## FW

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing.

#### Prefer it:

#### 1] Actor specificity:

#### A] Aggregation – every policy benefits some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action.

#### B] No act-omission distinction – choosing to omit is an act itself – governments decide not to act which means being presented with the aff creates a choice between two actions, neither of which is an omission

#### C] No intent-foresight distinction – If we foresee a consequence, then it becomes part of our deliberation which makes it intrinsic to our action since we intend it to happen

o/w

#### 2] Lexical pre-requisite: threats to bodily security preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis that inhibits the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose

#### 3] Only consequentialism explains degrees of wrongness—if I break a promise to meet up for lunch, that is not as bad as breaking a promise to take a dying person to the hospital. Only the consequences of breaking the promise explain why the second one is much worse than the first. Intuitions outweigh—they’re the foundational basis for any argument and theories that contradict our intuitions are most likely false even if we can’t deductively determine why.

#### 4] Substitutability—only consequentialism explains necessary enablers.

**Sinnott-Armstrong 92** [Walter, professor of practical ethics. “An Argument for Consequentialism” Dartmouth College Philosophical Perspectives. 1992.]

**A moral reason to do an act is consequential if and only if the reason depends only on the consequences of either doing the act or not doing the act.** For example, a moral reason not to hit someone is that this will hurt her or him. A moral reason to turn your car to the left might be that, if you do not do so, you will run over and kill someone. A moral reason to feed a starving child is that the child will lose important mental or physical abilities if you do not feed it. All such reasons are consequential reasons. All other moral reasons are non-consequential. Thus, **a moral reason** to do an act **is non-consequential if** and only if **the reason depends even partly on some property that the act has independently of its consequences. For example, an act can be a lie regardless of what happens as a result of the lie** (since some lies are not believed), and some moral theories claim that that property of being a lie provides amoral reason not to tell a lie regardless of the consequences of this lie. Similarly, the fact that an act fulfills a promise is often seen as a moral reason to do the act, even though the act has that property of fulfilling a promise independently ofits consequences. All such moral reasons are non-consequential. In order to avoid so many negations, I will also call them 'deontological'. This distinction would not make sense if we did not restrict the notion of consequences. If I promise to mow the lawn, then one consequence of my mowing might seem to be that my promise is fulfilled. One way to avoid this problem is to specify that the consequences of an act must be distinct from the act itself. My act of fulfilling my promise and my act of mowing are not distinct, because they are done by the same bodily movements.10 Thus, my fulfilling my promise is not a consequence of my mowing. A consequence of an act need not be later in time than the act, since causation can be simultaneous, but the consequence must at least be different from the act. Even with this clarification, it is still hard to classify some moral reasons as consequential or deontological,11 but I will stick to examples that are clear. In accordance with this distinction between kinds of moral reasons, I can now distinguish different kinds of moral theories. I will say that **a moral theory is consequentialist if and only if it implies that all basic moral reasons are consequential. A moral theory is then non-consequentialist or deontological if it includes any basic moral reasons which are not consequential**. 5. Against Deontology So defined, the class of deontological moral theories is very large and diverse. This makes it hard to say anything in general about it. Nonetheless, I will argue that no deontological moral theory can explain why moral substitutability holds. My argument applies to all deontological theories because it depends only on what is common to them all, namely, the claim that some basic moral reasons are not consequential. Some deontological theories allow very many weighty moral reasons that are consequential, and these theories might be able to explain why moral substitutability holds for some of their moral reasons: the consequential ones. But even these theories cannot explain why moral substitutability holds for all moral reasons, including the non-consequential reasons that make the theory deontological. The failure of deontological moral theories to explain moral substitutability in the very cases that make them deontological is a reason to reject all deontological moral theories. I cannot discuss every deontological moral theory, so I will discuss only a few paradigm examples and show why they cannot explain moral substitutability. After this, I will argue that similar problems are bound to arise for all other deontological theories by their very nature. The simplest deontological theory is the pluralistic intuitionism of Prichard and Ross. Ross writes that, when someone promises to do something, 'This we consider obligatory in its own nature, just because it is a fulfillment of a promise, and not because of its consequences.'12 Such deontologists claim in effect that, **if I promise to mow the grass, there is a moral reason for me to mow the grass, and this moral reason is constituted by the fact that mowing the grass fulfills my promise.** This reason exists regardless of the consequences of mowing the grass, even though it might be overridden by certain bad consequences. **However**, if this is why I have a moral reason to mow the grass, then, even **if I cannot mow the grass without starting my mower, and starting the mower would enable me to mow the grass, it still would not follow that I have any moral reason to start my mower, since I did not promise to start my mower**, and starting my mower does not fulfill my promise. Thus, **a moral theory cannot explain** moral **substitutability if it claims that properties** like this **provide moral reasons.**

## Contention 1 is Mining

#### Private companies are set to mine in space – new tech and profit motives make space lucrative

Gilbert 21, (Alex Gilbert is a complex systems researcher and PhD student in Space Resources at the Colorado School of Mines, “Mining in Space is Coming”), 4-26-21, Milken Institute Review, https://www.milkenreview.org/articles/mining-in-space-is-coming // MNHS NL

