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## 1

#### In setting an end, every agent must recognize freedom as a necessary good, Gewirth 84 bracketed for grammar and gendered language

[Alan Gewirth, () "The Ontological Basis of Natural Law: A Critique and an Alternative" American Journal Of Jurisprudence: Vol. 29: Iss. 1 Article 5, 1984, https://scholarship.law.nd.edu/ajj/vol29/iss1/5/, DOA:9-10-2018 // WWBW Recut LHP AV]

Let me briefly sketch the main line of argument that leads to this conclusion. As I have said, the argument is based on the generic features of human action. To begin with, **every agent acts for purposes [t]he[y] regards as good.** Hence, **[t]he[y] must regard as necessary goods the freedom** and well being **that [is]** are the generic features and **necessary conditions of** his **action** and successful action in general. From this, it follows that **every agent logically must hold or accept** that he has **rights to these conditions**. For if he were **to deny** that he has **these rights**, then he **would** have to **admit that it is permissible** for other persons **to remove** from him the very **conditions** of freedom and well-being **that**, as **an agent**, he **must have**. But **it is contradictory** for him **to hold both that [t]he[y] must have these conditions and also that he may not have them.** Hence, on pain of self-contradiction, every agent must accept that he has rights to freedom and well-being. Moreover, **every agent must further admit that all other agents also have those rights, since all other actual or prospective agents have the same general characteristics of agency** on which he must ground his own right-claims. What I am saying, then, is that every agent, simply by virtue of being an agent, must regard his freedom and well being as necessary goods and must hold that he and all other actual or prospective agents have rights to these necessary goods. Hence, every agent, on pain of self-contradiction, must accept the following principle: Act in accord with the generic rights of your recipients as well as of yourself. The generic rights are rights to the generic features of action, freedom, and well-being. I call this the Principle of Generic Consistency (PGC), because it combines the formal consideration of consistency with the material consideration of the generic features and rights of action.

#### Prefer –

#### A] performativity – argumentation requires the assumption that freedom is good – else agents would be unable to make arguments

#### B] prerequisite – condoning any action requires condoning the freedom required to take that action – so my theory’s a prerequisite to theirs and my offense acts as a side-constraint to your framework.

#### C] culpability – absent a conception of free will, people can just claim they were acting of desires they can’t control.

#### D] probability – it’s logically contradictory to deny my framework because that would use freedom to do so. Therefore, it’s impossible for my framework to be false

#### The universality of freedom justifies a libertarian state. Otteson 09

Otteson 09 brackets in original James R. Otteson (professor of philosophy and economics at Yeshiva University) “Kantian Individualism and Political Libertarianism” The Independent Review, v. 13, n. 3, Winter 2009

In a crucial passage in Metaphysics of Morals, Kant writes that the “Universal Principle of Right” is “‘[e]very action which by itself or by its maxim enables the freedom of each individual’s will to co-exist with the freedom of everyone else in accordance with a universal law is right.’” He concludes, “Thus the universal law of right is as follows: **let your external actions be such that the free application of your will can co-exist with the freedom of everyone in accordance with a universal law**” (1991, 133, emphasis in original).5 **This** stipulation **becomes** for Kant **the grounding justification for the existence of a state**, its raison d’être, and the reason we leave the state of nature is to secure this sphere of maximum freedom compatible with the same freedom of all others. Because this freedom must be complete, in the sense of being as full as possible given the existence of other persons who demand similar freedom, it entails that **the state may**—indeed, must—**secure this condition** of freedom, **but undertake to do nothing else because any other** state **activities** would **compromise** **the** very **autonomy the state seeks to defend**. **Kant’s position** thus outlines and implies a political philosophy that **is broadly libertarian**; that is, **it endorses a state constructed with the sole aim of protecting** its citizens **against invasions of** their **liberty**. For Kant, individuals create a state to protect their moral agency, and in doing so they consent to coercion only insofar as it is required to prevent themselves or others from impinging on their own or others’ agency. In his argument, **individuals cannot rationally consent to a state that instructs them in morals, coerces virtuous behavior, commands them to trade or not, directs their pursuit of happiness, or forcibly requires them to provide for** their own or **others**’ pursuits of happiness. And except in cases of punishment for wrongdoing,6 **this** severe limitation on the scope of the state’s authority **must always be respected**: “The rights of man must be held sacred, however great a sacrifice the ruling power may have to make. There can be no half measures here; it is no use devising hybrid solutions such as a pragmatically conditioned right halfway between right and utility. For all politics must bend the knee before right, although politics may hope in return to arrive, however slowly, at a stage of lasting brilliance” (Perpetual Peace, 1991, 125). The implication is that **a Kantian state protects** against invasions of **freedom and does nothing else**; in the absence of invasions or threats of invasions, it is inactive.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with a libertarian state.

