# The Ground Floor AC (LAY LOBBYISTS) EXTENSIONS

## Opening & Definitions

#### [Gorove] Recall professor Goroves's definition, appropriation of OS means taking space for one's own use to carry out commercial activities on a celestial body. This means arguments about space exploration are irrelevant since we can explore space without appropriating it.

#### **[SSA]** Recall the Social Security Administration’s definition of Private Entities as non-governmental, this means arguments about private entities being headed by government officials go away since those entities by definition are outside the government.

## Framework

#### [Value] Recall my value of justice, meaning actions that treat people as they deserve, this is the highest value in the round because the resolution prescribes it. So, if my opponent doesn't link to justice, they don't meet their resolutional burden.

#### **[Winter & Leighton]** Look to Professors Winter and Leighton, who argue that systemic exclusion denies people’s due. When we arbitrarily exclude people from our moral circle, we don't allow the benefits from many of our policies to go to them. This means they don't experience the benefits of Util

#### [Standard] Recall the Standard of Social equality, which means acknowledging that all people have a role in reifying SV, we measure its VC based on process and product, so if I show that the process by which Private companies app space is unequal, or that the apportion results in inequality, we affirm.

**1. My burden in the round is only to show that Private Appropriation is unequal in either process or product, which means that if I win either of my contentions, that's enough to affirm.**

**2. This criterion controls the internal link to util because if not everyone benefits from a social good, they don't experience util, so my criterion is a side constraint on theirs; we only care about util if we promote SE.**

**3.This means that arguments about generic benefits of Priv App don't matter if they don't link to equality, so arguments about asteroid mining or satellites do not matter, because we can achieve social benefits in an unequal way. I can make 5 people multi-millionaires, but that would benefit only those people**

## Thesis

#### [Thesis] They make many arguments, but don't respond to the crux of my position. We must value dignity before dollars, and concessions before commerce. Affirming rejects a system that prioritizes disparity, and promotes equality first.

## C1: Process

#### [C1] Look to C1, the process of Private Appropriation is exclusive and unjust.

#### [Utrata 1] Recall Alina Utrata 1’s analysis, the private space industry spends billions lobbying politicians to get money for their products. Bezos and Musk use huge amounts of public funds, as a lunar lander. The Bezos bailout was an attempt to get even more money to companies that are already rich. This justifies sending private companies into Outer Space to colonize territories that governments want.

#### [Shammas & Holen] Look at Victor Shammas and Thomas Holen's point those private entities can not app without state support. The new space complex is inextricably linked to public money. For instance, the Air Force and NASA have both directly engaged with private companies, similar to the British East India Company. This is an attempt to colonize Outer Space, by reinstating a clear link between public and private entities.

#### [Utrata 2] Look to Utrata 2, who shows that as a result of this relationship, regulation on space companies fails because states actively make money off their contracts, like with Blue Origin or SpaceX. As a result, they have a disincentive to ever regulate those companies because they will lose money if they set limits. This creates unearned political advantages for private companies, which promotes inequality.

#### 1. This outweighs the neg’s arguments about asteroid mining on probability, because these relationships are already happening, and those impacts rely on a huge link chain, so we should prefer arguments about existing impacts, over speculative impacts that haven’t happened.

#### 2. This outweighs negs arguments on strength of linking the VC because even if the impacts happen, they don't have anything to do with equality while outs do

#### 3. This precludes any arg about the value or importance of space app, because it will always come at the coast of political equality, so even if appropriation itself is a good idea, the process in which it happens will never be just, so this independently wins me access to the VC, even if the outcome is good. EG: It's similar to cheating on a test, even if you get a great result, the process is always unjust because you gave yourself an unfair advantage.

## C2: Product

#### [C2] Look to C2, private appropriation causes unjust and unequal products and outcomes.

#### [Utrata 3] Remember Utrata 3’s point that space companies appeal to a threat of exemption to harm specific groups, for example, Elon Musk has comaed extinction will happen, to justify harms to global South, for example, Indonesia and Boca Chica. After space X moved in, residents were pushed out because rocket activity made their homes unsafe, further wildlife refuges in the area were also harmed, so people without the economic means of fighting these corporations won't be able to compete with space companies.

#### [McCann] Look at Jesse McCann’s recording that private appropriation only benefits the rich, space tourism is only possible for people with vast sums of money, further there’s a huge amount of pollution that is released on communities that can’t handle it, or don't have the means of fighting it.

#### [Utrata 4] Look to Utrata 4, the util logic of space fails, since it always sacrifices some groups for others. Instead of looking to the benefits of civilization for all, it's always on people who have the economic means of expanding and don't need to worry about the pollution. Huge amounts of new labor are sensed to support colonization and capitalism, so many underpaid workers are added to exploitation that already exists.

#### 1. This shows the opposite of any arguments to be true because actively damaging the environment and increasing the rich-poor gap doesn't help at all. So even if we evaluate under util, we still win.

#### 2. This outweighs negative arguments qualitatively. Even if they do serve particular groups, they do so by harming the infrastructure of society, so they sacrifice some people to benefit others, which is not utilitarian.

#### 3. This precludes any neg arguments about benefits because they cause one harm to reduce another.

#### 4. This shows any arguments about benefits to be untrue because the only people who experience those benefits have to already have the money to afford them. So, even if asteroid mining gets us resources, those resources won’t be shared among the general population.

#### 5. Aff offense outweighs cyclicality because there are requirements to dig up as many resources as possible, and won’t that happen the cycle will just continue, so we will soon run out of places to apportion. This controls the link to util since there is only a certain amount of supplies to dig up.