

Guru Patel

Mr. McGhee

LD Debate Forensics

Jan/Feb Topic

Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

Lincoln Douglas Debate Case Outline

Affirmative

(Introductory Quote):

“Corporations are a good thing. But corporations should not be running our government... They have driven the American economy since its founding, and the prosperity of our country is largely dependent on the free operation of corporations. But some corporations don’t want free markets, and they don’t want democracy. THEY WANT PROFITS.”

It is because I agree with (author and qualifications) Robert F. Kennedy, who was also referred to as RFK, who was a lawyer, politician, governor, advisor, and U.S. attorney general in the position that (main idea) the appropriation of outer space by private entities is clearly unjust, that I feel compelled to affirm today’s resolution.

Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

For clarification of today’s round, I offer the following (if negative put in the word *counter*) definitions:

Word: Unjust

Source: [Oxford Languages](#)

Definition: Not based on or behaving to what is morally right and fair

Word: Private Entities

Source: [https://www.law.cornell.edu/definitions/uscode.php?width=840&height=800&iframe=true&def_id=6-USC-625312480-168358316&term_occur=999&term_src=title:6:chapter:6:subchapter:I:section:1501#:~:text=\(A\)%20In%20general%20Except%20as,%2C%20employee%2C%20or%20agent%20thereof](https://www.law.cornell.edu/definitions/uscode.php?width=840&height=800&iframe=true&def_id=6-USC-625312480-168358316&term_occur=999&term_src=title:6:chapter:6:subchapter:I:section:1501#:~:text=(A)%20In%20general%20Except%20as,%2C%20employee%2C%20or%20agent%20thereof).

Definition: Any person or private group, organization, proprietorship, partnership, trust, cooperative, corporation, or other commercial or nonprofit entity

The highest value within today's round is Safety. (The value) Safety is defined as free from all manners of threats

Source: <http://everydaydebate.blogspot.com/2013/09/values-in-lincoln-douglas-debate.html>

(The value) Safety is most important in today's round because, having private entities, who generally HAVE A LOWER STANDARD OF SAFETY, control and colonize would cause mass extinction of the human race. Also, having the same private entities take in all of the financial benefits does in fact damage the safety of the rest of a population.

The best criterion for evaluating this resolution is Utilitarianism. (This criterion) Utilitarianism is defined as the philosophy that actions which provide for the greatest number and happiness, safety, life, ect. are morally correct.

Source: [CDE's Dictionary of Lincoln-Douglas Debate](#)

It best achieves my value of Safety because Utilitarianism allows safety and increases it drastically. If an action or result benefits an individual or group, then it has to be safe. If the majority is being benefited, then safety is taken into account as something that is not safe and may cause harm to life, cannot be a benefit.

In affirming the resolution, I offer the following contentions:

Contention I: The capitalist tendency of private entities mainly benefits the very same private entities, damaging the safety and well-being of the rest of Earth's population.

Warrant: Companies such as SpaceX, Blue Origin, Bigelow Airspace, Virgin Galactic, and Boeing, which are making millions of dollars through space exploration. However, that is not directly helping the world's population. Having 1% of the population continue to increase their wealth, while 99% to stay the same hurts the well-being of Earth's population AS

A WHOLE. For example, SpaceX made a total of 1.5 billion dollars. This income could be somewhere else productively, such as in health-care, public transportation, and education. As the wealth of private entities continues to rise, negative things would and will occur, damaging the world. Having not enough money, riots and war may occur within the 99% group and against the 1% group. Also, private entities may use their wealth to harm the world's population through warfare themselves, furthermore damaging the safety of the world.

Impact: This claim affects my criterion of Utilitarianism as it is not in the best interest of the majority, which would clearly be the 99%, to allow the 1% to make truckloads of money and continue to increase their wealth. All of the space exploration that would occur by the private entities would benefit themselves, not others, not the majority.

Contention II: The appropriation of outer space by private entities may cause mass extinction.

