumed that the resources of space are economically accessible, this not only eliminates the need for resource wars, it can also preserve the benefits of civilisation which are being eroded today by “resource war-mongers”, most notably the governments of the “Anglo-Saxon” countries and their “neo-con” advisers. It is also worth noting that the $1 trillion that these have already committed to wars in the Middle-East in the 21st century is orders of magnitude more than the public investment needed to aid companies sufficiently to start the commercial use of space resources.

Industrial and financial groups which profit from monopolistic control of terrestrial supplies of various natural resources, like those which profit from wars, have an economic interest in protecting their profitable situation. However, these groups’ continuing profits are justified neither by capitalism nor by democracy: they could be preserved only by maintaining the pretence that use of space resources is not feasible, and by preventing the development of low-cost space travel. Once the feasibility of low-cost space travel is understood, “resource wars” are clearly foolish as well as tragic. A visiting extra-terrestrial would be pityingly amused at the foolish antics of homo sapiens using long-range rockets to fight each other over dwindling terrestrial resources—rather than using the same rockets to travel in space and have the use of all the resources they need!

7.2. High return in safety from extra-terrestrial settlement

Investment in low-cost orbital access and other space infrastructure will facilitate the establishment of settlements on the Moon, Mars, asteroids and in man[/woman]-made space structures. In the first phase, development of new regulatory infrastructure in various Earth orbits, including property/usufruct rights, real estate, mortgage financing and insurance, traffic management, pilotage, policing and other services will enable the population living in Earth orbits to grow very large. Such activities aimed at making near-Earth space habitable are the logical extension of humans’ historical spread over the surface of the Earth. As trade spreads through near-Earth space, settlements are likely to follow, of which the inhabitants will add to the wealth of different cultures which humans have created in the many different environments in which they live.

Success of such extra-terrestrial settlements will have the additional benefit of reducing the danger of human extinction due to planet-wide or cosmic accidents [27]. These horrors include both man-made disasters such as nuclear war, plagues or growing pollution, and natural disasters such as super-volcanoes or asteroid impact. It is hard to think of any objective that is more important than preserving peace. Weapons developed in recent decades are so destructive, and have such horrific, long-term side-effects that their use should be discouraged as strongly as possible by the international community. Hence, reducing the incentive to use these weapons by rapidly developing the ability to use space-based resources on a large scale is surely equally important [11] and [16]. The achievement of this depends on low space travel costs which, at the present time, appear to be achievable only through the development of a vigorous space tourism industry.

### 1NC – PP

#### 1] Util can’t guide action because it never has consistent rules – morality constantly changes based on each situation’s specific benefits. Without tangible rules to tell people how to be moral, they don’t know how to act.

#### 2] There’s always infinite pleasure and pain in the universe—util is incoherent since we can’t add or subtract from that

**Bostrom ’08** (Bostrom, Nick [Professor at University of Oxford, director of Oxford’s Future of Humanity Institute, PhD from London School of Economics]. The Infinitarian Challenge to Aggregative Ethics. 2008. http://www.nickbostrom.com/ethics/infinite.pdf)

In the standard Big Bang model, assuming the simplest topology (i.e., that space is singly connected), there are three basic possibilities: the universe can be open, flat, or closed. **Current data suggests a flat or open universe**, although the final verdict is pending. **If the universe is either open or flat, then it [that] is spatially infinite at every point in time and the model entails that it contains an infinite number of galaxies, stars, and planets**. There exists a common misconception which confuses the universe with the (finite) ‘observable universe’. But **the observable part**—the part that coulsd causally affect us—**would be just an infinitesimal fraction of the whole**. Statements about the “mass of the universe” or the “number of protons in the universe” generally refer to the content of this observable part; see e.g. [1]. **Many cosmologists [also] believe that our universe is just one in an infinite ensemble of universes** (a multiverse), **and this adds to the probability that the world is canonically infinite**; for a popular review, see

#### 3] Predictions are impossible – any action could theoretically cause nuke war in 10 billion years

#### A] There’s no non-arbitrary cutoff to calculations since ethics shouldn’t be, but even if there were, finite possibility of infinite extinction impacts on each side make expected utility equal.

#### B] Util Can’t guide action: it requires constantly calculating to determine the maximally productive time to make an action.

#### 4] Justifying predictions is circular – there’s no reason trends continue, which means they’re justified by experience, but that relies on extrapolating trends.

#### 5] Aggregation impossible – Multiple chemicals in the brain make me happy. So, there’s no way to compare them. Or determine which ones to maximize.

#### 6] Calculative regress: util requires we calculate how much time to spend on our calculations, then how much time to spend on those calculations to infinity, freezing action which means we can never do anything since we’re always calculating the time to calculate.

#### Presumption and permissibility negate –

#### 1] Semantics – Ought is defined as expressing obligation which means absent a proactive obligation you vote neg since there’s a trichotomy between prohibition, obligation, and permissibility and proving one disproves the other two. Semantics outweighs – A. it’s key to predictability since we prep based on the wording of the res B. It’s constitutive to the rules of debate since the judge is obligated to vote on the resolutional text.

