

NC Lib

Framework:

I Negate the resolution resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

My value is justice because of the word just in the resolution.

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.

Preserving free choice to decide what is best for oneself is the best way to be ethical, because people have differing opinions of what is ethical. Accordingly, my criterion is preserving freedom.

People are not merely pawns of society, but real people with goals, dreams, and interests. It's simply unethical to use one human against their will for the benefit of others. Nozick 74

Nozick 74, Robert Nozick, [American political philosopher, former professor at Harvard University], Anarchy, State, and Utopia, 1974.

Side constraints express the inviolability of other persons. But why may not one violate persons for the greater social good? **Individually, we each sometimes choose to undergo some pain or sacrifice for a greater benefit or to avoid greater harm: we go to the dentist to avoid worse suffering later; we do some unpleasant work for its results; some persons diet to improve their health or looks; some save money to support themselves when they are older. In each case, some cost is borne for the sake of the greater overall good.** Why not, similarly, hold that some persons have to bear some costs that benefits other persons more, for the sake of the overall social good? **But there is no social entity with a good that undergoes some sacrifice for its own good. There are only individual people, different individual people, with their own individual lives. Using one of these people for the benefit of others, uses him and benefits others. Nothing more. What happens is**

that something is done to him for the sake of others. Talk of an overall social good covers this up.
(Intentionally?) To use a person in this way does not sufficiently respect and take account of the fact that he is a separate person, that his is the only life he has. He does not get some overbalancing good from his sacrifice, and no one is entitled to force this upon him--least of all a state or government that claims his allegiance (as other individuals do not) and that therefore scrupulously must be neutral between its citizens.

Individuals have rights, so people must respect your actions and cannot restrict you, meaning the government's only obligation is to protect rights. Philosophy professor Edward Feser writes:

Feser, Edward, (Professor of Philosophy at Pasadena City College), IEP,
<https://www.iep.utm.edu/nozick/>. [ajv].

The various programs of the modern liberal welfare state are thus immoral, not only because they are inefficient and incompetently administered, but because they make slaves of the citizens of such a state. Indeed, the only sort of state that can be morally justified is what Nozick calls a minimal state or "night-watchman" state, a government which protects individuals, via police and military forces, from force, fraud, and theft, and administers courts of law, but does nothing else. In particular, such a state cannot regulate what citizens eat, drink, or smoke (since this would interfere with their right to use their self-owned bodies as they see fit), cannot control what they publish or read (since this would interfere with their right to use the property they've acquired with their self-owned labor - e.g. printing presses and paper - as they wish), cannot administer mandatory social insurance schemes or public education (since this would interfere with citizens' rights to use the fruits of their labor as they desire, in that some citizens might decide that they would rather put their money into private education and private retirement plans), and cannot regulate economic life in general via minimum wage and rent control laws and the like (since such actions are not only economically suspect - tending to produce bad unintended consequences like unemployment and housing shortages - but violate citizens' rights to charge whatever they want to for the use of their own property).

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

Contention 1: Rights

Appropriation is establishing property rights in something formerly un-owned

Dominiak 17

Łukasz Dominiak (Associate Professor at Nicolaus Copernicus University in Poland; he holds a PhD and habilitation in political philosophy and is a Fellow of the Mises Institute).

“Libertarianism and Original Appropriation.” *Historia i Polityka*, 29/2017: 22. Pp. 43-56. JDN.
<https://apcz.umk.pl/HiP/article/view/HiP.2017.026/13714>

