

(New) Novice Neg

(Use this one)

I negate the resolution resolved: The appropriation of outer space for private entities is unjust.

Before I read my case, I would like to offer the following definitions

Outerspace: the physical universe beyond the earth's atmosphere.- oxford languages

Private entity: any person or private group - Cornell

Unjust: not based on or behaving according to what is morally right and fair- Merriam Webster

My Single Standard is utilitarianism

Cummiskey 90 (Dr. David Cummiskey, Bates College, "Kantian Consequentialism," *Ethics*, Vol. 100, No. 3 (Apr., 1990), pp. 586-615 Published by: The University of Chicago Press, Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2381810>)

We must not obscure the issue by characterizing this type of case as the sacrifice of individuals for some abstract "social entity." It is not a question of some persons having to bear the cost for some elusive "overall social good." Instead, the question is whether some persons must bear the inescapable cost for the sake of other persons. Robert Nozick, for example, argues that "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." But why is this not equally true of all those whom we do not save through our failure to act? By emphasizing solely the one who must bear the cost if we act, we fail to sufficiently respect and take account of

the **many other** separate **persons** each with only one life, who will **bear the cost of our inaction.** In such a situation, what would a conscientious Kantian agent, an agent motivated by the unconditional value of rational beings, choose? A morally good agent recognizes that the basis of all particular duties is the principle that "rational nature exists as an end in itself". Rational nature as such is the supreme objective end of all conduct.

If one truly believes that all rational beings have an equal value, then the rational solution to such a dilemma involves maximally promoting the lives of as many rational beings as possible.

In order to avoid this conclusion, the non-consequentialist Kantian needs to justify agent-centered constraints. As we saw in chapter 1, however, even most Kantian deontologists recognize that agent-centered constraints require a non-value-based rationale. But we have seen that Kant's normative theory is based on an unconditionally valuable end. How can a concern for the value of rational beings lead to a refusal to sacrifice rational beings even when this would prevent other more extensive losses of rational beings? If the moral law is based on the value of rational beings and their ends, then what is the rationale for prohibiting a moral agent from maximally promoting these two tiers of value? If I sacrifice some for the sake of others, I do not use them arbitrarily, and I do not deny the unconditional value of rational beings. Persons may have "dignity, that is, an unconditional and

incomparable worth" that transcends any market value, but persons also have a fundamental **equality that dictates that some must** sometimes **give way for the sake of others.**

The concept of the end-in-itself does not support the view that we may never force another to bear some cost in order to benefit others.

The contention is Space exploration

A: Space is exciting to us, making us want to explore

[European Space Agency 2005 "The Impact of Space Activities on Society" pg 24

<https://www.esa.int/esapub/br/br237/br237.pdf>] Wrench

The excitement and the challenge of space exploration also impact upon society by inspiring us: with a spirit of adventure, with a sense of awe at the beauty and mystery of the Universe that it reveals, with a greater awareness

of the precious fragility of our own home planet, and with a greater understanding of our place in the cosmos.

Space activities and the cosmic wonders they help reveal, not only inspire artists, poets and songwriters, they also imbue every one of us with a sense of what humanity can accomplish as a species, when we set our minds to a task: a powerful antidote to the social depression that arises in times of international tension.

A society without challenges to overcome is one that stultifies and stagnates: responding to the challenge of space impacts upon society by helping to keep it alive and vibrant.

B: Space exploration fails without private sector helping boost the space economy

WAMU 20 [(interviewing Ariel Ekblaw, founder and lead of MIT Media Lab's Space Exploration Initiative and Charles Bolden, NASA administrator from 2009-2017) "How Private Companies Are Changing The Future Of Space Exploration," February 6, 2020, <https://wamu.org/story/20/02/06/how-private-companies-are-changing-the-future-of-space-exploration/>] TDI

How **Private Companies Are Changing The Future Of Space Exploration** LISTEN SpaceX founder Elon Musk addresses the media alongside NASA Administrator Jim Bridenstine, and astronauts Doug Hurley and Bob Behnken, during a press conference announcing new developments of the Crew Dragon reusable spacecraft, at SpaceX headquarters in Hawthorne, California on