#### Impact calc – Aggregation fails – there is no one for whom aggregate good is good-for. Korsgaard:

Christine Korsgaard, “The Origin of the Good and Our Animal Nature” Harvard, n.d. RE

According to the second view I will consider, hedonism, the good just is pleasurable experience or consciousness and the absence of painful experience or consciousness. What makes a being capable of having a final good is simply that the being is conscious. Otherwise, its good is not relative to its nature. As is often noticed, on this theory it is a real question whether some of the other animals might not have a better life, or at least be capable of having a better life, than human beings, given their apparent enthusiasm for simple and readily available joys. Although I’ll treat it as a separate theory, hedonism, I believe, has an inherent tendency to collapse either into a version of the intrinsic value theory, or into a version of the third view I am about to describe. Obviously, it is possible to regard hedonism simply as a particular instance of the intrinsic value theory, one that singles out conscious experience as the only possible bearer of intrinsic value. But I think this way of looking at hedonism does not do justice to the intuition that has made hedonism seem plausible to so many thinkers, which is precisely the idea that the final good must have an irreducibly subjective or relational element. That is, what makes hedonism seem plausible is precisely the idea that the final good for a sensate being must be something that can be felt or experienced as a good by that being. It is something that can be perceived or experienced as welcome or positive from the being’s own point of view, and that is therefore relative to the being’s own point of view.9 The intrinsic value version of hedonism tries to capture the essentially subjective element of the final good by attaching objective intrinsic value to a subjective experience, but when this move is made the essentially relational or relative character of subjectivity tends to drop out. The goodness of the experience is detached from its goodness for the being who is having the experience, and instead is located in the character of the experience itself. This defect shows up most clearly in utilitarian versions of hedonism, which allow us to add the goodness of pleasant experiences across the boundaries between persons or between animals. There is no subject for whom the total of these aggregated experiences is a good, so the aggregate good has completely lost that relational character: the goods are detached from the beings from whom they are good. This relational element of value, I believe, is better captured by the third theory I am about to describe.

#### Prefer –

#### 1] Coherence – anything else is either repugnant or infinitely regressive, Boaz 15 bracketed for glang:

David Boaz, executive vice president of the Cato Institute, “The Libertarian Mind: A Manifesto for Freedom”, 2/10/15, <https://books.google.com/books/about/The_Libertarian_Mind.html?id=zs8NBAAAQBAJ>. //LHP AV \*Bracketed for gendered language\*