Ownership¹, or property, on the other hand is a normative concept. **To own a thing is to have a right to possess** it, i.e. to be in such a juridical position that one's claim to deal with the thing at will is a justified claim whereas claims of other persons are unjustified or less justified than the owner's. As Barnett puts it, **“rights are those claims a person has to legal enforcement that are justified, on balance, by the full constellation of relevant reasons, whether or not they are actually recognized and enforced by a legal system” (2004). To recognise someone's ownership is therefore to assert that his possession of a thing is just, rightful, lawful, licit or reasonable etc., is to conclude that he ought to possess the thing if such is his will, even if he actually does not possess it.** As Kinsella writes, “ownership is the right to control, use, or possess, while possession is actual control” (2009). Thus, ownership is a threefold normative or juridical relation between the owner, the thing owned and the rest of mankind such as the owner may control the thing to the exclusion of others because he has the best title to do it. Hence, the distinction between possession and ownership is a distinction between factual and normative relation. Having drawn the above distinction between possession and ownership, we are ready to define original appropriation. **Thus, original appropriation is acquiring ownership of unowned things.** To originally appropriate is to establish property rights, i.e. justified claims to physical things that at the moment of acquisition are unowned. What is important to underline again, is that original appropriation is not about taking factual possession of things that are unpossessed or unowned – this process is called occupation and can be conceived as one of the possible investitive facts that can result in original appropriation but should not be confounded with the latter. Neither is it about acquiring ownership of things already owned. It is about instituting new property rights to unowned things. As Nozick puts it, the topic of “original acquisition of holdings, the appropriation of unheld things includes the issues of how unheld things may come to be held” (2014), i.e. come to be owned. Hence, original appropriation is about creating normative relations between persons and things.

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 acquisition 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

The right of original appropriation comes from the right to property, and is just as important in protecting human's freedom and autonomy. Van der Vossen 9

Bas van der Vossen (Professor of Philosophy, University of Arizona). "What counts as original appropriation?" Politics Philosophy & Economics, 8: 355. 2009. JDN.

<https://philarchive.org/archive/VANWCA>

Instead, acts of original appropriation are required for a particular practice of (justified) property rights to get started at a specific moment in time. The reason for this is that justifications of property at the general level can only establish a general conclusion: that there is a justification for situations in which people have property rights. They tell us that there is no moral problem when certain individuals claim certain rights against others with respect to certain objects. But this leaves out an important thing. For a general justification does not tell us whether the holdings of any given set of persons are in fact justified, nor how we could know. If we want to establish that, we need to know how a particular individual, call her P, can come to own a particular object, name it O. In particular, we want to know how P can come to possess O when it is not already in someone else's possession.

The account of original appropriation thus serves the function of individuating property rights; it allows previously unowned objects to become covered by the (justified) property rights of particular individuals. Without it, we would lack an intuitively appealing means of identifying whether a given set of holdings that arose from a situation in which there were no property rights present constitutes legitimate property. Without it, we would lack the means of establishing the legitimacy of something that was not yet owned coming into someone's possession. This is the role of original appropriation. It involves specifying certain acts that signify that a person can legitimately claim to have a property right. It involves specifying what counts as original appropriation.

C2 – Private Space is Good to Humanity

Increase in property rights lead to the significant growth and development of the economy

All space travel improves the economy, benefitting everyone.

Rainey, 17 | Rainey, Kristine. “Economic Development of Space.” NASA, NASA, 3 Aug. 2017,

https://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/station/research/benefits/economic_development.

While the International Space Station (ISS) has proven its value as a platform for a broad waterfront of research disciplines as well as technology development, it also provides an ideal opportunity to test new business relationships. This allows an opportunity to shift from a paradigm of government-funded, contractor-provided goods and services to a commercially provided, government-as-a-customer approach.

This interest in promoting a more commercially oriented market in low-Earth orbit (LEO) is driven by several goals. First, it can stimulate entirely new markets not achievable in the past. Second, it creates new stakeholders in spaceflight and represents great economic opportunity. Third, it ensures strong industrial capability not only for future spaceflight but also for the many related industries. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it allows cross-pollination of ideas, processes, and best practices, as a foundation for economic development.

From commercial firms spending some of their research and development funds to conduct research on the space station, to commercial service providers selling unique services to users of the orbiting lab, the beginnings of a new economy in LEO are starting to emerge. Commercial Service Providers Evolution of the space station as a laboratory in the vanguard of research in microgravity relies on a new and growing number of commercial service providers. Rather than follow the traditional model of government-funded, contractor-provided hardware or capability, a number of firms are entering a new phase of development of LEO—establishing a market. In this model, commercial firms develop capabilities that are then offered to government users and also marketed widely to potential new users of the ISS as a research platform. The space station gains important new (or updated) capability, while the service provider gains a new market in which to offer its services. Commercial Research The unique environment of microgravity provides opportunities for many types of commercially-viable research. Using model organisms (such as rodents or flatworms) to help understand terrestrial concerns such as bone loss or muscle wasting, performing materials research on colloids to develop products that are more uniform and have a longer shelf life, growing larger protein crystals on the space station to help develop monoclonal antibodies, and using the station as a launchpad for a flock of Earth-observing satellites, are just a few examples of the diverse research interests of the corporate world and how they intersect with the International Space Station. These summaries of commercial research activities in progress show the impact and interest in using the space station for research and development.

