# 1AR

## Case

### OV – Inequality

#### Private space appropriation guarantees massive inequality by extending capitalism to the universe – it’s a necessary spatial fix as we run out of resources. Traditional crisis impact calculus is privileged so prefer a FW of structural violence: 1) it’s the silent killer

### OV – Capitalism

#### Warming causes extinction and turns all conflicts. Capitalism is the root cause and is unsustainable because it requires a spatial fix – that’s why space billionaires are tricking the public into colonizing space using rosy pitch decks and mythologic futurism

#### Private space can’t solve earth problems- it requires inequality

Marx 19

(Paris Marx is a freelance writer, host of left-wing tech podcast Tech Won't Save Us, and editor of Radical Urbanist. <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2019/12/jeff-bezos-the-expanse-space-fantasy-sci-fi-syfy>, 12-14)

It’s worth wondering what Jeff Bezos thinks about the plight of Belters, but it’s likely he pays them little mind. His vision of space colonization makes no mention of the working class, placing far more emphasis on the lives well-off residents will be able to lead and the small percentage of people who will be lauded as geniuses. That blind spot echoes how Bezos treats the Amazon workers who are responsible for his great wealth, leaving them to toil in warehouses where they’re constantly monitored, afraid to take bathroom breaks, get injured at rates more than twice the industry average, and have to suffer through high temperatures needed so the robots keep working (the robots, the workers are told, do not function well in cooler temperatures). Bezos may well believe the Belters are in their rightful place and not think much more about it, but that’s not the only way The Expanse demonstrates how regular people could suffer in a capitalist space future. Sacrificing People for Power Just as Bezos has little consideration for Amazon warehouse workers, the powerful in The Expanse have a similar disinterest in the plight of common people. That’s demonstrated both by senior members of government and one of the richest men in the solar system, the show’s very own Bezos. Back on Earth, the UN of The Expanse has failed to maintain an economy, to use Bezos’s words, of “dynamism and growth” despite colonizing the solar system. UN deputy undersecretary Chrisjen Avasarala explains that the government is unable to provide enough opportunities for its residents, so while some of them work, many survive on a welfare payment called Basic Assistance. It’s similar to the basic income that Silicon Valley titans have called for in response to the threat of automation, but when the show leaves the UN’s halls of power to give viewers a rare glimpse of the streets of Earth, it’s clear that’s not working out as promised. When one of the main characters escapes the Martian embassy, she meets a group of people who live in shanties near the sewers despite receiving the payment. One of the men explains the difficulty of their lives: being denied medication from clinics, children exposed to radiation from nearby factories, drinking sewer water in the summers, and applying for vocational training at seventeen years old and still waiting at fifty-two because there are so few spots. A small cash payment doesn’t make up for the lack of education and employment, and there’s a later allusion to a class of undocumented people on Earth who aren’t even eligible for Basic. While the high-ranking figures of the UN are portrayed as being aloof from the suffering of the have-nots, wealthy industrialist Jules-Pierre Mao sees them as having no humanity whatsoever. It’s hard to imagine that Bezos doesn’t feel some connection to a character like Mao, who owns a massive conglomerate that secretly built its own stealth ships and is willing to sacrifice as many lives as it takes to control the “protomolecule” alien life-form. Mao believes the proto-molecule could be used as a weapon but also hopes it could be merged with humans to create a higher form of life. Bezos has no problem squeezing the last bit of labor from Amazon workers, then casting them aside when they’re spent, but Mao’s dehumanization of people below him goes much further. He infects a station of 1.5 million people and uses Belter children as live test subjects, all of whom die as a result of his experiments. At one point, Mao states, “our actions affect the lives of millions . . . billions . . . entire planets . . . in ways that few people can comprehend,” but he doesn’t feel a responsibility to those billions of people. Rather, he develops a god complex that leads him to feel that he alone can move humanity forward, not so different from the ideologies of billionaires like Bezos and Musk. Don’t Let Billionaires Chart the Future While Bezos and Musk might have deluded themselves into believing that space colonization will be our salvation, The Expanse suffers no such delusions. It gives us a much more realistic glimpse of what space colonization driven by capitalism might look like: a terrible deal for anyone who isn’t enormously wealthy or in a high-ranking position in government or the military. Most of us would still be under the boot of those in power, as the Belters find themselves, or cast off to survive on a poverty stipend. Just as workers in the present have to fight against colonial powers and abusive bosses, so do Belters. The OPA isn’t always populated with the most ethical people, but over the course of the first three seasons, it grows from being a disorganized advocacy group to a quasi-government with a ship fighting alongside the navies of Earth and Mars. It’s the most inspiring development of the series, and the fourth season seems poised to delve further into what it actually means for Belters to have power. Will they live up to the Belter proverb that states, “the more you share, the more your bowl will be plentiful”; will their newfound power corrupt their stated egalitarian values; or will that story line be cast off if the show’s new billionaire benefactor doesn’t care so much about Belters? While it might bewilder us that Bezos would ever swoop in to save a TV show as honest about class conflict as The Expanse, it could be that we’re just overthinking it. It’s likely he sees it as little more than part of a PR campaign to get people to buy into his ambition to profit from the resource wealth of asteroids and other space rocks. And while the show doesn’t shy away from depicting the viciousness of capitalism in space, for Bezos, it might be much simpler than that — any vision of capitalism dominating us even as we spread out through the galaxy is a vision, as far as he’s concerned, worth promoting. Billionaires will never promote a future that breaks with capitalism because that would challenge their own positions of power and privilege right here in the present. And while dreams of space can entice the imagination, our future — at least in the near term — doesn’t lie among the asteroids. Our future is here on Earth, building a society where ordinary people are put before the rich and powerful.

