### 1st OFF

#### Our interpretation is that the resolution should define the division of affirmative and negative ground and offense. It was *negotiated* and *announced in advance*, providing both sides with a reasonable opportunity to prepare to engage one another’s arguments.

#### ‘Resolved’ preceding a colon indicates a legislative forum.

Blanche Ellsworth 81, English professor at SFSU and M.A. in English from UC Berkeley, 1/1/1981, *English Simplified*, 4th Edition, cc

A colon is also used to separate 3. THE SALUTATION OF A BUSINESS LETTER FROM THE BODY, Dear Sir Dear Ms. Weiner NOTE: In an informal letter, a comma follows the salutation: Dear Mary, Dear Uncle Jack 4. PARTS OF TITLES, REFERENCES, AND NUMERALS. TITLE: Principles of Mathematics: An Introduction REFERENCE: Luke 3:4—13 NUMERALS: 8:15 PM 5. PLACE OF PUBLICATION FROM PUBLISHER Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill 6. THE WORD RESOLVED FROM THE STATEMENT OF THE RESOLUTION. Resolved: That this committee go on record as favoring new legislation.

#### Appropriation of outer space” by private entities refers to the exercise of exclusive control of space.

TIMOTHY JUSTIN TRAPP, JD Candidate @ UIUC Law, ’13, TAKING UP SPACE BY ANY OTHER MEANS: COMING TO TERMS WITH THE NONAPPROPRIATION ARTICLE OF THE OUTER SPACE TREATY UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LAW REVIEW [Vol. 2013 No. 4]

The issues presented in relation to the nonappropriation article of the Outer Space Treaty should be clear.214 The ITU has, quite blatantly, created something akin to “property interests in outer space.”215 It allows nations to exclude others from their orbital slots, even when the nation is not currently using that slot.216 This is directly in line with at least one definition of outer-space appropriation.217 [\*\*Start Footnote 217\*\*Id. at 236 (“Appropriation of outer space, therefore, is ‘the exercise of exclusive control or exclusive use’ with a sense of permanence, which limits other nations’ access to it.”) (quoting Milton L. Smith, The Role of the ITU in the Development of Space Law, 17 ANNALS AIR & SPACE L. 157, 165 (1992)). \*\*End Footnote 217\*\*]The ITU even allows nations with unused slots to devise them to other entities, creating a market for the property rights set up by this regulation.218 In some aspects, this seems to effect exactly what those signatory nations of the Bogotá Declaration were trying to accomplish, albeit through different means.219

#### Outer Space is considered anything that sits above the Earth’s atmosphere

Betz 21 [(Eric Betz, Science & tech writer for @Discovermag, @Astronomymag and others), “The Kármán Line: Where does space begin?”, Astronomy, https://astronomy.com/news/2021/03/the-krmn-line-where-does-space-begin, March 5, 2021] SS

These days, spacecraft are venturing into the final frontier at a record pace. And a deluge of paying space tourists should soon follow. But to earn their astronaut wings, high-flying civilians will have to make it past the so-called Kármán line. This boundary sits some 62 miles (100 kilometers) above Earth's surface, and it's generally accepted as the place where Earth ends and outer space begins.

#### Private entities are non-governmental corporations

UpCounsel ND [(UpCounsel is an interactive online service that makes it faster and easier for businesses to find and hire legal help solely based on their preferences. “Private Entity: Everything You Need to Know”, UpCounsel, https://www.upcounsel.com/private-entity#importance-of-private-entities, No Date] SS

A private entity can be a partnership, corporation, individual, nonprofit organization, company, or any other organized group that is not government-affiliated. Indian tribes and foreign public entities are not considered private entities.

Unlike publicly traded companies, private companies do not have public stock offerings on Nasdaq, American Stock Exchange, or the New York Stock Exchange. Instead, they offer shares privately to interested investors, who may trade among themselves.

#### Justice implies a desirable departure from the status quo – that means the aff must rectify an injust social interaction

IHS n.d. [(Institute for Humane Studies at George Mason University, non-profit organization that engages with students and professors) “What is Justice?”] JL

One of the most influential accounts of the origin and nature of justice comes from Plato’s Republic. According to Plato’s account, we can think of the principles of justice as mutually agreed to principles for the coordination and structure of social interaction that would benefit all who are subject to them. What those principles are will depend on the society. In addition, there’s a second theory of justice that Plato offers that’s more general. According to this second theory, justice is “each getting what is rightfully theirs and no one getting what is rightfully another’s.” In other words, questions of justice always ask, “Who has a right to what?”

#### Justice is a policy question

Merriam Webster ND [(Mesrriam Webster) “Justice” https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/justice] BC

Essential Meaning of justice

1: the process or result of using laws to fairly judge and punish crimes and criminals

#### Vote neg to preserve limits and equitable division of ground – the resolution is the most predictable stasis point for debates, anything outside of that ruins prep and clash by allowing the affirmative to pick any grounds for debate. That greenlights a race away from the core topic controversies that allow for robust contestation, which favors the aff by making neg ground inapplicable, susceptible to the perm, and concessionary.

#### Two additional impacts:

#### Accessibility – Cutting negs to every possible aff wrecks small schools, which has a disparate impact on under-resourced and minority debaters. Counter-interpretations are arbitrary, unpredictable, and don’t solve the world of neg prep because there’s no grounding in the resolution

#### Link turns their education offense – getting to the third and fourth level of tactical engagement is only possible with refined and well-researched positions connected to the resolutional mechanism. Repeated debates over core issues incentivize innovative argument production and improved advocacy based on feedback and nuanced responses from opponents.