Any theory of rights has to begin somewhere. Most libertarian philosophers would begin the argument earlier than Jefferson did. **Humans**, unlike animals, come into the world without an instinctive knowledge of what their needs are and how to fulfill them. As Aristotle said, man is a reasoning and deliberating animal; humans use the power of reason to understand their own needs, the world around them, and how to use the world to satisfy their needs. So they **need a social system that allows them to** use their **reason,** to **act** in the world, and to **cooperate with others** to achieve purposes that no one individual could accomplish. Every person is a unique individual. Humans are social animals—we like interacting with others, and we profit from it— **but** **we** think and **act individually**. **Each** individual **owns himself or herself [themselves]**. **What other possibilities** besides self—ownership **are there?**  • **Someone** – a king or a master race – **could own others.** Plato and Aristotle did argue that there were different kinds of humans, some more competent than others and thus endowed with the right and responsibility to rule, just as adults guide children. Some forms of socialism and collectivism are—explicitly or implicitly—-based on the notion that many people are not competent to make decisions about their own lives, so that the more  talented should make decisions for them. **But** that would mean **there were no universal** human **rights,** only rights **that** some haveand others do not**, denying the** essential **humanity of those who are** deemed to be **owned**.  • **Everyone owns everyone**, a fully-fledged communist system. **In such** a system, **before any**one **could** take an **act**ion**, [t]he[y] would need to get permission from everyone** else. **But how could each** other person **grant permission without consulting everyone else**? **You’d have an infinite regress, making any action** at all logically **impossible**. ln practice, since such mutual ownership is impossible, this system would break down into the previous one: some- one, or some group, would own everyone else. That is what happened in the communist states: the party became a dictatorial ruling elite.  Thus, either communism or aristocratic rule would divide the world into factions or classe. **The only possibility** that is humane, logical, and suited to the nature of human beings **is self-ownership**. Obviously, this discussion has only scratched the surface of the question of self-ownership; in any event, I rather like Jefferson’s simple declaration: Natural rights are self-evident.

### Contention

#### Injustice requires someone wronged, but initial acquisition doesn’t violate any entity’s rights– therefore, private appropriation of outer space cannot be unjust, Feser 05:

Edward Feser, [Associate Professor of Philosophy at Pasadena City College] “THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN UNJUST INITIAL ACQUISITION,” 2005 //LHP AV

The reason **there is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition** of resources is that there is no such thing as either a just or an unjust initial acquisition of resources. The concept of **justice**, that is to say, simply **does not apply** to initial acquisition. **It applies only after initial acquisition has already taken place**. In particular, it applies only to transfers of property (and derivatively, to the rectification of injustices in transfer). This, it seems to me, is a clear implication of the assumption (rightly) made by Nozick that **external resources are initially unowned**. Consider the following example. **Suppose** **an individual** **A seeks to acquire some previously unowned resource R**. **For it to be** the case that A commits an **injustice** in acquiring R, it would also have to be the case that **there is some individual** **B** (or perhaps a group of individuals) **against whom A commits the injustice**. **But for B to have been wronged** by A’s acquisi- tion of R, **B would have to have had a rightful claim over R,** **a right to R**. By hypothesis, **however**, **B did not have a right to R, because no one had a right to it—it was unowned, after all**. So B was not wronged and could not have been. In fact, **the very first person who could conceivably be wronged by anyone’s use of R would be, not B, but A himself, since A is the first one to own R**. Such a wrong would in the nature of the case be an injustice in transfer—in unjustly taking from A what is rightfully his—not in initial acquisition. **The same thing, by extension, will be true of all unowned resources: it is only after some- one has initially acquired them that anyone could unjustly come to possess them, via unjust transfer**. It is impossible, then, for there to be any injustices in initial acquisition.7

## 2

#### CP text: The United States federal government should:

#### A] Fund a public-private partnership for deep space exploration

#### B] Triple NASA’s budget and earmark increased funding for cooperative deep space exploration

Galeon 17 [(Dom, writer for Futurism), “SpaceX Asks the U.S. To Fund a Public-Private Partnership for Deep Space Exploration,” July 14, 2017, <https://futurism.com/spacex-asks-the-u-s-to-fund-a-public-private-partnership-for-deep-space-exploration>] TDI