A better economy means decreased poverty and an increased quality of life for everyone in a country.

NASA, 13 | NASA. “Benefits Stemming from Space Exploration - NASA.” NASA, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Sept. 2013, <https://www.nasa.gov/sites/default/files/files/Benefits-Stemming-from-Space-Exploration-2013-TAGGED.pdf>.

Innovation. There are numerous cases of societal benefits linked to new knowledge and technology from space exploration. Space exploration has contributed to many diverse aspects of everyday life, from solar panels to implantable heart monitors, from cancer therapy to light-weight materials, and from water-purification systems to improved computing systems and to a global search-and-rescue system⁴. Achieving the ambitious future exploration goals as outlined above will further expand the economic relevance of space. Space exploration will continue to be an essential driver for opening up new domains in science and technology, triggering other sectors to partner with the space sector for joint research and development. This will return immediate benefits back to Earth in areas such as materials, power generation and energy¹ OECD Handbook on Measuring the Space Economy, March 2012. ² ISECG space agencies include, in alphabetical order: ASI (Italy), CNES (France), CNSA (China), CSA (Canada), CSIRO (Australia), DLR (Germany), ESA (Europe), ISRO (India), JAXA (Japan), KARI (Republic of Korea), NASA (United States of America), NSAU (Ukraine), Roscosmos (Russia), UKSA (United Kingdom). ³ The Global Exploration Roadmap can be downloaded at www.globalspaceexploration.org ⁴ Spinoff materials published by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (e.g. Spinoff database, spinoff.nasa.gov/spinoff/database; Spinoff 2012, spinoff.nasa.gov/Spinoff2012); Page 1 ISECG – Benefits Stemming from Space Exploration storage, recycling and waste management, advanced robotics, health and medicine, transportation, engineering, computing and software. Furthermore, innovations required for space exploration, such as those related to miniaturisation, will drive improvements in other space systems and services resulting in higher performance and lower cost. These will in turn result in better services on Earth and better return of investment in institutional and commercial space activities. In addition, the excitement generated by space exploration attracts young people to careers in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, helping to build global capacity for scientific and technological innovation. Culture and Inspiration. Space exploration offers a unique and evolving perspective on humanity's place in the Universe, which is common to all. Every day, space exploration missions fulfill people's curiosity, producing fresh data about the solar system that brings us closer to answering profound questions that have been asked for millennia: What is the nature of the Universe? Is the destiny of humankind bound to Earth? Are we and our planet unique? Is there life elsewhere in the Universe? New Means to Address Global Challenges. Partnerships and capabilities developed through space exploration create new opportunities for addressing global challenges. Space exploration is a global endeavour contributing to trust and diplomacy between nations. Enhanced global partnerships and exploration capabilities may help advance international preparedness for protecting the Earth from catastrophic events such as some asteroid strikes, advancing collaborative research on space weather and protecting spacecraft by developing new means for space debris removal. Knowledge derived from space exploration may also contribute to implementing policies for environmentally sustainable development. In summary, space scientists and engineers who overcame past challenges could not have predicted all the ways in which their innovations are now being used on Earth. Though the precise nature of future benefits from space exploration is unpredictable, current trends suggest that significant

benefits may be generated in areas such as new materials, health and medicine, transportation, and computer technology. **New opportunities for job creation and economic growth are being created by private enterprises that are increasingly investing in space exploration and seeking ways to make space exploration more affordable and reliable, and thus, more**

sustainable and profitable. There is no activity on Earth that matches the unique challenges of space exploration. The first fifty years of space activity have generated benefits for people around the globe.

This past record gives strong reason for confidence that renewed investments in space exploration will have similarly positive impacts for future generations.

Not just space travel in general, but specifically that of private companies, creates a faster improvement in the economy such as with new jobs

**Space property rights preserve the environment, both in space and on Earth
Reinstein 99 says**

Ezra J. Reinstein (JD, Associate at Kirkland & Ellis), *Owning Outer Space*, 20 Nw. J. Int'l L. & Bus. 59 (1999). JDN.