#### Prefer our impact: they’ve skewed the game which necessarily comes first because it makes evaluating the aff impossible. The role of individual debate rounds on broader subject formation is white noise – *can you remember what happened in doubles of the Loyola tournament your junior year?* – individual rounds don’t affect our subjectivity, so fairness is the only impact your ballot can resolve. You should presume all their truth claims false because they have not been properly tested

#### They can’t get offense: we don’t exclude them, only persuade you that our methodology is best. Every debate requires a winner and loser, so voting negative doesn’t reject them from debate, it just says they should make a better argument next time.

#### Paradigm issues:

#### Drop the debater – their abusive advocacy skewed the debate from the start

#### Competing interps – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation

#### Fairness is a voter ­– necessary to determine the better debater

#### Education is a voter – why schools fund debate

## Case

### Framing

**The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing**

**First, pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable. People consistently regard pleasure and pain as good reasons for action, despite the fact that pleasure doesn’t seem to be instrumentally valuable for anything.**

**Moen 16** [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] SJDI

Let us start by observing, empirically, that a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues**.** This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. “Pleasure” and “pain” are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative.2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values**.** If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, I might ask: “What for?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable**.** You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good.3 As Aristotle observes**:** “We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value.

**Moral uncertainty means preventing extinction should be our highest priority.  
Bostrom 12** [Nick Bostrom. Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford. “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy (2012)]  
These reflections on **moral uncertainty suggest** an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate.¶ **Our present understanding of axiology might** well **be confused. We may not** nowknow — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet **be able to imagine the best ends** of our journey. **If we are** indeedprofoundly **uncertain** about our ultimate aims,then we should recognize that **there is a great** option **value in preserving** — and ideally improving — **our ability to recognize value and** to **steer the future accordingly. Ensuring** that **there will be a future** version of **humanity** with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely **is** plausibly **the best way** available to us **to increase the probability that the future will contain** a lot of **value.** To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

**Reducing the risk of extinction is always priority number one.   
Bostrom 12** [Faculty of Philosophy and Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford.], Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.  Forthcoming book (Global Policy). MP. http://www.existenti...org/concept.pdfEven if we use the most conservative of these estimates, which entirely ignores the   possibility of space colonization and software minds, **we find that the expected loss of an existential   catastrophe is greater than the value of 10^16 human lives**.  **This implies that the expected value of   reducing existential risk by a mere one millionth of one percentage point is at least a hundred times the   value of a million human lives.**  The more technologically comprehensive estimate of 10  54 humanbrain-emulation subjective life-years (or 10  52  lives of ordinary length) makes the same point even   more starkly.  Even if we give this allegedly lower bound on the cumulative output potential of a   technologically mature civilization a mere 1% chance of being correct, we find that the expected   value of reducing existential risk by a mere one billionth of one billionth of one percentage point is worth   a hundred billion times as much as a billion human lives. **One might consequently argue that even the tiniest reduction of existential risk has an   expected value greater than that of the definite provision of any ordinary good, such as the direct   benefit of saving 1 billion lives.**  And, further, that the absolute value of the indirect effect of saving 1  billion lives on the total cumulative amount of existential riskâ€”positive or negativeâ€”is almost   certainly larger than the positive value of the direct benefit of such an action.

### Space Col Good

#### Rhetorics on Space col comes from racist ideologies against indigenous cultures and forgets about violent history against those communities

Drake 18 [(NADIA DRAKE, science journalist and contributing writer at National Geographic.), “We need to change the way we talk about space exploration”, National Geographic, https://www.nationalgeographic.com/science/article/we-need-to-change-way-we-talk-about-space-exploration-mars, NOVEMBER 9, 2018] SS

When discussing space exploration, people often invoke stories about the exploration of our own planet, like the European conquest and colonization of the Americas, or the march westward in the 1800s, when newly minted Americans believed it was their duty and destiny to expand across the continent.

But increasingly, government agencies, journalists, and the space community at large are recognizing that these narratives are born from racist, sexist ideologies that historically led to the subjugation and erasure of women and indigenous cultures, creating barriers that are still pervasive today.

To ensure that humanity’s future off-world is less harmful and open to all, many of the people involved are revising the problematic ways in which space exploration is framed. Numerous conversations are taking place about the importance of using inclusive language, with scholars focusing on decolonizing humanity’s next journeys into space, as well as science in general.

“Language matters, and it’s so important to be inclusive,” NASA astronaut Leland Melvin said recently during a talk at the University of Virginia.

Lucianne Walkowicz, an astronomer featured in National Geographic’s docudrama series Mars, spent the last year studying the ethics of Mars exploration as the Chair of Astrobiology at the U.S. Library of Congress. We recently spoke with Walkowicz to examine the problems associated with old-fashioned verbiage and to discuss some solutions. What follows is a record of that conversation, edited for length and clarity.

Why is it so crucial to consider the words we use when describing space exploration?

The language we use automatically frames how we envision the things we talk about. So, with space exploration, we have to consider how we are using that language, and what it carries from the history of exploration on Earth. Even if words like “colonization” have a different context off-world, on somewhere like Mars, it’s still not OK to use those narratives, because it erases the history of colonization here on our own planet. There’s this dual effect where it both frames our future and, in some sense, edits the past.

What are some of the problematic narratives the term “colonization” brings up?

One narrative that comes up a lot draws on the history of Europeans coming to the Americas.

I’ve seen people talk about the arrival of the first European settlers as this romantic, heroic story of people making it in a harsh environment. But of course, there were already people here, in the Americas, when those historical events happened.

Furthermore, a lot of the Europeans’ ability to live throughout the Americas came at the cost of genocide for indigenous people. I think it’s not intuitive, particularly when we talk to white Americans, for example, to think of the history of Columbus’s journey as a story of genocide. But it’s important to realize that’s what it is.

