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## 1NC

### 1NC – OFF

#### TEXT: The Outer Space Treaty ought to be amended to establish an international legal trust system governing outer space that does not ban the appropriation of space resources by private entities, but gives property rights. The Legal trust would include private property rights and would ensure the sustainable development as well as the equitable distribution of space resources.

Finoa ’20 – Ivan Finoa [Department of Law, University of Turin], “An international legal trust system to deal with the new space era,” 71st International Astronautical Congress (IAC) – The CyberSpace Edition, (12-14 October 2020). <<https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/66728932/_IAC_20_E7.VP.8.x58518_An_international_legal_trust_system_to_deal_with_the_new_space_era_BY_IVAN_FINO-with-cover-page-v2.pdf?Expires=1642044926&Signature=asvt6StaK5n9UnpXuJIlo4ziI839WzFYjDZy37bm70ObGy3vFJyHwWNGxhn2beze4QzYDPPX0pVEXAwYvDaINVNxN01Ify8YwG5loNRddlat-grf3iawic7KvwqPowxFe2GuemVvbB-KW8ZVBxigwS-gelSKIVy4KYR9UgiDrM6e6deEBnUTcULSwmsH-JdHNg13ytZ3vNVMMlxZW2MPOCRuB2WlOHdCLoC86VqafSoMwuec-d~Aisbgyt5F2vO-GjvI60bR7h2MSp0iT6P7apIDUUpHUsDGbvcdxp22HSxXdlvr7lSqtLnL5rKxujGDYq~R9B~WuGiorVL2hn74UQ__&Key-Pair-Id=APKAJLOHF5GGSLRBV4ZA>>CT

Considering the worsening climate change, in the future outer space might be our last Noah’s Ark. Now, humans must look to space as an opportunity to support growing resource requirements. Asteroids are rich in metals, which could be transported back to Earth. Unfortunately, the existing international legal framework discourages investments in the space economy. Once an enterprise invests billions of dollars in discovering and developing a mining site, it cannot claim any ownership because of the non-appropriation principle stipulated in Article 2 of the Outer Space Treaty (OST). Thus, other entities could legally access and exploit the same resource without any participation in the initial financial investment, increasing the risk of potential conflict. Bearing this in mind, the question arises, which legal regime could ensure effective allocation of resources, avoiding a chaotic space race to acquire valuable assets? The aim of this research is to argue that the first two articles of OST should be amended, to set up an international legal trust system which would guarantee different kinds of rights, dependently on the nature of the celestial body. E.g., property rights could be preferable to a lease over asteroids, as they could be exploited to their disappearance. This proposed system would be led by the United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs (UNOOSA), as the main trustee. The co-trustees would be the nations of the world. Prior to initiating any space activity, every entity would send a request to their national government. If all the legal parameters are respected, the nation would forward the operational request to the UNOOSA. In the case of acceptance, UNOOSA would record the permit on an international public registry. The country in which the company has been registered would investigate whether the activities of its national company are consistent with the permit. This would be the ordinary model. The extraordinary model would be when the applicant for the space activity is a state, then the trustee would be the UN. All lucrative activities would be subject to benefit-sharing. Finally, this research will demonstrate the valuable outcome of the International Legal Trust System and its advantages for all humankind. Private companies would rely on property rights, while the benefit-sharing could be used to finance the 17 Sustainable Development Goals adopted by the UN in 2015, which address peace, climate change, inequalities and poverty.

### 1NC – OFF

#### Interpretation – The aff must only garner offense from private entities appropriating outer space, to clarify, the aff may not gain offense off of Asteroids, Planets, or other celestial bodies

#### Violation -

#### 1] Semantics – Outer Space doesn’t include Earth or celestial bodies, just space Vocabulary.com ND (<https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/outer%20space>, ND, Vicabulary.com //Avery)

Outer space, also simply called space, refers to the relatively empty regions of the universe outside the atmospheres of celestial bodies.

Outer space is used to distinguish it from airspace (and terrestrial locations).

Contrary to popular understanding, outer space is not completely empty (i.e. a perfect vacuum) but contains a low density of particles, predominantly hydrogen gas, as well as electromagnetic radiation.

#### Here is what a celestial body is - Miriam Webster ND (<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/celestial%20body>, Mirian webster, ND//Avery)

Definition of celestial body

: an aggregation of matter in the universe (such as a planet, star, or nebula) that can be considered as a single unit (as for astronomical study)

#### 2] Logical definition – If we set up a colony on mars and people live there, the Martians wouldn’t say they are living in outer space, they would call outer space stuff outside of their atmosphere, now generalize for all celestial bodies

#### Standards:

#### 1] Limits – Only our interp accurately sets the upper limit to the topic. The CI will let the aff spec any planet or celestial body, like “The appropriation of Europa by private entities is unjust” and have legitimate offense under the plan. This makes it impossible for the neg to prep out all the different possible affs and kills fairness.

#### 2] Precision – Outer space is a common scientific term and is used to refer to “empty space” rather than celestial bodies. Precise readings of the topic allow us to get to the core controversy of the topic and discuss the nuances within it. Only 2 months to discuss the topic means we should discuss the right topic. Leads to in depth topic ed as we focus on the justice of taking space which stays pretty constant throughout the universe instead of random asteroids, planets, and stars.

