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#### Interpretation: private entities is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend that the appropriation of outer space by a subset of private entities is unjust.

Nebel 19 Jake Nebel [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs.] , 8-12-2019, "Genericity on the Standardized Tests Resolution," Briefly, https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/08/12/genericity-on-the-standardized-tests-resolution/ SM

Both distinctions are important. Generic resolutions can’t be affirmed by specifying particular instances. But, since generics tolerate exceptions, plan-inclusive counterplans (PICs) do not negate generic resolutions. Bare plurals are typically used to express generic generalizations. But there are two important things to keep in mind. First, generic generalizations are also often expressed via other means (e.g., definite singulars, indefinite singulars, and bare singulars). Second, and more importantly for present purposes, bare plurals can also be used to express existential generalizations. For example, “Birds are singing outside my window” is true just in case there are some birds singing outside my window; it doesn’t require birds in general to be singing outside my window. So, what about “colleges and universities,” “standardized tests,” and “undergraduate admissions decisions”? Are they generic or existential bare plurals? On other topics I have taken great pains to point out that their bare plurals are generic—because, well, they are. On this topic, though, I think the answer is a bit more nuanced. Let’s see why. 1.1 “Colleges and Universities” “Colleges and universities” is a generic bare plural. I don’t think this claim should require any argument, when you think about it, but here are a few reasons. First, ask yourself, honestly, whether the following speech sounds good to you: “Eight colleges and universities—namely, those in the Ivy League—ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions. Maybe other colleges and universities ought to consider them, but not the Ivies. Therefore, in the United States, colleges and universities ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions.” That is obviously not a valid argument: the conclusion does not follow. Anyone who sincerely believes that it is valid argument is, to be charitable, deeply confused. But the inference above would be good if “colleges and universities” in the resolution were existential. By way of contrast: “Eight birds are singing outside my window. Maybe lots of birds aren’t singing outside my window, but eight birds are. Therefore, birds are singing outside my window.” Since the bare plural “birds” in the conclusion gets an existential reading, the conclusion follows from the premise that eight birds are singing outside my window: “eight” entails “some.” If the resolution were existential with respect to “colleges and universities,” then the Ivy League argument above would be a valid inference. Since it’s not a valid inference, “colleges and universities” must be a generic bare plural. Second, “colleges and universities” fails the upward-entailment test for existential uses of bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Lima beans are on my plate.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some lima beans on my plate. One test of this is that it entails the more general sentence, “Beans are on my plate.” Now consider the sentence, “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” (To isolate “colleges and universities,” I’ve eliminated the other bare plurals in the resolution; it cannot plausibly be generic in the isolated case but existential in the resolution.) This sentence does not entail the more general statement that educational institutions ought not consider the SAT. This shows that “colleges and universities” is generic, because it fails the upward-entailment test for existential bare plurals. Third, “colleges and universities” fails the adverb of quantification test for existential bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Dogs are barking outside my window.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some dogs barking outside my window. One test of this appeals to the drastic change of meaning caused by inserting any adverb of quantification (e.g., always, sometimes, generally, often, seldom, never, ever). You cannot add any such adverb into the sentence without drastically changing its meaning. To apply this test to the resolution, let’s again isolate the bare plural subject: “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” Adding generally (“Colleges and universities generally ought not consider the SAT”) or ever (“Colleges and universities ought not ever consider the SAT”) result in comparatively minor changes of meaning. (Note that this test doesn’t require there to be no change of meaning and doesn’t have to work for every adverb of quantification.) This strongly suggests what we already know: that “colleges and universities” is generic rather than existential in the resolution. Fourth, it is extremely unlikely that the topic committee would have written the resolution with the existential interpretation of “colleges and universities” in mind. If they intended the existential interpretation, they would have added explicit existential quantifiers like “some.” No such addition would be necessary or expected for the generic interpretation since generics lack explicit quantifiers by default. The topic committee’s likely intentions are not decisive, but they strongly suggest that the generic interpretation is correct, since it’s prima facie unlikely that a committee charged with writing a sentence to be debated would be so badly mistaken about what their sentence means (which they would be if they intended the existential interpretation). The committee, moreover, does not write resolutions for the 0.1 percent of debaters who debate on the national circuit; they write resolutions, at least in large part, to be debated by the vast majority of students on the vast majority of circuits, who would take the resolution to be (pretty obviously, I’d imagine) generic with respect to “colleges and universities,” given its face-value meaning and standard expectations about what LD resolutions tend to mean.

#### It applies to private entities:

#### Upward entailment test – spec fails the upward entailment test because saying that one company’s appropriation is bad does not entail that all companies’ appropriation is bad

#### Adverb test – adding “usually” to the res doesn’t substantially change its meaning

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Precision –any deviation justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 2] Limits—specifying a type of appropriation offers huge explosion in the topic since they get permutations of hundreds of governments, specific companies, and different sectors in the world.

#### Drop the debater to preserve fairness and education – use competing interps –reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation

#### Hypothetical neg abuse doesn’t justify aff abuse, and theory checks cheaty CPs

#### No RVIs—it’s their burden to be topical.

### CP

#### TEXT: The Outer Space Treaty ought to be amended to establish an international legal trust system governing outer space.

Finoa 21 [Ivan Finoa (Department of Law University of Turin), “Building a New Legal Model for Settlements on Mars,” A. Froehlich (ed.), Assessing a Mars Agreement Including Human Settlements, Studies in Space Policy 30, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-65013-1_7>]CT

7.5 A Proposal for an International Legal Trust System

Since several legal and policy issues may arise from the actual legal framework, a new international legal regime for outer space shall: (a) Provide for property rights or a lease allocation system, both incentivising investments in the space sector. The system would be supervised and led by the United Nations (UN) through the United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs (UNOOSA). (b) Establish the rule of law in outer space. A laissez faire system could turn into anarchy whereby countries and companies could race to grab as many resources as possible bringing considerable potential conflict. (c) Recognise outer space as common heritage of mankind, instead of res communis.24 (d) Provide a sustainable exploitation of celestial bodies, to avoid the uncontrolled production of space debris or to prevent the complete exhaustion of the celestial bodies’ masses or their natural orbits.25 The United Nations should manage the ordered and sustainable economic development in outer space for the present and future generations. (e) Prevent the militarisation of outer space and favours the international collaboration, which are the same aims of the Outer Space Treaty’ drafters. (f) Consider the weak points of the Moon Agreement which led to nations’ refusal to sign. Only a widely accepted agreement would have the power of law in the international context.

The abovementioned requirements could be met by establishing an international Legal Trust System (ILTS). A trust is an arrangement that assigns assets to one or more trustees that will manage them in the interest of one or more beneficiaries. The latter may include the trustee or the settlor.26 Translated in the ILTS, mankind would assume the role of settlor and beneficiary of the outer space resources. The UNOOSA would act as main trustee of outer space resources and trading property rights and leases to companies and countries. The rights over the celestial bodies or over its resources would depend on the nature of the celestial body itself. For example, property rights are preferable to a lease over asteroids, as they could just disappear after the exploitation. Both leases and property rights can be provided over lands and mining sites on Mars. Leases or defeasible titles are preferable for some land mass on those celestial bodies which could hypothetically be used by humankind pending an Earth disaster. In the case of lucrative activities, such as mining, companies will choose whether to get the exclusive use over the resource through payment of the lease or through annual payment linked to net proceeds or to production charges.

7.6 The Functioning of the International Legal Trust System

When a company is interested in leasing or buying an outer space resource, before starting any operations, it must send a plan of work to the United Nations. The plan of work shall include all the details of the activity that would be carried out; it shall be consistent with pre-established parameters of sustainability and shall not interfere with other space activities. If the UN approves the company plan of work, the country of the company assumes the role of co-trustee for the specific resource. Thus, as a cotrustee, countries must investigate whether all activities of their national companies are consistent with the plan of work authorised by the UN. These supervisory duties would be added to the responsibility of nations for all space objects that are launched within their territory.27 The UN, as main trustee, would oversee that countries are performing their duties. This model would be the ordinary one. There would be also an extraordinary model, in which the UN would be the only trustee. This model would be possible in two instances: when the country of the applicant for a private company is not technologically able to act as a trustee or when the applicant of the activity is a country itself. Furthermore, as stated previously, the beneficiaries of this trust are the countries of the world and their citizens; hence all mankind would take concrete profit from lease transactions and benefit sharing. The income from the sales, leases and benefit sharing can be distributed to mankind by financing international global goals, following a similar model of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals adopted by the United Nations in 2015, which addressed poverty, inequality, climate change, environmental degradation, and peace and justice. Finally, the International Legal Trust System would meet acceptance because every country would obtain benefit sharing to improve its living standard and space faring nations would rely on property rights.