October 10, 2019. (Philip Pacheco / AFP) **Private companies like SpaceX are testing vehicles for**

manned space missions. We'll peer out into the near future and next steps in human space exploration. Guests Ariel Ekblaw, founder and lead of MIT Media Lab's Space Exploration Initiative. (@ariel_ekblaw) Charles Bolden, NASA administrator from 2009-2017, and a former astronaut and Marine Corps general. (@cboldenjr) Interview Highlights American astronaut Christina Koch broke the record for the longest-ever space flight by a woman today. Where is human space exploration going next? Ariel Ekblaw: "It's a huge milestone. Part of her story around the spacesuit, and the sizing of the spacesuits, and the all-female spacewalk is something that we pay a lot of attention to at our group at M.I.T. And then being able to be in space for that length of time provides an invaluable sense of knowledge of what is the human lived experience of space." How might we better design for her comfort to delight her in space? To now, thanks to standing on the shoulders of groups like NASA and Charlie's work, think about not just a survivalist mode for space exploration, but what are the artifacts, and the tools, and the experiences that we could design for Christine in the future? Given her experience of this 300-plus-day journey and stay to really delight her for her experience in

space exploration. And in the future, scale that to space tourists and others besides astronauts." On **how close we are to regular space tourism** Ariel Ekblaw: **"I would say we're both close — we're dangerously close — and yet so far away. So companies like Blue Origin and Virgin Galactic are racing to be able to send some of the first space tourists into low Earth orbit on some of their crafts, in either this year, or upcoming years.** With Axiom and the announcement from NASA about the first commercial

space station to be attached to the International Space Station. **"We're beginning to build up that infrastructure**

that could support real space tourism. There are still, as I'm sure Charlie can also speak to, large unanswered questions about how do you prepare someone if not off the street — A space enthusiast — for the experience of space when they're not necessarily going to have the same in-depth, extensive training as a NASA astronaut? How do we keep them safe? How do we handle mental health? How do we prepare them for both the excitement and the responsibility that they might have as a member of a crew in a resource constrained environment?" On whether people who aren't trained as astronauts should be able to go into space Charles Bolden: "Yes, without a doubt. ... They've got to have some training. But I would say it depends on what the flight is going to be. I haven't had a chance to talk to Beth Moses from Virgin Galactic. But Beth would be — she's not a normal person off the street, because she's the astronaut training officer at Blue Origin. But Beth had an opportunity to fly, and she didn't go through years of training. You know, I think there's some fundamental things that you teach someone about mobility. And, 'don't touch that.' And you let them go." **On whether it's possible to go to Mars without**

commercial interest involved Ariel Ekblaw: **"I think it's critical to have both.** As Charlie and

Dava Newman — another colleague of mine — have shown: **the path from moon to Mars is going to be a**

public-private partnership path. And **we need the capability that private brings** and the inspiration that NASA and that the governments can still bring to the task." On what it's like to go to space Charles Bolden: "It's much more spectacular than the pictures portray. We have great cameras nowadays. They're better and better than they ever were before, but they just cannot capture what the human eye sees.

God's camera is pretty awesome. The ability to play around with Newton's law, the fact that, you know, because gravity is overcome by the speed at which you're going around the planet allows us to seem like we're floating. And that's a lot of fun to get to play with. You know, a body at rest stays at rest, a body in motion stays in motion. And for every action, there's an equal and opposite reaction. It makes all that stuff that you learned in middle school, if you learned it, or if you avoided it, it brings it to life for you. So that's incredible." From The Reading List Wall Street Journal: "Space Is Poised for Explosive Growth. Let's Get It Right." — "In the 19th century, urban planners wrangled the chaotic metropolises of Paris and New York into "planned cities," turning warrens of streets into orderly grids, building sewage systems and transit lines, and allowing for new types of architecture, such as apartment buildings. Today, we face a similar inflection point in developing the nearest reaches of space. "The next decade is set to bring explosive commercial growth and more private industry players to low-earth orbit, the area spanning 100 to 1,240 miles above the planet's surface. SpaceX has proposed a satellite-based internet, and Planet is growing its fleet of Earth-imaging satellites. NASA plans a transition towards commercial management of the international space station. Several startups are developing low-earth orbit advertisements—logos or other designs, visible in the night sky, made from tiny, reflective satellites. Entrepreneurs are making plans for space hotels. "Before we let rampant development go unchecked, we should consider how these efforts might conflict with or complement each other. We still have the chance to intentionally design humanity's first 'planned orbit.'" MIT Media Lab: "Democratizing Access to Space" — "The Space Exploration Initiative's founding mission is to rigorously, vigorously build out the technologies of our sci-fi space future while keeping our innovations and team as open and accessible as possible. When we say we're 'democratizing access to space exploration,' what do we mean? In the context of our blue sky goal — to realize an inclusive, impactful — we approach democratization in four core ways. We are: "1. Democratizing access by inviting and uniting new disciplines in our creative practice]" 2. Democratizing access by designing space tools, products, and experiences for all of us, not just the pinnacle of human talent embodied by astronauts. "3. Democratizing access by developing hands-on, widely accessible opportunities to shape the technologies of our space future. "4. Democratizing access through the celebration of new narratives through which we can tell the story of Space Exploration, writ large." The Verge: "This was the decade the commercial spaceflight industry leapt forward" — "Two years into the decade, on May 25th, 2012, a small teardrop-shaped capsule arrived at the International Space Station, packed with cargo and supplies for the crew living on board. Its resupply mission at the ISS wasn't remarkable, but the vehicle itself was unique: it was a Dragon cargo capsule, owned and operated by a private company called SpaceX. "Before 2012, only vehicles operated by governments had ever visited the ISS. The Dragon was the first commercial vehicle to dock with the station. The milestone was a crowning achievement for the commercial industry, which has