A lot of those historical narratives are also bound up in the history of slavery, for example, so when we talk about how colonies in Virginia grew from being a few settlers to becoming tens of thousands of people, it’s also important to realize that roughly half of those people came against their own will, and many died along the way.

#### Earth is dying

Arora 19 (Naveen Kumar Arora, Professor in the Department of Environmental Science, Ex-Head Department of Env. Microbiology, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University.)(“Earth: 50 years challenge”, Environmental Sustainability, March 2019, Volume 2, Issue 1, pp 1–3)//ASMITH

The life of earth is estimated to be 4.54 billion years with an error range of 50 million years. Life appeared on earth around 3.5 billion years ago. Around 200,000 years ago, Homo sapiens evolved and started the great civilizations on the planet. Study suggests that human population is only 0.01% of all the life forms on Earth. This shows how existence of humans is just a miniscule part if we compare it with the existence of our planet or of the presence of life on earth. But if we go through the events particularly in last 10,000 years (of recorded history of mankind), it becomes clear that the presence of humans on earth brought several changes in both the biological and non-biological components. Most of the striking changes have appeared in last 50 years or so. According to reports, humans have destroyed about 83% of wild mammals and half the species of plants till date. On the whole, humans have consumed 30% of the known resources resulting into scarcer ecosystem services for future generations. If these trends continue, the Earth will soon be experiencing mass extinctions and we will be left with an even more degraded planet.

Humans in last 50 years, because of ever-increasing population associated with pollution and destruction of natural ecosystems have completely changed the face of the Earth. The exponential increase in human population in last few decades brought about many drastic changes on Earth making it look much degraded and bruised. One such phenomenon is Earth’s present carbon dioxide (a potent green house gas) level in the atmosphere which has exceeded 411 parts per million (ppm), much higher as compared to about 323 ppm about 50 years ago, resulting in major environmental issues such as global warming and climate change. According to the Fifth Assessment Report of Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, anthropogenic activities have been described as the main cause of increased green house gases level, of which 2/3rd come from burning of fossil fuels and 1/3rd is from land use changes. The increased clearing of forests and vegetated lands, due to overgrazing and industrial transformation, in the 1970s showed disturbed albedo and evapotranspiration leading to warming of earth, change in carbon cycle and global catastrophic events of biodiversity extinction. NASA’s Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS) analyzed that the average global temperature of earth has increased by about 0.8 °C since 1880 and two-thirds of this warming has been reported since 1975. The nexus of responses and catastrophic events also point towards the accelerated rate of melting of glaciers with the loss of 226 gigatons/year of ice between 1971 and 2009. The highest impacted glacier loss was reported from Greenland Ice Sheet (about sixfold higher) and Antarctic ice (almost quadrupled) in merely 20 years. Correspondingly, the sea level rise has almost doubled in last 20 years, with increment being 3.1 mm/year since 1993. Chemical and pesticide pollution is another menace to the ecosystems. According to reports, more than 1,40,000 chemicals including pesticides, plastics, etc. have been synthesized till date since 1950 and each year 10 millions tons of toxic compounds are being dumped into the environment leading to land degradation, soil salinization and contamination of water resources. This has resulted in the problem of safe drinking water around the globe. As per reports of CNN, about 500 million tons of heavy metals, toxic sludge and hazardous solvents were estimated to be released in global water supply in 2007 making it unsafe to consume. Plastic pollution is also a big nuisance caused by humans on Earth. The stats show that annual production of plastics during 1970s was about 50 million metric tons and it has increased to over 348 million metric tons at present. In terms of biodiversity losses, WWF’s Living Planet Report highlights that humans have eradicated 60% of the Earth’s wildlife in less than 50 years. About 20% of Amazon forests are lost in the last half century. A recent study revealed that of total global tree cover loss between 2001 and 2015, 27% depreciation came from commodity driven deforestation i.e. conversion of forests permanently in order to expand commodities such as meat, minerals, oils and gas. Other drivers are forestry i.e. loss within the managed forests or tree plantations (26%), shifting agricultural practices (24%), wildfires (23%), and urbanization (0.6%). Half of the shallow-water corals have also been leached out by anthropogenic activities polluting the oceans and seas in last 30 years. The recent analysis shows that the population of freshwater animals has plummeted by 75% since 1970s. Reports say that the damage done is so rapid that even if we end it now, it will take centuries to replenish the natural world.

The global human footprints over the past 50 years are so dominating that even the view of the planet from space shows the modification of various critical ecosystems and the demography. The complementing series of aerial pictures taken through satellites show that many hotspot ecosystems and areas have been tremendously degraded. Focusing on what all we have lost over the past half century, the red list is so long that it cannot be confined in few pages. The Great Barrier Reef visible even from space has shown 50% loss due to severe bleaching by increased temperature of the oceans in just 30 years and is predicted that up to 90% may die within next century. Shrinking of the Dead Sea has shown an alarming rate of around four feet a year and the sea has already lost one-third of its surface area. The increasing temperature has caused high rate of snow melting in the European mountain range The Alps, and the most unsettling event reported in 2017 was that the winter season was 38 days shorter in comparison to that in 1960. The human oriented massive irrigation project over past 50 years has shrunk the fourth largest lake Aral Sea, to only 10% and it will soon be a thing of the past. NASA’s monitoring of Arctic Sea ice since 1978 have detected a steep decline in overall ice content. The polar ice thawing stories over the past half centuries have been highly alarming and Antarctic alone has lost 40 billion tons of ice each year from 1979 to 1989 and this trend rose to 252 billion tons per year in 2009 and today Antarctic has already lost 6 times the ice it had 40 years ago. The ‘Third Pole’ i.e. The Himalayan- Hindu Kush mountain range and the Tibetan Plateau in Central Asia is also impacted by the negative trends of global warming and in the past 50 years this remote region has lost 509 glaciers resulting in the local temperature rise by 1.5 °C. Recently in 2018, a huge chunk of ice in Helheim Glacier in Greenland, about the size of Manhattan, with 10 billion tons of ice, split out and tumbled into sea; this loss was indicated as the most disturbing irreversible loss. The record breaking heat waves in Australia and Europe are already the hard and fast evidences to how much humans have changed the face of Earth. Australia witnessed the hottest summer in the recorded history in the year 2018–2019. The high melting of glaciers and warming of the poles led to the extreme freezing of Chicago, which became colder than Mount Everest, Siberia and the poles. The summers in Iran shockingly changed the size and color of Lake Urmia from green to brown due to blooming of algae and bacteria. Similarly, there are numerous reports which show the decline of fertile lands, increased soil salinity, loss of forests and so on, clearly visible by the satellite images.