#### The legal trust would incentivize investment in space while preventing conflict and ensuring sustainable development and the equitable distributions of resources.

Finoa ’20 – Ivan Finoa [Department of Law, University of Turin], “An international legal trust system to deal with the new space era,” 71st International Astronautical Congress (IAC) – The CyberSpace Edition, (12-14 October 2020). <<https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/66728932/_IAC_20_E7.VP.8.x58518_An_international_legal_trust_system_to_deal_with_the_new_space_era_BY_IVAN_FINO-with-cover-page-v2.pdf?Expires=1642044926&Signature=asvt6StaK5n9UnpXuJIlo4ziI839WzFYjDZy37bm70ObGy3vFJyHwWNGxhn2beze4QzYDPPX0pVEXAwYvDaINVNxN01Ify8YwG5loNRddlat-grf3iawic7KvwqPowxFe2GuemVvbB-KW8ZVBxigwS-gelSKIVy4KYR9UgiDrM6e6deEBnUTcULSwmsH-JdHNg13ytZ3vNVMMlxZW2MPOCRuB2WlOHdCLoC86VqafSoMwuec-d~Aisbgyt5F2vO-GjvI60bR7h2MSp0iT6P7apIDUUpHUsDGbvcdxp22HSxXdlvr7lSqtLnL5rKxujGDYq~R9B~WuGiorVL2hn74UQ__&Key-Pair-Id=APKAJLOHF5GGSLRBV4ZA>>CT

Considering the worsening climate change, in the future outer space might be our last Noah’s Ark. Now, humans must look to space as an opportunity to support growing resource requirements. Asteroids are rich in metals, which could be transported back to Earth. Unfortunately, the existing international legal framework discourages investments in the space economy. Once an enterprise invests billions of dollars in discovering and developing a mining site, it cannot claim any ownership because of the non-appropriation principle stipulated in Article 2 of the Outer Space Treaty (OST). Thus, other entities could legally access and exploit the same resource without any participation in the initial financial investment, increasing the risk of potential conflict. Bearing this in mind, the question arises, which legal regime could ensure effective allocation of resources, avoiding a chaotic space race to acquire valuable assets? The aim of this research is to argue that the first two articles of OST should be amended, to set up an international legal trust system which would guarantee different kinds of rights, dependently on the nature of the celestial body. E.g., property rights could be preferable to a lease over asteroids, as they could be exploited to their disappearance. This proposed system would be led by the United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs (UNOOSA), as the main trustee. The co-trustees would be the nations of the world. Prior to initiating any space activity, every entity would send a request to their national government. If all the legal parameters are respected, the nation would forward the operational request to the UNOOSA. In the case of acceptance, UNOOSA would record the permit on an international public registry. The country in which the company has been registered would investigate whether the activities of its national company are consistent with the permit. This would be the ordinary model. The extraordinary model would be when the applicant for the space activity is a state, then the trustee would be the UN. All lucrative activities would be subject to benefit-sharing. Finally, this research will demonstrate the valuable outcome of the International Legal Trust System and its advantages for all humankind. Private companies would rely on property rights, while the benefit-sharing could be used to finance the 17 Sustainable Development Goals adopted by the UN in 2015, which address peace, climate change, inequalities and poverty.

### PIC

#### All states except the United States should ban the appropriation of Mars by private entities

#### Solves all their escalation scenarios and maintains benefits of space col of Mars

### DA

#### Current law is not a barrier to space settlement.

Gesl 18 [Paul M. Gesl (Maj, USAF JD), “PREPARING FOR THE NEXT SPACE RACE: Legislation and Policy Recommendations for Space Colonies,” A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements for the Degree of MASTER OF OPERATIONAL ARTS AND SCIENCES (April 2018). <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/AD1053024.pdf>] CT

Existing Legal Framework for Space Colonies

In 1967, the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (OST) entered into force.43 This document, which is over 50 years old, was drafted when space issues were very different, yet it is still the primary binding international law on space activities. The OST places several limitations on potential colonization; however, it does not forbid the activity.

The first hurdle to a potential colony is Article II of the OST. “Outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means.”44 One could argue that this would prevent any colonization. In fact, some do just that. Attorney Michael Listner, who founded Space Law and Policy Solutions, views this article as a non-starter for colonization efforts. “When a private citizen makes a claim to private, real property, basically, that’s saying the United States is making a claim as well, because of that continuing jurisdiction, the U.S. government always has.”45 The publication theoutline.com, relying on an interview with Listner,took this one step further, arguing that this means “any base or settlement on Mars would have to be free to use by anyone who can travel there. A person can’t just set up a colony, claim independence, and create rules that restrict access to it.”46 However, Lister’s interpretation is incorrect as it is too strict an interpretation of the language. Theoutline.com appears to take the interpretation to an untenable conclusion that is not supported by the evidence. Even though this position is not credible, it is important to discuss because as the United States moves towards colonization, it will face similar criticisms from opponents. Article II of the OST was not written to ban establishing a colony on a celestial body. Instead it was written to prevent a country from claiming a celestial body, such as the moon, as their own sovereign territory. This more permissive interpretation is supported by other provisions of the OST.

The OST contains language that supports establishing colonies. Article IV, while generally a prohibitive Article, states, “The use of any equipment or facility necessary for peaceful exploration of the Moon and other celestial bodies shall also not be prohibited.”47 If this leaves any doubt, Article XII likely clears up the confusion.

All stations, installations, equipment and space vehicles on the Moon and other celestial bodies shall be open to representatives of other States Parties to the Treaty on a basis of reciprocity. Such representatives shall give reasonable advance notice of a projected visit, in order that appropriate consultations may be held and that maximum precautions may be taken to assure safety and to avoid interference with normal operations in the facility to be visited.48

This Article establishes two important facts under the treaty. First, space colonization is acceptable under the OST. A colony easily fits within the definition of a station or installation. Quite simply, if the drafters of the OST intended to prevent States from establishing colonies, they would have most certainly done so in uncertain terms. Second, a State can establish a colony either unilaterally, or with a selected group of international partners. The visits discussed in Article XII would not be necessary if every colony needed to be open to the international community. This also eviscerates claims like those cited by theoutline.com, discussed above. If any colony were open to any party that could reach it, the visits by representatives in Article XII would be nonsensical. Looking at these details in the language of the entire treaty is important, because without it, one could argue that Article I in the OST would prevent a State from establishing a colony. If a space colony established by a single State would deny other states free access to an area of a celestial body (namely the area where the colony is established), then facilities would be banned outright. However, Article XII directly undercuts this weak argument.

It is important to note that the OST equally applies to commercial entities. Private corporations are currently leading the way in planning for space colonization. A company that did not sign, or even exist when the OST was signed, is still bound by its provisions. Article VI establishes that these entities have to conform to the treaty, and more importantly that “the appropriate State Party to the Treaty” must both authorize and supervise these companies. 49 While not binding, the United Nations has spoken on the matter.

Space activities should require authorization by a competent national authority; such authority or authorities, as well as the conditions and procedures for granting, modifying, suspending and revoking the authorization, should be set out clearly within the regulatory framework; States might employ specific procedures for the licensing and/or for the authorization of different kinds of space activities.”50

These two citations together indicate that the United States must authorize and supervise the activities of commercial companies operating in space. If those activities include colonization, then legislation must appropriately supervise it.

#### But, non-appropriation makes space settlement impossible- that’s their whole case. **AND, even if it’s theoretically possible, without private appropriation space settlement will not happen – no incentives, and would result in conflict.**

Thomas 05 [Jonathan Thomas, “Privatization of Space Ventures: Proposing a Proven Regulatory Theory for Future Extraterrestral Appropriation,” 1 BYU Int'l L. & Mgmt. R. 191 (2005). https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/ilmr/vol1/iss1/7]CT

The current corpus juris spatialis based on res communis has received wide criticism by legal commentators, in part because of the practical limitations of its idealistic principles in application. For example, one commentator addressing the potential problems of future colonization of celestial bodies argued that the prohibition against private and national appropriation may cause deleterious effects when colonizers build settlements. Although these colonizers may occupy the property, they will have no legal control of their communities and could be uprooted for the purposes of putting that property to a better use for the benefit of common heritage. This risk may serve as a strong disincentive to the preservation of sectarian colonization in a res communis society.