SpaceX Asks the U.S. To Fund a Public-Private Partnership for Deep Space Exploration The best chance of success could come from pooling our resources. / Off World/ Deep Space Exploration/ NASA/ Public Private Partnerships SpaceX/Flickr Image by SpaceX/Flickr WORKING TOGETHER Some 10 years back now, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) decided to work with private space companies to ferry people and cargo to the International Space Station (ISS). At the time, the space agency perhaps didn’t expect that it was heralding in a new era in space exploration. Both NASA and private agencies like SpaceX and Blue Origin have benefited from the collaboration. The former is able to save on costs, while the latter get to pursue their own individual programs, such as perfecting their reusable rocket technologies for commercial use. Without this partnership, these companies would not have been able to grow and develop at the same rate. Thus far, the joint missions have been limited to just orbital and near-orbit launches, like the Commercial Orbital Transportation Services (COTS) program, but SpaceX wants that to change. At a hearing of the U.S. Senate’s Subcommittee on Space, Science, and Competitiveness on Thursday, SpaceX’s senior vice president for global business and government affairs Tim Hughes asked the U.S. government to open up deep space exploration for similar public-private partnerships. “The principles applied in past programs for low Earth orbit capability can and should be applied to deep space exploration,” he said, referencing the COTS program. ADVERTISEMENT A DEEP SPACE FUTURE In order for the U.S. and for humankind to establish a more permanent presence in space, Hughes asserts that the government should fund a COTS-like program for deep space. It won’t really be a matter of funding the competition, he argued, because the program could run parallel to NASA’s existing deep space exploration plans, such as the Space Launch System (SLS) and the Orion spacecraft. Living Off The Land: A Guide To Settling Mars [Infographic] Click to View Full Infographic “I think [these] can be readily supplemented with public-private partnerships to allow us to sustain a permanent presence in space,” said Hughes. NASA could impose “high level requirements” for this deep space partnership, just like it does with COTS, Hughes added. The partnership could prove particularly beneficial for NASA right now given the recent reports saying it doesn’t have the funding needed for its Mars mission. Of course, as with any change, push back is to be expected. For one, more established aerospace firms that already work with NASA — Lockheed Martin and Boeing, among others — might not be in favor of this idea. The important thing, however, is to realize that deep space exploration is an entirely different ballgame than missions in near-Earth orbit, and the best chance of success may come from pooling our resources.

#### The CP turns the aff and prevents stifling of innovation – k2 climate tech.

Van Burken 20 [(Rebecca, technology policy analyst at Reason Foundation) “Biden Can Utilize Space Companies and Public-Private Partnerships,” December 14, 2020 https://reason.org/commentary/biden-can-utilize-space-companies-and-public-private-partnerships/] TDI

