### 1

#### 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.

## Asteroid Mining DA

### New V

#### The private sector is essential for asteroid mining – competition is key and government development is not effective, efficient, or cheap enough. Thiessen 21:

Marc Thiessen, 6-1, 21, Washington Post, Opinion: SpaceX’s success is one small step for man, one giant leap for capitalism, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2020/06/01/spacexs-success-is-one-small-step-man-one-giant-leap-capitalism/

It was one small step for man, one giant leap for capitalism. Only three countries have ever launched human beings into orbit. This past weekend, SpaceX became the first private company ever to do so, when it sent its Crew Dragon capsule into space aboard its Falcon 9 rocket and docked with the International Space Station. This was accomplished by a company Elon Musk started in 2002 in a California strip mall warehouse with just a dozen employees and a mariachi band. At a time when our nation is debating the merits of socialism, SpaceX has given us an **incredible testament to the power of American free enterprise.** While the left is advocating unprecedented government intervention in almost every sector of the U.S. economy, from health care to energy, **today Americans are celebrating the successful privatization of space travel.** If you want to see the difference between what government and private enterprise can do, consider: It took a private company to give us the first space vehicle with touch-screen controls instead of antiquated knobs and buttons. It took a private company to give us a capsule that can fly entirely autonomously from launch to landing — including docking — without any participation by its human crew. It also took a private company to invent a reusable rocket that can not only take off but land as well. When the Apollo 11 crew reached the moon on July 20, 1969, Neil Armstrong declared “the Eagle has landed.” On Saturday, SpaceX was able to declare that the Falcon had landed when its rocket settled down on a barge in the Atlantic Ocean — ready to be used again. That last development will save the taxpayers incredible amounts of money. The cost to NASA for launching a man into space on the space shuttle orbiter was $170 million per seat, compared with just $60 million to $67 million on the Dragon capsule. The cost for the space shuttle to send a kilogram of cargo into to space was $54,500; with the Falcon rocket, the cost is just $2,720 — a decrease of 95 percent. And while the space shuttle cost $27.4 billion to develop, the Crew Dragon was designed and built for just $1.7 billion — making it the lowest-cost spacecraft developed in six decades. SpaceX did it in six years — far faster than the time it took to develop the space shuttle. ***The private sector does it better, cheaper, faster and more efficiently than government***. Why? Competition. Today, SpaceX has to compete with a constellation of private companies — including legacy aerospace firms such as Orbital ATK and United Launch Alliance and innovative start-ups such as Blue Origin (which is designing a Mars lander and whose owner, Jeff Bezos, also owns The Post) and Virgin Orbit (which is developing rockets than can launch satellites into space from the underside of a 747, avoiding the kinds of weather that delayed the Dragon launch). In the race to put the first privately launched man into orbit, upstart SpaceX had to beat aerospace behemoth Boeing and its Starliner capsule to the punch. It did so — for more than $1 billion less than its competitor. **That spirit of competition and innovation will revolutionize space travel in the years ahead.** Indeed, Musk has his sights set far beyond Earth orbit. Already, SpaceX is working on a much larger version of the Falcon 9 reusable rocket called Super Heavy that will carry a deep-space capsule named Starship capable of carrying up to 100 people to the moon and eventually to Mars. Musk’s goal — the reason he founded SpaceX — is to colonize Mars and make humanity a multiplanetary species. He has set a goal of founding a million-person city on Mars by 2050 complete with iron foundries and pizza joints. Can it be done? Who knows. But this much is certain: **Private-sector innovation is opening the door to a new era of space exploration**. Wouldn’t it be ironic if, just as capitalism is allowing us to explore the farthest reaches of our solar system, Americans decided to embrace socialism back here on Earth?

#### Space regulation scares investors away and spills over to other space activities. Freeland 05

Steven Freeland (BCom, LLB, LLM, University of New South Wales; Senior Lecturer in International Law, University of Western Sydney, Australia; and a member of the Paris-based International Institute of Space Law). “Up, Up and … Back: The Emergence of Space Tourism and Its Impact on the International Law of Outer Space.” Chicago Journal of International Law: Vol. 6: No. 1, Article 4. 2005. JDN. <https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1269&context=cjil>

V. THE NEED FOR CELESTIAL PROPERTY RIGHTS? ¶ The fundamental principle of "non-appropriation" upon which the international law of outer space is based stems from the desire of the international community to ensure that outer space remains an area beyond the jurisdiction of any state(s). Similar ideals emerge from UNCLOS (in relation to the High Seas) as well as the Antarctic Treaty, 42 although in the case of the latter treaty, it was finalised after a number of claims of sovereignty had already been made by various States and therefore was structured to "postpone" rather than prejudice or renounce those previously asserted claims.43 In the case of outer space, its exploitation and use is expressed in Article I of the Outer Space Treaty to be "the province of all mankind," a term whose meaning is not entirely clear but has been interpreted by most commentators as evincing the desire to ensure that any State is free to engage in space activities without reference to any sovereign claims of other States. This freedom is reinforced by other parts of the same Article and is repeated in the Moon Agreement (which also applies to "other celestial bodies within the solar system, other than the earth")." Even though both the scope for space activities and the number of private participants have expanded significantly since these treaties were finalised, it has still been suggested that the nonappropriation principle constitutes "an absolute barrier in the realization of every kind of space activity., 4 ' The amount of capital expenditure required to research, scope, trial, and implement a new space activity is significant. To bring this activity to the point where it can represent a viable "stand alone" commercial venture takes many years and almost limitless funding. From the perspective of a private enterprise contemplating such an activity, it would quite obviously be an important element in its decision to devote resources to this activity that it is able to secure the highest degree of legal rights in order to protect its investment. Security of patent and other intellectual property rights, for example, are vital prerequisites for private enterprise research activity on the ISS, and these rights are specifically addressed by the ISS Agreement between the partners to the project and were applicable to the experiments undertaken by Mark Shuttleworth when he was onboard the ISS.46