#### 3] Ground – The aff can find obscure articles antagonizing the mining or colonization of other planets, and then just say private companies appropriating X part of “outer space” is topical. Neg will always be on the back foot since the neg has to be responsive to the aff for edu value but there isn’t always an author saying why we should colonize Io for example, but the aff doesn’t have to care since they decide the field of battle, killing any possible edu value of the round or real fairness

#### Voters -

#### 1] Education – 2-month time limit on the topic means every round is valuable. Specific education about the direct question the resolution asks is the only take away we get from this event. Precision in what they aff can read forces concise topic research in a limited area that allows us to deeply explore every area of the topic.

#### 2] Fairness – Fairness controls engagement with the 1AC and what we are actually able to do in the round. If the game stops becoming fair we have no reason to play in the first place. If every round was 80/20 skewed towards the aff then no one would ever be able to play the game. Fairness is key to clash and is an internal link into any of their offense

#### Paradigms -

#### Topicality is drop the debater – We indict your ability to read and garner offense from the affirmative in the first place. Drop the argument on T also decks the entire aff so they are equivalent. The more the aff drops offense to meet the shell the less they solve and you can vote on presumption.

#### Competing interps over reasonability – Reasonability is always arbitrary and can never set a Brightline on what is reasonable and what isn’t. T is a question of models not specific affirmatives or rounds.

#### No RVIs on T –

#### 1] T is a gateway issue for the negative towards the affirmative. Affirmative is always proactive towards topicality while the neg is forced to always be reactive towards the affirmative. The ground is skewed because we always have to hyper tailor T args to the affirmative while the aff can infinitely prep out the 6 T shells on the Topic.

#### 2] Illogical – You don’t get to win for following the rules. That’s like me getting to win because I didn’t read 8 condo positions

#### 3] Deterrence – Winning you are topical isn’t justification for an aff ballot. Deters debaters from calling out untopical affs against techier opponents because they will always lose on the flow even if they are true. Shouldn’t actively punish for trying to meet the rules of the game.

#### T outweighs 1AR theory –

#### 1] T is a forced reaction to untopical affs, even if we did something wrong, you drew first blood. Any abuse from the negative is predicated by abuse from the affirmative.

#### 2] All theory collapses to reasonability. Evaluate competing interps about the rules of the topic before arbitrary discussion of the rules of the game.

### 1NC – OFF

#### We stopped appeasing Russia – they’ll pocket concessions from coop and increase aggression – tensions aren’t the result of understandings but hardened differences

Haddad and Polakova 18 [Benjamin Haddad Director, Future Europe Initiative - Atlantic Council. Alina Polyakova Director, Project on Global Democracy and Emerging Technology Fellow - Foreign Policy, Center on the United States and Europe. Don’t rehabilitate Obama on Russia. March 5, 2018. https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2018/03/05/dont-rehabilitate-obama-on-russia/]

Obama’s much-ballyhooed “Reset” with Russia, launched in 2009, was in keeping with optimistic attempts by every post-Cold War American administration to improve relations with Moscow out of the gate. Seizing on the supposed change of leadership in Russia, with Dmitry Medvedev temporarily taking over the presidency from Vladimir Putin, Obama’s team quickly turned a blind eye to Russia’s 2008 war with Georgia, which in retrospect was Putin’s opening move in destabilizing the European order. Like George W. Bush before him, Obama vastly overestimated the extent to which a personal relationship with a Russian leader could affect the bilateral relationship. U.S.-Russia disagreements were not the result of misunderstandings, but rather the product of long-festering grievances. Russia saw itself as a great power that deserved equal standing with the U.S. What Obama saw as gestures of good will—such as the 2009 decision to scrap missile defense plans for Poland and the Czech Republic—Russia interpreted as a U.S. retreat from the European continent. Moscow pocketed the concessions and increasingly inserted itself in European affairs. The Kremlin was both exploiting an easy opportunity and reasserting what it thought was its historic prerogative.