<https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/njilb/vol20/iss1/7>

Nevertheless, **protection of the environment in space ranks high on the list of policies to be considered.** 39 The importance of an environmentalist ethos in this context derives, in part, from the concerns we already deal with on Earth: **the preservation of the natural environment for its own sake and for our communal survival,** as well as the conservation of natural resources. Other environmental concerns particular to space exist also. Orbiting litter may soon seriously hinder our ability to maintain a global communications link. Waste disposal and resource maintenance techniques may determine whether the moon's limited water supply will be contaminated and the moon will remain a dead satellite. Environmental considerations are, and must be, a factor in any system of space law. **The root causes of Earth's environmental problems are limited resources, limited waste disposal sites, and limited living space.** **Commercial development of space might be an effective solution.** If minerals are extracted from dead asteroids floating through our solar system, perhaps there would be one less strip-mined rain forest. If solar energy is captured and beamed down to Earth's electric grid, that could be one less oil spill in our oceans. **And if other worlds are colonized, then overpopulation can be allayed, possibly forever.** But we are left with the question: "Which legal regime will best satisfy the needs of the terrestrial and extraterrestrial environments?"

1] Resources being commonly owned would mean it's not appropriation, 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 **first** point is actually a fairly trivial one. **If resources start out commonly owned then** for this very reason they do not start out unowned, in which case **there is no initial acquisition** of any sort to speak of, unjust or otherwise. **We all (somehow) just own everything**. Thus, **anyone who takes without the consent** of the rest of us **would be committing** (if he is committing an injustice at all) an **injustice in transfer** rather than acquisition. This is perfectly in line with my claim that injustices in holdings can take place only after someone already has ownership of resources, either through initially acquiring them from their unowned state or because the resources are "just owned" from the start; it has no tendency to show that initial acquisition itself can be just or unjust.

2] Common ownership is indeterminate and thus collapses to the Nozickian unowned world, 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

There is another problem with **the common-ownership assumption** besides its lack of support, namely, that it **seems irremediably indeterminate**. Indeed, at first sight it appears vacuous. **If everyone has an equal right to every part of the world, how does this differ** exactly **from Nozick's assumption that everything is initially unowned**—an assumption on which, too, everyone has an equal right to everything (since no one, at the start anyway, has any right to anything in particular at all)? **Ownership**, that is to say, **seems to imply exclusion**. Your (or even our) **owning something implies that there are others who do not own it**, thus, it appears that **we cannot intelligibly all own something** much less everything. This is no doubt (part of) why Locke, though he held that God initially gave the world to mankind in common, also held that individuals can acquire portions of it for their exclusive use. **Initial common “ownership” in the Lockean sense entails only that the various resources constituting the world are initially “up for grabs”**; for these resources truly to become anyone's property in any

meaningful sense, specific individuals actually have to go out and do something with them.

ON CASE

On fw –

1. Util only cares about the majority, which ignores problems of minority populations and justifies genocide
2. Pain and pleasure are subjective, i.e. serial killers get pleasure from causes bias because only our own pleasure/pain is accessible
3. Induction fails—the past is not a reliable predictor of the future and can't use induction to prove induction because that would be circular
4. Causes Oppression Olympics—ignores all but one instances of oppression in order to take action
5. Util doesn't motivate action--we only know the consequences of actions once we take the action, so we don't know what actions are moral
6. Aggregation of impacts fails, i.e. can't compare a migraine to 5 headaches
7. Consequences are infinitely cascading, any brightline they set is arbitrary and self-serving

Also It literally justifies slavery – if majority is slave owners, it justifies it

Libertarianism comes first because to decide that we want util or to decide what one feels as pleasure or pain – people need to have their own rights – concedes peoples's own brains need to decide what pleasure and pain are

All extinction impacts made in this round are a slippery slope fallacy. No matter what the aff says, extinction won't truly happen. There could be millions of deaths, but some people will still leave. The aff is using extinction loosely, and has so many things that need to happen before extinction happens. People can't live life by following that anything they do leads to extinction. And for people to even decide that extinction is bad, they need to have rights, meaning my fw comes first.

Topicality

1 – Nebel

1 – Interpretation: The affirmative debater may not specify a type of appropriation to ban.

Violation: They spec korea.