Space exploration is back. after decades of disappointment, a combination of better technology, falling costs and a rush of competitive energy from the private sector has put space travel front and center. indeed, many analysts (even some with their feet on the ground) believe that commercial developments in the space industry may be on the cusp of starting the largest resource rush in history: mining on the Moon, Mars and asteroids. While this may sound fantastical, some baby steps toward the goal have already been taken. Last year, NASA awarded contracts to four companies to extract small amounts of lunar regolith by 2024, effectively beginning the [era of commercial space mining](https://payneinstitute.mines.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/149/2020/09/Payne-Institute-Commentary-The-Era-of-Commercial-Space-Mining-Begins.pdf). Whether this proves to be the dawn of a gigantic adjunct to mining on earth — and more immediately, a key to unlocking cost-effective space travel — will turn on the answers to a host of questions ranging from what resources can be efficiently. As every fan of science fiction knows, the resources of the solar system appear virtually unlimited compared to those on Earth. There are whole other planets, dozens of moons, thousands of massive asteroids and millions of small ones that doubtless contain humungous quantities of materials that are scarce and very valuable (back on Earth). Visionaries including Jeff Bezos [imagine heavy industry moving to space](https://www.fastcompany.com/90347364/jeff-bezos-wants-to-save-earth-by-moving-industry-to-space) and Earth becoming a residential area. However, as entrepreneurs look to harness the riches beyond the atmosphere, access to space resources remains tangled in the realities of economics and governance. Start with the fact that space belongs to no country, complicating traditional methods of resource allocation, property rights and trade. With limited demand for materials in space itself and the need for huge amounts of energy to return materials to Earth, creating a viable industry will turn on major advances in technology, finance and business models. That said, there’s no grass growing under potential pioneers’ feet. Potential economic, scientific and even security benefits underlie an emerging geopolitical competition to pursue space mining. The United States is rapidly emerging as a front-runner, in part due to its ambitious Artemis Program to lead a multinational consortium back to the Moon. But it is also a leader in creating a legal infrastructure for mineral exploitation. The United States has adopted the world’s first spaceresources law, recognizing the property rights of private companies and individuals to materials gathered in space. However, the United States is hardly alone. Luxembourg and the United Arab Emirates (you read those right) are racing to codify space-resources laws of their own, hoping to attract investment to their entrepot nations with business-friendly legal frameworks. China reportedly views space-resource development as a national priority, part of a strategy to challenge U.S. economic and security primacy in space. Meanwhile, Russia, Japan, India and the European Space Agency all harbor space-mining ambitions of their own. Governing these emerging interests is an outdated treaty framework from the Cold War. Sooner rather than later, we’ll need [new agreements](https://issues.org/new-policies-needed-to-advance-space-mining/) to facilitate private investment and ensure international cooperation.

Back up for a moment. For the record, space is already being heavily exploited, because space resources include non-material assets such as orbital locations and abundant sunlight that enable satellites to provide services to Earth. Indeed, satellite-based telecommunications and global positioning systems have become indispensable infrastructure underpinning the modern economy. Mining space for materials, of course, is another matter. In the past several decades, planetary science has confirmed what has long been suspected: celestial bodies are potential sources for dozens of natural materials that, in the right time and place, are incredibly valuabl**e**. Of these, water may be the most attractive in the near-term, because — with assistance from solar energy or nuclear fission — H2O can be split into hydrogen and oxygen to make rocket propellant, facilitating in-space refueling. So-called “rare earth” metals are also potential targets of asteroid miners intending to service Earth markets. Consisting of 17 elements, including lanthanum, neodymium, and yttrium, these critical materials (most of which are today mined in China at great environmental cost) are required for electronics. And they loom as bottlenecks in making the transition from fossil fuels to renewables backed up by battery storage. The Moon is a prime space mining target. Boosted by NASA’s mining solicitation, it is likely the first location for commercial mining. The Moon has several advantages. It is relatively close, requiring a journey of only several days by rocket and creating communication lags of only a couple seconds — a delay small enough to allow remote operation of robots from Earth. Its low gravity implies that relatively little energy expenditure will be needed to deliver mined resources to Earth orbit. The Moon may look parched — and by comparison to Earth, it is. But recent probes have confirmed substantial amounts of water ice lurking in [permanently shadowed craters](http://lroc.sese.asu.edu/posts/1105) at the lunar poles. Further, it seems that solar winds have implanted significant deposits of helium-3 (a light stable isotope of helium) across the equatorial regions of the Moon. Helium-3 is a potential fuel source for second and third-generation fusion reactors that one hopes will be in service later in the century. The isotope is packed with energy (admittedly hard to unleash in a controlled manner) that might augment sunlight as a source of clean, safe energy on Earth or to power fast spaceships in this century. Between its water and helium-3 deposits, the Moon could be the resource stepping-stone for further solar system exploration. Asteroids are another near-term [mining target](https://foreignpolicy.com/2016/04/28/the-asteroid-miners-guide-to-the-galaxy-space-race-mining-asteroids-planetary-research-deep-space-industries/). There are all sorts of space rocks hurtling through the solar system, with varying amounts of water, rare earth metals and other materials on board. The asteroid belt between the orbits of Mars and Jupiter contains most of them, many of which are greater than a kilometer in diameter. Although the potential water and mineral wealth of the asteroid belt is vast, the long distance from Earth and requisite travel times and energy consumption rule them out as targets in the near term. The prospects for space mining are being driven by technological advances across the space industry. The rise of reusable rocket components and the now-widespread use of off-the-shelf parts are lowering both launch and operations costs. Once limited to government contract missions and the delivery of telecom satellites to orbit, private firms are now emerging as leaders in developing “NewSpace” activities — a catch-all term for endeavors including orbital tourism, orbital manufacturing and mini-satellites providing specialized services. The space sector, with a market capitalization of $400 billion, could grow to as much as $1 trillion by 2040 as private investment soars.