Though Russia’s invasion of Ukraine in 2014 was the final nail in the coffin of the Reset, President Obama remained reluctant to view Moscow as anything more than a local spoiler, and thought the whole mess was best handled by Europeans. France and Germany spearheaded the Minsk ceasefire process in 2014-2015, with U.S. support but without Washington at the table. The Obama administration did coordinate a far-ranging sanctions policy with the European Union—an important diplomatic achievement, to be sure. But to date, the sanctions have only had a middling effect on the Russian economy as a whole (oil and gas prices have hurt much more). And given that sanctions cut both ways—potential value is destroyed on both sides when economic activity is systematically prohibited—most of the sacrifice was (and continues to be) born by European economies, which have longstanding ties to Russia. In contrast, the costs of a robust sanctions policy have been comparatively minor in the United States; Obama spent little political capital to push them through at home. The Obama administration also sought to shore up NATO’s eastern flank through the European Reassurance Initiative (ERI), which stationed rotating troops in Poland and the Baltics while increasing the budget for U.S. support. Nevertheless, the president resisted calls from Congress, foreign policy experts, and his own cabinet to provide lethal weapons to Ukraine that would have raised the costs on Russia and helped Kyiv defend itself against Russian military incursion into the Donbas. As Obama told Jeffrey Goldberg, he viewed any deterrent moves by the United States as fundamentally not credible, because Russia’s interests clearly trumped our own; it was clear to him they would go to war much more readily that the United States ever would, and thus they had escalatory dominance. Doing more simply made no sense to Obama. This timid realpolitik was mixed up with a healthy dose of disdain. Obama dismissed Russia as a “regional power” that was acting out of weakness in Ukraine. “The fact that Russia felt it had to go in militarily and lay bare these violations of international law indicates less influence, not more,” Obama said at the G7 meeting in 2014. This line has not aged well. Obama’s attitudes on Russia reflected his administration’s broadly teleological, progressive outlook on history. Russia’s territorial conquest “belonged in the 19th century.” The advance of globalization, technological innovation, and trade rendered such aggression both self-defeating and anachronistic. The biggest mistake for America would be to overreact to such petty, parochial challenges. The 2015 National Security Strategy favored “strategic patience”. But was it patience… or passivity? As its actions in 2016 proved, Russia is very much a 21st century power that understands how to avail itself of the modern tools available to it, often much better than we do ourselves. The same intellectual tendencies that shaped Obama’s timid approach to Ukraine were reflected in his administration’s restrained response as evidence of Russian electoral interference began to emerge in the summer of 2016. Starting in June, intelligence agencies began reporting that Russian-linked groups hacked into DNC servers, gained access to emails from senior Clinton campaign operatives, and were working in coordination with WikiLeaks and a front site called DCLeaks to strategically release this information throughout the campaign cycle. By August, Obama had received a highly classified file from the CIA detailing Putin’s personal involvement in covert influence operations to discredit the Clinton campaign and disrupt the U.S. presidential elections in favor of her opponent, Donald Trump. That fall through to his departure from the White House, the president and his key advisers struggled to find an appropriate response to the crime of the century. But out of all the possible options, which included a cyber offensive on Russia and ratcheted up sanctions, the policy that was adopted in the final months of Obama’s term was, characteristically, cautious. Obama approved additional narrow sanctions against Russian targets, expelled 35 Russian diplomats, and shut down two Russian government compounds. It’s true that Obama faced a difficult political environment that constrained his ability to take tougher measures. Republican opponents would have surely decried any loud protests as a form of election meddling on Hillary Clinton’s behalf. Donald Trump was already flogging the narrative that the elections were rigged against him. And anyway, Clinton seemed destined to win; she would tend to the Russians in her own time, the thinking went. But just as with the decision to not provide weapons to Ukraine, the Obama administration also fretted about provoking Russia into taking even more drastic steps, such as hacking the voting systems or a cyber attack on critical infrastructure. In the end, the administration’s worries proved to be paralyzing. “I feel like we sort of choked,” one Obama administration official told the Washington Post. Much ink has been spilled over President Trump’s effusive praise for Putin and his brutal regime. “You think our country’s so innocent?” candidate Trump famously replied to an interviewer listing the many human rights abuses of Putin’s Russia, including the harassment and murder of journalists. Obama, on the other hand, never had any ideological or psychological sympathy for Putin or Putinism. By the end of his second term, the two men were barely on speaking terms, the iciness of their encounters in full public view. For most of Obama’s two terms, however, this personal animosity did not translate into tougher policies. Has the Trump administration been tougher on Russia than Obama, as the president claims? Trump’s own boasting feels like a stretch, especially given how he seems to have gone out of his way to both disparage NATO and praise Putin during the course of his first year in office. Still, many of his administration’s good policies have been obscured by the politics of the Mueller investigation and the incessant furor kicked up by the president’s tweets. As Tom Wright has noted, the Trump administration seems to pursue two policy tracks at the same time: the narrow nationalism of the president’s inflammatory rhetoric openly clashing with the seriousness of his administration’s official policy decisions.

These tensions are real, but all too often they become the story. Glossed over is the fact that President Trump has appointed a string of competent and widely respected figures to manage Russia policy—from National Security Council Senior Director Fiona Hill to Assistant Secretary of State for European affairs Wess Mitchell to the Special Envoy for Ukraine Kurt Volker. The Trump administration is, in fact, pursuing concrete policies pushing back on Russian aggression that the Obama administration had fervently opposed. The National Security Strategy of 2017, bringing a much-needed dose of realism to a conversation too often dominated by abstractions like the “liberal world order”, singles out both China and Russia as key geopolitical rivals. During Trump’s first year, the administration approved the provision of lethal weapons to Ukraine, shut down Russia’s consulate in San Francisco as well as two additional diplomatic annexes, and rather than rolling back sanctions, Trump signed into law additional sanctions on Russia, expanded LNG sales to a Europe dependent in Russian gas imports, and increased the Pentagon’s European Reassurance Initiative budget by 40 percent. (A president who berated U.S. investments for European defense has actually dramatically increased American military presence on Europe’s threatened borders.) While many of these policies may have been implemented despite rather than because of the president—on the expansion of sanctions in particular, Trump faced a veto-proof majority in Congress—credit should be given where credit is due.

The Trump administration’s sober policy decisions should not excuse the president’s praise for Vladimir Putin, nor his reckless undermining of America’s stated commitment to enforcing Article 5 during his first speech in front of NATO. But the fact remains that the U.S. is taking concrete steps to strengthen Europe against Russian aggression. And let’s not be coy about it: if the president’s strident complaining about unequal burden-sharing in NATO finally snaps European allies out of their complacency and helps spur military investment on the continent, this won’t be good news for Russia either. Indeed, he will have succeeded in moving the needle on an issue that has frustrated every one of his predecessors since 1989. Has Trump’s bluster, especially on Article 5, been cost-free? Hardly. Nevertheless, talking to diplomats around town suggests that after initial months of uneasiness, most Europeans have learned to deal with the Trump administration in a dispassionate and pragmatic manner that stands in stark relief with much of the hysteria that passes for commentary in the U.S.