1] Private exploration solves cap

2] Private solves climate via innovation

3] Private solves war

## T- Must implement, define unjust

**1AR – implementation**

**C/I – Affirmatives must identify private appropriation of outer space as unjust.**

We meet:

**Unjust means unfair or immoral**

**OED no date** ["unjust, adj. and n." Oxford English Dictionary, https://www-oed-com.proxy.hw.com/viewdictionaryentry/Entry/214856] HWIC

A. adj.

1. Not fair or equitable.

Thesaurus »

**Definitions of "resolved" don't matter – yes congress can pass a bill that says "X is unjust" but that doesn't entail a prohibition of X**

**-- Even if unjust means unlawful that is incoherent if the law doesn't exist in the first place**

**1] Predictability – the topic is intuitively a moral statement, not a policy action – turns ground bc interpretations of the resolution guide pre-tournament prep**

**2] No ground loss – topic disads (ie not politics) are still reasons to negate because they're reasons that appropriation is more just than the alternative**

**3] Clash – a model where offense mainly consists of case turns (ie space col good / capitalism good) ensures the debate stays focused on the aff and promotes deep topic research**

**4] Topic ed – aff model encourages research into concepts like the non-appropriation principle and the philosophical aspect of the topic**

**5] Use reasonability – if we win sufficient defense to their standards, default to substance – key to deter friv theory and preserve substance which o/w on urgency – intervention is inevitable so intervene for substance**

## Framing

1] Our framing is util so we meet all their points under the framing

2] On actor spec, the resolution doesn’t specify an actor so we don’t need to either. We defend whole rez so theres no abuses

## AT: Mining DA

#### The DA is *literally* enclosure

Corbyn 18

(Zoe, <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2018/jun/09/asteroid-mining-space-prospectors-precious-resources-fuelling-future-among-stars>, 6-9)