A team of researchers’ from several countries including Sweden, Australia, Denmark, USA, England, Canada, Germany and Holland declared climate change and biodiversity loss as the “core boundaries” which if breached can transform Earth to inhabitable state. Stephen Hawking in his recently published book “Brief Answers to the Big Questions” stated that the biggest threat to mankind on Earth is the human induced climate change. Although the technology has advanced at an unprecedented rate and this has improved the living standards a lot but the cost of this development in terms of damage to the planet as a whole is also extraordinary. We share the planet with millions of other species but have almost single handedly exploited it to the extent that every specie is affected one way or the other. The industrial, agricultural and the infrastructural revolution have resulted in over exploitation of resources and pollution of every nook and corner of the planet. The technologies which were developed to adorn and ease our routines has brought antonymic effect threatening the survival and has made it very clear that no human science can replace “nature’s perfect systems” which have been carving the environment and ecosystems of earth to balance it in the zone of habitability.

#### Space col is key to ensure human survival – pursuing it as soon as possible is crucial

Kovic 18 (Marko Kovic, co-founder and president of the thinktank ZIPAR, the Zurich Institute of Public Affairs Research. He is also co-founder and CEO of the consulting firm ars cognitionis,. He has a PhD in political communication, University of Zurich) “Why space colonization is so important”, Nov 10, 2018, https://medium.com/@marko\_kovic/space-colonization-why-nothing-else-matters-a877723f77d4)//ASMITH

Why, you might wonder, does space colonization matter, possibly more than anything else, as the title of this article claims? Because the future of humankind directly and completely dependent on whether and how we manage to colonize space.

Space colonization is a double-edged sword. On one hand, the creation of permanent and self-sustainable human habitats beyond Earth is unavoidable if humankind is to exist in the long-term future. On the other hand, however, space colonization could bring about a catastrophically bad future if we colonize space in a bad way. That future that might be worse than one in which humankind does not exist.

Space or bust: Why we must reach for the stars

Why should we pursue space colonization in the first place? Don’t we have more pressing problems today, on Earth?

Yes, we do have many problems on Earth today, and we should try to solve them. But space colonization is just that: A strategy for dealing with certain problems. An the problems that space colonization would be dealing with are, arguably, among the greatest problems of them all: Existential risks; risks that might lead to the extinction of humankind [1]. Currently, all of our proverbial existential eggs are in the same basket. If a natural existential risk strikes (for example, a large asteroid colliding with Earth) or if a man-made existential risk results in a catastrophic outcome (for example, runaway global warming [2, 3]), all of humankind is at risk because humankind is currently limited to planet Earth. If, however, there are self-sustainable human habitats beyond Earth, then the probability of an irreversibly catastrophic outcome for all of humankind is drastically reduced.

Investing in space colonization today could therefore have immense future benefits. Using resources today in order to make space colonization possible in the medium-term future is not a waste, but a very profitable investment. If humankind stays limited to Earth and if we go extinct as a consequence of doing so, then we will all the billions of life years and billions of humans who might have come to exist — and who would have experienced happiness and contributed to humankind’s continued epistemic and moral progress.

Taking space colonization more seriously today does not, of course, mean that we should only pursue space colonization and ignore everything else that is bad in the world. We should continue dealing with current global problems and, at the same time, invest greater resources into space colonization. At this point in our history and our technological development, even modest amounts of resources directed at space colonization would go a long way, such as public funding of basic research. Additionally, it is very likely that technological advances in the domain of space colonization would improve our lives in other ways as well thanks to technology transfer [4] — investing in space colonization today would probably be a win-win situation.

So the situation seems clear: We must pursue space colonization and try to spread beyond Earth as fast as possible. Unfortunately, there is a catch: Yes, we must colonize space if humankind is to survive, but space colonization itself is very risky. So much so that bad outcomes of space colonization might be even worse for humankind than “merely” going extinct.

#### Every second of delayed colonization kills 10^29 potential human lives

Bostrom 3 Nick Bostrom, philosopher at the University of Oxford, a Ph.D. degree in philosophy from the London School of Economics, and was a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellow at the University of Oxford, 2003, “Astronomical Waste: The Opportunity Cost of Delayed Technological Development”, Utilitas Vol. 15, No. 3, https://nickbostrom.com/astronomical/waste.html#\_edn8, EO

As I write these words, suns are illuminating and heating empty rooms, unused energy is being flushed down black holes, and our great common endowment of negentropy is being irreversibly degraded into entropy on a cosmic scale. These are resources that an advanced civilization could have used to create value-structures, such as sentient beings living worthwhile lives.