Each administration should be judged on what it has achieved. At the end of the Obama’s two terms, Putin had elevated Russia to a credible revisionist power on the international stage. Russia annexed Crimea and occupied much of Eastern Ukraine; by successfully propping up the degenerate Assad regime, the Kremlin gained a veto on any possible political solution to Syria, and got a meaningful foothold in the broader region for the first time since Sadat threw Soviet advisors out; and its populist allies and fellow-travelers were on the rise in Europe, fueling both anti-Americanism and illiberalism; and most damning of all, it managed to meddle, almost unopposed, in U.S. politics—all on Obama’s watch.

There is plenty left to criticize in how the Trump administration has done things in its first year. The Trump administration’s apparent unwillingness to take steps to deter hostile foreign powers from meddling in American politics is inexcusably irresponsible. And in the Middle East, the Trump administration seems hell-bent on following Obama’s myopic policy of retreat and narrow preoccupation with fighting ISIS to the exclusion of all else. But despite the president’s campaign promises, his administration has been the first in the post-Cold War era to not try for a “Reset” with Moscow. If Vladimir Putin wanted to sow chaos and confusion in Washington, he has succeeded beyond his wildest dreams. If he wanted a pliant ally in America, he has abjectly failed.

#### Appeasing Russia shreds the NPT and causes nuke prolif – extinction

Umland 17 [Andreas Umland is a German political scientist, historian and Russian interpreter, specializing in contemporary Russian and Ukrainian history. He is a Member of the Institute for Central and East European Studies at the Catholic University, and a senior research fellow at the Institute for Euro-Atlantic Cooperation in Kyiv. The Price of Appeasing Russian Adventurism. January 16, 2017. https://carnegieeurope.eu/strategiceurope/67692]

A major foreign policy challenge for the incoming U.S. administration will be how to deal with Russia’s new international assertiveness and foreign military adventures. Some signs in recent weeks, especially regarding the ongoing confrontation between Russia and Ukraine, point to a friendlier U.S. approach toward Moscow. Such a shift would have very serious consequences for the rest of the world.

A new rapprochement between Washington and Moscow may go far beyond the attempt by the administration of outgoing U.S. President Barack Obama to reset Russian-U.S. relations after the Russian-Georgian War in 2008. Supposedly, a dovish American approach toward the Kremlin would put U.S. concerns before those of countries and peoples currently in conflict with Russia.

To be sure, a number of probable members of the new administration, like Rex Tillerson, Mike Pompeo, and James Mattis, have voiced hawkish views on Russian imperialism. Yet apparently, U.S. President-elect Donald Trump and some of those advising him specifically on Russia, like Michael Flynn, Paul Manafort, and Carter Page, hope that U.S. tolerance of Russian freedom of movement in the former Soviet space—in particular, in Ukraine—would make the Kremlin more cooperative in other fields, such as the fight against Islamist terrorism, and in other regions, such as Syria or the Arctic.

However, one wonders whether Trump and other so-called Putinversteher in the incoming administration fully understand the stakes. The risks do not only concern the fundamental national interests of such pro-American countries as Ukraine, Estonia, Georgia, or Poland. The U.S. administration’s tolerance of Russia’s violation of Ukrainian territorial integrity would have larger implications for the future of humanity.

In view of the security assurances that the United States gave Ukraine under the 1994 Budapest Memorandum, a move by Washington to appease Moscow would be another crack in the splintering international nuclear nonproliferation regime. Acquiescence to Russia’s territorial gains in Ukraine would further undermine the already-shattered 1968 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), one of the world’s most important multilateral agreements.

Under the Budapest Memorandum, three official nuclear-weapons states under the NPT—Russia, the UK, and the United States—assured the inviolability of Ukraine’s borders. In two simultaneous but separate declarations, the other two official nuclear-weapons states, China and France, also expressed their respect for Ukraine’s political sovereignty. This was the core of a shrewd deal between the five guarantor states of the NPT and Ukraine (as well as Belarus and Kazakhstan), which had inherited parts of the Soviet nuclear arsenal. In exchange for Kyiv’s readiness to give up its weapons of mass destruction and join the NPT, the world’s five major nuclear powers explicitly acknowledged their obligation to observe and protect Ukraine’s territorial integrity.

But since 2014, if not before, Moscow has manifestly violated the Budapest Memorandum. As the agreement forms an important annex to the NPT, its violation through continuing Russian occupation of Ukraine’s territory undermines the logic of the international mechanism to prevent the spread of atomic weapons. That not only harshly punishes a country that voluntarily agreed to give up its nuclear weapons in exchange for security assurances. It also demonstrates how an official nuclear-weapons state can use its nuclear deterrence potential to implement and secure territorial expansion with military means.

Worse, two other official nuclear powers, Beijing and Paris, have implicitly assisted Russia in its subversion of the nonproliferation regime. Despite having expressed its respect for Ukraine’s territorial integrity, China did not support a 2014 UN General Assembly resolution against Russia’s annexation of Crimea. And several prominent French center-right parliamentarians have visited Crimea since its annexation by Russia, even though the French government that in 1994 declared its respect for Ukraine’s sovereignty was also a center-right administration (albeit under Socialist president François Mitterrand).