#### 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 “P” and “~P” are true

#### 3] Intuitions – A. We assume statements to be false until proven true. That is why we don’t believe in alternate realities or conspiracy theories; B. Statements are more often false than true because any part of the resolution could be false.

#### 4] Negating is harder – A. The aff gets the first and last speech which controls the direction of the debate, B. Affirmatives can strategically uplayer in the 1AR giving them a 7-6 time skew advantage, splitting the 2NR, C. They have infinite prep

### Case

#### 1] Calculative regress—util would require we calculate how much time to spend on our calculations and so on—means we’re never ever to take productive actions.

#### 2] Act util collapses to rule util—people who always try to act in the right way make mistakes and would never be able to make decisions—only rule util solves, where we have the rule that is most likely to, in most instances, do more good. That rule is the NC—protection of freedom is a good base line because without direct violation of each other’s sovereignty, we’re way less likely to do harm to them.

#### 3] Valuing a state of affairs concerning a person assumes we value that person in the first place—you wouldn’t care about a person being sad if you didn’t value that person—means util presupposes deontological obligations to respect humanity

#### 4] Util’s repugnant—it can’t ever recognize things as intrinsically bad—even things like slavery and rape could be obligatory to have some chance of a greater future good

#### 5] Can’t aggregate—people have different conceptions of pleasure and pain—there are people like masochists who enjoy physical pain

#### Strong commercial space industry catalyzes tech innovation – progress at the margins and spinoff tech change global information networks.

**Hampson 17** [Joshua Hampson, 1-27-2017, "The Future of Space Commercialization," Niskanen Center, <https://www.niskanencenter.org/wp-content/uploads/old_uploads/2017/01/TheFutureofSpaceCommercializationFinal.pdf>]//DDPT

Innovation is generally hard to predict; some new technologies seem to come out of nowhere and others only take off when paired with a new application. It is difficult to predict the future, but it is reasonable to expect that a growing space economy would open opportunities for technological and organizational innovation.

In terms of technology, the difficult environment of outer space helps incentivize progress along the margins. Because each object launched into orbit costs a significant amount of money—at the moment between $27,000 and $43,000 per pound, though that will likely drop in the future —each 19 reduction in payload size saves money or means more can be launched. At the same time, the ability to fit more capability into a smaller satellite opens outer space to actors that previously were priced out of the market. This is one of the reasons why small, affordable satellites are increasingly pursued by companies or organizations that cannot afford to launch larger traditional satellites. These small 20 satellites also provide non-traditional launchers, such as engineering students or prototypers, the opportunity to learn about satellite production and test new technologies before working on a full-sized satellite. That expansion of developers, experimenters, and testers cannot but help increase innovation opportunities.

Technological developments from outer space have been applied to terrestrial life since the earliest days of space exploration. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) maintains a website that lists technologies that have spun off from such research projects. Lightweight 21 nanotubes, useful in protecting astronauts during space exploration, are now being tested for applications in emergency response gear and electrical insulation. The need for certainty about the resiliency of materials used in space led to the development of an analytics tool useful across a range of industries. Temper foam, the material used in memory-foam pillows, was developed for NASA for seat covers. As more companies pursue their own space goals, more innovations will likely come from the commercial sector.

Outer space is not just a catalyst for technological development. Satellite constellations and their unique line-of-sight vantage point can provide new perspectives to old industries. Deploying satellites into low-Earth orbit, as Facebook wants to do, can connect large, previously-unreached swathes of 22 humanity to the Internet. Remote sensing technology could change how whole industries operate, such as crop monitoring, herd management, crisis response, and land evaluation, among others. 23 While satellites cannot provide all essential information for some of these industries, they can fill in some useful gaps and work as part of a wider system of tools. Space infrastructure, in helping to change how people connect and perceive Earth, could help spark innovations on the ground as well. These innovations, changes to global networks, and new opportunities could lead to wider economic growth.

#### Space weapons obviate the need for conventional forces---that solves US empire, militarization, and foreign occupations that kill millions, while making hegemony sustainable -

Dolman, 10 - Professor of Comparative Military Studies at the US Air Force’s Air Command and Staff College (ACSC), Air University’s first space theorist, served at the National Security Agency and the United States Space Command
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--UQ – hegemony overstretched now – we have boots on ground and bases all over the world occupying foreign land when we should be using diplomacy

--Causes a slippery slope where we view occupation as answer to everything – Vietnam, Iraq, Afghanistan – why not NoKo, Iran, or Venezuela?

--Space weaponization is super expensive – money taken from bases and boots on ground. No need for ANY conventional military anymore

--We will have made heg sustainable – hold stuff at risk from sky, and no more global empire or threats to sovereignty

With the purpose of domain operations defined, the proper role of the tactical use of military force is discernible—with serious implications for the militarization of space. Any activity that contributes to the essential mission, preparing to control or contest the domain within the limits assigned by the political authority, and doing so when called upon, is appropriate. Although the US military is willing to take on any mission the political authority assigns it, and will do its best to carry that mission out, many roles are simply inappropriate for its purpose. They do not add value. Specifically, American military force is currently engaged in occupation duties around the globe that are more properly diplomatic or policing than war fighting.