Other commentators argue that the current corpus juris spatialis based on the idealistic res communis principle has actually slowed the development of outer space exploration because privately and publicly funded organizations cannot appropriate outer space.61 Under the corpus juris spatialis, there exists no probability or possibility of return on investments, which results in insufficient monetary incentive for businesses or private persons. Even with the daunting needs created by increasing population and consumption, and decreasing resources on earth, many states may not even attempt to exploit extraterrestrial resources because the current corpus juris spatialis does not guarantee that their own citizens will benefit from the investments made with their tax dollars. A future lack of resources, combined with a body of law that mandates common ownership of potential resources, may create a black market for extraterrestrial resources, or it may engender armed conflicts over the lack of supplies available to states.63

While there is little past precedent to justify it, and little present sentiment to support it, the current corpus juris spatialis clings to the idea that in the future, humans will be able to share the resources of space in common. One commentator illustrates these idealistic ideas and assumptions:

The articles of the various [outer space J treaties all predicate themselves upon the theory that mankind will work together for the common good with no real advantage to be gained other than the praise of his fellow man. It assumes that people are able to co-operate, and that they will indeed do so whenever dealing with outer space ventures. While the global effort in researching, developing and exploring space for the sheer joy of the information obtained, accomplished in the spirit of teamwork is a noble goal, it is clear that a world full of economic strife is ripe to intervene.64

These assumptions of the Outer Space Treaty and the Moon Treaty are unrealistic at present. Perhaps someday humankind will develop ideal characteristics that the Outer Space Treaty and Moon Treaty would like it to engender. In the meantime, it may be impractical to attempt to solve the dilemma of space appropriation based on characteristics yet to be consistently demonstrated.

Furthermore, res communis principles would become problematic as applied to space law due to the following problems: (1) the application of res communis theory in the Western world has been unsuccessful; and (2) scarcity of resources in res communis society is fatalistic to the society. It could be argued that the success of res communis ideology, albeit on a small scale, indicates that humankind should be able to implement the res communis ideology into corpus juris spatialis. While res communis ideology has seen some success in other societies, it is not prudent to assume that it will enjoy the same successful application in our increasingly capitalistic, modern society. Societies that have successfully implemented res communis ideology have had entirely different goals and values systems than those of the capitalist societies that are now developing the means for further space exploration. 65 While the isolated successes of communal societies in Africa and the Australian Outback are indeed admirable, they are certainly not the pioneers of space exploration and appropriation. Furthermore, it is difficult to posit that capitalistic nations can successfully switch to a res communis ideology. Groups that originated in capitalistic societies and subsequently switched to communal living have ultimately failed and reverted back to the individual ownership system from which they came. 66

The second problem with using res communis as a basis for property endowment in outer space law is the damaging effect of individual appropriation on the community when scarcity arises. Even in a res communis society where the community owns all property, individual members of the community nonetheless use certain parts of that property to the exclusion of the rest of the community. Such individual use and appropriation against the community is seen as permissible under res communis ideology supported by Lockean notions of property endowment; an individual may exclude the community from property if he or she mixes his or her labor with that property. This individual appropriation does not have a damaging impact on the community as long as there IS "'enough and as good left in common for others.71 However, when there IS scarcity, the rights of the community against the individual become increasingly hostile.

In outer space, scarcity will always be an Issue and thus will limit the utility of res communis based on Lockean principles of property endowment.72 The universe potentially may contain billions of solar systems and planets, but some celestial bodies may prove to be gold mines, while others prove to be "the Sahara."73 More important than the scarcity of limited resources, however, is the scarcity created by human lifespan and technological limitations. The time that space travel presently takes in comparison to the average human life span limits our ability to exploit celestial resources. Furthermore, technological limitations already have created issues of scarcity: such as the increasing problems of satellite positioning and traffic in geostationary orbit.

#### Space Settlement is coming now and prevents inevitable extinction. Settlement requires private industry and rule of law.

Gesl 18 [Paul M. Gesl (Maj, USAF JD), “PREPARING FOR THE NEXT SPACE RACE: Legislation and Policy Recommendations for Space Colonies,” A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements for the Degree of MASTER OF OPERATIONAL ARTS AND SCIENCES (April 2018). <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/AD1053024.pdf>] CT

Why the United States Needs to Think About Space Colonization Now

The United States’ space policies under the previous two Presidential administrations have not matched the ambition of the commercial sector. The author has criticized the National Space Policies of both President Obama and George W. Bush as being too “Earth-Centric.”6 Based on the current state of technologies, it is easy to dismiss space colonization as, at best, a problem to worry about tomorrow and, at worst, mere science fiction. This is irresponsible. Reaching space is difficult. Colonizing it will be even more difficult; however, we cannot overlook it as a likely possibility. NASA viewed space colonization as an endeavor within humanity’s reach in the 1970s.7 Now it is beginning to take shape as a reality. In 2015 at the Pioneering Space National Summit, policy makers, industry leaders and advocates agreed that “The long term goal of the human spaceflight and exploration program of the United States is to expand permanent human presence beyond low-Earth orbit in a way that will enable human settlement and a thriving space economy. This will be best achieved through public-private partnerships and international collaboration (emphasis in original).”8 Additionally, there have been several attempts in Congress to pursue space settlement.9 Private industry appears to be taking the lead in this race. Elon Musk, the CEO of SpaceX intends to establish a colony of a million settlers on the surface of Mars.10 SpaceX is targeting the first manned missions to make this a reality to launch in 2024.11 Mr. Musk envisions the full colonization to take 40-100 years.12 Even if this timeline misses its ambitious deadline by a decade, humanity will be a multi-planetary species in many readers’ lifetimes. It is important to note that Mr. Musk recently stated that SpaceX is “building the first Mars, or interplanetary ship, and I think we’ll be able to do short trips, flights by first half of next year.”13 Even though he joked that the company might miss their timeline, his comments highlight that colonization is an issue that is fast approaching.14 Another factor to consider is that a legal framework needs to be developed before a Martian colony is at its full capacity. Mr. Musk envisions using SpaceX’s BFR to send approximately 100 people per flight to Mars.15 Additionally, SpaceX appears to be planning for humans living on the lunar surface in their Moon Base Alpha.16 SpaceX is not alone in their ambitions. United Launch Alliance (ULA) published their plans to expand the population of humans living and working in space. Their Cis-lunar 1,000 framework is a 30-year plan to develop the cis-lunar economy and grow the population of humans living and working in space from six to 1,000.17 Space colonization is more important to our species than the economic benefits of a space economy and the conquests of exploration. The current world population is 7.4 billion people.18 According to the World Wildlife Foundation and the Global Footprint Network, “the equivalent of 1.7 planets would be needed to produce enough natural resources to match our consumption rates and a growing population.”19 The problem will likely grow worse as the population of the planet continues to grow. According to the United Nations, the Earth’s population will grow to over 11 billion people by 2100.20 Based partially on this, “Prof [Stephen] Hawking said it was only a matter of time before the Earth as we know it is destroyed by an asteroid strike, soaring temperatures or over-population.”21 Hawking further stated that, “When we have reached similar crisis in or (sic.) history there has usually been somewhere else to colonise (sic.). Columbus did it in 1492 when he discovered the new world. But now there is no new world. No Eutopia (sic.) around the corner. We are running out of space and the only places to go are other worlds.”22 The late Professor Hawking is not alone in his view, the National Space Society observed the benefits of expanding into space. “Outer space holds virtually limitless amounts of energy and raw materials, which can be harvested for use both on Earth and in space. Quality of life can be improved directly by utilization of these resources and also indirectly moving hazardous and polluting industries and/or their waste products off planet Earth.”23 These are just several of the many compelling reasons to colonize space advocated by groups such as the National Space Society and the Space Frontier Foundation.24 ULA appears to be taking steps to meet their ambitions for the future. ULA announced the first step towards making their Cis-lunar 1,000 vision a reality. In October 2017, they announced a partnership with Bigelow Aerospace to launch a habitat to low lunar orbit.25 The launch is expected to be completed before the end 2022.26 Some feel that colonization is going to happen, no matter what governments do.27 If colonization is going to happen, then it is in the United States’ best interest to develop a legal framework that supports the efforts and protects our citizens who will travel to and live in these habitats. This is important for several reasons. First, private corporations appear to have an interest in colonizing space, so it is in humanity’s future whether the government is involved nor not. However, governments can take actions that will accelerate things.28 Second, it is in the best interest of the United States’ economy to support commercial companies that are expanding into space. Third, if the United States does not create a favorable legal framework for space colonization, someone else will. Finally, as humanity expands away from the surface of the Earth, it is important to create a free society based on the principles of the Rule of Law rather than some other form of government, or an anarchistic company town.

#### An extinction event is inevitable, unpredictable, and the risk is growing. Space settlement is the only solution and it requires a thriving private space industry including orbital installations, mining, and tourism.