U.S. appeasement of Russia regarding its annexation of Crimea and interference in Ukraine’s eastern Donbas region would compound the effects of these earlier aberrations. The United States would be disregarding its earlier statements about Ukraine’s accession to the NPT and voluntary nuclear disarmament. The UK would be the only guarantor state of the NPT left that behaves more or less in line with the logic of the world’s nonproliferation regime with regard to Ukraine.

### 1NC – OFF

#### There was only ever one debate to be had, that of being versus becoming. This card is extremely complicated and if you even try to answer it you’re gonna lose.

Bataille 1985Georges. "The labyrinth." trans. Allan Stoekl, Visions of Excess, ed. Allan Stoekl (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1985) 5 (1985). The Labyrinth (1930). Michigan km <3, recut by fhs-cm // JMK // Damien-AD

\*\*This evidence is gender-modified – pronouns are replaced in brackets

Negativity, in other words, the integrity of determination - Hegel I. THE INSUFFICIENCY OF BEINGS [Humans] act in order to be. This must not be understood in the negative sense of conservation (conserving in order not to be thrown out of existence by death), but in the positive sense of a tragic and incessant combat for a satisfaction that is almost beyond reach. From incoherent agitation to crushing sleep, from chatter to turning inward, from overwhelming love to hardening hate, existence sometimes weakens and sometimes accomplishes "being". And not only do states have a variable intensity, but different beings "are" unequally. A dog that runs and barks seems "to be" more than a mute and clinging sponge, the sponge more than the water in which it lives, an influential [human] more than a vacant passerby. In the first movement, where the force that the master has at [their] disposal puts the slave at [their] mercy, the master deprives the slave of a part of [their] being. Much later, in return, the "existence" of the master is impoverished to such an extent that it distances itself from the material elements of life. The slave enriches [their] being to the extent that [they] enslaves these elements by the work to which [their] impotence condemns him. The contradictory movements of degradation and growth attain, in the diffuse development of human existence, a bewildering complexity. The fundamental separation of [humans] into masters and slaves is only the crossed threshold, the entry into the world of specialized functions where personal "existence" empties itself of its contents; a [human] is no longer anything but a part of being, and [their] life, engaged in the game of creation and destruction that goes beyond it, appears as a degraded particle lacking reality. The very fact of assuming that knowledge is a function throws the philosopher back into the world of petty inconsistencies and dissections of lifeless organs. Isolated as much from action as from the dreams that turn action away and echo it in the strange depths of animated life, [they] led astray the very being that [they] chose as the object of [their] uneasy comprehension. "Being" increases in the tumultuous agitation of a life that knows no limits; it wastes away and disappears if [they] who is at the same "being" and knowledge mutilates himself by reducing himself to knowledge. This deficiency can grow even greater if the object of knowledge is no longer being in general but a narrow domain, such as an organ, a mathematical question, a juridical form. Action and dreams do not escape this poverty (each time they are confused with the totality of being), and, in the multicolored immensity of human lives, a limitless insufficiency is revealed; life, finding its endpoint in the happiness of a bugle blower or the snickering of a village chair-renter, is no longer the fulfillment of itself, but is its own ludicrous degradation - its fall is comparable to that of a king onto the floor. At the basis of human life there exists a principle of insufficiency. In isolation, each [human] sees the majority of others as incapable or unworthy of "being". There is found, in all free and slanderous conversation, as an animating theme, the awareness of the vanity and the emptiness of our fellowmen; an apparent stagnant conversation betrays the blind and impotent flight of all life toward an indefinable summit. The sufficiency of each being is endlessly contested by every other. Even the look that expresses love and admiration comes to me as a doubt concerning my reality. A burst of laughter or the expression of repugnance greets each gesture, each sentence or each oversight through which my profound insufficiency is betrayed - just as sobs would be the response to my sudden death, to a total and irremediable omission. This uneasiness on the part of everyone grows and reverberates, since at each detour, with a kind of nausea, [humans] discover their solitude in empty night. The universal night in which everything finds itself - and soon loses itself - would appear to be the existence for nothing, without influence, equivalent to the absence of being, were it not for human nature that emerges within it to give a dramatic importance to being and life. But this absurd night manages to empty itself of "being" and meaning each time a [human] discovers within it human destiny, itself locked in turn in a comic impasse, like a hideous and discordant trumpet blast. That which, in me, demands that there be "being" in the world, "being" and not just the manifest insufficiency of human or nonhuman nature, necessarily projects (at one time or another and in reply to human chatter) divine sufficiency across space, like the reflection of an impotence, of a servilely accepted malady of being. II. THE COMPOSITE CHARACTER OF BEINGS AND THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF FIXING EXISTENCE IN ANY GIVEN *Ipse* Being in the world is so uncertain that I can project it where I want - outside of me. It is a clumsy man, still incapable of eluding the intrigues of nature, who locks being in the me. Being in fact is found NOWHERE and it was an easy game for a sickly malice to discover it to be divine, at the summit of a pyramid formed by the multitude of beings, which has at its base the immensity of the simplest matter. Being could be confined to the electron if ipseity were precisely not lacking in this simple element. The atom itself has a complexity that is too elementary to be determined ipsely. The number of particles that make up a being intervene in a sufficiently heavy and clear way in the constitution of its ipseity; if a knife has its handle and blade indefinitely replaced, it