Biden Can Utilize Space Companies and Public-Private Partnerships The commercial space industry is making NASA's operations more cost-effective and encouraging innovation. By Rebecca van Burken December 14, 2020 President-elect Joe Biden will predictably distance himself from many of the Trump administration’s policies and positions, but its openness to commercial space partnerships should not be among them. The expansion of public-private space partnerships that began during the Obama administration has continued during the Trump administration. These public-private partnerships have helped lead to many major space successes, including crewed-launches returning to American soil through SpaceX and the first-ever civilian passenger on a private suborbital spaceflight as part of Virgin Galactic’s 2019 VSS Unity SpaceShipTwo launch. These successes, and others, reflect positively on the U.S. space sector. However, they would not have happened without the entrepreneurial nature of commercial space. Unlike government engineers and scientists, commercial space operations are not constrained by government bureaucracy nor reliant on taxpayer funding. This allows commercial space companies to explore some seemingly far-fetched ideas, like 3D printing of small rockets, a concept being pioneered by the small start-up Relativity. Commercial space companies must also develop and maintain a competitive edge to survive in the market. Significant competition ultimately creates less-costly services that give NASA more bang for its buck when developing new technology. Competitive market pressures have created inspiring innovation exemplified by SpaceX’s reusable rocket technology and proposals for recycling and turning discarded orbiting tanks into space stations. Without the federal government’s continued openness to commercial space, innovation, and invention in the U.S. space industry could be stifled. Commercial space continues to show up when the government needs new services. Over the last few years, we have seen amazing new technologies developed to track environmental and climate concerns. This is, in part, because NASA has entered into deals with private companies like Planet that are able to analyze data collected by satellite imagery. Planet has stakes in defense satellite imagery but has expanded its portfolio to collect data for climate scientists and researchers to use. Its constellation of 120 satellites is at work photographing every portion of the world at least once a day, which provides constant and up-to-date environmental information. By maintaining deals like that with commercial satellite companies, NASA can avoid the costs of creating its own satellite constellation and other remote sensing technology. Additionally, NASA does not need to focus its energies on updating technologies to keep up with new software and technological capabilities. Companies that worry about competition in the market naturally reassess their services and the burden of doing this should be put on private industry, not on the government. Biden’s team should seek out the most effective private partners, hiring new talent in civil programs to use these systems. This would also free up funding for crewed space exploration. In addition to looking to develop new partnerships for space-related efforts, a Biden administration should reassess the government’s old partnerships. Prior to the election, Reuters reported that some Biden associates believe he may try to continue funding the International Space Station (ISS) beyond its planned termination in 2025. Reuters reported: …Biden, on the other hand, would likely call for a delayed moonshot and propose a funding extension for the International Space Station if he wins the White House, according to people familiar with the fledging Biden space agenda.Pushing back the moon mission could cast more doubt on the long-term fate of Boeing Co’s Space Launch System (SLS) rocket, just as Elon Musk’s SpaceX and Jeff Bezos’ Blue Origin scramble to bring rival rockets to market as soon as next year. Extending support for the space station for a decade would also be a major boost for Boeing, whose $225 million annual ISS operations contract is set to expire in 2024 and is at the depths of a financial crisis caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and the 737 MAX grounding after fatal crashes. This directly contradicts the Trump administration’s efforts to cease funding for the archaic space station by 2025. If Biden were to continue funding this aging facility via NASA it would drain funds that could be used for more important space activities, including manned missions. Commercial companies are primed and ready to take over the space station’s functions, and NASA should allow them to do so. If Biden has taxpayers and NASA continue to fund the ISS, it would most likely continue to contract with a company that famous for draining government money—Boeing. The partnerships with Boeing are the types of space policies the incoming Biden administration should be reviewing. It should ask Congress for a Government Accountability Office audit of Boeing’s work on the Space Launch System (SLS). The contract is for the development of a rocket with heavy-lift capacities that is designed to bring humans and cargo to the moon and back. Unfortunately, it has had numerous delays and cost overruns and is still not ready for a test flight, as Bloomberg reported in August: Boeing Co.’s Space Launch System, the largest rocket in NASA’s history, will carry a price tag of at least $9.1 billion — or 30% more than the previous estimate for a key element in the agency’s plan to return to the moon. Additionally, the costs for new ground infrastructure at Florida’s Kennedy Space Center to support the deep-space exploration program has jumped to $2.4 billion, Kathy Lueders, NASA’s associate administrator for human spaceflight, said in a blog post Wednesday. That’s also a 30% increase, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration said in an email Thursday. While we wait for Boeing to reuse obsolete space shuttle hardware on SLS, companies like Blue Origin and SpaceX are continually reusing entire launch boosters. Biden’s administration needs a real review of whether it would be more cost and time effective to work with companies like SpaceX or Blue Origin. SLS is estimated to cost NASA $1 billion or more for each launch, after having already consumed $18.3 billion since 2010. By contrast, SpaceX has had its self-funded heavy-lift rocket Starship in development since 2012 and has been doing successful prototype tests since 2019. Another space entity that will be a key issue for the Biden administration is the military agency, U.S. Space Force, created by President Trump. Reason magazine had detailed the numerous reasons a Space Force should not have been created. Now that it does exist, the Space Force should be viewed as an agency that does not need to spend taxpayers’ money to create its own technology for its missions. Instead, it should use the readily available market of commercial partners ready to contract services. Space News recently reported that Space Force is just now learning of the private sector’s capabilities: [Gen. John “Jay”] Raymond said in years past the only commercially viable services have been space launch and communications provided by geosynchronous satellites. But the Space Force is now becoming aware of other capabilities that are being offered commercially such as space tracking data, weather data and on-orbit satellite servicing. Raymond, chief of operations for Space Force, has previously committed to working closely with commercial satellite companies for space-related missions. Col. Michael “Hopper” Hopkins, commander of NASA’s SpaceX Crew-1 mission, was commissioned into the Space Force and began a new line of Space Force officers expected to launch to the ISS. To facilitate continued partnerships between Space Force and private enterprise, the Biden administration could back an initiative currently proposed to Congress that Space Force acquisitions be “speedy and agile.” Flexibility for Space Force would include pushing acquisition power to the lowest level of management and removing bureaucracy to make its programs more efficient. We are at a pivotal moment in the space industry’s history. The federal government has the opportunity to partner with space industry innovators like Elon Musk, Jeff Bezos, and Richard Branson, and ensure there’s the opportunity for new space startups to emerge and add value to the market. The other path, a government and NASA-centric approach to space, would likely stifle technological developments and breakthroughs by private companies, cost taxpayers a lot more money, and cause the United States to fall behind other nations in a number of key areas.