But while it may be technically possible to mine asteroids a generation from now, the question is should we? One set of issues is around justice, according to Tony Milligan and Robert Sparrow, who study space ethics at King’s College London and Monash University, Australia, respectively. If asteroids belong to anyone, it is to everyone, says Sparrow. Should private companies be permitted to profit from resources that are part of our extraterrestrial commons? While the companies can be taxed, it is hard to see it being equitably distributed across humanity, says Milligan. There are also issues around safety and liability. What if mining an asteroid somehow changes its trajectory, putting it on a collision course with Earth? When it comes to the environment, mining lifeless asteroids is not expected to disrupt any ecosystems but there are still some that may be worth protecting, just like the Grand Canyon or Uluru. Ceres and Vesta, the largest asteroids in the asteroid belt, could be considered unique and distinctive, says Milligan. And do we want to live in the middle of a “giant celestial quarry”, or feel a sense that we “belong” to a place? He draws an analogy to the development of the American frontier. It was so quick and got so out of control that a lot was destroyed in the process. “It became very difficult to get people to think in the long term when there were such short-term advantages to be had,” he says. “We have done so badly at looking after our home that the desire to mine asteroids can’t help but appear profoundly arrogant,” says Sparrow. However, Bonin flips that argument on its head. “I actually think of it as an ultimate act of environmental stewardship for Earth,” he says. People need resources, he argues, and mining asteroids could ensure they were obtained without hurting the planet.

#### The DA Heavily discounts all aff evidence- its industry propaganda modelled of Theranos et al

RIEDERER 14

(RACHEL, Silicon Valley Says Space Mining Is Awesome and Will Change Life on Earth. That’s Only Half Right. <https://newrepublic.com/article/117815/space-mining-will-not-solve-earths-conflict-over-natural-resources> 5-19)

It's become clear that there’s just not enough stuff on Earth to go around. We’re constantly fighting over land and water, jockeying for access to our home planet’s diamonds or oil or sugarcane or schools of fish. In the last few years a chorus of voices has arisen to suggest that we could solve these petty human squabbles by looking to space. “Everything we hold of value on this planet, metals, minerals, real estate, energy sources, fuel—the things we fight wars over—are literally in near infinite quantities in the solar system,” says Peter Diamandis, one of the founders of the asteroid-mining company Planetary Resources. He claims we have a “moral obligation to become an interplanetary species,” and that if we harness the resources in space, "the entire human race will be the beneficiary." Naveen Jain, founder of Moon Express, wants to do on the moon what Diamandis wants to do with asteroids. A recent CNBC profile quotes him as saying, “Once you take a mind-set of scarcity and replace it with a mind-set of abundance, amazing things can happen here on Earth.” This kind of exultant talk is perhaps to be expected from entrepreneurs describing their companies’ dreams, but Diamandis and Jain are not alone. In a radio interview this April, Neil deGrasse Tyson, the public face of American astrophysics, also voiced his excitement about the potential of space mining. “If you haul an asteroid the size of a house to Earth, it could have more platinum on it than has ever been mined in the history of the world. More gold than has ever been mined in the history of the world. When that happens”—and here his voice takes on the dreamy tone familiar to fans of "COSMOS: A Spacetime Odyssey," the Fox series he hosts—“the scarcity that has led to human-to-human violence, there’s a chance it could all go away.” Tyson admitted that he was being “a little hopeful”—he has also noted that it is far more likely that any resources found in space will be put to use in space first, not hauled back to Earth (more on that later)—but his comment captures the aura of starry-eyed excitement that surrounds space mining ventures. At Slate, Will Oremus wrote about the terrestrial tech world’s blasé response to the founding of Planetary Resources, and commanded, “Wake up! This is outer space we’re talking about! This is awesome!” It is awesome. To read about these ambitious plans, and to contemplate the scale of human brainpower and industriousness required to pull them off, fills one with awe. These new companies talk about space in a way that sounds unfamiliar to the civilian ear accustomed to the reverent tone of planetarium field trips; rather than the vastness of space, the companies emphasize its accessibility. Moon Express calls the moon “the eighth continent.” Planetary Resources wants to “bring the solar system into humanity’s sphere of influence.” Experiencing awe is fun. It's even more fun to imagine a world of outer-space abundance in which we don’t have to worry about fossil fuels and everyone can afford a platinum case for their iPhone. And there is great potential for resource extraction in space, though these ventures will carry great upfront costs and plenty of uncertainty about whether they will actually come to fruition. Many deadlines and timeline estimates are fast approaching or have passed already. What’s misleading about these projects isn’t that they’re subject to budget problems and delays, but that they come couched in overblown rhetoric about their potential to radically alter human life, to do away with the notion of scarcity and deliver us to a future of plenty and peace. It’s a pattern that has become familiar in Silicon Valley: develop a plan for a business that will do something cool and make a lot of money, but describe it instead as something that will change the world. Return to that platinum asteroid for a moment. There’s one that Planetary Resources has been tracking: It passes near the Earth’s orbit every 23 months and is a half-kilometer by one kilometer in size. A spacecraft could travel to it in around eight months. Diamandis estimates its total worth at between $300 billion and $5 trillion. If it were to be mined at some point in the future, it would drive down the global price of platinum, which might make some items more affordable—luxury jewelry, of course, but also catalytic converters for cars and hard disks for laptops and DVRs—but it would primarily make the investors of Planetary Resources extremely rich.