loses even the shadow of its ipseity; it is not the same for a machine which, after six or five years, loses each of the numerous elements that constituted it when new. But the ipseity that is finally apprehended with difficulty in the machine is still only shadowlike. Starting from an extreme complexity, being imposes on reflection more than the precariousness of a fugitive appearance, but this complexity - displaced little by little becomes in turn the labyrinth where what had suddenly come forward strangely loses its way. A sponge is reduced by pounding to a dust of cells; this living dust is formed by a multitude of isolated beings, and is lost in the new sponge that it reconstitutes. A siphonophore fragment is by itself an autonomous being, yet the whole siphonophore, to which this fragment belongs, is itself hardly different from a being possessing unity. Only with linear animals (worms, insects, fish, reptiles, birds and mammals) do the living individual forms definitively lose the faculty of constituting aggregates bound together in a single body. But while societies of nonlinear animals do not exist, superior animals form aggregates without ever giving rise to corporeal links; [humans] as well as beavers or ants form societies of individuals whose bodies are autonomous. But in regard to being, is this autonomy the final appearance, or is it simply error? In men, all existence is tied in particular to language, whose terms determine its modes of appearance within each person. Each person can only represent [their] total existence, if only in [their] own eyes, through the medium of words. Words spring forth in [their] head, laden with a host of human or superhuman lives in relation to which [they] privately exists. Being depends on the mediation of words, which cannot merely present it arbitrarily as "autonomous being," but which must present it profoundly as "being in relation". One need only follow, for a short time, the traces of the repeated circuits of words to discover, in a disconcerting vision, the labyrinthine structure of the human being. What is commonly called knowing - when a [human] knows [their] neighbour - is never anything but existence composed for an instant (in the sense that all existence composes itself - thus the atom composes its unity from variable electrons), which once made of these two beings a whole every bit as real as its parts. A limited number of exchanged phrases, no matter how conventional, sufficed to create the banal interpenetration of two existing juxtaposed regions. The fact that after this short exchange the [human] is aware of knowing [their] neighbour is opposed to a meeting without recognition in the street, as well as to the ignorance of the multitude of beings that one never meets, in the same way that life is opposed to death. The knowledge of human beings thus appears as a mode of biological connection, unstable but just as real as the connections between cells in tissue. The exchange between two human particles in fact possesses the faculty of surviving momentary separation. A [human] is only a particle inserted in unstable and entangled wholes. These wholes are composed in personal life in the form of multiple possibilities, starting with a knowledge that is crossed like a threshold - and the existence of the particle can in no way be isolated from this composition, which agitates it in the midst of a whirlwind of ephemerids. This extreme instability of connections alone permits one to introduce, as a puerile but convenient illusion, a representation of isolated existence turning in on itself. In the most general way, every isolable element of the universe always appears as a particle that can enter into composition with a whole that transcends it. Being is only found as a whole composed of particles whose relative autonomy is maintained. These two principles dominate the uncertain presence of an ipse being across a distance that never ceases to put everything in question. Emerging in universal play as unforeseeable chance, with extreme dread imperatively becoming the demand for universality, carried away to vertigo by the movement that composes it, the ipse being that presents itself as a universal is only a challenge to the diffuse immensity that escapes its precarious violence, the tragic negation of all that is not its own bewildered phantom's chance. But, as a man, this being falls into the meanders of the knowledge of [their] fellowmen, which absorbs [their] substance in order to reduce it to a component of what goes beyond the virulent madness of [their] autonomy in the total night of the world. Abdication and inevitable fatigue - due to the fact that "being" is, par excellence, that which, desired to the point of dread, cannot be endured - plunge human beings into a foggy labyrinth formed by the multitude of "acquaintances" with which signs of life and phrases can be exchanged. But when [they] escapes the dread of "being" through this flight - a "being" that is autonomous and isolated in night - a [human] is thrown back into insufficiency, at least if [they] cannot find outside of himself the blinding flash that [they] had been unable to endure within himself, without whose intensity [their] life is but an impoverishment, of which [they] feels obscurely ashamed. III. THE STRUCTURE OF THE LABYRINTH Emerging out of an inconeivable void into the play of beings, as a lost satellite of two phantoms (one with a bristly beard, the other softer, her head decorated with a bun), it is in the father and mother who transcend [them] that the miniscule human being first encountered the illusion of sufficiency. In the complexity and entanglement of wholes, to which the human particle belongs, this satellite-like mode of existence never entirely disappears. A particular being not only acts as an element of a shapeless and structureless whole (a part of the world of unimportant "acquaintances" and chatter), but also as a peripheral element orbiting around a nucleus where being hardens. What the lost child had found in the self-assured existence of the all-powerful beings who took care of [them] is now sought by the abadoned [human] wherever knots and concentrations are formed throughout a vast incoherence. Each particular being delegates to the group of those situated at the centre of the multitudes the task of realizing the inherent totality of "being". [they] is content to be a part of a total existence, which even in the simplest cases retains a diffuse character. Thus relatively stable wholes are produced, whose centre is a city, in its early form a corolla that encloses a double pistil of sovereign and god. In the case where many