The rate of this loss boggles the mind. One recent paper speculates, using loose theoretical considerations based on the rate of increase of entropy, that the loss of potential human lives in our own galactic supercluster is at least ~10^46 per century of delayed colonization.[1] This estimate assumes that all the lost entropy could have been used for productive purposes, although no currently known technological mechanisms are even remotely capable of doing that. Since the estimate is meant to be a lower bound, this radically unconservative assumption is undesirable.

We can, however, get a lower bound more straightforwardly by simply counting the number or stars in our galactic supercluster and multiplying this number with the amount of computing power that the resources of each star could be used to generate using technologies for whose feasibility a strong case has already been made. We can then divide this total with the estimated amount of computing power needed to simulate one human life.

As a rough approximation, let us say the Virgo Supercluster contains 10^13 stars. One estimate of the computing power extractable from a star and with an associated planet-sized computational structure, using advanced molecular nanotechnology[2], is 10^42 operations per second.[3] A typical estimate of the human brain’s processing power is roughly 10^17 operations per second or less.[4] Not much more seems to be needed to simulate the relevant parts of the environment in sufficient detail to enable the simulated minds to have experiences indistinguishable from typical current human experiences.[5] Given these estimates, it follows that the potential for approximately 10^38 human lives is lost every century that colonization of our local supercluster is delayed; or equivalently, about 10^29 potential human lives per second.

While this estimate is conservative in that it assumes only computational mechanisms whose implementation has been at least outlined in the literature, it is useful to have an even more conservative estimate that does not assume a non-biological instantiation of the potential persons. Suppose that about 10^10 biological humans could be sustained around an average star. Then the Virgo Supercluster could contain 10^23 biological humans. This corresponds to a loss of potential equal to about 10^14 potential human lives per second of delayed colonization.

What matters for present purposes is not the exact numbers but the fact that they are huge. Even with the most conservative estimate, assuming a biological implementation of all persons, the potential for one hundred trillion potential human beings is lost for every second of postponement of colonization of our supercluster.[6]

II. THE OPPORTUNITY COST OF DELAYED COLONIZATION

From a utilitarian perspective, this huge loss of potential human lives constitutes a correspondingly huge loss of potential value. I am assuming here that the human lives that could have been created would have been worthwhile ones. Since it is commonly supposed that even current human lives are typically worthwhile, this is a weak assumption. Any civilization advanced enough to colonize the local supercluster would likely also have the ability to establish at least the minimally favorable conditions required for future lives to be worth living.

The effect on total value, then, seems greater for actions that accelerate technological development than for practically any other possible action. Advancing technology (or its enabling factors, such as economic productivity) even by such a tiny amount that it leads to colonization of the local supercluster just one second earlier than would otherwise have happened amounts to bringing about more than 10^29 human lives (or 10^14 human lives if we use the most conservative lower bound) that would not otherwise have existed. Few other philanthropic causes could hope to match that level of utilitarian payoff.

#### Space col encourages healthcare innovations- solves diseases

Donoviel 19 (Dorit Donoviel, 7-19-2019, "Space exploration is reinventing healthcare," [20+ years leadership experience as executive director of R&D overseeing diverse areas of biomedical research from basic to applied science, drug discovery, and technology development. Executing a multi-million dollar national research portfolio of grants addressing the plethora of physiological and behavioral challenges of humans in space. Executive Director, Translational Research Institute for Space Health at Baylor College of Medicine] The Hill, https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/453853-space-exploration-is-reinventing-healthcare) TDI

Though many do not realize it, humans have been living and working in space continuously for the past two decades. The conditions of spaceflight have accelerated our ability to study progressive degenerative diseases. This novel paradigm of understanding human physiology under the stresses of living in space holds great promise for new sources of medical breakthroughs for Earth.

Although astronauts are carefully selected to be exceptionally healthy and exhibit peak physical and mental performance, after only four to six months in space, they can develop numerous medical conditions. Without appropriate exercise, they lose bone and muscle mass. They become prone to developing kidney stones. Their hearts become deconditioned. Their blood vessels stiffen. A subset of astronauts develop a swelling of the optic nerve and possibly an increase in pressure on the brain. Even dormant viruses become activated, alongside changes to the immune system. There is a sense of urgency to solve these problems if we are to send humans to Mars and return them safely in the next decade or two.

This is why NASA is investing in cutting-edge research for human health and performance including high-risk high-reward approaches funded through the Translational Research institute for Space Health (TRISH). Supporting potentially ground-breaking innovations requires a leap of faith in the right direction.

Keeping astronauts healthy during deep space exploration missions — where there are no hospitals and no medical specialists — requires a different paradigm for healthcare. Astronauts are typically engineers and scientists, and only occasionally physicians. On the way to Mars, when communications with Earth will be limited, they could be forced to act as both patients and healthcare providers. If a medical condition is allowed to progress when they are millions of miles away from Earth, the situation could become catastrophic.

Therefore, astronauts will need to detect even the most subtle changes in their own health status early enough to prevent disease. This requires a healthcare paradigm of predicting, preventing and mitigating ailments by intervening early.

This means enabling monitoring, diagnostic and therapeutic medical capabilities that are simple to use, safe, robust and miniaturized. Additionally, what will work in a small spacecraft in the hands of an engineer is also likely to work in a community clinic with limited resources. Or even in our homes. This different approach to healthcare can help save lives and reduce costs — at a global level.

Space demands the best in healthcare innovations, focusing on prevention and early intervention using smart, creative solutions. On a mission to Mars, blood tests will be done in a matter of minutes, by the patient, on a single drop of blood. A trained and adaptive computer algorithm will track health status based on a variety of physiological parameters and alert astronauts when important deviations from normal become evident.