Vote neg –

Definite singulars imply a generic “rules reading” in the context of moral statements

Cohen 1 — (Ariel Cohen, Professor of Linguistics @ Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, PhD Computational Linguistics from Carnegie Mellon University, “On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars”. Journal of Semantics 18: 183-209, Oxford University Press, 2001, accessed 12-7-20, HKR-AM) **BP = bare plurals

According to the rules and regulations view, on the other hand, generic sentences do not get their truth or falsity as a consequence of properties of individual instances. Instead, generic sentences are evaluated with regard to rules and regulations, which are basic, irreducible entities in the world. Each generic sentence denotes a rule; if the rule is in effect, in some sense (different theories suggest different characterizations of what it means for a rule to be in effect), the sentence is true, otherwise it is false. The rule may be physical, biological, social, moral, etc. The paradigmatic cases for which this view seems readily applicable are sentences that refer to conventions, i.e. man-made, explicit rules and regulations, such as the following example (Carlson 1995: 225):

(40) Bishops move diagonally.

Carlson describes the two approaches as a dichotomy: one has to choose one or the other, but not both. One way to decide which approach to choose is to consider a case where the behavior of observed instances conflicts with an explicit rule. Indeed, Carlson discusses just such a case. He describes a supermarket where bananas sell for \$0.49/lb, so that (41a) is true. One day, the manager decides to raise the price to \$1.00/lb. Immediately after the price has changed, claims Carlson, sentence (41a) becomes false and sentence (41b) becomes true, although the overwhelming majority of sold bananas were sold for \$0.49/lb.

(41) a. Bananas sell for \$0.49/lb.

b. Bananas sell for \$1.00/lb.

Consequently, Carlson reaches the conclusion that the rules and regulations approach is the correct one, whereas the inductivist view is wrong.

While I share Carlson’s judgements, I do not accept the conclusion he draws from them. Suppose the price has, indeed, changed, but the supermarket employs incompetent cashiers who consistently use the old price by mistake, so that customers are still charged \$0.49/lb. In this case, I think there is a reading of (41a) which is true, and a reading of (41b) which is false. These readings are more salient if the sentence is modified by expressions such as actually or in fact:

(42) a. Bananas actually sell for \$0.49/lb.

b. In fact, bananas sell for \$1.00/lb.

BP generics, I claim, are ambiguous: on one reading they express a descriptive generalization, stating the way things are. Under the other reading, they carry a normative force, and require that things be a certain way. When they are used in the former sense, they should be analysed by some sort of inductivist account; when they are used in the latter sense, they ought to be analysed as referring to a rule or a regulation. The respective logical forms of the two readings are different; whereas the former reading involves, in some form or another, quantification, the latter has a simple predicate-argument structure: the argument is the rule or regulation, and the predicate holds of it just in case the rule is ‘in effect’.

The resolution is a generic moral statement that implies that the aff has to defend all forms of private appropriation being unjust.

Vote neg:

1] Precision outweighs. A] stasis point – the rez is a precondition to debate – abandoning it makes us two ships passing which destroys the activity B] link turns pragmatics since no precision justifies the aff defending anything which is the most unfair and un-educational. C] Jurisdiction – tournament rules say to vote under the topic which makes it a meta constraint on the ballot

2] Limits – they explode them since they can defend any form of appropriation compounded by infinite combinations, every aff can say only their aff, that outweighs since the neg can never beat back extensive frontlines to unique affs geared to take out generics and encourages cherry picking abusive affs the neg can't respond to. Controls the internal link to ground – affs will always be hyperspecific and negs general prep won't work against them.

3] Predictability – there's infinite affs they can specify with different permutations of states which means I don't know what to prepare for and the aff is always ahead – supercharged by the fact that the aff knows the only

4] ground specific to aff – no neg ground against ban on korea – they shift out of every disad and K through specificity weighing – megaconstellations XI IR etc it's just a ban on private korea.

TVA – you could have just read the plan as an advantage under a whole res advocacy Vote on fairness since anything else arbitrarily skews the round to the unfair debater and it frames my ability to respond to their arguments in the first place. Competing interps since reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention, and I win under reasonability if I win strong standards.