cities abdicate their central function in favour of a single city, an empire forms around a capital where sovereignity and the gods are concentrated; the gravitation around a centre then degrades the existence of peripheral cities, where the organs that constituted the totality of being wilt. By degrees, a more and more complex movement of group composition raises to the point of universality the human race, but it seems that universality, at the summit, causes all existence to explode and decomposes it with violence. The universal god destroys rather than supports the human aggregates that raise [their] ghost. [they] himself is only dead, whether a mythical delirium set [them] up to be adored as a cadaver covered with wounds, or whether through [their] very universality [they] becomes, more than any other, incapable of stopping the loss of being with the cracked partitions of ipseity. IV. THE MODALITIES OF COMPOSITION AND DECOMPOSITION OF BEING The city that little by little empties itself of life, in favour of a more brilliant and attractive city, is the expressive image of the play of existence engaged in composition. Because of the composing attraction, composition empties elements of the greatest part of their being, and this benefits the centre - in other words, it benefits composite being. There is the added fact that, in a given domain, if the attraction of a certain centre is stronger than that of a neighbouring centre, the second centre then goes into decline. The action of powerful poles of attraction across the human world thus reduces, depending on their force of resistance, a multitude of personal beings to the state of empty shadows, especially when the pole of attraction on which they depend itself declines, due to the action of another more powerful pole. Thus if one imagines the effects of an influential current of attraction on a more or less arbitrarily isolated form of activity, a style of clothing created in a certain city devalues the clothes worn up to that time and, consequently, it devalues those who wear them within the limits of the influence of this city. This devaluation is stronger if, in a neighbouring country, the fashions of a more brilliant city have already outclassed those of the first city. The objective character of these relations is registered in reality when the contempt and laughter manifested in a given centre are not compensated for by anything elsewhere, and when they exert an effective fascination. The effort made on the periphery to "keep up with fashion" demonstrates the inability of the peripheral particles to exist by themselves. Laughter intervenes in these value determinations of being as the expression of the circuit of movements of attraction across a human field. It manifests itself each time a change in level suddenly occurs: it characterizes all vacant lives as ridiculous. A kind of incandescent joy - the explosive and sudden revelation of the presence of being - is liberated each time a striking appearance is contrasted with its absence, with the human void. Laughter casts a glance, charged with the mortal violence of being, into the void of being, into the void of life. But laughter is not only the composition of those it assembles into a unique convulsion; it most often decomposes without consequence, and sometimes with a virulence that is so pernicious that it even puts in question composition itself, and the wholes across which it functions. Laughter attains not only the peripheral regions of existence, and its object is not only the existence of fools and children (of those who remain vacant); through a necessary reversal, it is sent back from the child to its father and from the periphery to the centre, each time the father or the centre in turn reveals an insufficiency comparable to that of the particles that orbit around it. Such a central insufficiency can be ritually revealed (in saturnalia or in a festival of the ass as well as in the puerile grimaces of the father amusing [their] child). It can be revealed by the very action of children or the "poor" each time exhaustion withers and weakens authority, allowing its precarious character to be seen. In both cases, a dominant necessity manifests itself, and the profound nature of being is disclosed. Being can complete itself and attain the menacing grandeur of imperative totality; this accomplishment only serves to project it with a greater violence into the vacant night. The relative insufficiency of peripheral existences is absolute insufficiency in total existence. Above knowable existences, laughter traverses the human pyramid like a network of endless waves that renew themselves in all directions. This reverberation convulsion chokes, from one end to the other, the innumerable being of [human] - opened at the summit by the agony of God in a black night. V. THE MONSTER IN THE NIGHT OF THE LABYRINTH Being attains the blinding flash in tragic annihilation. Laughter only assumes its fullest impact on being at the moment when, in the fall that it unleashes, a representation of death is cynically recognised. It is not only the composition of elements that constitutes the incandescence of being, but its decomposition in its mortal form. The difference in levels that provokes common laughter - which opposes the lack of an absurd life to the plenitude of successful being - can be replaced by that which opposes the summit of imperative elevation to the dark abyss that obliterates all existence. Laughter is thus assumed by the totality of being. Renouncing the avaricious malice of the scapegoat, being itself, to the extent that it is the sum of existences at the limits of the night, is spasmodically shaken by the idea of the ground giving way beneath its feet. It is in universality (where, due to solitude, the possibility of facing death through war appears) that the necessity of engaging in a struggle, no longer with an equal group but with nothingness, becomes clear. THE UNIVERSAL resembles a bull, sometimes absorbed in the nonchalance of animality and abandoned to the secret paleness of death, and sometimes hurled by the rage of ruin into the void ceaselessly opened before it by a skeletal torero. But the void it meets is also the nudity it espouses TO THE EXTENT THAT IT IS A MONSTER lightly assuming many crimes, and it is no longer, like the bull, the plaything of nothingness, because nothingness itself is its plaything; it only throws itself into nothingness in order to tear it apart and to illuminate the night for an instant, with an immense laugh - a laugh it never would have attained if this nothingness had not totally opened beneath its feet.<b>Georges Bataille</b>