Automated eye exams will be performed by the astronauts on themselves and images will be analyzed by a computer for changes. Customized medications will be tailor-made for the patient on the spot. If a minor medical procedure is required, the caregiver will learn and practice beforehand using augmented reality tools and software simulations adjusted for zero-gravity.

Kidney stones will be found early and treated quickly and painlessly using ultrasound to “push” them out of the kidney so they can be cleared naturally with urination. Sleep and mood will be improved using sound stimulation and health will be improved by individualized diets which will be enriched with high-nutrient plants grown efficiently within a small footprint. Most importantly, all these advances have clear and important applications on Earth.

Space exploration has already yielded hundreds of inventions that filled our arsenal for fighting diseases. To land women and men on Mars and return them healthy, we must reinvent healthcare. The positive consequences of this work will impact all of humanity. The spirit of Apollo is alive and well in space health research today. And for science, medicine and technology pioneers, our most important work is still ahead.

### Heg Good

#### US leadership in this decade solves global war and results in a peaceful end to Chinese revisionism **Erickson and Collins 10/21** [(Andrew, A professor of strategy in the U.S. Naval War College’s China Maritime Studies Institute)(Gabriel, Baker Botts fellow in energy and environmental regulatory affairs at Rice University’s Baker Institute for Public Policy) “A Dangerous Decade of Chinese Power Is Here,” Foreign Policy, 10/18/2021] U.S. and allied policymakers are facing the most important foreign-policy challenge of the 21st century. **China’s power is peaking**; so is the political position of Chinese President Xi Jinping and the Chinese Communist Party’s (CCP) **domestic strength.** In the long term, China’s **likely decline** after this peak is a **good thing.** But right now, it creates a **decade of danger** from a system that increasingly realizes it only has a **short time** to fulfill some of its **most critical**, long-held **goals.**

Within the next five years, China’s leaders are likely to conclude that its deteriorating demographic profile, structural economic problems, and technological estrangement from global innovation centers are eroding its leverage to annex Taiwan and achieve other major strategic objectives. As Xi internalizes these challenges, his foreign policy is likely to become even more accepting of risk, feeding on his nearly decadelong track record of successful revisionist action against the rules-based order. Notable examples include China occupying and militarizing sub-tidal features in the South China Sea, ramping up air and maritime incursions against Japan and Taiwan, pushing border challenges against India, occupying Bhutanese and Tibetan lands, perpetrating crimes against humanity in [Xinjiang](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/11/16/world/asia/china-xinjiang-documents.html), and coercively enveloping Hong Kong.

The relatively low-hanging fruit is plucked, but Beijing is emboldened to grasp the biggest single revisionist prize: Taiwan.

Beijing’s actions over the last decade have triggered backlash, such as with the so-called AUKUS deal, but concrete constraints on China’s strategic freedom of action may not fully manifest until after 2030. It’s remarkable and dangerous that China has paid few costs for its actions over the last 10 years, even as its military capacities have rapidly grown.

Beijing will likely conclude that under current diplomatic, economic, and force postures for both “gray zone” and high-end scenarios, the 2021 to late 2020s timeframe still favors China—and is attractive for its 68-year-old leader, who seeks a historical achievement at the zenith of his career.

U.S. planners must mobilize resources, effort, and risk acceptance to maximize power and thereby deter Chinese aggression in the coming decade—literally starting now—and innovatively employ assets that currently exist or can be operationally assembled and scaled within the next several years. That will be the first step to pushing back against China during the 2020s—a decade of danger—before what will likely be a waning of Chinese power.

As Beijing aggressively seeks to undermine the international order and promotes a narrative of inevitable Chinese strategic domination in Asia and beyond, it creates a dangerous contradiction between its goals and its medium-term capacity to achieve them. China is, in fact, likely nearing the apogee of its relative power; and by 2030 to 2035, it will cross a tipping point from which it may never recover strategically. Growing headwinds constraining Chinese growth, while not publicly acknowledged by Beijing, help explain Xi’s high and apparently increasing risk tolerance. Beijing’s window of strategic opportunity is sliding shut.

China’s skyrocketing household debt levels exemplify structural economic constraints that are emerging much earlier than they did for the United States when it had similar per capita GDP and income levels. Debt is often a wet blanket on consumption growth. A 2017 analysis published by the Bank for International Settlements found that once the household debt-to-GDP ratio in a sample of 54 countries exceeded 60 percent, “the negative long-run effects on consumption tend to intensify.” China’s household debt-to-GDP ratio surpassed that empirical danger threshold in late 2020. Rising debt service burdens thus threaten Chinese consumers’ capacity to sustain the domestic consumption-focused “dual circulation” economic model that Xi and his advisors seek to build. China’s growth record during the past 30 years has been remarkable, but past exceptionalism does not confer future immunity from fundamental demographic and economic headwinds.

As debt levels continue to rise at an absolute level that has accelerated almost continuously for the past decade, China also faces a hollowing out of its working-age population. This critical segment peaked in 2010 and has since declined, with the rate from 2015 to 2020 nearing 0.6 percent annually—nearly twice the respective pace in the United States. While the United States faces demographic challenges of its own, the disparity between the respective paces of decline highlights its relative advantage compared to its chief geopolitical competitor. Moreover, the United States can choose to access a global demographic and talent dividend via immigration in a way China simply will not be able to do.

Atop surging debt and worsening demographics, China also faces resource insecurity. China’s dependence on imported food and energy has grown steadily over the past two decades. Projections from Tsinghua University make a compelling case that China’s oil and gas imports will peak between 2030 and 2035. As China grapples with power shortages, Beijing has been reminded that supply shortfalls equal to even a few percentage points of total demand can have outsized negative impacts.