Hertzler and Rench 16 [Kevin Hertzler and Rebecca McCauley Rench (PhD), “GLOBAL EXTINCTION or a Space-Industrial Complex,” Potomac Institute for Policy Studies (2016). <https://www.potomacinstitute.org/steps/images/PDF/Articles/HertzlerSTEPS_2016Issue3.pdf>] CT

Yet, the bigger existential threat of annihilation of all humanity, by nuclear holocaust or natural forces, is currently considered too remote to be taken seriously. The geological record has preserved the rise and decline of many species throughout earth’s history, whether their extinctions were the result of asteroid impacts, volcanic activity, solar flares, or gamma ray bursts from distant star systems. To think humanity above the historical trends of the universe is conceited and illogical. Perhaps it is time to reconsider the annihilation threat and to entertain the need for an off-Earth sustainable colony.

Humanity might not get a second chance at survival. The idea of an extinction event has long been fuel for science fiction writers, and is exemplified in the novel by Neal Stephenson entitled Seveneves. 3 In Seveneves, humanity will be wiped out on Earth within two years unless nations collaborate to put a small group of astronauts and scientists on the International Space Station in hopes they survive and repopulate the planet. Science fiction has been known to become science fact, both in ways that are beneficial to society, and in ways that have negative consequences. A study of threats and a dystopian future is also inculcated into academia, with Niklas Bostrom, the founder of the “Future of Humanity Institute,” as a recognized leader. While the risk in any given year might be quite small, there is almost certainly an eventual global extinction event. With a growing population and the speed of destructive technological advancements, the annual risk of humanity’s downfall may be increasing. When the inevitable is presented as a certain future, or happens before we can react, what will be humanity’s last collective thought? Given our current technological prowess, perhaps the time to take action is now. During a Wall Street Journal All Things Digital conference,4 Elon Musk said:

Either we spread Earth to other planets, or we risk going extinct. An extinction event is inevitable and we’re increasingly doing ourselves in.

World renown physicist Steven Hawking agrees and recently told a gathering at the Big Think:5

I believe that the long-term future of the human race must be in space. It will be difficult enough to avoid disaster on planet Earth in the next hundred years, let alone the next thousand, or million. The human race shouldn’t have all its eggs in one basket, or on one planet. Let’s hope we can avoid dropping the basket until we have spread the load.

The timing and the nature of this event remains truly unknown. Predictions suggest an existential event may come from space or be the product of our own hand, but we will likely remain ignorant of the cause until its near arrival. What we do know is that if humanity is still inhabiting only one planet, our unique life stories will be tragically and permanently erased. Thus, we confront the realization of the likelihood of a global extinction event that we have absolutely no control over, that we currently have no defense for, and no plans to escape from. We are deluded into believing that since an extinction event is rare, it can not occur in our lifetime. Consider the attitude expressed in the Jet Propulsion Laboratory’s Near Earth Object program’s website6 which states:

On an average of every several hundred thousand years or so, asteroids larger than a kilometer could cause global disasters … No one should be overly concerned about an Earth impact of an asteroid or comet. The threat to any one person from auto accidents, disease, other natural disasters and a variety of other problems is much higher than the threat from [Near Earth Objects] NEOs. Over long periods of time, however, the chances of the Earth being impacted are not negligible so that some form of NEO insurance is warranted. At the moment, our best insurance rests with the NEO scientists and their efforts to first find these objects and then track their motions into the future. We need to first find them, then keep an eye on them.

However, what will our response be if we find an NEO larger than a kilometer that is on a collision course with Earth? A database is not an insurance policy and leaves open the issue of an appropriate response. Currently, our only real hope lies with mitigation strategies predicated on intercepting7 or redirecting8 NEO objects. The former suggests using a robotic spacecraft that is weighted or carries a nuclear explosive and the latter will redirect the NEO object with a robotic spacecraft. However, as NASA states in their “Asteroid and Comet Watch” website9 a response requires decades of warning time if the NEO object is larger that a few hundred meters.

We needed Sputnik to motivate our resolve for the domination of space. The mental contrast of one day dreaming about space travel through science fiction, and then seeing it live on television in the living room, stimulated our imaginations. President Kennedy’s speech inspired a nation and the decade-long pursuit that saw a surge in academic scholarship and technological advances. There are many technologies and spinoffs10 woven into the fabric of the world culture that owe their birth to that speech and subsequent technology development.

Can we expect the development of a humanity insurance policy before a crisis begins? It might require funding of NASA at levels similar to the 1960s, when we successfully landed men on the moon. It might require the development of a space-industrial complex that could help drive future economic growth. It might require that we spread out to other planets and achieve Earth independence to stave off global human extinction, even on our watch. It does require that we take the threat, and its inevitability, seriously and devote resources to preventing our extinction.

The ancient seafarers were motivated to take risks for the sake of curiosity and the desire for exploration and resources.11 The drive to leave the planet and set up colonies is similar: There is the allure, the curiosity, the adventure, and the insurance. It could, and should, be an international effort justified based on the purpose of planning for the preservation of humanity.

Certain plans are underway. Mars One is a nonprofit organization that promotes its plans for a Mars settlement within fifteen years.12 Elon Musk’s company SpaceX is reportedly developing plans to send large numbers of people to Mars.13 And NASA recently released a comprehensive strategy14 that leverages nearterm space activities with a comprehensive capability development culminating in an independent human presence on Mars. The NASA plan, at a minimum, would provide a future with a sustainable presence for humanity in deep space and provide an answer to many global extinction scenarios. Some of these plans are more logistically feasible than others, but all demonstrate the ambition of a select sect of humanity interested in pursuing off-Earth colonization. This strategy is well reasoned and has the potential to save humanity as well as provide a much needed economic boost by creating a space-industrial complex with the nascent private-public partnerships15 for mining asteroids, manufacturing propellant on the moon, creating fuel depots, and launching humans into space. The spinoff technologies would fuel real job growth as evidenced by the Apollo program of the 1960s. Rather than a short lived event to win a space race, this modern space age will be designed as a sustained effort in human space colonization. The current roadblocks preventing this strategy from moving forward are budgets, political priorities, and the changeable public interests; the exact same denouement of the moon landings over 40 years ago. An article posted on the Washington Post website by Joel Achenbach made the following observation:16

At the moment NASA can’t even get an astronaut to the International Space Station without buying a seat on a Russian rocket. A new NASA space capsule that was conceived in 2005 likely won’t be ready until 2023, according to NASA’s latest estimate, and it’s built for 21-day missions, not for trips to Mars.

The same article quotes Doug Cooke, a former NASA associate administrator as saying:

There needs to be more of a plan for actually getting there [Mars]. You can’t have a flatline budget indefinitely and think you’re going to put all of this together by 2030.

We must support the mission of human space exploration and colonization with both our interests as well as our national budget priorities if we want any hope of surviving the inevitable existential global extinction event.

#### Space settlement outweighs every impact. Even slight delays result in an unfathomable loss of life.

Bostrom 03 [Nick Bostrom, “Astronomical Waste: The Opportunity Cost of Delayed Technological Development,” Utilitas Vol. 15, No. 3 (2003): pp. 308-314. https://nickbostrom.com/astronomical/waste.html#\_edn8,] CT

II. THE OPPORTUNITY COST OF DELAYED COLONIZATION

From a utilitarian perspective, this huge loss of potential human lives constitutes a correspondingly huge loss of potential value. I am assuming here that the human lives that could have been created would have been worthwhile ones. Since it is commonly supposed that even current human lives are typically worthwhile, this is a weak assumption. Any civilization advanced enough to colonize the local supercluster would likely also have the ability to establish at least the minimally favorable conditions required for future lives to be worth living. The effect on total value, then, seems greater for actions that accelerate technological development than for practically any other possible action. Advancing technology (or its enabling factors, such as economic productivity) even by such a tiny amount that it leads to colonization of the local supercluster just one second earlier than would otherwise have happened amounts to bringing about more than 10^29 human lives (or 10^14 human lives if we use the most conservative lower bound) that would not otherwise have existed. Few other philanthropic causes could hope to match that level of utilitarian payoff. Utilitarians are not the only ones who should strongly oppose astronomical waste. There are many views about what has value that would concur with the assessment that the current rate of wastage constitutes an enormous loss of potential value. For example, we can take a thicker conception of human welfare than commonly supposed by utilitarians (whether of a hedonistic, experientialist, or desire-satisfactionist bent), such as a conception that locates value also in human flourishing, meaningful relationships, noble character, individual expression, aesthetic appreciation, and so forth. So long as the evaluation function is aggregative (does not count one person’s welfare for less just because there are many other persons in existence who also enjoy happy lives) and is not relativized to a particular point in time (no time-discounting), the conclusion will hold. These conditions can be relaxed further. Even if the welfare function is not perfectly aggregative (perhaps because one component of the good is diversity, the marginal rate of production of which might decline with increasing population size), it can still yield a similar bottom line provided only that at least some significant component of the good is sufficiently aggregative. Similarly, some degree of time-discounting future goods could be accommodated without changing the conclusion.[7]

III. THE CHIEF GOAL FOR UTILITARIANS SHOULD BE TO REDUCE EXISTENTIAL RISK

In light of the above discussion, it may seem as if a utilitarian ought to focus her efforts on accelerating technological development. The payoff from even a very slight success in this endeavor is so enormous that it dwarfs that of almost any other activity. We appear to have a utilitarian argument for the greatest possible urgency of technological development. However, the true lesson is a different one. If what we are concerned with is (something like) maximizing the expected number of worthwhile lives that we will create, then in addition to the opportunity cost of delayed colonization, we have to take into account the risk of failure to colonize at all. We might fall victim to an existential risk, one where an adverse outcome would either annihilate Earth-originating intelligent life or permanently and drastically curtail its potential.[8] Because the lifespan of galaxies is measured in billions of years, whereas the time-scale of any delays that we could realistically affect would rather be measured in years or decades, the consideration of risk trumps the consideration of opportunity cost. For example, a single percentage point of reduction of existential risks would be worth (from a utilitarian expected utility point-of-view) a delay of over 10 million years. Therefore, if our actions have even the slightest effect on the probability of eventual colonization, this will outweigh their effect on when colonization takes place. For standard utilitarians, priority number one, two, three and four should consequently be to reduce existential risk. The utilitarian imperative “Maximize expected aggregate utility!” can be simplified to the maxim “Minimize existential risk!”.