#### Squo private companies are willing to invest, but the plan crosses a perception barrier which destroys investment

Shaw 13 - Lauren E, J.D. from Chapman University School of Law, ”Asteroids, the New Western Frontier: Applying Principles of the General Mining Law of 1872 to Incentive Asteroid Mining”, JOURNAL OF AIR LAW AND COMMERCE, Volume 78, Issue 1, Article 2, <https://scholar.smu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1307&context=jalc> // recut MNHS NL

To some, the mining of asteroids might sound like the premise of a science fiction novel' or the solution to the heartwrenching, fictional scenario depicted in the film Armageddon.2 To others, it evokes a fantastical idea that may come to fruition in a distant reality. However, impressively funded companies have plans to send spacecraft to begin prospecting on asteroids within the next two years.' The issues associated with the mining of asteroids should be addressed before these plans are set in motion. Much has been written about the issues that might arise from allowing nations to own these space bodies and the minerals they contain; one such issue is the impact on international treaties.4 However, little has been written about the applicability of preexisting mining laws-which provide a basic property right scheme for the private sector-such as the General Mining Law of 1872 (Mining Law) to the management of asteroid mining.' The literature to date on how to legally address asteroid mining is minimal.' The articles that do address it propose the creation of different systems, such as a "property rights-based system that relies on the doctrine of first possession"7 or an international authority that would regulate mining operations.' Implementing a scheme that offers ownership of extracted resources without bestowing complete sovereignty is necessary to avoid an impending legal limbo-that is, an outer space "Wild West" equivalent where there is neither certainty nor security in who owns what.9 If private sector miners of asteroids know this right already exists, they will have more incentive to extract resources.' 0 This, in turn, would increase the chances of successful missions, resulting in numerous scientific and explorative benefits, along with the potential replenishment of key elements that are becoming increasingly depleted on Earth yet are still needed for modern industry. Scientists speculate that key elements needed for modern industry, including platinum, zinc, copper, phosphorus, lead, gold, and indium, could become depleted on Earth within the next fifty to sixty years." Many of these metals, such as platinum, are chemical elements that, unlike oil or diamonds, have no synthetic alternative.12 Once the reserves on Earth are mined to complete depletion, industries will be forced to recycle the existing supply of minerals, which will result in increased costs due to increased scarcity.' 3 However, evidence is accumulating that asteroids only a few hundred thousand miles away from Earth may be composed of an abundance of natural resources-including many of the minerals being mined to depletion on Earth-that could lead to vast profits." Most of the minerals being mined on Earth, including gold, iron, platinum, and palladium, originally came from the many asteroids that hit the Earth after the crust cooled during the planet's formation.'

#### Space mining is the only way to solve climate change

Duran 21, (Paloma Duran is a journalist and industry analyst at Mexico Business News, “Is Space Mining the Best Option to Face Climate Change?”), 11-03-21, Mexico Business News, https://mexicobusiness.news/mining/news/space-mining-best-option-face-climate-change // MNHS NL

Going to net zero means that more mining is needed. Experts have said that the current supply cannot support the necessary metals demand for the green transition. As a result, new mining alternatives have gained greater relevance, among them is space mining. Several countries, including Mexico, have shown their interest in this alternative, creating a new space race. “The solar system can support a billion times greater industry than we have on Earth. When you go to vastly larger scales of civilization, beyond the scale that a planet can support, then the types of things that civilization can do are incomprehensible to us … We would be able to promote healthy societies all over the world at the same time that we would be reducing the environmental burden on the Earth,” said Dr. Phil Metzger, Planetary Scientist at the University of Central Florida. Currently, there are several attempts to address global warming and transition to a net zero carbon economy. There has been an increasing interest in renewable energy and infrastructure, which has increased demand for various minerals, especially lithium, cobalt, nickel, copper and rare earth elements. However, according to experts, the world is close to entering a metals supercycle, where demand will exceed available supply, causing prices to skyrocket. Consequently, the mining industry has sought alternatives to achieve the required supply. Options include recycling and improved mine waste management, sea mining and space mining. The latter is considered one of the alternatives with the greatest potential. However, a regulatory framework is still lacking and there is almost no experience in this regard. Despite the lack of knowledge regarding space mining, it has become a very attractive option since the planet is running out of resources. While some people believe that land-based mining is cheaper than space mining, experts believe this may change in the long term. Furthermore, within the solar system there are countless bodies rich in minerals, ores and elements that will accelerate the fight against climate change. “There will come a point when there is nothing left to mine on the surface, prompting mines to reach even further below. But even those resources are destined to run out and so we will aim toward ocean mining, which already has specific technologies that are being developed. Nevertheless, even those mines are limited as well. The mine of the future, which today may seem unlikely, will no longer be on our planet. There will be a time when space mining will be as common as an open leach mine,” Eder Lugo, Minerals Head at Siemens, told MBN. More than 150 million asteroids measuring approximately 100m are believed to be in the inner solar system alone. In addition, astronomers have also identified abundant minerals near the Earth’s space and the Main Asteroid Belt. There are three main groups into which asteroids are divided: C- type, S- type, and M- type. The last two groups are the most abundant in minerals such as gold, platinum, cobalt, zinc, tin, lead, indium, silver, copper and rare earth metals. "Energy is limited here. Within just a few hundred years, you will have to cover all of the landmass of Earth in solar cells. So, what are you going to do? Well, what I think you are going to do is you are going to move out in space … all of our heavy industry will be moved off-planet and Earth will be zoned residential and light-industrial,” said Jeff Bezos, Founder of Amazon and the Space Launch Provider Blue Origin.