#### Don’t believe that they can overcome technical barriers- they are lying to even say they can IDENTIFY the \*$&($& asteroid

Wired 1-23-17 https://www.google.com/search?q=namrata+goswami&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS858US858&oq=Namrata+Goswami&aqs=chrome.0.0l7.345j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8

THE COMMERCIAL SPACE industry pushes a particular brand of optimism. Its urge to inspire manifests as soaring soundtracks to three-minute mission-promo videos, press releases with words like “humanity,” and slick graphics of spacecraft that don’t exist yet but could any day now. In the particular case of asteroid mining, business leaders are selling a future in which materials plucked from space rocks make up for Earth’s shortfalls and support a thriving civilization. Everyone is rich, all are happy, and no one wants for anything. O pioneers! We are them! OK, fine, that’s an exaggeration. But the toned-down version of asteroid mining’s prospects is still hyperreal. "Our vision is to catalyze humanity's growth, both on and off the Earth," says Peter Diamandis, co-founder of mining company Planetary Resources, in a PR video. A graphical spacecraft, presumably future-theirs, flies away from our planet while he speaks. "At the end, the entire human race will be the beneficiary, as we expand our reach beyond the Earth, into the solar system," he continues. But traveling the road to space-based industry will require giant leaps. Like picking the most lucrative asteroids—the ones with lots of water and precious metals—from far afield. And negotiating spacecraft near their complicated gravitational fields. To do that, companies will have to leave the comfy confines of Earth's orbit, where they currently do all their experimenting. In May, Planetary Resources raised $21 million of venture capital for an Earth-observation program called Ceres. Ten small satellites will fly low around the planet, taking twice-daily images of Earth in wavelengths ranging from mid-infrared to visible—images that will “benefit multiple industries including agriculture, oil & gas, water quality, financial intelligence and forestry.” These satellites will, essentially, be prospecting Earth, using the same sensors Planetary Resources has developed to prospect asteroids. The utility, says president and CEO Chris Lewicki, is dual. “We are taking pictures of the Earth and using them not only to understand how our technology works but also to understand more about our planet,” he says. True enough, but it's also about the balance sheet: Earth-facing spacecraft, as all that venture capital suggests, are big money. Which is important for a company that has to continue existing until it can actually mine asteroids. The other big name in the industry, Deep Space Industries, is also in the Earth-observation business, kind of: It sells its spacecraft technologies to other companies, some of whom want to use them to peer down at our planet. Like HawkEye 360, a company that plans to monitor and map radio-wave broadcasts in near real-time. Deep Space Industries is the prime contractor developing and making the satellites that will become HawkEye's Pathfinder prototype. “Earth observation is kind of the hot thing in space right now,” says Meagan Crawford, Deep Space Industries' chief operating officer. “It’s where most of the value is being created.” But unlike Planetary Resources, Deep Space Industries isn’t planning its own world-watching missions, even if they plan to profit from others’. Their personal path to an asteroid is straighter: They hope to launch the prototype Prospector-X this year to see how its propulsion performs, how its avionics stand up to space radiation, and how its optical navigation system fares against obstacles. It will be in Earth orbit, but it’s not on the Earth-observation beat. It’s meant to show that the follow-on Prospector-1 will work—hopefully going to an asteroid by the end of the decade, the same timescale on which Deep Space is also working. “We think the best way to determine what these asteroids are really like is to go touch and feel and interact with one,” Crawford says. Spacecraft shortfalls Becoming a prime prospector of Earth doesn’t quite translate to asteroids, as the two space-body types are quite different. For one, Earth is, like, right here. Asteroids are way out there, moving very fast. And that makes getting to know them hard. The companies need to know about a specific rock's composition before embarking on a mining mission—something they can't accomplish with the same sensors they are deploying in Earth orbit, the same ones they hope to use to get detailed information once they are actually close to an asteroid. Scientific missions specced to learn more about what asteroids are made of, like NASA's newly funded Lucy and Psyche, will help the companies get the knowledge they need to get power. But Crawford admits that "the biggest missing piece for asteroid mining is scientific knowledge of target asteroids." Asteroids’ specifics are still fuzzy. That’s why space agencies keep sending missions like Lucy and Psyche, as well as the already-launched OSIRIS-REx, Dawn, and Hayabusa to them: because we don’t know a super lot about their details, beyond predictive models based on broad categories. “We don’t have a lot of experience with the real characteristics of asteroids,” says Zoe Szajnfarber, who studies the dynamics of technological innovation at George Washington University. What if a company chose a target asteroid based on predictions, only to find, upon arrival, that it holds much less water and platinum than checkbooks and customers hoped? Too bad, so sad. “If you make the choice to go to the one asteroid, that’s where you’re going,” says Szajnfarber. “It’s almost impossible to have enough fuel to change your mind and go to a different one.” Then, once you get there, there’s the problem of gravity. The companies' craft may master constellation- or formation-flying around our planet. But Earth, as globes have suggested for centuries, is basically a sphere. And its mass is pretty evenly distributed. Gravity is basically the same everywhere in a spacecraft’s orbit. Keeping spacecraft in line in such a boring gravitational field is “easy.” But have you seen pictures of asteroids? Those pockmarked potato colonies with weird peaks and valleys have complicated gravity and composition. The companies will have to climb over both these early obstacles before they get to even bigger ones: that part where they have to build robots that can mine and spacecraft that can bring the haul back into humanity’s reach. They can’t do any of it by planetary navel-gazing alone. But they are going to do planetary navel-gazing, whether under their own flags or customers’. That globe-centric system will at least make the companies money, which means they may be able to survive long enough to figure out how to do what they really want to do.