# Case

### Colonization Top

#### Failure to colonize guarantees extinction

Munevar '19 [Gonzalo; 4/19/19; Professor at Lawrence Technical University; "Deflecting Existential Risk with Space Colonization," https://filling--space.com/2019/04/19/deflecting--existential--risk--with--space--colonization/]

Why do you argue that “failure to move into the cosmos would condemn us to oblivion”? By having a significant presence in the solar system in the next few thousands of years and beyond, we will be in a better position to deflect asteroids and comets that might bring the end of humanity, and much other Earth life, in a horrible collision. And if perchance one such catastrophe proves inevitable (e.g. a rogue planet passing through the solar system), humanity would still survive by having colonized Mars and other bodies, as well as by having built artificial space colonies of the type advocated by Gerard O’Neill. Once the sun begins to turn into a red giant in a few billion years, we must have long moved into the outer solar system. In the very long run, we have to move into other solar systems. Relativistic--speed starships would be nice, but they are not necessary for the task of moving humanity to the stars. We can reach them, slowly but surely, by propelling some of our space colonies away from the sun, carrying perhaps millions of human beings. They would take advantage of the many resources to be found in the Oort Cloud, and then of equivalent clouds in other solar systems. Even interstellar space has resources to offer. Nuclear energy, probably fusion, would likely be required. It may take us tens of thousands of years, but in the cosmic time scale, that is but a blink in the eye. What are these catastrophic threats? Are there any records of catastrophic events happening before humans appeared on Earth? I have already mentioned collisions with asteroids and comets. Although the active geology of our planet tends to erase the record of many collisions, we can find a well--preserved record on the Moon and Venus, the two closest bodies to Earth. On the 600--million--years--old Venusian surface, the spacecraft Magellan discovered about one thousand impact craters at least twice the diameter of meteor craters on Earth. This impact record makes it reasonable to estimate a catastrophic impact on Earth every half a million years or so. Collisions with bodies of 5 km across would happen, on the average, every 20 million years. Apart from the Alvarez asteroid (crater near Yucatan) that led to the extinction of the dinosaurs and the majority of species on Earth 65 million years ago, there have been at least two more impacts by asteroids 10 km or larger in the last 300 million years.

#### It’s a moral imperative for long-term survival

Kovic '20 [Marko; July 2020; co--founder president of the Zurich Institute of Public Affairs Research; "Risks of space colonization," https://osf.io/hj4f2/download]

Space colonization, the establishment of permanent human habitats beyond Earth, has been the object of both popular speculation and scientific inquiry for decades. The idea of space colonization has an almost poetic quality: Space is the next great frontier, the next great leap for humankind, that we hope to eventually conquer through our force of will and our ingenuity. From a more prosaic point of view, space colonization is important because it represents a long--term survival strategy for humankind1. Space colonization is tremendously important for the future of humankind in two ways. First, space colonization means that the total future number of humans who will exist and whose lives will be worth living could be orders of magnitude greater than today [2, 3, 4]. By colonizing space, humankind could therefore create a future that is generally morally desirable: There could be vastly more people to enjoy vastly more life--years worth living if we succeed in colonizing space. Second, engaging in space colonization represents a strategy for mitigating existential risks. Existential risks are risks that could result in the extinction of humankind or in the permanent curtailing of humankind’s potential for future development [5]. In a more technical sense, existential risks can be thought of as risks that could cause the permanent loss of a large fraction of humankind’s future moral expected value [6]: If humankind goes extinct or stagnates prematurely, the majority of humankind’s positive future value (the many thousands of generations and many billions of people who could lead lives worth living) would be lost. Mitigating existential risks is therefore a moral priority, even though the current generation of humans and other sentient beings might not be affected by them in their own lifetimes.

#### They can’t solve anything because states will just colonize other planets.

### Terrestrial war

#### No war- mad solves for all conflict. Deterrence is even stronger in space because retaliation could easily cause loss of habitat.

#### Empirics go neg – safeguards worked and we’ve learned from the past

Tertrais 17 – Deputy Director of the Foundation for Strategic Research (Bruno, “‘On The Brink’ – Really? Revisiting Nuclear Close Calls Since 1945,” The Washington Quarterly 40(2):51-66)