#### Anthropogenic warming causes extinction --- mitigation efforts now are key

Griffin, 2015 (David, Professor of Philosophy at Claremont, “The climate is ruined. So can civilization even survive?”, CNN, 4/14/2015, <http://www.cnn.com/2015/01/14/opinion/co2-crisis-griffin/> )

Although most of us worry about other things, climate scientists have become increasingly worried about the survival of civilization. For example, Lonnie Thompson, who received the U.S. National Medal of Science in 2010, said that virtually all climatologists "are now convinced that global warming poses a clear and present danger to civilization." Informed journalists share this concern. The climate crisis "threatens the survival of our civilization," said Pulitzer Prize-winner Ross Gelbspan. Mark Hertsgaard agrees, saying that the continuation of global warming "would create planetary conditions all but certain to end civilization as we know it." These scientists and journalists, moreover, are worried not only about the distant future but about the condition of the planet for their own children and grandchildren. James Hansen, often considered the world's leading climate scientist, entitled his book "Storms of My Grandchildren." The threat to civilization comes primarily from the increase of the level of carbon dioxide (CO2) in the atmosphere, due largely to the burning of fossil fuels. Before the rise of the industrial age, CO2 constituted only 275 ppm (parts per million) of the atmosphere. But it is now above 400 and rising about 2.5 ppm per year. Because of the CO2 increase, the planet's average temperature has increased 0.85 degrees Celsius (1.5 degrees Fahrenheit). Although this increase may not seem much, it has already brought about serious changes. The idea that we will be safe from "dangerous climate change" if we do not exceed a temperature rise of 2C (3.6F) has been widely accepted. But many informed people have rejected this assumption. In the opinion of journalist-turned-activist Bill McKibben, "the one degree we've raised the temperature already has melted the Arctic, so we're fools to find out what two will do." His warning is supported by James Hansen, who declared that "a target of two degrees (Celsius) is actually a prescription for long-term disaster." The burning of coal, oil, and natural gas has made the planet warmer than it had been since the rise of civilization 10,000 years ago. Civilization was made possible by the emergence about 12,000 years ago of the "Holocene" epoch, which turned out to be the Goldilocks zone - not too hot, not too cold. But now, says physicist Stefan Rahmstorf, "We are catapulting ourselves way out of the Holocene." This catapult is dangerous, because we have no evidence civilization can long survive with significantly higher temperatures. And yet, the world is on a trajectory that would lead to an increase of 4C (7F) in this century. In the opinion of many scientists and the World Bank, this could happen as early as the 2060s. What would "a 4C world" be like? According to Kevin Anderson of the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research (at the University of East Anglia), "during New York's summer heat waves the warmest days would be around 10-12C (18-21.6F) hotter [than today's]." Moreover, he has said, above an increase of 4C only about 10% of the human population will survive. Believe it or not, some scientists consider Anderson overly optimistic. The main reason for pessimism is the fear that the planet's temperature may be close to a tipping point that would initiate a "low-end runaway greenhouse," involving "out-of-control amplifying feedbacks." This condition would result, says Hansen, if all fossil fuels are burned (which is the intention of all fossil-fuel corporations and many governments). This result "would make most of the planet uninhabitable by humans." Moreover, many scientists believe that runaway global warming could occur much more quickly, because the rising temperature caused by CO2 could release massive amounts of methane (CH4), which is, during its first 20 years, 86 times more powerful than CO2. Warmer weather induces this release from carbon that has been stored in methane hydrates, in which enormous amounts of carbon -- four times as much as that emitted from fossil fuels since 1850 -- has been frozen in the Arctic's permafrost. And yet now the Arctic's temperature is warmer than it had been for 120,000 years -- in other words, more than 10 times longer than civilization has existed. According to Joe Romm, a physicist who created the Climate Progress website, methane release from thawing permafrost in the Arctic "is the most dangerous amplifying feedback in the entire carbon cycle." The amplifying feedback works like this: The warmer temperature releases millions of tons of methane, which then further raise the temperature, which in turn releases more methane. The resulting threat of runaway global warming may not be merely theoretical. Scientists have long been convinced that methane was central to the fastest period of global warming in geological history, which occurred 55 million years ago. Now a group of scientists have accumulated evidence that methane was also central to the greatest extinction of life thus far: the end-Permian extinction about 252 million years ago. Worse yet, whereas it was previously thought that significant amounts of permafrost would not melt, releasing its methane, until the planet's temperature has risen several degrees Celsius, recent studies indicate that a rise of 1.5 degrees would be enough to start the melting. What can be done then? Given the failure of political leaders to deal with the CO2 problem, it is now too late to prevent terrible developments. But it may -- just may -- be possible to keep global warming from bringing about the destruction of civilization. To have a chance, we must, as Hansen says, do everything possible to "keep climate close to the Holocene range" -- which means, mobilize the whole world to replace dirty energy with clean as soon as possible.