The primary issue here is that diplomatic and police authorities have a different focus of effort; their purposes are to minimize or manage violence. When military personnel become good at occupying foreign lands, rooting out crime, building political institutions, and sponsoring markets, they are not increasing the skills needed to survive and prevail in the battlespace. This is not to say that all non-war activities are improper. Many of the functions necessary to war proficiency are simulated in non-war activities. Delivering humanitarian aid, for example, in a hurricane or earthquake ravaged terrain is excellent training for moving logistics into restricted access or contested territories in times of conflict. In many crisis situations, legitimate governing authority is unable to deliver goods because of lawlessness and threats to civilian personnel. In these situations, military forces carry an implicit threat of violence should bandits try to disrupt distribution activities.

As an ad hoc or temporary crisis response, all such activities have merit. They increase the capacity of civilian authorities to care for distressed populations, and they add valuable real-world training opportunities for legitimate military support functions. Serious problems emerge when these activities become routine, however.

For example, long duration support and logistics activities become ensconced over time as scheduled military functions, and drain away personnel and support that should be conserved for military operations. This increases the size of the military in terms of personnel and budget, and to the extent these actions become permanent (or at least long-term fixed requirements) they detract from the war fighting capacity of the services as these assets are not retrievable and mobile should another conflict occur.

Also, the perception of the US military as an occupying and imperial force grows the longer it is engaged in even humanitarian operations in a given locale. Americans generally believe their military is helping the people in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere, and I like to think that is the intent. Nonetheless, I can certainly understand that Afghani or Iraqi citizens would be suspicious of America ever returning control of their country after more than eight years (and counting) of significant presence.

The preceding is based on the notion that military occupation is not going well, thus its continuance is needed. This is a rather perverse military notion; perpetually reinforcing failure. It is the equivalent logic of the excesses of attrition warfare in WW I, or the body count mentality that extended America’s military involvement in Vietnam. It is the sunk cost dilemma. And it is accurate, to the extent the US has adopted a policy of 100 per cent success—victory— in the so-called War on Terror. The refrain that persists is that America cannot leave, for what is the price of failure?

It is just as important to ask the parallel question, what is the cost of success? Imagine that the US is wildly successful. Five or ten years from now, say, both Iraq and Afghanistan have viable liberal democratic governments with growing economies and friendly attitudes toward America. A few military personnel remain on permanent military bases fairly negotiated and welcomed by the local population. These two states become models for the Muslim world to emulate. What will it do then with this wonderful, state-building military force? Will America move on to the next authoritarian state, North Korea or Iran, perhaps? Why not Venezuela, or Cambodia? Name the state where corruption or oppression exists, the US military can fix it.

What if, in light of its extraordinary capacity to minimize violence, restore order, build governing institutions and markets, and establish popular governance, a few Americans start disagreeing with their own government’s policies? Imagine a disastrous natural event, an epoch-defining earthquake in the Mississippi basin, perhaps. Add in an economic downturn that pushes unemployment above twenty percent and an irresponsive or bumbling president and congress. No military professional today would answer the call for a military coup—but would the veterans of successful state-building in Iraq and Afghanistan be able to avoid helping their fellow citizens if they came begging for aid?

It is a slippery slope, to be sure, and not a danger that looms on the event horizon. But it crystallizes the propriety of use to which America’s military is being put today, and the preference that many anti-weaponization proponents have for a conventional response on earth for an attack on assets in space. It suggests a value for placing weapons in space that goes beyond military logic, and confronts the moral high ground claims of those who would avoid weaponizing space in all cases.

The fiduciary and social costs to weaponize space effectively will be immense. These are necessary costs if America, or any other state, is determined to have a military force structure that relies on space support and enablement to operate as it does now, increasingly so for the future. And it will have benefits for the military that may not be readily apparent; for where will the money come for this space weapons capacity? It will not come from school budgets or foreign aid programs. It will not come at the expense of health care reform or corporate bailouts. It will come from existing or planned military budgets, from the capacity of conventional military capabilities on the land and sea and in the air. There will be fewer aircraft carriers and high dollar aircraft fighters and bombers. If space weapons capable of targeting the earth are deployed, relatively slow moving ships and aircraft will be conceptually obsolete, instantly vulnerable to them. As money is scrounged for space lasers and exotic kinetic kill satellites, the systems these space weapons make defenseless will be scrapped. More funding will come from current ballistic and anti-ballistic missile development and deployment, as global ballistic missile defense from space is more cost and practically effective than comprehensive ground or sea-based systems. And most importantly, it will come from personnel reductions, from ground troops currently occupying foreign territory. In this way, America will retain its ability to use force to influence states around the world, but it will atrophy the capacity to occupy their territory and threaten their sovereignty directly. The era of US hegemony will be extended, but the possibility of US global empire will be reduced.