1] nasa already demolbilized –

2] misunderstands how it works – we already in a situation where rocket scientists can work at google i.e. hiring competition – public private means no longer conflict for hiring – having the cp doesn’t mean less rocket enginerers -

## 3 Graphical user interface, table Description automatically generated

## Case

### Hedge

#### 1ar theory is illegitimate –

#### A] 1ar theory time skews the rest of the round since they have the 1ar and 2ar, which is 7 minutes compared to my 2nr, which is 6 minutes. This gives them a whole minute advantage on the theory debate, that’s a lot in such a time crunched event and outweighs their strat stuff since I need time to execute strat and get ground.

#### Drop the arg on 1ar theory

#### A] the 1ar will always be incentivized to go for theory because they get a ballot implication, destroying substance engagement

#### B] You shouldn’t stake the round on incomplete 1ar blips that become 3 minute 2ars – that wrecks neg win percentage because it means the 2nr has to overcover 1 second arguments

### TT

**1] Constitutive: The ballot asks you to either vote aff or neg based on the given resolution a) Five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true which means its intrinsic to the nature of the activity**

#### 2] Bindingness: a) all arguments pre-assume that they are true as judges don’t vote an arguments proven false b) in order to win that your ROB is superior to TT you must prove true the claim that your ROB is better than TT.

### FWK

#### Permissibility Negates –

#### 1~ Semantics – Ought is defined as expressing obligation which means absent a proactive obligation you vote neg since there’s a trichotomy between prohibition, obligation, and permissibility and proving one disproves the other two.

#### 2~ Safety – It’s ethically safer to presume the squo since we know what the squo is but we can’t know whether the aff will be good or not if ethics are incoherent.

#### Presume neg- A. We assume statements to be false until proven true. That is why we don’t believe in alternate realities or conspiracy theories. The lack of a reason something is false does not me it is assumed to be true. B. Statements are more often false then true. If I say this pen is red, I can only prove it true in one way by demonstrating that it is indeed red, where I can prove it false in an infinite amount of ways.

#### 1] Util triggers permissibility – A] cascading B] induction C] culpability D] weigh ability

#### 2] Moen – A] Egoism Hijack B] No Maximization C] Masochists

#### 3] Bostrom – A] NC Hijacks - Epistemic uncertainty requires the minimal state – only the libertarian utopia preserves people’s freedom to pursue their conception of truth, Mack 18:

Eric Mack, June 15, 2018, “Robert Nozick’s Political Philosophy” <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/nozick-political/#FraDisPro> //LHP AV

