

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

Negative

(Introductory Quote):

“The Earth is the cradle of humanity, but mankind cannot stay in the cradle forever.”

It is because I agree with (author and qualifications) Konstantin Tsiolkovsky, an rocket scientist and one of the founding fathers of modern rocketry and astronautics in the position that (main idea) the appropriation of outer space by private entities is in fact perfectly just, that I feel compelled to negate today’s resolution,

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

For clarification of today’s round, I counter 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](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 Well-being.

(The value) Well-being is defined as a general sense that life is good and just.

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

(The value) Well-being is most important in today's round because when private entities take control and colonize space, they bring back wealth, ways to survive if extinction were to occur, new technologies, and bring a sense of teamwork in terms of working with other private entities. These benefits allow for the well-being of life and the environment of Earth and even of space.

The best criterion for evaluating this resolution is Utilitarianism.

(This criterion) Utilitarianism is defined as the doctrine that actions are right if they are useful or for the benefit of a majority.

Source: [Oxford Languages](#)

It best achieves my value of Well-being because Utilitarianism is important to consider. Although there may be well-being for a small group of people when the doctrine is not followed, there would not be well-being AS A WHOLE. Following the rules and guidelines of Utilitarianism allows for the well-being of a population, in this case that of Earth's, AS A WHOLE AND PROVIDES STABILITY.

In negating the resolution, I offer the following contentions:

Contention I: Private entities have been pivotal in the development of space technology.

Warrant: After the mid-1950s, space exploration was at its peak and in full form and speed. However, due to its high cost and other than satellites, space was largely abandoned by the globe. However, companies such as Jeff Bezo's Blue Origin and Elon Musk's SpaceX have reignited space exploration. Technologies such as creating the first

reusable rocket, Falcon 9, and Starlink communications satellites have helped humans to have a better life. The amazing thing is that billionaires such as Elon Musk and Jeff Bezos, as previously stated, are using their own money for the cost and funds. Taxpayers do not have to pay anything, which is a benefit in itself.

Impact: This claim affects Well-being and Utilitarianism. It is in the best interest of the human race to use these new technologies that Private Entities are creating to travel to space for a safer future. Humans can use these technologies to stop mass extinction from happening as well.

Contention II: Space colonization, through private entities, is the only way humans will be able to survive in the long-run (100 years, 200 years, maybe even 300 years from now).

Warrant: Although we have been surviving on this planet for centuries and thousands of years, our luck will not last forever. Our fate of extinction will come upon us one way or another. Large extinctions in Earth's history include Ordovician-Silurian, which occurred 440 million years ago and had 85 percent of life killed, Devonian, which occurred 365 million years ago and had 75 percent of life killed, Permian-Triassic, which occurred 260 million years ago and had 96 percent of life killed, Triassic-Jurassic, which occurred 200 million years ago and had 80 percent of life killed, and lastly, Cretaceous-Paleogene, which occurred 65 million years ago and had 76 percent of life killed. Climate change, pollution, earthquakes, disease, and a huge meteor impact, similar to that of the dinosaurs will kill us off one way or another. As a result, we must colonize as quickly as possible. This is only possible through private entities as government groups are nowhere close to as productive and efficient as private entities are. For example, in 2021 alone, SpaceX was able to launch 31 flights into space, which is A NEW RECORD IN A CALENDAR YEAR. Also the goals SpaceX has such as giving humans the ability to land on Mars in the 2020s may sound insane, but they are completely reachable. WE MUST USE PRIVATE ENTITIES TO LEAD US TO OUR GOAL OF SURVIVAL.

Impact: This claim affects well-being and Utilitarianism. Allowing private entities to colonize and control space is important as it will save the human-race, taking care of our well-being. Colonization through private entities is in our best interest due to all of the benefits humans receive.

Conclusion Option 1:

I have shown you that in Contention I Private entities have been pivotal in the development of space technology and that in Contention II Space colonization, through private entities, is the only way humans will be able to survive in the long-run (100 years, 200 years, maybe even 300 years from now).

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

Judge, Please Vote for Negative. Thank You.