#### We are becoming the High Unpredictables of the Church of the SubGenius who absolutely refuse to take ourselves seriously! In laughter we find ourselves and Others by breaking from western conceptions of desire – we are not everything, we will eventually disappear and we know absolutely nothing – but we’re okay with that! Are you?

Bordun 13 (Troy M. Bordun, PhD in Philosophy and Cultural Studies, Western University, “Georges Bataille, Philosopher of Laughter,” <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=mllgradconference>, pages 2-8, accessed 10/29/20, emma millar)

Expenditure is a loss of bodily energy, finding that expenditure pleasurable (if we are able) in excessive loss to the point of exhaustion. This exhaustion, of energy or one’s wealth, the two are the same, brings us closer to the very core of existence, human or otherwise: death and the desire to return to the continuity or fluidity of the universe. The Bataillean subject expends recklessly for no other purpose than that expenditure. Whether we are climaxing in sexual activity or donating all of our wealth, this loss, and the anxiety that stems from not being able to preserve ourselves for tomorrow, is joyous in a Spinozist sense. We experience the universe in its indifferent response to life and death and remove ourselves from the all-important place atop a hierarchy of other forms of life. Once we meditate on such a brute fact, refuse to take ourselves so seriously in a constant pursuit of some higher end, we laugh. 2. Setting the Stage To elaborate on what Bataille calls a philosophy of laughter, we can turn to his book Inner Experience. It takes the form of short and scattered essays written in the 30s up until its publication in 1943 (re-published and expanded in 1954).3 Its form is more like a diary than a philosophical text; but between the vague personal experiences Bataille relates are profound philosophical statements which give us much work to do. What I want to do then is leap into this text by way of laughter. It is perhaps the most significant of experiences Bataille writes on, I think mostly because it is an excellent blanket term and practice from which he discusses all the other themes and practices developed in the rest of his work. As well, I hope this account of laughter gives us a different perspective on the term, and furthermore, on ethics. The Preface to Inner Experience does not hesitate. This “ontology” is to outline a mode of being removed from the intoxicating aroma of “the desire to be everything”. Such a desire is defined by the construction of “narcotics” to avoid sufferings: we identify with the “entirety of the universe”, believe ourselves to be immortal, put hope for salvation in gods. Heidegger’s solipsistic Dasein, with its affirmation that everything is for the individual, or Immanuel Kant’s universalized morality, are two such examples, the latter Bataille notes in passing while the former seemed to trouble Bataille for many years. Herein one finds the key to man’s integrity: “NO LONGER TO WANT TO BE EVERYTHING, [which] is the hatred of salvation” (IE, 174). When two certainties are embraced, namely that we are not everything and that we will eventually disappear, one touches upon an inner experience, a finding of your respective place in the universe. When separated from the intoxication of the desire to be everything, we find, in addition, a place filled with laughter. The subject of Inner Experience is, firstly, the self-acknowledged suffering of disintoxication, from those narcotics which sustain a coherent and illusory stable identity, and secondly, to scale the summit to the “extreme limit of the possible.” 3. A Philosophy of Laughter In 1920, a then young Bataille was in London pursuing his studies at the British Museum. While there he was lucky enough to have dinner with Henri Bergson. Bataille knew he was a philosopher, but had not, up until this point, read him (and it seems by this year he had not read any philosophy). Prior to the meeting he picked up Bergson’s Laughter (1900). After reading and meeting the man, Bataille described feeling disappointed, by both the work and the author behind it. It was this year however that Bataille found the key to his thinking: laughter (IE, 66).4 32 years following he restates this finding and sums his oeuvre in the lecture, “Nonknowledge, Laughter, and Tears”: In fact, I can say that, insofar as I am doing philosophical work, my philosophy is a philosophy of laughter. It is a philosophy founded on the experience of laughter, and it does not even claim to go further. It is a philosophy that doesn’t concern itself with problems other than those that have been given to me in this precise experience.5 Bergson’s book, despite it being a disappointment, still “impassioned” Bataille because it was possible to reflect on such a topic. Laughter appears in Bataille’s work in the same way as sacrifice and poetry; it is another articulation of what he calls nonknowledge; that which escapes reason and understanding, those experiences (contra the transmission of logic and information) which are not within the realm of project, or as I began with, for the sake of simplicity, nonknowledge is the instant of unproductive expenditure. In other words, it is the unknown which causes us to laugh (NLT, 135). Indeed, it is the unexpected happenings which are the most unknown, and make us laugh most heavily (NLT, 136). When we shed our stable identities which are comprised of seriousness, projects, immortality, and the like

### 1NC – OFF

#### Midisclosure is a voting issue--- check the 1AC sent in the chat it’s not the one read in the 1AC--- makes 1NC strategy impossible because this aff wasn’t disclosed on the wiki or in round--- it’s a voter for clash and fairness and you can cross apply the no new 1AR theory from the T flow

### 1NC – Debris

#### [1] Tosar evidence admits companies don’t have the technological capability to mine now--- impact is inevitable if they win any risk of it

#### [2] The dust collisions internal link is about asteroid redirection not space mining--- nothing they read applies to asteroid mining and it proves other technology is an alt cause

#### [3] Debris exists now and the aff doesn’t clean up debris--- their Intaglita evidence outlines that there’s already hundreds of millions of particles--- the aff can’t solve and the impact is inevitable if they win it

#### [4] Alt causes in the Orwig evidence--- it outlines other countries could disrupt satellites and its already happening--- the impact is nonunique

#### [6] Infinite alt causes to Russian conflict--- Ukraine outweighs and makes the impact impossible or inevitable because it’s the world’s main focus right now--- by the time they have the capabilities to do space mining conflict will have already happened or diplomacy outweighs

### 1NC – Africa

#### [1] Infinite alt causes--- this is the paragraph before the one from which they cut

#### Space mining destroys the African economy

Oni 19 [(David, a space industry and technology analyst at Space in Africa. He’s a graduate of Mining Engineering from the Federal University of Technology Akure.) “The Effect of Asteroid Mining on Mining Activities in Africa,” Africa News, 9/24/19, <https://africanews.space/the-effect-of-asteroid-mining-on-mining-activities-in-africa/>]

Apart from the environmental impacts, major mining activities are largely hindered in Africa by a handful of other factors such as access to energy, health and safety volatility of commodity prices, etc. Other issues such as political uncertainty, economic instability