#### Developments in asteroid mining are key to solve poverty – even a small asteroid creates an unlimited supply and drops prices

**Gowan 13**Rajesh Gowan, March 15 2013, “Exploring the New Frontier: Space Mining,” (in [Economic Development](http://notenoughgood.com/category/economic-development/), [Environment](http://notenoughgood.com/category/environment-2/), [General Information](http://notenoughgood.com/category/uncategorized/), [International Economic Development](http://notenoughgood.com/category/international-economic-development/), [Technology](http://notenoughgood.com/category/technology/)) <http://notenoughgood.com/2013/03/space-mining/>

Growing up, many of you have probably watched [Star Trek](http://www.startrek.com/). Exploration of space was an exciting prospect indeed. What fascinated me though, while watching, was the huge abundance of resources available, such as basic [raw materials](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Raw_material), [energy](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Energy#Forms_of_energy), even food and water. I remember thinking that if this was actually possible it would solve all of Earth’s problems. [Poverty](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Poverty),[famine](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Famine) and [climate destruction](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Climate_change)would be a thing of the past. But is it just [science fiction](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Science_fiction)? Years ago I would have said “Yes!” Today I believe that [Space Mining](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Space_mining) is a scientific fact. “It’s one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind” as said by [Neil Armstrong](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neil_Armstrong). It has been over 50 years now since his words, came crackling from the moon. Major strides, around the subject of Space, have since been taken. *Space mining is real*. There are *currently two companies* gearing up to start with that very endeavor,  a company named [Deep Space Industries](http://deepspaceindustries.com/), and another named[Planetary Resources](http://www.planetaryresources.com/). Both *have drawn up* accelerated *plans to prospect*[*asteroids*](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Asteroids), and other near Earth objects, *with the view of mining* in the future. I say accelerated because these companies plan to have their probing done by 2015, and plan to begin mining *as early as 2023*. This has been further accelerated by[NASA](http://www.nasa.gov/) and President Obama, who have created a change of focus from the Moon, to[near Earth objects](http://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/asteroids/news/asteroid20130214.html), particularly for mining purposes. These companies are searching primarily for metals. However, water and hydrogen are also a high priority, as these could be used to produce rocket fuel in Space itself, which would further aid exploration activities. A plan currently exists to build a [Space fueling station](http://www.popsci.com/technology/article/2011-03/first-space-gas-station-launch-2015-servicing-geosynchronous-satellites), for that very purpose. Why Space, what if there nothing to be found? It is proven that there are a vast number of objects to be found. *There are over 9000 asteroid’s* viably *close to* the *Earth*. The largest body of water has also been found in Space, it has a volume that is 140 trillion times more, than our own oceans. Those numbers are simply astronomical, pardon the pun. Just last month, *the* [*asteroid* 1012\_DA14](http://sciencenavigators.org/asteroid-comes-closer-to-earth/)*measuring a mere 150feet* (45m) zoomed passed Earth. It, however, *had $65 billion worth of water and $130 billion worth of metals* within it. *Imagine what the numbers would be for, even a slightly, larger asteroid.*How can this solve our problems, here on Earth? This for me is the most exciting part, *if all these resources are brought to Earth, an unlimited supply would be created*. Think back to those stories, told by your parent and grandparents. The ones about how much milk used to cost, or how much they forked out for their cars. Those prices were laughably low. If resources could possibly be brought in from Space, *it would bring an end to*[*inflation*](http://www.investopedia.com/terms/i/inflation.asp#axzz2NQEnDiEJ)*all together.* *All that we will be paying for is the*[*means of production*](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Means_of_production). *This could eliminate poverty worldwide, as there will be an abundance of water for growing food, and an abundance of metals* and other materials *for housing*. Furthermore, mining on earth would become obsolete, freeing up valuable land, for farming and habitation. *This is very possible because of one simple law, the law of supply and demand.* *A huge supply of a resource, coupled to an equally huge demand, means the price of those resources will drop significantly.*What are costs and legal implications? Yes, the fact is that the initial costs are high. However like any new means of production, the initial costs will be recovered relatively quickly. Most of the costs will be negated, for the mined resources will also be used in the process of mining itself, for example, powering the Space vehicles and machinery with water and hydrogen from asteroids. The lack of atmosphere in Space also ensures an almost unlimited workable life for machinery and tools. These technologies have already been built and tested, and they stand at the ready. On the subject of Laws, new Laws will, eventually, be needed according to [Professor Frans Van Der Dunk](http://law.unl.edu/facstaff/faculty/resident/fvonderdunk.shtml). However he believes that, the [1967 Exploration of Space treaty](http://history.nasa.gov/1967treaty.html) Sec 2 which states: No claims of sovereignty can be made by any Country in Space,  will suffice and ensure no legal issues, from the process of mining, and from the process of bringing resources to Earth. What about [deep sea mining](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deep_sea_mining), as an alternative? The main issue with deep sea mining lays in the fact that, the ocean’s resources are completely unknown and undetectable. Resources available from Asteroids and other near Earth objects are presently detectable, measurable and fully known. Earth is going into a crisis from drastic climate changes. Drastic problems call for drastic solutions. If those solutions lay in Space, then I, resoundingly, say “Go for it!” Considering Mankind’s survival is at stake, I’m sure you would say the same.

### AT: Acceleration

#### The acceleration metaphor is arbitrary and collapses into endless criticism

Filip Vostal, Ph.d, Institute of Sociological Studies, University of Bistol, ’13

(“Thematizing speed: Between critical theory and cultural analysis,” European Journal of Social Theory 1–20, 2013)