The official purpose of Part III of ASU, “Utopia”, is to show that **the minimal state is** not merely legitimate and just; it is also **inspiring**. This purpose is advanced by sketching a framework for utopia that is inspiring and noting that this framework is highly akin to—Nozick actually says “equivalent to” (333)—the minimal state. Yet Nozick also says that the framework might not have any “central authority” (329). Still, the framework is akin to the minimal state because it is an institutional structure that enforces peaceful co-existence among voluntarily formed communities. **It protects the independence of such communities and their freedom to recruit members and also protects the liberty of individuals to enter and exit communities as they respectively choose**. Although Nozick is not explicit about this, we have to presume that the framework enforces the same norms of personal freedom, property, and contractual compliance that the minimal state enforces except insofar as individuals voluntarily relinquish such rights within the communities they enter. The framework is inspiring **because of the way it contributes to persons’ identification of and participation in communities** (and other networks of relationships) **through which they will find meaning and well-being**. It is inspiring to **anyone** **who appreciates how little each of us knows about what sorts of communities best suit** **human** beings in all their depth and diversity and how much the operation of **the framework assists individuals in their discovery of and engagement in communities that enhance their respective well-being.** Moreover, many persons may value the framework not merely for the way it enhances their own good but, also, for the ways in which it allows them to participate vicariously in others’ achievement of their different modes of flourishing (Lomasky 2002). 5.1 The Framework as Discovery Procedure The framework is—or, more precisely, sustains—a discovery procedure. Under the protective umbrella of the framework, individuals are presented with and can try out diverse communities while communities themselves arise and modify themselves in their competitive search to sustain, improve, or increase their membership. A wide range of communities will continually arise out of and in response to the evolving perceptions that diverse individuals will have about what modes of sociality will best suit them and will best attract welcome partners. Communities will survive and perhaps expand or be imitated insofar as they actually embody modes of relationship that serve well their actual or prospective membership or insofar as they successfully refine their offerings in the market place of communities. **The framework also insures that those who are already confident that they know what sort of community is best for them will be free to form those communities by voluntary subscription and, thereby, to manifest their actual value** (or disvalue) to themselves and to other seekers of well-being. Part of Nozick’s sub-text here is **a message to socialist utopians that nothing in the framework (or the minimal state) precludes their non-coercive pursuit of their ideal communities.** How, therefore, can socialists object to the framework (or the minimal state)? This generalizes Nozick’s earlier claims in ASU that that advocates of meaningful work and workers’ control of productive enterprises ought not to be hostile to the minimal state since the minimal state is fully tolerant of non-coercive endeavors to establish such conditions (246–253). In a short essay in Reason magazine published four years after ASU, Nozick asked, “Who Would Choose Socialism?” (Nozick 1978). More precisely, his question was: What percent of the adult population would choose “to participate in socialist interpersonal relations of equality and community” were they in position to choose between “a reasonably attractive socialist option and also a reasonably attractive non-socialist one?” (Nozick 1978: 277). Nozick takes the choice available to Israelis between membership and non-membership in kibbutzim to be a good instance of a choice between such options and notes that around six percent of the adult population of Israel in the 1970s had chosen the socialist option. He speculates that socialists are at least “tempted” to be imperialists precisely because they sense that there will be too few volunteers (Nozick 1978: 279). The discovery procedure that the framework sustains is a version of Millian experiments in living—albeit it is a version that places much more emphasis on the role of a marketplace of communities in providing individuals with experimental options. This discovery procedure (like Millian experiments in living) is, of course, a Hayekian invisible hand process. Given the enormous diversity among individuals, we do not know what one form of community would be best. The idea that there is one best composite answer to all of these questions [about what features utopia has], one best society for everyone to live in, seems to me to be an incredible one. (And the idea that, if there is one, we now know enough to describe it is even more incredible.) (311) Nor do we know what distinct modes of community would be best for distinct types of persons. Thus, we cannot design an inclusive utopia; nor can we design an array of mini-utopia such that some significantly fulfilling community will be available to everyone—or even to most. It is helpful to imagine cavemen sitting together to think up what, for all time, will be the best possible society and then setting out to institute it. Do none of the reasons that make you smile at this apply to us? (313–314) Given our ignorance, the best way to realize utopia—almost certainly many distinct utopia—is through the discovery procedure that the framework sustains. (We should note, however, an implicit, somewhat puzzling, and wholly unnecessary presupposition of Nozick’s discussion, viz, that individuals with utopian aspirations will generally seek out communities that are made up of other individuals like themselves. The suggestion is that chosen communities will be internally homogeneous with heterogeneity existing only across these communities.)