Warrant: Climate change, for example, would be increased through space exploration and taking control of it by private entities. According to Filippo Maggi, associate professor of aerospace engineering at Politecnico di Milano, Italy, "Hybrid engines can use different types of fuels, but they always generate a lot of soot" He also said: "These engines work like a candle, and their burning process creates conditions that are favorable for soot generation." Remember soot harms the safety of the environment, but also of humans. Soot gets into the human body through ingestion, inhalation, or through the skin and eye. When in the body, soot particles can cause coronary heart disease, breathing issues, including asthma, and even cancer. Not only did Filippo Maggi say that, but others agreed and came to similar conclusions as well. According to Dallas Kasaboski, principal analyst at the space consultancy Northern Sky Research, "a single Virgin Galactic suborbital space tourism flight, lasting about an hour and a half, can generate as much pollution as a 10-hour trans-Atlantic flight. In 2021 alone, SpaceX launched 31 flights, A NEW RECORD OF A CALENDAR YEAR. Think about how much pollution those flights caused. The large number of flights that are starting to be conducted compared to government sponsored agencies, further increases the chance of extinction. If climate change is not decreased soon, the human race and other species, maybe even all life, could be extinct.

Impact: This criterion affects Utilitarianism and safety. Increasing climate change is definitely not in the best interest of the world's population. The safety of humans would be at stake due to increased chances of death and mass extinction. Having the appropriation of outer space by private entities is not in the best interest of all and breaks the philosophies of Utilitarianism while also making life unsafe.

Conclusion Option 1:

I have shown you that in Contention I: The capitalist tendency of private entities mainly benefits the very same private entities, damaging the safety and well-being of the rest of Earth's population and that in Contention II: The appropriation of outer space by private entities may cause mass extinction.

For these reasons, we can clearly conclude that (value) Safety should be upheld and that the appropriation of outer space by private entities is clearly unjust.

Judge, please vote for Affirmative. Thank You.

CARD ON SAFETY: The work force when colonization on the moon and especially mars would not have a say. Although job opportunities arise due to space exploration and colonization in space, many negative effects come with those jobs which cannot be overlooked. Being millions of miles away, private entities may not allow them to return back to their homes on Earth. Things like sexual harrassment, slavery, poor wages, and poor housing could happen there. There is not much that can be done to stop private entities from using their power in a place so far from Earth. Oppression cannot be stopped during that time and place, which hurts the safety and well-being of the workforce there, which is a horrible negative effect of private entities colonizing mars. The freedoms of the private entities would hurt humans which is not something anybody would want. On the other hand, allowing space agencies sponsored by nations would allow the nations to have a say in places such as Mars so that private entities cannot take it upon themselves to do whatever they want.

CARD ON MONEY: Nasa, for example, its budget maxed out in the late 1960s. If we could give more money to them, similar to that of the private entities have, they would definitely be able to compete with private entities in terms of productivity and efficiency. I believe that private entities are only "PRODUCTIVE" due to their large budgets.

My opponent says how private entities would give nations lots of benefits, however, the nations would then start depending on private entities. Instead of depending on them, nations could give money to help their own governmental agencies.

My opponent says how private entities help with cost reduction, however, nations can do the same...

CARD ON MONEY: Nasa, for example, its budget maxed out in the late 1960s. If we could give more money to them,

similar to that of the private entities have, they would definitely be able to compete with private entities in terms of productivity and efficiency. I believe that private entities are only “PRODUCTIVE” due to their large budgets. My opponent says how private entities would give nations lots of benefits, however, the nations would then start depending on private entities. Instead of depending on them, nations could give money to help their own governmental agencies.

My opponent also talks about getting citizens to space, however, this can also be done by nations and governments. My opponent says how governments have other things to do instead of just giving citizens seats to space, however, agencies under the government would do that. THAT WOULD BE THEIR JOB, MEANING THAT GOVERNMENTS WOULD BE ABLE TO GIVE CITIZENS TICKETS AND ALLOW THEM TO GO SPACE.

My opponent says how private entities create lots of jobs and how governments are still in control of what private entities do in space, however, at that point it is decreased. The time and distance allows private entities more power than governments on Earth as they are so far away from where the action is taking place. My opponent says how governments would stop sexual harrassment, slavery, poor wages, and poor housing. However, those things still happened on Earth, so think how bad those things would be in space when governments do not have a large say.