For Rosa, acceleration is not simply a discursive construction but an over-determined social phenomenon with political and ethical implications. However, he builds on and extends the ascendant discursive trajectory characteristic of independent commentaries and critical literature. In his attempt to develop a critical theory of acceleration, he outlines a promising re-energized version of the Frankfurt School-inspired critique of late modern/capitalist temporality. This grounding, however, **precludes him from seeing acceleration as anything other than a pathology and symptom of capitalist modernity**. Despite the originality and rigour of the concept of social acceleration, which is in many respects ground-breaking, **there are problematic aspects**. Rosa and Scheuerman (2009) rightly claim that we have to understand acceleration in its unevenness, saying that not all social processes, populations, territories, segments and spheres are affected equally; in fact, some of them may not be affected at all. However, elsewhere Rosa seems to suggest the square presence of acceleration in modern societies when he talks about ‘acceleration as a new form of totalitarianism’ (2010a: 61–3). This contradiction conveys the main merit as well as the main problem of his account. On the one hand, acceleration is not levelled nor a constant social occurrence; on the other, following the discursive tendency established by popular science writings and other critical literature, and following the intellectual commitments of the Frankfurt School, Rosa argues for acceleration as an **inescapable, unavoidable and omnipresent condition negatively affecting almost all spheres and layers of societ**y, including our collective and personal realities and capacities. Building on this premise, Rosa’s critical theory of acceleration, albeit minimally, loses its forcibility and potential in the light of unchecked dilemmas – similar to the critics of speed, the issue of individual perception, processing and negotiation of acceleration **remains unexplored and somewhat neglected**. In other words, **Rosa couches acceleration as new form of social domination – an evil force – associated with the dynamics of late modernity.** This tendency is apparent in the way in which he treats deceleration. Slowdown in Rosa’s conception always succumbs to acceleration dynamics: it can be explained as a consequence of speed-up, a functional necessity of speed-up or a reactionary drive against it (2010a: 33–41). Even acceleration’s antipode is thus a fully subordinate offshoot of it.

Another problematic aspect of Rosa’s account is that he somewhat does not distinguish between corporeal and intended experience of speed and the oppressive need for speed associated with time-pressure; something Tomlinson calls, ‘sedentary speed’ (2007a: 3; see also Hassan, 2003: 2). The former is connected with physiognomic properties of speed experience, including thrill and excitement (Balint, 1959; Duffy, 2009; Wollen, 2002). In terms of the latter, it is a type of speed experience typically associated with the rat-race metaphor that appears to define the late modern experience – especially when it is further tied to the transformation of the workplace and/or to increasing embeddedness of communication technologies, such as smartphones (see Agger, 2011), in our daily lives. Although sedentary speed does not principally exclude the corporeal dimension, it has more to do with the very embodied experience and a specific contemporaneous mood or presentist mindset dramatically apparent with time-famine, hurry sickness and even related time-management/counselling industries. In other words, we can experience sedentary speed ‘without even stirring from our office desk’ (Tomlinson, 2007a: 3) yet the conveniences and opportunities resulting from conscious and carefully calculated speeding-up, either in a spatial or figurative sense, are rendered as relics of an early-modern mindset.

Rosa has certainly developed a benchmark study that accounts for one of the most systematic attempts to bring the analysis of speed and acceleration into debates within critical social theory. Arguably, however, when acceleration is couched as an irreducibly negative object of analysis, a degree of causality and essentialism potentially **overshadows the question of agency** as well as speed’s complicated historical and cultural dimensions – including positive appreciations (see Kern, 2004: 109ff). As Wagner (1994: xii, 8) notes, the history of modernity is characterized by the double nature of liberty and discipline. This ambiguity arguably holds also for the social experience of speed as modernity’s particular manifestation. John Tomlinson’s account that I will now turn to can be considered not only as a useful corrective of some problematic features of the critical social theory of speed, but also as an account that pays specific attention to the ambiguity and ambivalence of speed in modernity.

#### Aff fails – affirming “uncertainty” leads to vulnerability, cooption and an even faster move away from the status quo

David McIvor, Kettering Foundation, ’11

(“The Politics of Speed: Connolly, Wolin, and the Prospects for Democratic Citizenship in an Accelerated Polity,” Polity Vol. 43 No. 1)

Wolin has recently addressed the challenges of an accelerating society hostile to democratic habits and practices by reflecting on the idea of agitation. According to the OED, the verb “to agitate” means both “to perturb, excite, or stir up” and “to discuss.” Wolin notes the tension between the first meaning “with its provocative and frenetic connotations” and the second “which implies . . . a leisurely conversation” that “takes time.”81 Agitation therefore implies two different notions of politics: a style of radical protest that seeks to interrupt the status quo, and a deliberative politics of representative bodies. Crucially, **the frenetic forms of agitation** are not the mirror opposite of the slower tempos of deliberation, but instead grow out of public experiences **and deliberations that are “initially resistant, [and] hesitant**.”82 Drawing on the period of the English Civil War, Wolin catalogued the micro-political conditions that ultimately allowed the grievances, demands, and aspirations of the “agitators” to gain power and prominence.83 The tension between the tempos of disruption among the English soldiers and the slower tempos of Parliament added urgency to the agitators’ claims. Actions that began in “slow-motion” gradually gathered momentum until the tempos of political action seemed to coalesce and accelerate. Revolutions, then, can change time by exacerbating the tension between the tempos in which politics takes place. For Wolin, then, agitation “suggests a politics of premeditated spontaneity and of varying but controlled tempos.”84

In some ways Wolin’s description of revolution seems to converge with Connolly’s emphasis on speed as a means of creating a pluralistic ethos and ultimately political change. Yet Connolly, as I have argued above, has **elided the intense requirements of slow time** practice that support the possibility of successful, “rapid” change. Furthermore, Wolin finds that the tempos of frenetic agitation have “not vanished . . . [but] simply switched location.” The rise of corporate-driven capitalism has appropriated the revolutionary tempo through the “troika effect,” which unites capital, technology and science: By enlisting technological innovation and scientific discovery and joining them with its own impulses, capital has produced an unprecedented form of power. The combination has quickened the rate of change throughout the world . . . . Globalized capital . . . may be said to monopolize agitation . . . thus corporate capital is the agitator, the exemplar of permanent revolution, of normalized agitation.85