This is not the case. The absence of any deliberate nuclear explosion (except for testing) since 1945 can simply be explained by human prudence and the efficiency of mechanisms devoted to the guardianship of nuclear weapons. Banning nuclear weapons may or may not be a good idea. But it should not be based on the myth of an inherently and permanently high risk of nuclear use. The analysis that follows covers the deliberate use of nuclear weapons by a legitimate authority, either by error (“false alarm”) or not (“nuclear crisis”). It does not cover the risk of an accidental nuclear explosion, an unauthorized launch, or a terrorist act.3 It covers 37 different known episodes, including 25 alleged nuclear crises and twelve technical incidents, which have been mentioned in the literature to one degree or another as potentially dangerous.4 The short answer? If we are to discard Pope John Paul II’s explanation (“Divine Providence”),5 it is that the system worked and that, with rare exceptions, those in charge of nuclear weapons have been responsible, prudent, and careful. “Close calls” have ranged in fact from “not-so-close” to “very distant.” False Alarms A number of technical incidents have taken place since 1945, all of which led to one degree or another to nuclear precautionary measures, generally involving the elevation of alert levels. Most of these incidents are well documented, but one of them does not seem to have taken place at all. It was revealed in 2015 that in the midst of the Cuban Missile Crisis, a Mace missile squadron based in Okinawa received a launch order.6 The ambassador of a Latin American country to the United Nations claimed that this incident “could have altered the course of civilization forever.”7 One should note that according to the account—based on a single testimony—the safeguards worked: given that the procedure was not respected (the order came at DEFCON-2, whereas it was supposed to happen only at DEFCON-1), the unit commander suspended the launch.8 In any case, an in-depth inquiry by Stars & Stripes magazine at the end of 2015 did not find any confirmation of the incident; U.S. Air Force historians did not find any trace of it.9 At least a dozen real incidents took place in the United States in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s. (Even though there is little or no evidence that as many happened in other countries, one should assume that some also occurred in the Soviet Union or elsewhere.)10 In these cases, alert levels were elevated due to a false alarm, generally caused by the malfunction of a technical system. For instance, in 1960 a U.S. early warning radar in Greenland confused the moonrise with a missile launch.11 In 1961, a dysfunctional transmitter made the Strategic Air Command (SAC) believe that its lines of communication had been cut off.12 In 1962, a cascade of minor incidents and misinterpretation led to bombers being put on alert.13 The same year, a rare conjunction of events led a U.S. radar station to believe that a Soviet missile attack was underway.14 Something similar occurred in 1967, when a solar storm jammed three early warning radars.15 In 1980, two incidents caused by faulty computer chips led U.S. authorities to mistakenly believe that a Soviet attack could be underway.16 In the Soviet Union, a well-known 1983 incident of the same sort was recently publicized through a documentary entitled The Man Who Saved The World (2014), according to which “millions of lives were hanging by a thread,” and no less than “the end of our civilization” was at stake.17 A more sobering account of the incident casts serious doubts on whether this was actually the case. When the alarm sounded in the Soviet nuclear command center because of a U.S. missile launch, the officer in charge suspected that it was a mistake and requested visual confirmation. Such confirmation never came, and the command thus stood down.18 Some incidents involve direct human errors. This was the case for the infamous magnetic tape mistake of 1979, which went up the chain of command to the U.S. presidency. Woken up by a phone call announcing that 200 missiles were coming in the direction of U.S. territory, National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski requested a confirmation.19 He was informed a couple of minutes later that ten times that number of missiles had now been detected. The cause was the insertion of a tape used for training and exercises in SAC computers. Nobody knows what President Jimmy Carter would have done had Brzezinski told him that he only had a few minutes to decide, but can one seriously believe that he would have launched a massive counter-strike in the absence of any confirmation that an attack was underway? In a few of these incidents, a real launch caused confusion. In 1980, for instance, the Soviet Union launched four submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) as part of an exercise, and a U.S. early warning radar wrongly judged that one of them was going in the direction of the United States. This evaluation was quickly corrected.20 The Norwegian rocket launch of 1995 belongs in the same category and has become another poster child for nuclear dangers. However, the episode should rather be taken as a testimony to Russian cool-headedness. Norwegian and American scientists launched a new type of rocket, the Black Brant XII, in order to study weather data; they had sent word of the launch to Moscow, but the information had not reached the appropriate authorities. Since Black Brant XII was new, large, and with a high-altitude trajectory, its launch was interpreted as a possible missile strike. Some in the general staff raised the hypothesis of a highaltitude electro-magnetic pulse (EMP) detonation. Yeltsin considered an interception, but it soon became clear that Russia was not a target. “After the rocket emerged onto a ballistic curve, the direction of the flight became clear, and we could see that it would in no way touch on Russian territory, but land in the Spitsbergen region—we calmed down and took no serious measures …”21 Generals Vladimir Dvorkin, a well-known Russian expert, and Eugene Habiger, former head of STRATCOM, denied that the incident had any character of gravity.22 The System Worked Based on the above examples, one must wonder: is luck a necessary hypothesis to explain why none of these events led to nuclear war? Is it not at least equally possible that since 1945, people in charge of nuclear weapons “have taken greater care [of them] than is taken in any other situation involving human agents and complex mechanical systems”?23 Nuclear-armed countries have set up mechanisms designed to ensure that nuclear weapons will not be used by mistake. This includes fail-safe procedures (where non-use remains the default condition up until the last possible moment) as well as dual phenomenology (the need to confirm the attack by two independent means relying on different physical principles). When The Man Who Saved The World was shown in New York City, the Russian mission to the United Nations issued a communiqué that stated: “Under no circumstances a decision to use nuclear weapons could be made or even considered in the Soviet Union (Russia) or in the United States on the basis of data from a single source or a system. For this to happen, a confirmation is necessary from several systems: ground-based radars, early-warning satellites, intelligence reports, etc.”24 In all the incidents mentioned above, safety mechanisms worked, even in the early 1960s when they were still rudimentary. Furthermore, is it credible to imagine that the head of a State or government would order a nuclear strike without being certain that a major military attack was underway? U.S. nuclear expert Jeffrey G. Lewis rightly argues that he cannot imagine that an American president would embark in nuclear reprisals if there was the slightest doubt on the reality of the attack.25 Retired Russian General Vladimir Dvorkin thinks similarly, claiming that “No president, no matter what president it is, will ever make a decision about launch-on-warning based on information about one rocket or missile or even…two or three missiles.”26 From the point of view of logic and complex systems analysis, it remains possible that a combination of incidents can lead to the failure of all safety mechanisms designed to prevent accidental nuclear war. Such a thesis is embodied by the classic work of Scott D. Sagan, The Limits of Safety. It would thus only be “a matter of time” due to cumulative probabilities.27 In a recent documentary about nuclear risks, author Eric Schlosser reiterates the point: “it’s also due to luck, pure luck, and the problem with luck is that eventually it runs out…Every machine ever invented eventually goes wrong.”28 But the probability of failure increases markedly with time only if conditions do not change—and conditions do change. Safety mechanisms have been perfected (without necessarily becoming more complex) and lessons of past incidents are being learned. Sagan claimed in 1993 that the Yom Kippur war (see below), as well as the 1979 and 1980 incidents (see above), are proof that organizations fail to learn from experience. But if that was the case, why would the number of known incidents have significantly declined since 1983? We only know of one significant incident in nearly 35 years: the Black Brant XII episode. Charles Perrow, the father of “normal accidents” theory (those resulting from the complexity and interconnection of systems), wrote: “with regard to firing [nuclear weapons] after a false warning we reach a surprising conclusion, one I was not prepared for: because of the safety systems involved in a launch-on- warning scenario, it is virtually impossible for well-intended actions to bring about an accidental attack.”29

### Nanotech

#### Morton is entirely speculative and not actually about ai or nanotech

#### Long timeframe to nanotech benefits and impacts

**Nanowerk 7** (11/14, Nanowerk Spotlight: “Nanotechnology investing - understanding the technology and accepting the time frames are key.” http://www.nanowerk.com/spotlight/spotid=3294.php)

Probably not much help for an individual investor, who depends on publicly traded stocks for his investment, but an interesting guidance for professional investors in early stage companies, Dr. James M. Tour has published an article in the Fall 2007 issue of Nanotechnology Law & Business ("Nanotechnology: The Passive, Active and Hybrid Sides—Gauging the Investment Landscape from the Technology Perspective") where he describes a tool to pigeonhole a specific nanotechnology in order to gauge its commercialization horizon (0–5 years vs. 15–50 years vs. 7–12 years) based on the nanotechnology type: a passive, active or hybrid nanotechnology, respectively.

Tour is the Chao Professor of Chemistry, Professor of Computer Science, and Professor of Mechanical Engineering and Materials Science at Rice University and is also Director of Rice University’s Carbon Nanotechnology Laboratory in the Smalley Institute for Nanoscale Science and Technology.

Tour's basic premise is that investors are (or at least should be) proficient in assessing the business aspects of prospective investments in technology companies. Often though, especially with nascent and emerging fields like nanotechnologies, the technology horizon assessment remains illusive. By grouping different nanotechnologies into "passive", "active" and "hybrid" nanotechnologies he sets out to define categories that might be helpful to get a better grip on assessing a technology's time horizon with regard to commercialization. Some of his comments might also somewhat deflate the balloons of proponents of revolutionary, molecular manufacturing type nanotechnology. While he doesn't say it won't happen, he adds several decades to the more optimistic forecasts that are out there. "The truly exciting developments in nanotechnology, the ones that are science fiction-like in vision, are often 30-50 years away, or even 100 years out, so my suggestion is to invest elsewhere unless you have a dynasty-like horizon and the capital to sustain the vision at each round throughout the century" Tour tells Nanowerk. "Our research in the area of passive nanotechnology has shown that the simple addition of a nanomaterial to a host matrix can have a profound effect on the behavior of the overall composite structure, and applications are foreseeable in the near-term. The active nanotechnological components, which require far greater control, afford exciting laboratory demonstrations but their **utility is generally far off**. The hybrid systems, that enhance known complex platforms, are intermediate in horizon."

#### Grey goo theory is literally fiction

**Ball 2003** (Philip Ball, a science writer and a consultant editor of Nature (“Nanotechnology Science's Next Frontier or Just a Load of Bull?” New Statesman, June 23, Questia)

Such concerns say more about human nature than about nanotechnology. These fears loom large not because we are terrified, but because we are fascinated by them. Any nanotech researcher will tell you that assessing the prospects of this field on the basis of grey goo is like basing predictions of the impact of space travel on Star Trek. No one has the faintest idea how to make a replicating nanobot. "The nearest we can get to a self-replicating machine such as a mosquito is a helicopter," says Kroto--that is, big, cumbersome and not self-replicatingat all. The assembly-line approach to nanotechnology on which Drexler's grey goo idea was based, in which nanoscale robotic arms pick up and manipulate molecular fragments like so many factory components, is sheer fiction. Even Drexler no longer rates grey goo as an important concern for nanotechnology.

#### Grey goo isn’t a threat—qualified authors

**Park 03** Robert L.**,** Professor of Physics and former chairman of the Department of Physics at the University of Maryland, (“End of the World?” Issues in Science and Technology, Volume: 20. Issue: 1. Publication Date: Fall 2003. Page Number: 84, www.questia.com)

What follows is a set of brilliant essays forming more or less independent chapters that could be read in any order. He does not ignore the continued threat of nuclear holocaust or collision between Earth and an asteroid, but we have lived with these threats for a long time. His primary focus is on 21st century hazards, such as bioengineered pathogens, out-of-control nanomachines, or superintelligent computers. These new threats are difficult to treat because they don't yet exist and may never do so. He acknowledges that the odds of self-replicating nanorobots or "assemblers" getting loose and turning the world into a "grey-goo" of more assemblers are remote. After all, we're not close to building a nanorobot, and perhaps it can't be done. But this, Rees points out, is "Pascal's wager." The evaluation of risk requires that we multiply the odds of it happening (very small) by the number of casualties if it does (maybe the entire population). Personally, I think the grey-goo threat is zero. We are already confronted with incredibly tiny machines that devour the stuff around them and turn it into replicas of themselves. There are countless millions of these machines in every human gut. We call them bacteria and they took over Earth billions of years before humans showed up. We treat them with respect or they kill us.