#### Not enough asteroids meet all criteria for viability, fail to solve

Rincon, science editor, 14

(Paul, <https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-25716103>, 1-13)

A new study might contain some bad news for companies hoping to mine asteroids for their valuable ores. In the last couple of years, start-ups - including one backed by Sir Richard Branson - have announced plans to extract resources from space rocks. But calculations by Dr Martin Elvis suggest our cosmic neighbourhood might not be such a treasure trove after all. The Harvard astrophysicist argues just 10 near-Earth asteroids might be suitable for commercial-scale mining. But Eric Anderson, co-founder of asteroid mining company Planetary Resources, told BBC News that the values quoted in the study were off - conservatively - by a factor of 100. Dr Elvis, from the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics in Cambridge, US, has developed an equation to estimate the number of asteroids in the Solar System that could be exploited in a cost-effective way. His research paper is in press at the journal Planetary and Space Science, and has been posted on the pre-print server Arxiv.org. In 2012, Planetary Resources, backed by billionaire investors including Hollywood director James Cameron as well as Google executives Larry Page and Eric Schmidt, unveiled their vision of using robotic spacecraft to squeeze the chemical components of fuel as well as minerals out of asteroid rocks. Several months later, the company was joined by a competitor - Deep Space Industries - which plans to use low-cost spacecraft called Fireflies and Dragonflies to reconnoitre and return samples from near-Earth asteroids. Advocates of asteroid mining say it could turn into a trillion-dollar business, but some experts have been sceptical of the idea. Concentrating efforts While acknowledging the uncertainties, Dr Elvis worked out the factors that would make an asteroid commercially viable to mine and what fraction of known space rocks met these requirements. He assumed that mining operations would want to focus on iron-nickel asteroids (known as M-type), considered the most promising targets for finding so-called platinum-group metals. These include platinum, along with iridium, palladium and others. These are rare in the Earth's crust because they dissolve in molten iron, instead being mainly concentrated in the planet's core. Platinum and palladium are the most economically important, having a wide range of uses in industry. But according to the analysis, just 1% of near-Earth asteroids are rich in these elements. Suitable asteroids also need to be relatively easy to reach, further narrowing the pool by ruling out all but the nearest objects to Earth. The operative parameter here is delta-v - the change in velocity needed to send mining equipment to the target and return with a larger mass of ore. The size of the target is also a factor; the paper suggests it wouldn't be worth mining asteroids smaller than about 100m because the total value of the ore they would produce wouldn't be enough to cover the costs of a space mission. However, Dr Elvis points out that the ore values in his analysis range from a low of $800m to a high of $8.8bn. "Such a large range of values could greatly change the profitability of a venture, making more accurate assays necessary," he explained.