Drop the debater

A] to deter future abuse

B] dropping the advocacy is functionally the same

No RVIs

A] logic – im fair vote for me makes no sense – logic comes first on all args because they need to make sense to be evaluable

B] no rvis because rvis make affs abusive to bait theory and win on a long counterinterp

C] chilling effect – people won't read theory against good theory debaters which makes infinite uncheckable abuse that outweighs

Prefer a norms creation model of competing interps, in which you defend a norm being good or bad based on all potential applications and benefits of said norm:

[1] Resolvability - no way to determine how much abuse happened in the round because it's not tangible, means we need to debate if the norm itself is good or bad

[2] Norm Setting - anything else allows debaters to get away with infinitely abusive practices because they will make arbitrary and self serving arguments as to why in round they were not abusive - norm setting is the terminal impact to theory & the reason it was created in the first place

[3] Accessibility - holistic applications allow debaters to rigorously create and set norms to make debate a safer space - anything else is too round-dependent and fails to improve debate, accessibility o/w its k2 debating in the first place

[4] Anything else incentivizes people to read hyper specific affs and then say it's common topic ground, but the reason it's common topic ground despite it being abusive is because everyone agreed on it – people agreeing on being abusive doesn't make it non abusive.

Their entire case links to war

War Good

War now spurs disarm – otherwise, nuclear war that is actually deadly is inevitable

Daniel Deudney 18. Associate Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University. 03/15/2018. "The Great Debate." The Oxford Handbook of International Security. www.oxfordhandbooks.com, doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198777854.013.22. //reem

Although nuclear war is the oldest of these technogenic threats to civilization and human survival, and although important steps to restraint, particularly at the end of the Cold War, have been achieved, the nuclear world is increasingly changing in major ways, and in almost entirely dangerous directions. The third "bombs away" phase of the great debate on the nuclear-political question is more consequentially divided than in the first two phases. Even more ominously, most of the momentum lies with the forces that are pulling states toward nuclear-use, and with the radical actors bent on inflicting catastrophic damage on the leading states in the international system, particularly the United States. In contrast, the arms control project, although intellectually vibrant, is largely in retreat on the world political stage. The arms control settlement of the Cold War is unraveling, and the world public is more divided and distracted than ever. With the recent election of President Donald Trump, the United States, which has played such a dominant role in nuclear politics since its scientists invented these fiendish engines, now has an impulsive and uninformed leader, boding ill for nuclear restraint and effective crisis management. Given current trends, it is prudent to assume that sooner or later, and probably sooner, nuclear weapons will again be the used in war. But this bad news may contain a "silver lining" of good news. Unlike a general nuclear war that might have occurred during the Cold War, such a nuclear event now would probably not mark the end of civilization (or of humanity), due to the great reductions in nuclear forces achieved at the end of the Cold War.

Furthermore, **politics** on “the day after” could have **immense potential for positive change**. The survivors would not be likely to envy the dead, but would surely have a **greatly renewed resolution for “never again.”** **Such an event**, completely unpredictable in its particulars, **would unambiguously put the nuclear-political question back at the top of the world political agenda**. It would unmistakably remind **leading states of their vulnerability**. It might also **trigger more robust efforts to achieve the global regulation of nuclear capability**. Like the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki that did so much to catalyze the elevated concern for nuclear security in the early Cold War, and like the experience “at the brink” in the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962, **the now bubbling nuclear caldron holds the possibility of inaugurating a major period of institutional innovation and adjustment toward a fully “bombs away” future.**

That’s good – war later is worse

Turchin & Denkenberger 18 [Alexey Turchin & David Denkenberger. Turchin is a researcher at the Science for Life Extension Foundation; Denkenberger is with the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute (GCRI) @ Tennessee State University, Alliance to Feed the Earth in Disasters (ALLFED). 09/2018. “Global Catastrophic and Existential Risks Communication Scale.” Futures, vol. 102, pp. 27–38.]