So why isn't Earth turned into grey-goo by bacteria? The simple answer is that they run out of food. You can't make a bacterium out of just anything, and they don't have wings or legs to go somewhere else for dinner. Unless they can hitch a ride on a wind-blown leaf or a passing animal, they stop multiplying when the local food supply runs out. Assemblers will do the same thing. You should find something else to worry about.

### Warming

#### Space colonization by private companies solves risk of climate change within a decade.

Christina **Reedy, 17** - ("When Will the First Human Space Colony Be Established?," Futurism, 8-17-17, 12-26-2021https://futurism.com/when-will-the-first-human-space-colony-be-established)//AW

THE FINAL FRONTIER Our days on Earth may be numbered. Great minds have postulated that humanity must spread itself across multiple planets in order to avoid being entirely wiped out by one natural disaster. Physicist Stephen Hawking has gone so far as to predict such a catastrophe will occur on Earth in the next 100 years, which doesn’t give us much time to pack our rocket ships. Click to View Full Infographic Will humanity be ready to colonize space before doomsday? We asked Futurism readers when they thought humans will colonize off-planet, and the results revealed quite a consensus. More than 70 percent of people who took the poll thought a colony will be established during the first half of the 21st century, and the decade with the most votes — a whopping 36 percent of participants — was the 2030s. Satish Varma, a software engineer, explained why he voted for this decade. Varma wrote in his response that our technological advances in spacecraft design, artificial intelligence (AI), and bionics will be the driving forces that finally propel us into space long term. “Currently there are some promising advances in space exploration and artificial intelligence by companies like SpaceX, Google, and Tesla in a short time frame,” Varma wrote. Varma’s observations are right on — both SpaceX and Blue Origin have recently reached significant milestones in developing reusable rockets, which will be key in making space travel economically viable. Google has recently developed an AI that can learn almost as fast as we can, making the technology much more promising for real-world applications, like flying spaceships. ADVERTISEMENT WHAT THE EXPERTS HAVE TO SAY The technologies have enticed governments and companies around the world to take the idea of space colonization seriously. The two most popular targets for human occupation are currently Mars and the Moon. The Moon gets a little less attention these days, but scientists have estimated that we could build a colony there over the pan of six years and for as little as $10 billion. The Chinese and European space agencies are carefully examining the possibility of a Moon base, as such a resource would greatly reduce the cost of traveling to other planets — including Mars. On the Mars front, the United Arab Emirates (UAE) has announced its intention to establish a settlement on the Red Planet by 2117. Other nations are likely to beat the UAE in reaching this goal, however, as the U.S. government has tasked NASA with getting humans on Mars by 2033, and China has set an even more ambitions goal: by the end of the decade. These government efforts align with readers’ predictions. But SpaceX CEO Elon Musk hopes to prove just how much more efficient private companies are than government bureaucracies. His plan, too, is to send humans to Mars by 2020, but that isn’t his only goal. He wants to make travel to the Red Planet affordable, setting the price cap at $200,000 in his new plan that focuses on establishing a self-sustaining space civilization rather than a simple exploratory expedition. Such an establishment will be paramount to the future of the human species, Musk said. “History suggests there will be some doomsday event, and I would hope you would agree that becoming a multi-planetary species would be the right way to go,” Musk said at a press conference last year. “I want to make Mars seem possible… like something that we can do in our lifetimes.” ADVERTISEMENT With all these efforts to get humans off world over the course of the next few decades, it seems like a good bet a Martian colony is not only something this generation could see, but something it will.

#### Space exploration and research is crucial to solving climate change on earth

Greg **Autry 19**, 7-20-2019,( Greg Autry is an American space policy expert, educator, entrepreneur and author. He is a Clinical Professor of Space Leadership, Business and Policy at the Thunderbird School of Global Management at Arizona State University. He serves as Chair of the Safety Working Group on the COMSTAC.) "Space Research Can Save the Planet—Again," Foreign Policy, https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/07/20/space-research-can-save-the-planet-again-climate-change-environment/

The first glimpse humanity got of the world from above was transformative. In 1968, the U.S. astronaut William Anders returned from circling the moon in Apollo 8 with a photograph. It was a simple snapshot of the Earth, the whole Earth, rising above the desolate lunar surface. But it was also momentous, representing the very first time anyone had gotten far enough away to view how fragile the world was. The contrast between the lone blue-and-green marble and the cold emptiness of space was beautiful and shocking. As Anders later remarked, “We came all this way to explore the moon, and the most important thing is that we discovered the Earth.” Anders’s Earthrise photo provided conservationists with the iconic illustration they needed. On April 22, 1970, 20 million people turned out for the largest civic event in U.S. history: Earth Day. Today conservationists and other critics are more likely to see space programs as militaristic splurges that squander billions of dollars better applied to solving problems on Earth. These well-meaning complaints are misguided, however. Earth’s problems—most urgently, climate change—can be solved only from space. That’s where the tools and data already being used to tackle these issues were forged and where the solutions of the future will be too. Space research has already been critical in averting one major environmental disaster. It was NASA satellite data that revealed a frightening and growing hole in the ozone layer over the South Pole, galvanizing public concern that, in 1987, produced the Montreal Protocol: the first international agreement addressing a global environmental problem. Since then, thanks to worldwide restrictions on damaging chlorofluorocarbons, the ozone situation has stabilized, and a full planetary recovery is expected. As this case showed, space can provide the vital information needed to understand a problem—and a surprising range of ways to solve it. Climate change is a poster child for the critical role of space data. Trekking across the globe to measure ice sheets with drills and gauge sea temperatures from the sides of ships is an expensive, slow, and insufficient way to assay the state of the planet. Satellites operated by NASA, the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and an increasing number of commercial firms provide a plethora of multispectral imaging and radar measurements of developments such as coral reef degradation, harmful plankton blooms, and polar bears negotiating thinning ice. Much of the technology involved in observing the Earth today was initially developed for probes sent to explore other planets in our solar system. IT WAS NASA SATELLITE DATA THAT REVEALED A FRIGHTENING AND GROWING HOLE IN THE OZONE LAYER OVER THE SOUTH POLE, GALVANIZING PUBLIC CONCERN THAT, IN 1987, PRODUCED THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL: THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT ADDRESSING A GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEM. Indeed, understanding the evolution of other planets’ climates is essential for modeling possible outcomes on Earth. NASA probes revealed how, roughly 4 billion years ago, a runaway greenhouse gas syndrome turned Venus into a hot, hellish, and uninhabitable planet of acid rain. Orbiters, landers, and rovers continue to unravel the processes that transformed a once warm and wet Mars into a frigid, dry dust ball—and scientists even to conceive of future scenarios that might terraform it back into a livable planet. Discovering other worlds’ history and imagining their future offers important visions for climate change mitigation strategies on Earth, such as mining helium from the moon itself for future clean energy. Spinoff technologies from space research, from GPS to semiconductor solar cells, are already helping to reduce emissions; the efficiency gains of GPS-guided navigation shrink fuel expenditures on sea, land, and air by between 15 and 21 percent—a greater reduction than better engines or fuel changes have so far provided. Modern solar photovoltaic power also owes its existence to space. The first real customer for solar energy was the U.S. space program; applications such as the giant solar wings that power the International Space Station have continually driven improvements in solar cell performance, and NASA first demonstrated the value of the sun for powering communities on Earth by using solar in its own facilities. Promisingly, space-based solar power stations could overcome the inconvenient truth that wind and solar will never get us anywhere near zero emissions because their output is inherently intermittent and there is, so far, no environmentally acceptable way to store their power at a global scale, even for one night. Orbital solar power stations, on the other hand, would continually face the sun, beaming clean power back through targeted radiation to Earth day or night, regardless of weather. They would also be free from clouds and atmospheric interference and therefore operate with many times the efficiency of current solar technology. Moving solar power generation away from Earth—already possible but held back by the current steep costs of lifting the materials into space—would preserve land and cultural resources from the blight of huge panel farms and save landfills from the growing problem of discarded old solar panels. Sustainable energy advocates in the U.S. military and the Chinese government are actively pursuing space-based solar power, but just making solar cells damages the environment due to the caustic chemicals employed. Space technology offers the possibility of freeing the Earth’s fragile biosphere and culturally important sites from the otherwise unavoidable damage caused by manufacturing and mining. The U.S. start-up Made in Space is currently taking the first steps toward manufacturing in orbit. The company’s fiber-optic cable, produced by machinery on the International Space Station, is orders of magnitude more efficient than anything made on Earth, where the heavy gravity creates tiny flaws in the material. Made in Space and others are eventually planning to build large structures, such as solar power stations, in space. As these technologies develop, they will augment each other, bringing costs down dramatically; space manufacturing, for instance, slashes the cost of solar installations in space. MINING THE SOLAR SYSTEM COMES WITH ITS OWN POTENTIAL IMPACTS, BUT EXTRACTING RESOURCES FROM DISTANT AND LIFELESS WORLDS IS CLEARLY PREFERABLE TO THE CONTINUED DEGRADATION OF THE EARTH. Eventually, firms will be able to supply endeavors in space with materials from the moon and asteroids, avoiding the cost and environmental impact of lifting them into orbit. Mining the solar system comes with its own potential impacts, but extracting resources from distant and lifeless worlds is clearly preferable to the continued degradation of the Earth. Perhaps the most powerful role space can play is as inspiration. Space tourism might seem like a frivolity for the rich, but it can be so much more. I’ve spent some time with astronauts, and they all report that seeing the Earth without borders and observing its fragile atmosphere shook them to their core, inspiring in them a powerful sense of connection and respect for the environment. As Andrew Newberg, a neuroscientist and physician who has studied this “overview effect,” put it, “You can often tell when you’re with someone who has flown in space. It’s palpable.” Subjecting thousands of the world’s wealthiest and most powerful individuals to a transcendent experience couldn’t hurt—especially if less wealthy Earthlings soon get a chance to follow them. The leaders of the biggest space firms are already thinking way beyond tourism. Tory Bruno, the CEO of United Launch Alliance, envisions a future in which a thousand or more people work in Earth and moon orbits. These people would build stations, conduct research, and produce goods for use in space and on Earth. The Amazon mogul Jeff Bezos imagines a spacefaring civilization that keeps our home planet pristine and protected, as a sort of national park, while dirty extractive and manufacturing processes take place in orbital facilities. SpaceX’s Elon Musk wants to transform Mars back into the healthy world it once was and then fill it with life-forms from Earth—including a significant human population. Some experts have mocked this idea. But experts also lampooned Musk’s plans for reusing rocket boosters and building a high-performance electric car for the masses. The fact is that while some of the plans described by Musk, Bezos, and others might seem utopian or hubristic, given the realities of climate change, humanity needs hope. A future that concentrates only on managing apocalypse, without offering the potential for something better, is no future at all. In the worst scenario, our precious blue-and-green marble will end up looking like its neighbors Venus or Mars simply because we chose not to learn from them.