Speedy agitation has been co-opted by corporate capital, which in turn “encourages change, elevates fashion to a norm, and . . . instructs an agitated populace that virtually every job and habitat are temporary.”86 **This emphasis on flux** and change disrupts the attachments that normally develop over time, including those related to vocation or community (and, by extension, those which lead to agitation). For Wolin, a hopeful politics today depends on whether or not “agitation . . . can find its bearings.”86 In order for this to occur the “appropriate tempo” of democratization must be identified. Since Wolin identifies this tempo as the slower one found at the local level of state, county, and municipality**, we must wonder if he has not** fallen into the nostalgic shackles **that Connolly has already fit for him.** Far from it. While recognizing the difficulty of frenetic agitation in a hurrying, racing world, Wolin thinks that such agitation can emerge from and alter the slower tempos of small-scale deliberation and debate occurring in local politics. Agitation can “educate . . . and energize” particularism, leading it to “challenge the center” in changed times. Democratic agitation “takes time” in that it must be nursed by patient deliberation, but it also “takes time” when, energized by such micro-political activities, it alters the status quo in powerful, lasting ways.

#### Colonization not appropriation? Its not taking possession of anything.

**Dictionary ND**, Dictionary.com, “appropriation”, <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/appropriation>, DD AG

**the act of** appropriating or **taking possession of something**, often without permission or consent.

### 1NC – Speed Inevitable

#### Speed is inevitable

De Lousy, 2001

[Jean, Javault, Patrick. Queen's Quarterly108. 3 (Fall 2001): 329-338, My kingdom for a horse: the revolutions of speed, Proquest] /Wyo-MB

In my opinion, not really. For me speed is the most important analytical instrument. In some other society - in which speed had not been made such a work of technology, of industrial innovation - one might be able to consider other important means of analysis. Speed has been at the centre of everything in the world we inhabit.¶ Even in the animal kingdom, speed is a determining factor. Three elements are key to animal evolution: claws, fangs, and speed. Think of the gazelle running flat out; the strength of this animal - with neither fangs nor claws - is simple speed. Surrounded by quick, cunning, ferocious predators, it survives by speed alone. The only creatures to be taken down by the carnivores will be those too old or sick to keep up the pace. In ancient Greek society, the adolescent is called the "runner," and the marathon is not a competition unique to Greek society. In fact, the Olympic games have now become our global celebration of a society based on speed. The history of speed is not simply one of technical innovation and refinement, but one concerned with the evolution of life, of living. It is an essential tool of analysis when we look at the history of our world.

### 1NC – Speed Focus Bad

#### Focus on speed as the sole axis of social and historical interrogation is reductionist and fails

Winchester, 1999

[Nik, research student in the Department of Sociology, University of Bristol, Speed as metaphysics, History of the Human Sciences 1999 12: 159, Sage Journals] /Wyo-MB

What result occurs from taking Virilio’s analysis as a theoretically tenable¶ proposition? Arthur Kroker offers us Speed: ‘Power’, ‘Wars’, ‘Flesh’, and,¶ minus any hint of irony, ‘Fetishism’ (Kroker, 1992: 25–30).¶ Speed ﬂesh, then, for ‘bodies without wills’ in a war machine which¶ functions on the basis of a biological logic, and which projects the psychology of the ‘last man’ into all those drifting ‘metabolic vehicles,’¶ waiting to be boarded by the mediascape. (Kroker, 1992: 32–3)¶ When speed becomes the refracting prism of analysis, the single projection¶ banalizes the analysis through reduction and wastage. The reduction via the¶ a priori explanatory of the refracting concept, analysis occurs only at the¶ point where the sufﬁx is attached to the object, the object exists through the¶ lens of speed – wastage as the result of the raising of the lens itself. If the¶ object resists the totalizing impulse of the concept, it is rendered peripheral¶ and to its limit, not worthy of analysis, therefore consigned to erasure. The¶ self-aggrandizing mode of the exponential raising of the concept, which in¶ Virilio means to the furthest extent of its metaphysical qualities, haunts the¶ writing and the theory such that nothing else may enter, the conceptual space¶ inscribes a deﬁnitive closure.¶ Reading these texts a perspicuous comment from Cornelius Castoriadis¶ haunted my thoughts:¶ I can always project a volume onto a plane, a ﬁgure onto an axis, the¶ operation leaves me with some result in my hands; I cannot project¶ social-historical life onto one of its ‘axes’, for the operation leaves me¶ with nothing. (Castoriadis, 1997: 220)¶ Speed acts, it is an autonomical process, the metaphysics of Geist becomes¶ the metaphysics of speed. One sphere of life dominates (correctly so if we are¶ convinced of its divinity), speed is the axis of the slaughter-bench of history¶ (literally), history is the history of speed. Either metaphysics or the singular¶ projection, in Virilio’s work there is little difference in the implication, the¶ very singularity of the analysis actively prevents an analysis that explores¶ speed as an interjection within modernity. Nothing seems to arrive because¶ nothing escapes speed. While speed is certainly a ﬁgure on the axis of social¶ life, and one that lacks sustained analysis within the theoretical corpus, to¶ raise it to this singular projection resists comprehension of speed within¶ social-historical life. Whereas in the work of Max Weber we see a subtle, and¶ multidimensional, analysis of the characterological effects of the vicissitudes¶ of modernity, by contrast the reductive analysis and dominating metaphysic¶ of speed preclude a studied comprehension of the object, particularly the¶ ethical dimension of the projection. The discerned loss loses profundity in¶ terms of a theoretical superﬁciality of its thesis.