Domestic resource insufficiency by itself does not hinder economic growth—as the Four Asian Tigers’ multi-decade boom attests. But China is in a different position. Japan and South Korea never had to worry about the U.S. Navy interdicting inbound tankers or grain ships. In fact, the United States was avowedly willing to use military force to protect energy flows from the Persian Gulf region to its allies. Now, as an increasingly energy-secure United States pivots away from the Middle East toward the Indo-Pacific, there is a substantial probability that energy shipping route protection could be viewed in much more differentiated terms—with oil and liquefied natural gas cargoes sailing under the Chinese flag viewed very differently than cargoes headed to buyers in other regional countries.

Each of these dynamics—demographic downshifts, rising debts, resource supply insecurity—either imminently threatens or is already actively interfering with the CCP’s long-cherished goal of achieving a “moderately prosperous society.” Electricity blackouts, real estate sector travails (like those of Evergrande) that show just how many Chinese investors’ financial eggs now sit in an unstable $52 trillion basket, and a solidifying alignment of countries abroad concerned by aggressive Chinese behavior all raise questions about Xi’s ability to deliver. With this confluence of adverse events only a year before the next party congress, where personal ambition and survival imperatives will almost drive him to seek anointment as the only Chinese “leader for life” aside from former leader Mao Zedong, the timing only fuels his sense of insecurity. Xi’s anti-corruption campaigns and ruthless removal of potential rivals and their supporters solidified his power but likely also created a quiet corps of opponents who may prove willing to move against him if events create the perception he’s lost the “mandate of heaven.” Accordingly, the baseline assumption should be that Xi’s crown sits heavy and the insecurity induced is thereby intense enough to drive high-stake, high-consequence posturing and action.

While Xi is under pressure to act, the external risks are magnified because so far, he has suffered few consequences from taking actions on issues his predecessors would likely never have gambled on. Reactions to party predations in Xinjiang and [Hong Kong](https://home.treasury.gov/policy-issues/financial-sanctions/recent-actions/20210716_33) have been restricted to diplomatic-signaling pinpricks, such as sanctioning responsible Chinese officials and entities, most of whom lack substantial economic ties to the United States. Whether U.S. restraint results from a fear of losing market access or a belief that China’s goals are ultimately limited is not clear at this time.

While the CCP issues retaliatory sanctions against U.S. officials and proclaims a triumphant outcome to its hostage diplomacy, these tactical public actions mask a growing private awareness that China’s latitude for irredentist action is poised to shrink. Not knowing exactly when domestic and external constraints will come to bite—but knowing that when Beijing sees the tipping point in its rearview mirror, major rivals will recognize it too—amplifies Xi and the party’s anxiety to act on a shorter timeline. Hence the dramatic acceleration of the last few years.

Just as China is mustering its own strategic actions, so the United States must also intensify its focus and deployment of resources. The United States has taken too long to warm up and confront the central challenge, but it retains formidable advantages, agility, and the ability to prevail—provided it goes all-in now. Conversely, if Washington fails to marshal its forces promptly, its achievements after 2030 or 2035 will matter little. Seizing the 2020s would enable Beijing to ~~cripple~~ [destroy] the free and open rules-based order and entrench its position by economically subjugating regional neighbors (including key U.S. treaty allies) to a degree that could offset the strategic headwinds China now increasingly grapples with.

Deterrence is never certain. But it offers the highest probability of avoiding the certainty that an Indo-Pacific region dominated by a CCP-led China would doom treaty allies, threaten the U.S. homeland, and likely set the stage for worse to come. Accordingly, U.S. planners should immediately mobilize resources and effort as well as accept greater risks to deter Chinese action over the critical next decade.

The greatest threat is armed conflict over Taiwan, where U.S. and allied success or failure will be fundamental and reverberate for the remainder of the century. There is a high chance of a major move against Taiwan by the late 2020s—following an extraordinary ramp-up in People’s Liberation Army capabilities and before Xi or the party state’s power grasp has ebbed or Washington and its allies have fully regrouped and rallied to the challenge.

So how should policymakers assess the potential risk of Chinese action against Taiwan reaching dangerous levels by 2027 or possibly even earlier—as emphasized in the testimonies of Adms. Philip Davidson and John Aquilino? In June, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Gen. Mark Milley testified to the House of Representatives that Xi had “challenged the People’s Liberation Army to accelerate their modernization programs to develop capabilities to seize Taiwan and move it from 2035 to 2027,” although China does not currently have the capabilities or intentions to conduct an all-out invasion of mainland Taiwan.

U.S. military leaders’ assessments are informed by some of the world’s most extensive and sophisticated internal information. But what’s striking is open-source information available to everyone suggests similar things. Moving forward, a number of open-source indicators offer valuable “early warning lights” that can help policymakers more accurately calibrate both potential timetables and risk readings as the riskiest period of relations—from 2027 onward—approaches.

Semiconductors supply self-sufficiency. Taiwan is the “OPEC+” of semiconductors, accounting for approximately two-thirds of global chip foundry capacity. A kinetic crisis would almost certainly disrupt—and potentially even completely curtail—semiconductor supplies. China presently spends even more each year on semiconductor imports (around $380 billion) than it does on [oil](http://english.customs.gov.cn/Statics/0aba4bfd-f8ed-477c-9d16-dc3def897b7b.html), but much of the final products are destined for markets abroad. Taiwan is producing cutting-edge 5-nanometer and 7-nanometer chips, but China produces around 80 percent of the rest of the chips in the world. The closer China comes to being able to secure “good enough” chips for “inside China-only” needs, the less of a constraint this becomes.