permanently altered the spaceflight sector over the last 10 years. "This decade, the space industry has seen a shift in the way it does business, with newer players looking to capitalize on different markets and more ambitious projects. The result has been an explosion of growth within the commercial sector. It's allowing for easier access to space than ever before, with both positive and negative results. Such growth is providing the commercial space industry with lots of momentum coming into the 2020s, but it's unclear if this pace is something that can be kept up." Axios: "NASA's murky commercial space future" — "NASA's plans to create a robust economy in low-Earth orbit where private spaceflight companies can flourish could eventually leave the agency's astronauts stranded on Earth with nowhere to go. "Why it matters: NASA hopes to play a lead role in developing a private spaceflight economy, including private sector astronauts. The agency sees this as a way to free it up to focus on farther afield goals like bringing humans back to the Moon and, eventually, to Mars.

Subpoint C- Job Growth

<https://workingnation.com/private-companies-propelling-job-growth-in-the-space-industry/>

Ramona Schindelheim, Schindelheim 21, "Private Companies Propelling Job Growth in the Space Industry."

(Schindelheim 21), hiring and investments in the space industry increased in 2020 and the first quarter of 2021, according to The Space Report released by Space Foundation, which describes itself as a "nonprofit advocacy organization, offering a gateway to education, information and collaboration for space exploration and space-inspired industries that define the global space ecosystem." The Space Report—an analysis of Bureau of Labor Statistics data—found 5,000 new jobs were added in five key sectors in the industry, marking a 3.2% increase from the prior year. Manufacturing of space vehicles and guided missiles, as well as broadcast and wireless communications equipment, created the most jobs in the space sector last year, according to the report. In 2020, private space employment totaled 147,953 workers, the highest level since 2011, when 149,818 were employed, according to the data. Space career job options also include space

and geoscientists, electricians, and engineers of all types—. Analysis also found that in regard to U.S. salaries, the average private sector space salary was \$123,234, more than double the average salary for all U.S. private sector jobs of \$59,202, and well above the average annual salary of \$95,350 for STEM occupations, according to 2019 data, the most recent year available," according to the report.

D: This economic growth is good; Economic growth key to check every world crisis — disease, food shortages, pollution, poverty, military readiness are much worse in a world without economic growth

Ferrara 14 ***edited for ableist language*** 2014, January 14th. Peter Ferrara: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/peterferrara/2014/01/14/why-economic-growth-is-exponentially-more-important-than-income-inequality/#4b4f36b91483> SW

(Ferrara 14) Such economic growth has produced dramatic improvements in personal health as well.

Throughout most of human history, a typical lifespan was 25 to 30 years, as Moore and Simon report. But "from the mid-18th century to today, life spans in the advanced countries jumped from less than 30 years to about 75 years." Average life expectancy in the U.S. has grown by more than 50% since 1900. Infant mortality declined from 1 in 10 back then to 1 in 150 today. Children under 15 are at least 10 times less likely to die, as one in four did during the 19th century, with their death rate reduced by 95%. The maternal death rate from pregnancy and childbirth was also 100 times greater

back then than today. Moore and Simon further recount, "Just three infectious diseases – tuberculosis, pneumonia, and diarrhea – accounted for almost half of all deaths in 1900." Today, **we have virtually eliminated or drastically reduced** these and other **scourges of infectious disease** that have killed or [injured] billions throughout human history, such as typhoid fever, cholera, typhus, plague, smallpox, diphtheria, polio, influenza, bronchitis, whooping cough,

malaria, and others. Besides the advances in the development and application of modern health sciences, **this has resulted from the drastic reduction in filthy and unsanitary living conditions that economic growth has made possible** as well. More recently, great progress is being made against heart disease and cancer. Also greatly contributing to the well-being of working people, the middle class, and the poor