### Space militarization

#### Space commercialization is a strong constraint on conflict – solves space war

Wendy N. Whitman **Cobb 20**, is currently an associate professor of strategy and security studies at the US Air Force's School of Advanced Air and Space Studies, 7-21-2020, "Privatizing Peace: How Commerce Can Reduce Conflict in Space," Routledge & CRC Press, <https://www.routledge.com/Privatizing-Peace-How-Commerce-Can-Reduce-Conflict-in-Space/Cobb/p/book/9780367337834> // AAli

By the end of the twentieth century, scholars zeroed in on the democratic peace theory which attempts to explain why democracies do not go to war with other democracies and why, in some analyses, they seem to be more prone to peace in general than non-democracies. Similar to the golden arches, what is it about democracy that seems to induce such peacefulness? Academics have proposed everything from the nature of mediating institutions to the restraint of public opinion, to trade relations. While these variations will be explored further in Chapter 3, of interest here are the versions that focus explicitly on trade, commercial ties, and capitalism. Along these lines, Erik Gartzke argues, "peace ensues when states lack differences worthy of costly conflict."31 If the costs of conflict are too high, then states should be more unlikely to engage in it. To this end, economic globalization can provide the means through which costs are raised. “The integration of world markets not only facilitates commerce, but also creates new interests inimical to war. Financial interdependence ensures that damage inflicted on one economy travels through the global system, afflicting even aggressors."32 Focusing his analysis primarily on the influence of capitalism, Gartzke's findings suggest that states with markets more closely tied to the global economy are far less likely to experience a militarized dispute.

In thinking about the space environment today, there are obvious principles of capitalism at work. However, China, a major spacefaring state that has been making capitalist reforms, arguably remains far from a true capitalist country. This is especially true in their space industry which is heavily subsidized by the state and almost wholly integrated with China's military.34 Many other states continue to subsidize space activities heavily as well. A better approach through which to examine conflict in space is presented by an offshoot of the capitalist peace which is termed the commercial peace. The commercial peace thesis emphasizes the role of trade and the connections made through it to explain a lack of conflict. Han Dorussen and Hugh Ward write:

Trade is important not only because it creates an economic interest in peace but also because trade generates 'connections' between people that promote communication and understanding.... Based on these ideas, the flow of goods between countries creates a network of ties and communication links. If two countries are more embedded in this network, their relations should be more

peaceful 35

Given the interconnectedness of the global economy to space-based assets, a version of the commercial peace thesis can be used to argue that the chance of conflict in space is less than is commonly understood or recognized precisely because of the extent to which the global economy has become dependent on space-based assets.

To understand this argument, consider a scenario in which Russia, in preparation for a new assault on Eastern Europe, attacks a key US military satellite with the purpose of disrupting and disabling military communications in Europe. This action would conceivably enable the Russians to undertake their attack under more favorable conditions and prevent a quicker response from America and its allies. However, if the satellite was attacked via an ASAT that kinetically destroyed the US satellite, the debris cloud created from the attack could have disastrous consequences beyond military communications Much like the movie Gravity, the debris cloud could cause a chain reaction, hitting and ~~disabling~~ dismantling other satellites that would in turn disrupt civilian communications, business transactions, and perhaps even Russian military satellites. The economic effects of lost satellites would not be restricted to one country alone; the global economic consequences in terms of lost property (satellites), lost transactions, and financial havoc would echo throughout the world, including in Russia itself. Finally, the attack on one satellite could even ultimately endanger the ISS and its inhabitants, several of which are Russians. Destruction of the ISS would negate billions of dollars in investment from not just Russia, but other countries that have participated in it including Japan, Italy, and Canada. Therefore, an attack on a US military satellite would not just be an attack on one but an attack on all.

While the previous scenario highlights several reasons why it would not be in Russia's best interest to attack a US satellite, this book argues that the economic argument is both the strongest and the most restraining especially as space becomes more congested, competitive, contested, and commercialized. The emergence of private space companies enhances this argument. "In the commercial sector, companies need reliability and legal enforcement mechanisms if they are going to operate profitably in a shared environment."36 In order to foster the growing area of space commercialization, companies must be assured that the activities they undertake in space will be protected in some way or, at a minimum, allowed to proceed to the extent where they can reap the profit. This could be done through international organizations that would provide some sort of space traffic control, but the likelihood of a major international breakthrough on rules regarding space is unlikely in the near term. Therefore, actors must rely on the protections afforded them by an increasingly globalized economy that is ever more dependent on space-based assets.

#### MAD checks space escalation – nuclear response and debris

Bowen 18 [Bleddyn Bowen, Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Leicester. The Art of Space Deterrence. February 20, 2018. https://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/commentary/the-art-of-space-deterrence/]

Fourth, the ubiquity of space infrastructure and the fragility of the space environment may create a degree of existential deterrence. As space is so useful to modern economies and military forces, a large-scale disruption of space infrastructure may be so intuitively escalatory to decision-makers that there may be a natural caution against a wholesale assault on a state’s entire space capabilities because the consequences of doing so approach the mentalities of total war, or nuclear responses if a society begins tearing itself apart because of the collapse of optimised energy grids and just-in-time supply chains. In addition, the problem of space debris and the political-legal hurdles to conducting debris clean-up operations mean that even a handful of explosive events in space can render a region of Earth orbit unusable for everyone. This could caution a country like China from excessive kinetic intercept missions because its own military and economy is increasingly reliant on outer space, but perhaps not a country like North Korea which does not rely on space. The usefulness, sensitivity, and fragility of space may have some existential deterrent effect. China’s catastrophic anti-satellite weapons test in 2007 is a valuable lesson for all on the potentially devastating effect of kinetic warfare in orbit.

#### Government sector will inevitably militarize space

**Shamas & Holden, 2019**, Victor Shamas &, Oslo Metropolitan University, Work Research Institute (AFI), Oslo, Norway; Thomas Holden, Independent scholar, Oslo, Norway, 2019, Palgrave Communications, One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space, https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9

On the other hand**, outer space still remains firmly within the domain of the state and is likely to do so for the foreseeable future, with the likely continued importance of military uses of satellite technology and the weaponization of Earth’s orbit**—crucially, the Outer Space Treaty only prohibits nuclear arms and other ‘weapons of mass destruction' in space, not conventional weapons, such as ballistic missiles.