My opponent also says in contention 2 how nobody should own space or any part of it. I completely agree with this, however, private entities are not needed in space. Instead nations should be there to allow private entities to not use their powers in a bad and negative way like previously stated.

Also, my opponent does not really argue by first contention on private entities taking in most of their profits instead of providing that money for other things. THIS CONTENTION SO GO ON THE AFF’S SIDE.

My opponent also clearly stated that her case goes under Utilitarianism, which means that her case goes under my value criterion. As a result, my value criterion should be upheld and clearly overrule her value and value criterion.

Conclusion Option 1:

I have shown you that in Contention I: The capitalist tendency of private entities mainly benefits the very same private entities, damaging the safety and well-being of the rest of Earth’s population and that in Contention II: The appropriation of outer space by private entities may cause mass extinction.

For these reasons, we can clearly conclude that (value) Safety should be upheld and that the appropriation of outer space by private entities is clearly unjust.

Common LD Terms

Abusive- An argument that leaves no ground for the other side to debate

Affirmative (Aff)- The side of the debate that agrees with the resolution.

Ballot- The evaluation the judge writes after each round declaring a winner, assigning speaker points, and offering constructive criticism.

Break- To progress to the final rounds of competition.

Case- The pre-prepared speech that is read in the constructive period.

Claim- The thesis statement of a contention that must be proved by a warrant.

Concession- Admission that the other side is correct on a point.

Contention- Major reasons that are the foundation of a case. Formulated in the constructive speech and then extended throughout the debate.

Counter Interpretation- A different, and perhaps more appropriate, way of looking at the resolution. This may involve defining a word or phrase differently.

Criteria- Plural, criterion.

Criterion- The major part of a case that is used to achieve the value.

Cross Apply- The term used when a debater wants to use the same argument without repeating the entire

argument.

Cross Examination (CX)- Three minute questioning period.

Crystallization- 1: Giving of voting issues during the last speech. 2: Solidifying of arguments emphasizing impacts during rebuttals.

Extend- To repeat an argument during another rebuttal. Used to describe the line judges may draw across the page into the next column rather than rewriting the entire argument.

Flights- The stacking of two debates in the same room with the same judge in the same round, one right after the other.

Flow- Special notes taken in each round.

Flowing- Taking detailed notes summarizing the key arguments of the round.

Impact- The part of a contention that explains why an argument matters.

Intrinsic- Of itself. (If something is intrinsically valuable, you value it not because of what it does for you, but for its own sake).

Kritik- A distinct argument used in LD and Policy debate that criticizes cultural assumptions made in either the resolution or a particular case.

LD- Lincoln Douglas debate.

Link- Attachment, relationship.

Negative (Neg)- The position that disagrees with the resolution.

Overview- An overarching argument or observation about the round that comes before any other arguments during a rebuttal.

Pairings (Posting)- The list put up before each debate round letting debaters know who they will be debating, where the round will take place, the judge, and the time of the round.

Prelims- The first 3-6 rounds before the break.

Preparation time (prep Time)- A total of 4 minutes used during a round to prepare speeches.

Rebuttal- A speech that argues both for your side and against the side of your opponent. A good rebuttal must address attacks made by the other side.

Resolution- Statement to be debated.

Roadmap- A statement of what you will be doing in the upcoming speech. Example: I will first be going over the affirmative case, and then I will move on to the negative.”

Running- The use of any specific and thematic positions in your case.

Signposting- 1: Noting which argument you are on. 2: Noting what order you will be going in before beginning a rebuttal.

Speaker Points- The rating a judge gives on his or her ballot evaluating the speaking abilities of the debater. Sub Point- A minor point falling under the umbrella of a contention.

Tag Line- The claim that goes at the beginning of each contention or sub point.

Time Suck- Intentionally taking up extra time so that your opponent will run out of time either with poor and weak extra arguments or by drawing out arguments in cross examination.

Topical- Policy term that has crossed over to LD. An argument that does not directly address the resolution and is therefore irrelevant.

Value- The judging standard for the round.

Voters- The main issues you would like the judge to focus on when deciding the round. Presented in the last speech.

Warrant- Reasoning that makes an assertion (claim) true.