### Innovation

#### Private space is spectacle not innovation

Marx 21

(Paris Marx is a socialist writer and host of the Tech Won't Save Us podcast. <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2021/07/billionaires-space-richard-branson-jeff-bezos-elon-musk> , 7-13)

For all the lauding of private space companies and the space billionaires that champion them, they remain heavily reliant on government money. This is the real face of the private space industry: billions of dollars in contracts from NASA, the military, and increasingly for telecommunications that are helping companies like SpaceX and Blue Origin control the infrastructure of space — and it’s all justified to the public under the promise that it’s in service of grand visions that are nothing more than marketing ploys. Part of the reason SpaceX has been so successful at winning these contracts is because Musk is not an inventor but a marketer. He knows how to use PR stunts to get people to pay attention, and that helps him win lucrative contracts. He also knows what things not to emphasize, like the potentially controversial military contracts that don’t get tweets or flashy announcement videos. Bezos’s trip to space is all about embracing spectacle, because he realizes it’s essential to compete for the attention of the public and the bureaucrats deciding who gets public contracts.

#### Xt Aronoff— public funding is the basis of most innovation and the reason why private companies succeed in the first place; rhetoric that private can do what governments and public can’t do generates a dangerous series of myths that billionaires use to manipulate the global view of progress.

## AT: Public Trust CP

#### 1] Public trust doctrine is a terrible method – outdated, unenforceable, forecloses other effective action

Lazarus JD 86

Richard J Lazarus (harvard law professor witta law degree from harvard), 1986 " Changing Conceptions of Property and Sovereignty in Natural Resources: Questioning the Public Trust Doctrine," Iowa Law Review, https://www.repository.law.indiana.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3055&amp;context=facpub, // HW AW

Over the last fifteen years, the public trust doctrine has been the object of a remarkable revival in natural resources law. At the time of its "Renaissance" it served to highlight important societal values not then in focus. Accelerating changes in the law suggest that it is now time to bring that revival to a close-to lift the public trust doctrine "patch" from the emerging fabric of modern natural resources law. Operation of the doctrine inevitably depends on the judicial application of labels that obscure the true factors behind the judicial decision. Moreover, those **legal categories upon which the doctrine inexorably relies may have been meaningful once, but they have become arbitrary and wooden with age.** Natural resources law has for too long been inflicted with a host of such false legal categorizations, **inhibiting its developments in times of new information and changing social values**. Indeed, the recent history of natural resources law is most prominently marked by a continuous struggle to be freed of historical shackles so that natural resources law can properly be fused with and into modern notions of tort and property law. Simply put, **the public trust doctrine, even if aimed at promoting needed resource conservation and environmental protection goals, is a step in the wrong direction.** The doctrine amounts to a romantic step 476. The historical underpinnings upon which the public trust doctrine is based, especially Roman law, have in recent years come under sharp attack by commentators, thus further weakening the long-term viability of the doctrine. See supra note 10. 477. L. FULLER, supra note 164, at viii. 71 IOWA LAWREVIEW 631 [19861 backward toward a bygone era at a time when we face modern problems that demand candid and honest debate on the merits, including consideration of current social values and the latest scientific information. The complex and pressing resource allocation and environmental protection issues we currently face will continue to tax severely the most concerted societal efforts and the best legal and scientific minds. Dramatic shifts in legal rules, primarily in traditional notions of private property, will continue to be necessary, challenging the patience and understanding of the public, to whom the law must ultimately justify its legitimacy. Although perhaps unfortunate, short of a major redirection of this nation's social and economic infrastructure, 478 little, if any, room is left in these tasks ahead for the mythopoeism of the public trust doctrine.