in America has been the dramatically declining cost of food resulting from economic growth and soaring productivity in agriculture. As Moore and Simon report, "Americans devoted almost 50 percent of their incomes to putting food on the table in the early 1900s compared with 10 percent in the late 1900s." While most of human history has involved a struggle against starvation, today in America the battle is against obesity, even more so among the poor. Moore and Simon quote Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation, "The average consumption of protein, minerals, and vitamins is virtually the same for poor and middle income children, and in most cases is well above recommended norms for all children. Most poor children today are in fact overnourished." That cited data comes from the U.S. Census Bureau. As a result, poor children in America today "grow up to be about 1 inch taller and 10 pounds heavier than the GIs who stormed the beaches of Normandy in World War II." That has resulted from a U.S. agricultural sector that required 75% of all American workers in 1800, 40% in 1900, and just 2.5% today, to "grow more than enough food for the entire nation and then enough to make the United States the world's breadbasket." Indeed, today, "The United States feeds three times as many people with one-third as many total farmers on one-third less farmland than

in 1900," in the process producing "almost 25 percent of the world's food." Moreover, it is **economic growth that has provided the resources enabling us to dramatically reduce pollution and improve the environment, without trashing our standard of living**. Moore and Simon write that at the beginning of the last century,

"Industrial cities typically were enveloped in clouds of black soot and smoke. At this stage of the industrial revolution, factories belched poisons into the air—and this was proudly regarded as a sign of prosperity and progress. Streets were smelly and garbage-filled before the era of modern sewage systems and plumbing." Not any of these truly dramatic advances for the poor, working people and the middle class could have been achieved by redistribution from "the rich." Only economic growth could achieve these results. Nor would it have been worth sacrificing any of these world shattering gains for greater economic "equality." And Barack Obama's leftist protestations to the contrary notwithstanding, economists have long recognized the conflict between economic equality and maximizing economic growth. Put most simply, penalizing investors, successful entrepreneurs, and job creators with higher taxes, to reward the less productive with government handouts, to make everyone more equal, is a sure fire way to get less productivity, fewer jobs, lower wages, and reduced economic growth. The above history, and the future prospects below, are why to most benefit the poor, working people, and the middle class, our nation's overriding goal must be to maximize economic growth. Consider, if total real compensation, wages and benefits, grow at just 1% a year, after 20 years the real incomes of working people would be only 22% greater. After 40 years, a generation, real incomes would be 50% more. But with sustained real compensation growth of 2%, after just 20 years the real incomes and living standards of working people would be nearly 50% greater, and after 40 years they would be 120% greater, more than doubled. At sustained 3% growth in wages and

benefits, after 20 years the living standards of working people will have almost doubled, and after 40 years they will have more than tripled. The U.S. economy sustained a real rate of economic growth of 3.3% from 1945 to 1973, and achieved the same 3.3% sustained real growth from 1982 to 2007. (Note that this 3.3% growth rate for the entire economy includes population growth. Real wages and benefits discussed above is a per worker concept). It was only during the stagflation decade of 1973 to 1982, reflecting the same Keynesian economics that President Obama is pursuing today, that real growth fell to only half long term trends. If we could revive and sustain that same 3.3% real growth for 20 years, our total economic production (GDP) would double in that time. After 30 years, our economic output would grow by 2 and two-thirds. After 40 years, our prosperity bounty would grow by 3 and two-thirds. If we are truly following growth maximizing policies, we could conceivably do even better than we have in the past. At sustained real growth of 4% per year, our economic production would more than double after 20 years. After 30 years, GDP would more than triple. After 40 years, a generation, total U.S. economic output would nearly quadruple. America would by then have leapfrogged another generation ahead of the rest of the world.

Achieving and sustaining such economic growth should be the central focus of

national economic policy, for it would solve every problem that plagues and threatens us today.

Such booming economic growth would produce surging revenues that would make balancing the budget so much more feasible. Surging GDP would reduce the national debt as a percent of GDP relatively quickly, particularly with balanced budgets not adding any further to the debt.

Sustained, rapid economic growth is also the ultimate solution to poverty, as after a couple of decades or so of such growth, the poor would climb to the same

living standards as the middle class of today. With sustained, robust, economic growth, maintaining the most

powerful military in the world, and thereby ensuring our nation's security and national defense, will require a smaller and smaller percentage of GDP over time.

That security itself will promote capital investment and economic growth in America. The booming economy will produce new technological marvels that will make our defenses all the more advanced. With the economy rapidly advancing, there will be more than enough funds for education. There will also be more than enough to clean up and maintain a healthy environment.