Crude oil, grain, strategic metals stockpiles—the commercial community (Planet Labs, Ursa Space Systems, etc.) has developed substantial expertise in cost-effectively tracking inventory changes for key input commodities needed to prepare for war.

Electric vehicle fleet size—the amount of oil demand displaced by electric vehicles varies depending on miles driven, but the more of China’s car fleet that can be connected to the grid (and thus powered by blockade-resistant coal), the less political burden Beijing will face if it has to weather a maritime oil blockade imposed in response to actions it took against Taiwan or other major revisionist adventures. China’s passenger vehicle fleet, now approximately 225 million units strong, counts nearly 6.5 million electric vehicles among its ranks, the lion’s share of which are full-battery electrics. China’s State Council seeks to have 20 percent of new vehicles sold in China be electric vehicles by 2025. This target has already basically been achieved over the last few months, meaning at least 3.5 to 4 million (and eventually many more) new elective vehicles will enter China’s car fleet each year from now on.

Local concentration of maritime vessels—snap exercises with warships, circumnavigations, and midline tests with swarms of aircraft highlight the growing scale of China’s threat to [Taiwan](https://www.andrewerickson.com/2021/06/quick-look-cmsis-4-6-may-2021-conference-large-scale-amphibious-warfare-in-chinese-military-strategy-taiwan-strait-campaign-focus/). But these assets alone cannot invade the island. To capture and garrison, Beijing would need not only air, missile, naval, and special operations forces but also the ability to move lots of equipment and—at the very least—tens of thousands of personnel across the Taiwan Strait. As such, Beijing would have to amass maritime transport assets. And given the scale required, this would alter ship patterns elsewhere along China’s coast in ways detectable with artificial intelligence-facilitated imagery analysis from firms like Planet Labs (or national assets).

Only the most formidable, agile American and allied deterrence can kick the can down the road long enough for China’s slowdown to shut the window of vulnerability. Holding the line is likely to require frequent and sustained proactive enforcement actions to disincentivize full-frontal Chinese assaults on the rules-based order in the Indo-Pacific. Chinese probing behavior and provocations must be met with a range of symmetric and asymmetric responses that impose real costs, such as publishing assets owned by Chinese officials abroad, cyber interference with China’s technological social control apparatus, “hands on” U.S. Navy and Coast Guard enforcement measures against Maritime Militia-affiliated vessels in the South China Sea, intensified air and maritime surveillance of Chinese naval bases, and visas and resettlement options to Hong Kongers, Uyghurs, and other threatened Chinese citizens—including CCP officials (and their families) who seek to defect and/or leave China. U.S. policymakers must make crystal clear to their Chinese counterparts that the engagement-above-all policies that dominated much of the past 25 years are over and the risks and costs of ongoing—and future—adventurism will fall heaviest on China.

Bombastic Chinese reactions to emerging cohesive actions verify the approach’s effectiveness and potential for halting—and perhaps even reversing—the revisionist tide China has unleashed across the Asian region. Consider the recent nuclear submarine deal among Australia, the United States, and the United Kingdom. Beijing’s strong public reaction (including toleration of [nuclear threats](https://www.globaltimes.cn/page/202109/1234460.shtml) made by the state-affiliated *Global Times*) highlights the gap between its global information war touting China’s irresistible power and deeply insecure internal self-perception. Eight nuclear submarines will ultimately represent formidable military capacity, but for a bona fide superpower that believes in its own capabilities, they would not be a game-changer. Consider the U.S.-NATO reaction to the Soviet Union’s commissioning of eight Oscar I/II-class cruise missile subs during the late Cold War. These formidable boats each carried 24 SS-N-19 Granit missiles specifically designed to kill U.S. carrier battle groups, yet NATO never stooped to public threats.

With diplomatic proofs of concepts like the so-called AUKUS deal, the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue, and hard security actions like the Pacific Deterrence Initiative now falling into place, it is time to comprehensively peak the non-authoritarian world’s protective action to hold the line in the Indo-Pacific. During this decade, U.S. policymakers must understand that under Xi’s strongman rule, personal political survival will dictate Chinese behavior. Xi’s recreation of a “one-man” system is a one-way, high-leverage bet that decisions he drives will succeed.

If Xi miscalculates, a significant risk given his suppression of dissenting voices while China raises the stakes in its confrontation with the United States, the proverbial “leverage” that would have left him with outsized returns on a successful bet would instead amplify the downside, all of which he personally and exclusively signed for. Resulting tensions could very realistically undermine his status and authority, embolden internal challengers, and weaken the party. They could also foreseeably drive him to double down on mistakes, especially if those led to—or were made in the course of—a kinetic conflict. Personal survival measures could thus rapidly transmute into regional or even global threats.

If Xi triggered a “margin call” on his personal political account through a failed high-stakes gamble, it would likely be paid in blood. Washington must thus prepare the U.S. electorate and its institutional and physical infrastructure as well as that of allies and partners abroad for the likelihood that tensions will periodically ratchet up to uncomfortable levels—and that actual conflict is a concrete possibility. Si vis pacem, para bellum (“if you want peace, prepare for war”) must unfortunately serve as a central organizing principle for a variety of U.S. and allied decisions during the next decade with China.

Given these unforgiving dynamics and stakes, implications for U.S. planners are stark: Do whatever remains possible to “peak” for deterrent competition against China by the mid-to-late 2020s, and accept whatever trade-offs are available for doing so.

Nothing we might theoretically achieve in 2035 and beyond is worth pursuing at the expense of China-credible capabilities we can realistically achieve no later than the mid-to-late 2020s.