My value and value criterion actually overway my opponents value and value criterion due to the fact that not all private entities are Capitalist and that they are not only in it for the profits. HOWEVER, THIS IS NOT THE CASE: IT IS FICTION. The amazing thing is that billionaires such as Elon Musk and Jeff Bezos, as previously stated, are using their own money for the cost and funds. Taxpayers do not have to pay much, which is a benefit in itself. Private entities also are not capitalist. I have proven that they are helping others and the environment, through new technologies. Private entities such as spacex and blue origin are also doing charity work through their profits, falsifying my opponent's argument that they are only in it for the money.

My opponent keeps on trying to get me to say that private entities cause more climate change and global warming, however, LIKE I HAVE SAID MULTIPLE TIMES, THEY ARE CREATING NEW TECHNOLOGIES TO DECREASE THE AMOUNT OF POLLUTION BEING CREATED. Their technologies are way better than government driven agencies such as Nasa, whose space rockets CASE WAY MORE pollution than that of private entities. My opponent could also give no examples to show that not all private entities are using environmentally friendly technology.

Also, the positive effects through private entities outweigh any positive effects my opponent gave and my opponent gave none. When they colonize space, they bring back wealth, ways to survive if extinction were to occur, new technologies, and bring a sense of teamwork in terms of working with other private entities. These benefits allow for the well-being of life and the environment of Earth and even of space. My opponent says that humans landing in space is not possible, however, it is proven that it is. Scientists have said that it is quite reachable and possible.

New jobs will be and are being made by private entities

CARD ON JOBS: New jobs will be and are being made by private entities

CARD ON WORKING TOGETHER: Private entities are much more keen to work together. Nation states however, are prone towards warfare and hatred. The largest example we can give is the space race between the United States and the Soviet Union, which is now mainly present-day Russia. Instead of working together like how SpaceX and Blue Origin would work together, they fought against each other, not in a war, but in a space race. If both nations had worked together, much more could have been accomplished. However, that did not happen. The arms war between Pakistan and India is also an example. Although this was not related to space, it just shows how nations always fight against each other, no matter the cause. As a result, we must put our trust in Private Entities to save us from extinction and lead us towards a bright future.

Benefits such as GETTING SAVED FROM EXTINCTION, WHICH IS CLEARLY GOING TO HAPPEN UNLESS WE COLONIZE, receiving new technologies to survive and learn about the universe's past, and even more job opportunities on different planets such as the Moon are really important as they will open up the gateway to further life for the human race.

My opponent talks about how capitalism causes climate change and how private entities are only in it for the money and profit, nothing else. However, it HAS BEEN PROVEN that private entities are creating environmental safe technologies that are getting better and better at stopping pollution. Technologies such as creating the first reusable rocket, Falcon 9, and Starlink communications satellites are way more environmental freindly compared to those created the government, for example, Nasa, a organization under the United states.

My opponents' arguments on capitalism make sense, however, nations are not going to disappear and will still be there for the safety of its citizens. Nations will still be able to provide support to the workforce in space.

Also, my opponent says how we should not depend on private entities, however, ...

CARD ON WORKING TOGETHER: Private entities are much more keen to work together. Nation states however, are prone towards warfare and hatred. The largest example we can give is the space race between the United States and the Soviet Union, which is now mainly present-day Russia. Instead of working together like how SpaceX and Blue Origin would work together, they fought against each other, not in a war, but in a space race. If both nations had worked together, much more could have been accomplished. However, that did not happen. The arms war between Pakistan and India is also an example. Although this was not related to space, it just shows how nations always fight against each other, no matter the cause. As a result, we must put our trust in Private Entities to save us from extinction and lead us towards a bright future.

My opponent says how private entities follow capitalism and how colonization on the moon and mars have negative effects such as slavery on the working force. However, this would not happen as the working force could easily have a negotiation and sign contracts with the employer, in this case the private entities. Also, colonization will save us from extinction so it is better to stay alive then have to face slightly negative effects.

My opponent says that things like sexual harrassment and overall oppression will still occur on the moon. However, even if it was not private entities that were leading space exploration, similar to Earth, these things will happen with other groups such as nations leading the charge. My opponent says how that things happen on earth, however, that is human nature to do bad things. However, we can minimize everyones problems through negotiations and contracts to be in the best interest of everyone.

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.