### 1NC – Speed Good

**Fast tech development good—solves resource scarcity**

**Simon in ‘96**

Julian Simon, Former Professor of Business Administration at the University of Maryland and Former Senior Fellow at the CATO Institute, “The Ultimate Resource 2”, 1996, p. 30-31

**The most important elements in raw-material price trends have been (**1) the rate of movement from richer to poorer ores and mining locations, that is, the phenomenon of "exhaustion"; and (2) **the continued development of technology, which has more than made up for exhaustion.** Is the rate of development of such new technology slowing up? To the contrary**: the pace of development of new technology seems to be increasing**. Hence, if the past differs from the future, **the bias is likely to be in the direction of understating the rate at which technology will develop, and therefore under-estimating the rate at which costs will fall. The fall in the costs of natural resources**, decade after decade and century after century, **should shake us free from the idea that scarcity must increase sometime.** And please notice that current prices do not mislead us about future scarcities. If there is reason to judge that the cost of obtaining a certain re-source in the future will be much greater than it is now, speculators will hoard that material to obtain the higher future price, thereby raising the present price. So current price is our best measure of both current *and* future scarcity (more about this later).

#### Resource shortages cause war

Mauer 86 – economist (Nathan, The Kondratieif Waves, p 197-8)

The overall trend of the economy shapes perceptions as to its strength and direction. In a hull market, "experts" are almost uniformly optimistic; in a bear market the owlish analysts almost universally suggest caution. **It is during the upward swings**, soon after a trough and just before a peak, **that wars become more likely**. It should be rioted that peak wars are the result of a different kind of socioeconomic psychological pressure and have quite different economic results than trough wars. Nations become socially and politically unsettled after a long period of boom and expansion, perhaps because **in their final stages, peoples' expectations begin to outrun actual growth in the general level of prosperity. War** then **becomes the ultimate destination**. In as much as **all nations are attempting to expand simultaneously, the intense competition for resources and markets leads eventually to military confrontations, which become contagious**. One explanation suggested is that **during trough wars the public is still largely concerned with** private considerations and **their own wellbeing**. They tend to be less interested in international disputes, world crusades, or campaigns involving large investment of cash, effort, and the nervous energy needed to pursue projects to a conclusion. **Trough wars tend to be short**. They are more a matter of choice and sudden decision by the stronger power. Inasmuch as **peak wars are the result of frustration of expectations** {usually with economic elements), **peak wars tend to be more desperate, more widespread, and more destructive**.

## 1NC – Generic Alt Solvency Card vs. Virilio

### It is essential to create new forms of community, democracy and social activism that challenge the state and giant corporations – only way to solve technology and violence

Kellner, 1999

[Douglas, Chair in philosophy of education at UCLA, Virilio, War and Technology : Some Critical Reflections, Theory Culture Society 1999 16: 103, Sage Publications] /Wyo-MB

But while there are still threats to world peace and even human survival from the dark forces of military capitalism, one of the surprising events of the past decade is the emergence of a new form of Microsoft capitalism, of less lethal and more decentralized new technologies, of new modes of peaceful connection and communication. The project of this new form of technocapitalism is the development of an information-entertainment society that we might call the infotainment society and which is sometimes described as the "information superhighway." This form of capitalism is a softer capitalism, a less violent and destructive one, a more ecological mode of social organization, based on more flexible, smaller-scale, and more ludic technologies.[6]¶ The differences between hard military capitalism and a softer Microsoft capitalism are evident in the transformation of the computer from a top-down, highly centralized, specialized machine controlled by big organizations to the smaller scale, more flexible, and more ludic personal computer (see Turkle 1996 for elaboration of this distinction). Moreover, the surprising development of the Internet opens up new public spheres and the possibility of political intervention by groups and individuals excluded from political dialogue during the era of Big Media, controlled by the state and giant corporations (for elaboration of this argument see Kellner 1995, 1996, and forthcoming).¶ Of course, Microsoft capitalism has its own dangers ranging from economic worries about near-monopoly control of economic development through software domination to the dangers of individuals getting lost in the proliferating terrains of cyberspace and the attendant decline of individual autonomy and initiative, social relations and interaction, and community. Yet the infotainment society promises more connections, interactions, communication, and new forms of community. The project is in far too early stages to be able to appropriately evaluate so for now we should rest content to avoid the extremes of technophobia which would reject the new technologies out of hand as new forms of alienation or domination contrasted to technophilic celebrations of the information superhighway as the road to a computopia of information, entertainment, affluence, and democracy.

### 1NC – Virilio Wrong – Militarism

#### Virilio’s view of tech wrong—overemphasis on war and military tech

Kellner, 1999

[Douglas, Chair in philosophy of education at UCLA, Virilio, War and Technology : Some Critical Reflections, Theory Culture Society 1999 16: 103, Sage Publications] /Wyo-MB

Yet I want to argue in this study that Virilio has a flawed conception of technology that is excessively one-sided and that misses the emancipatory and democratizing aspects of new computer and media technologies. My argument is that his vision of technology is overdetermined by his intense focus on war and military technology and that this optic drives him to predominantly negative and technophobic perspectives on technology per se. However, precisely the one-sidedness and extremely critical discourse on war and military technology, as well as his reflections on war, cinema, technologies of representation and vision machines, constitute some of the most valuable aspects of his work.