2. “Civilizational collapse risks” As most human societies are fairly complex, a true civilizational collapse would require a drastic reduction in human population, and the break-down of connections between surviving populations. Survivors would have to rebuild civilization from scratch, likely losing much technological abilities and knowledge in the process. Hanson (2008) estimated that the minimal human population able to survive is around 100 people. Like X risks, there is little agreement on what is required for civilizational collapse. Clearly, different types and levels of the civilizational collapse are possible (Diamond, 2005) (Meadows, Randers, & Meadows, 2004). For instance, one definition of the collapse of civilization involves, collapse of long distance trade, widespread conflict, and loss of government (Coates, 2009). How such collapses relate to existential risk needs more research. 3. **“Human extinction risks” are risks that all humans die, and no future generations** (in the extended sense mentioned above) will ever exist. 4. **“All life on Earth ends risks” involve the extinction of all life on earth.** As this includes *H. sapiens*, such risks are at the very least on a par with human extinction, but are likely **worse** as the loss of **biodiversity** is higher, and (without life arising a second time) **no other civilizations, human or otherwise, would be possible on Earth.** 5. “Astronomical scale risks” include the demise of all civilizations in the affectable universe. This of course includes human extinction, and all life on Earth, and so again are at the very least on a par, **and very likely much worse outcomes, than those two.** 6. **“S-risks” include collective infinite suffering** (Daniel, 2017). These differ from extinction risks insofar as extinction leads to a lack of existence, whereas this concerns ongoing existence in undesirable circumstances. These also vary in scale and intensity, but are generally out of scope of this work. Even with a focus squarely on X Risk, global catastrophic risks and civilizational collapse are critically important. This is because there is at least some likelihood that global catastrophic risks increase the probability of human extinction risks—and the more extreme end of civilizational collapses surely would. Before shifting to a discussion of probability appropriate to X risk, we’ll discuss some reasons to link these kinds of risk. First, global risks may have a fat tail—that is a low probability of high consequences—and **the existence of such fat tails strongly depend on the intrinsic uncertainty of global systems** (Ćirković, 2012) (Baum, 2015), (Wiener, 2016) (Sandberg & Landry, 2015). This is especially true for risks associated with **future world wars, which may include not only nuclear weapons, but weapons incorporating synthetic biology and nanotechnology, different AI technologies, as well as Doomsday blackmail weapons** (Kahn, 1959). Another case are the risks associated with climate change, where runaway global warming is a likely fat tail (Obata & Shibata, 2012a), (Goldblatt & Watson, 2012). Second, global catastrophes could be part of double catastrophe (Baum, Maher, & Haqq-Misra, 2013) or start a chain of catastrophes (Tonn & and MacGregor, 2009), and in this issue (Karieva, 2018). Even if a single catastrophic risk is insufficient to wipe us out, an unhappy coincidence of such events could be sufficient, or under the wrong conditions could trigger a collapse leading to human extinction. Further, global catastrophe could weaken our ability to prepare for other risks. Luke **Oman has estimated the risks of human extinction because of nuclear winter: “The probability I would estimate for the global human population of zero resulting from the 150 Tg of black carbon scenario in our 2007 paper would be in the range of 1 in 10,000 to 1 in 100,000”** (

Full-scale nuclear war. There is roughly 0.02-7% chance per year of **accidental full-scale nuclear war between the US and Russia** (Barrett, Baum, & Hostettler, 2013). **With fairly high**

probabilities of nuclear winter and civilization collapse given nuclear war, this is order of **magnitude 10%** this century. We should also take into consideration that despite reductions in nuclear weapons, a new nuclear arms race is possible in the 21st century. Such a race may include more devastating weapons or cheaper manufacturing methods. Nuclear war could include the creation of large cobalt bombs as doomsday weapons or attacks on nuclear power plants. It could also start a chain of events which result in civilization collapse. Nanotechnology risks. Although molecular manufacturing can be achieved without self-replicating machines (Drexler & Phoenix, 2004), technological fascination with biological systems makes it likely that self-replicating machines will be created. Moreover, catastrophic uses of nanotechnology needn't be due to accident, but also due to the actions of purposeful malignant agents. Therefore, we estimate the chance of runaway self-replicating machines causing "gray goo" and thus human extinction to be one per cent in this century. There could also be extinction risks from weapons produced by safe exponential molecular manufacturing. See also (Turchin, 2016). Artificial pandemic and other risks from synthetic biology. An artificial multipandemic is a situation in which multiple (even hundreds) of individual viruses created through synthetic biology are released simultaneously either by a terrorist state or as a result of the independent activity of biohackers (Turchin, Green, & Dekenbergern, 2017). Because the capacity to create such a multipandemic could arrive as early as within the next ten to thirty years (as all the needed technologies already exist), it could overshadow future risks, like nanotech and AI, so we give it a higher estimate. There are also other possible risks, connected with synthetic biology, which are widely recognized as serious (Bostrom, 2002). Agricultural catastrophe. There is about a one per cent risk per year of a ten per cent global agricultural shortfall occurring due to a large volcanic eruption, a medium asteroid or comet impact, regional nuclear war, abrupt climate change, or extreme weather causing multiple breadbasket failures (Denkenberger 2016). This could lead to 10% mortality. Red AI risks. The risks connected with the possible creation of non-aligned Strong AI are discussed by (Bostrom, 2014), (Yudkowsky, 2008), (Yampolskiy & Fox, 2013) and others. It is widely recognized as the most serious x risk. AI could start an "intelligence explosion wave" through the Universe, which could prevent appearance of the other civilizations before they create their own AI. Purple Something like the Caribbean crisis in the past, but larger size. Currently, there are no known purple risks. If we could be sure that Strong AI will appear in the next 100 years and would probably be negative, it would constitute a purple risk. Another example would be the creation of a Doomsday weapon that could kill our species with global radiation poisoning much greater ionizing radiation release than all of the current nuclear weapons (Kahn, 1959). A further example would be a large incoming asteroid being located, or an extinction level pandemic has begun. These situations require quick and urgent effort on all levels.