### Offense

#### Small arsenals and tests prove no extinction

Frankel et al. 15 [Dr. Michael J. Frankel is a senior scientist at Penn State University’s Applied Research Laboratory, where he focuses on nuclear treaty verification technologies, is one of the nation’s leading experts on the effects of nuclear weapons, executive director of the Congressional Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack, led development of fifteen-year global nuclear threat technology projections and infrastructure vulnerability assessments; Dr. James Scouras is a national security studies fellow at the Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory and the former chief scientist of DTRA’s Advanced Systems and Concepts Office; Dr. George W. Ullrich is chief technology officer at Schafer Corporation and formerly senior vice president at Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC), currently serves as a special advisor to the USSTRATCOM Strategic Advisory Group’s Science and Technology Panel and is a member of the Air Force Scientific Advisory Board. 04-15-15. “The Uncertain Consequences of Nuclear Weapons Use.” The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory. DTIC. <https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a618999.pdf>] Justin

Scientific work based on real data, rather than models, also cast additional doubt on the basic premise. Interestingly, publication of several contradictory papers describing experimental observations actually predated Schell’s work. In 1973, nine years before publication of The Fate of the Earth, a published report failed to find any ozone depletion during the peak period of atmospheric nuclear testing.26 In another work published in 1976, attempts to measure the actual ozone depletion associated with Russian megaton-class detonations and Chinese nuclear tests were also unable to detect any significant effect.27 At present, with the reduced arsenals and a perceived low likelihood of a large-scale exchange on the scale of Cold War planning scenarios, official concern over nuclear ozone depletion has essentially fallen off the table. Yet continuing scientific studies by a small dedicated community of researchers suggest the potential for dire consequences, even for relatively small regional nuclear wars involving Hiroshimasize bombs. Nuclear Winter The possibility of catastrophic climate changes came as yet another surprise to Department of Defense scientists. In 1982, Crutzen and Birks highlighted the potential effects of high-altitude smoke on climate,29 and in 1983, a research team consisting of Turco, Toon, Ackerman, Pollack, and Sagan (referred to as TTAPS) suggested that a five-thousand-megaton strategic exchange of weapons between the United States and the Soviet Union could effectively spell national suicide for both belligerents.30 They argued that a massive nuclear exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union would inject copious amounts of soot, generated by massive firestorms such as those witnessed in Hiroshima, into the stratosphere where it might reside indefinitely. Additionally, the soot would be accompanied by dust swept up in the rising thermal column of the nuclear fireball. The combination of dust and soot could scatter and absorb sunlight to such an extent that much of Earth would be engulfed in darkness sufficient to cease photosynthesis. Unable to sustain agriculture for an extended period of time, much of the planet’s population would be doomed to perish, and—in its most extreme rendition—humanity would follow the dinosaurs into extinction and by much the same mechanism.31 Subsequent refinements by the TTAPS authors, such as an extension of computational efforts to three-dimensional models, continued to produce qualitatively similar results. The TTAPS results were severely criticized, and a lively debate ensued between passionate critics of and defenders of the analysis. Some of the technical objections critics raised included the TTAPS team’s neglect of the potentially significant role of clouds;32 lack of an accurate model of coagulation and rainout;33 inaccurate capture of feedback mechanisms;34 “fudge factor” fits of micrometer-scale physical processes assumed to hold constant for changed atmospheric chemistry conditions and uniformly averaged on a grid scale of hundreds of kilometers;35 the dynamics of firestorm formation, rise, and smoke injection;36 and estimates of the optical properties and total amount of fuel available to generate the assumed smoke loading. In particular, more careful analysis of the range of uncertainties associated with the widely varying published estimates of fuel quantities and properties suggested a possible range of outcomes encompassing much milder impacts than anything predicted by TTAPS.37 Aside from the technical issues critics raised, the five-thousand-megaton baseline exchange scenario TTAPS envisioned was rendered obsolete when the major powers decreased both their nuclear arsenals and the average yield of the remaining weapons. With the demise of the Soviet Union, the nuclear winter issue essentially fell off the radar screen for Department of Defense scientists, which is not to say that it completely disappeared from the scientific literature. In the last few years, a number of analysts, including some of the original TTAPS authors, suggested that even a “modest” regional exchange of nuclear weapons—one hundred explosions of fifteenkiloton devices in an Indian–Pakistani exchange scenario—might yet produce significant worldwide climate effects, if not the full-blown “winter.”38 However, such concerns have failed to gain much traction in Department of Defense circles.
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