#### 2] The public trust doctrines established in the squo fail to regulate corporations effectively, doing it in space would be as if not even worse than how it’s already operating. The CP doesn’t solve for risks

#### 3] The CP doesn’t solve for capitalism, risk of strengthening structural inequality from allowing private companies to capitalize in space to any extent outweighs.

# 2AR

## Cap v3 o/v

### Short

#### Stopping cap is not about revolution, piecemeal reform is sufficient to begin the necessary transition.

#### The plan decimates capitalist futurism – space col is the single justification for the ultra-rich – rejection means solvency

#### Space is the ultimate spatial fix that will allow infinite destruction of every climate – cap drowns absent it

#### K prior -- capitalism must be fought “at the level of discursive battle”.

#### nationalization ensures sustainable and green exploration – solves debris and climate

FW

* Nothing’s dropped. We meet on util, we defend util through the view of moral calculus on structural violence
* ~~Don’t need actor spec~~

TURNS

1. Private solves cap
2. Private exploration and innovation is key to solving climate
3. Private solves global war

They only extended the innovation pref on case

1. They claim private does better, cheaper, and faster BUT THEY COMPLETELY DROP OUR ARGUMENTS ON WHY PRIVATE BETTER IS A MYTH

SOLVENCY

1. Plan can’t solve climate via the spacial fix

* We warrant in the 1AC that cap is the RC of climate which the neg completely undermined in both the 1NC and NR so we do solve
* The reason why climate is so bad is because private owners like bezos and musk direct the public’s attention away from real issues and create false ones to build up their narrative and savior complex of how their sham programs supposedly save humanity when they don’t.

## CP

They say that the CP is more specific so it solves

* Our arguments about how their system is outdated. They misunderstand that warrant

#### 1] Their claims that they make the trust doctrine more specific are new coming out of the 2NR so don’t evaluate it it’s abusive, you can’t choose to clarify in cross it’s status and then modify it in the 2NR - Additionally they say that the system doesn’t fail and reference the OST but the OST is a clear example of a failure.

#### - The OST does a shitty job at regulating space activity and empirically fails, nations made a bunch of loopholes with it

#### 2] The public trust doctrines established in the squo fail to regulate corporations effectively, doing it in space would be as if not even worse than how it’s already operating. The CP doesn’t solve for any of our or their impacts.

#### 3] The CP doesn’t solve for capitalism, it risks strengthening structural inequality from allowing private companies to capitalize in space to any extent outweighs.

## DA

The only benefits that they proposed on the da was that it:

1. Creates new jobs – this is a new argument so I’m not evaluating it
2. Solves asteroids – it doesn’t which I’ll get to on the LBL

Public can prevent extinction from collisions

Asteroid not only extinction scenario, second was solving climate

LBL

1. Mining Fails- THEY COMPLETELY DROP AND AVOID ALL THE WARRANTS OF MY CARDS.

* All they literally say is that mining would be good and better but don’t attack our warrants. They try and further out it by saying their impacts o/w
* Extend all of the arguments they dropped in the 2NR
  + Mining fails because of technological borders. Our tech isn’t advanced enough to perform these missions and withstand harsh climates in space that’s Wired 22

1. Asteroid turn
   * They claim that only private can solve and prevent extinction from collisions yet they give ZERO examples of examples or how.
   * The probability of an asteroid hitting is infinitely low anyways so there’s no race between state intervention. States could easily solve a threat because government telescopes will detect it immediately and act immediately
2. Innovation/Climate solve turn

* They concede all of our warrants on innovation, this entire thesis that private can do better that their DA and CP are build upon are already answered in the 1AC and further answered in the 1AR

#### Xt Aronoff— public funding is the basis of most innovation and the reason why private companies succeed in the first place; rhetoric that private can do what governments and public can’t do generates a dangerous series of myths that billionaires use to manipulate the global view of progress.

# Judge Feedback