Global wars drive calls for world government

Chase-Dunn 12 [Christopher Chase-Dunn, Distinguished Professor of Sociology and Director of the Institute for Research on World-Systems at the University of California-Riverside, Hiroko Inoue, Research Assistant at the Institute of Research on World-Systems, "Accelerating democratic global state formation", <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0010836712443168>, June 6, 2012, imp, **we do not endorse this cards pathetic non-utilitarianism]

All the previous advances in global governance have taken place after a hegemon has declined and there has been a world war among rivals. H. G. Wells saw the importance of catastrophes in the emergence of a new civilization (Wagar, 1961). The idea here is that major organizational changes tend to emerge after huge catastrophes when the existing institutions are in disarray and need to be rebuilt and when people are sufficiently disgusted with the old failed institutions that have led to disaster.¹⁵ Of course, political actors who seek to promote the emergence of an effective and democratic global state must also do all that they can to try to prevent another war among the great powers because humanistic morality must trump whatever advantages might result from such a catastrophe. This said, many believe that it is rather likely that major calamities will occur in the coming decades regardless of the efforts of far-sighted world citizens and social movements. And it would make both tactical and strategic sense to have plans for how to move forward if indeed a perfect storm of calamities were to come about.

disarm movements are latent now

Ragheb 18 [Magdi Ragheb, Prof. @ Department of Nuclear, Plasma, and Radiological Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. 08-08-18. "Safeguards, Non -Proliferation, and Peaceful Nuclear Energy."

<http://mragheb.com/NPRE%20402%20ME%20405%20Nuclear%20Power%20Engineering/Safeguards%20Non%20Proliferation%20and%20Peaceful%20Nuclear%20Energy.pdf> //reem

The "axiom of proliferation" states that as long as some states cling to the possession of nuclear weapons, others will also seek to acquire them. According to "catastrophe theory," serious nuclear disarmament is apparently waiting for some event that would stir action toward the eventual goal of humanity to eliminate nuclear weapons. An analogy is advanced of a village fully aware about the need to build gates along railroad tracks that pass through it, remaining inactive then spring into action until the time that one of its residents is hit by a passing train.

States are motivated by fear – elevating the nuclear threat via use would cause global buy-in for a world state

Sargent 19 [Brianna Sargent, "THE HOBBSIAN STATE OF NATURE AMONG NATIONS", Undergraduate Thesis @ Ashland University Honors College,

https://etd.ohiolink.edu/apexprod/rws_etd/send_file/send?accession=auhonors1556751283322051&disposition=inline, April 2019, imp]

Were the threat great enough, the nations would either form an international government with an assembly to represent each nation or allow one man or one government to rule over them all. This threat would have to be a threat to the very existence of each nation. This principle of existential fear controls all nations and why they have not exited the state of nature to be under one sovereign. As of now, there is no threat that scares nations enough to give up their own sovereignty, but if a threat of this magnitude were to be felt, then a world government would be absolutely necessary to the survival of the nations and the world.