#### Asteroid mining can happen with private sector innovation and is key to solve a laundry list of impacts--climate change, economic decline and asteroid collisions. Taylor 19

Chris Taylor [journalist], 19 - ("How asteroid mining will save the Earth — and mint trillionaires," Mashable, 2019, accessed 12-13-2021, https://mashable.com/feature/asteroid-mining-space-economy)//ML

How much, exactly? We’re only just beginning to guess. [Asterank](http://www.asterank.com/" \t "_blank), a service that keeps track of some 6,000 asteroids in NASA’s database, prices out the estimated mineral content in each one in the current world market. More than 500 are listed as “>$100 trillion.” The estimated profit on just the top 10 asteroids judged “most cost effective” — that is, the easiest to reach and to mine, subtracting rocket fuel and other operating costs, is around $1.5 trillion.¶ Is it ours for the taking? Well, here’s the thing — we’re taking it already, and have been doing so since we started mining metals thousands of years ago. Asteroid strikes are the only reason rare metals exist in the Earth’s crust; the native ones were all sucked into our planet’s merciless iron core millions of years ago. Why not go to the source?¶ As a side project, space mining can grab water from the rocks and comets — water which, with a little processing makes rocket fuel. Which in turn makes even more currently unimaginable space operations possible, including ones that could give the planet all the energy it needs to avert climate catastrophe. Cislunar space — the bit around us and the moon, the local neighborhood, basically — is about to get very interesting.¶ It’s hard, even for the most asteroid-minded visionaries, to truly believe the full scope of this future space economy right now. Just as hard as it would have been in 1945, when an engineer named Vannevar Bush first proposed [a vast library of shared knowledge that people the world over would access via personal computers](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Memex), to see that mushroom into a global network of streaming movies and grandmas posting photos and trolls and spies who move the needle on presidential elections. ¶ No technology’s pioneer can predict its second-order effects.¶ The space vision thing is particularly difficult in 2019. Not only do we have plenty of urgent problems with democracy and justice to keep us occupied, but the only two companies on the planet to have gone public with asteroid-mining business plans, startups that seemed to be going strong and had launched satellites already, were just bought by larger companies that are, shall we say, less comfortable executing on long-term visions.¶ Planetary Resources was founded in 2012 in a blaze of publicity. Its funding came from, among others, Larry Page, Eric Schmidt, Ross Perot, and the country of Luxembourg. It had inked an orbital launch deal with Virgin Galactic. And it was sold last October to a blockchain software company. (To 21st century readers, this paragraph would look like I’m playing tech world mad libs.)¶ In January, the other company, Deep Space Industries, also partly funded by Luxembourg (way to get in the space race, Luxembourg!), was sold to Bradford Space, owned by a U.S. investment group called the American Industrial Acquisition Corporation. Maybe these new overlords plan on continuing their acquisitions' asteroid mining endeavors rather than stripping the companies for parts. Both companies have been notably silent on the subject. “The asteroid mining bubble has burst,” [declared The Space Review](http://www.thespacereview.com/article/3633/1), one of the few online publications to even pay attention.¶ That’s also to be expected. After all, anyone trying to build Google in 1945 would go bankrupt. Just as the internet needed a half-dozen major leaps forward in computing before it could even exist, space industry needs its launch infrastructure.¶ Currently, the world’s richest person and its most well-known entrepreneur, Jeff Bezos and Elon Musk, respectively, are working on the relatively cheap reusable rockets asteroid pioneers will need. (As I was writing this, Bezos announced in an email blast that one of his New Shepherd rockets had flown to space and back five times like it was nothing, delivering 38 payloads for various customers while remaining entirely intact.) ¶ Meanwhile, quietly, Earth’s scientists are laying the groundwork of research the space economy needs. Japan’s Hayabusa 2 spacecraft has been in orbit around asteroid Ryugu for the last year and a half, learning everything it can. (Ryugu, worth $30 billion according to Asterank, is the website's #1 most cost-effective target.) The craft dropped [tiny hopping robot rovers](https://www.space.com/41941-hayabusa2-asteroid-rovers-hopping-tech.html) and a [small bomb](https://www.space.com/japan-hayabusa2-asteroid-bomb-video.html) on its target; pictures of the small crater that resulted were released afterwards.¶ Officially, the mission is to help us figure out how the solar system formed. Unofficially, it will help us understand whether all those useful metals clump together at the heart of an asteroid, as some theorize. If so, it’s game on for asteroid prospectors. If not, we can still get at the metals with other techniques, such as optical mining (which basically involves sticking an asteroid in a bag and drilling with sunlight; sounds nuts to us, but [NASA has proved it in the lab](https://www.nasa.gov/directorates/spacetech/niac/2017_Phase_I_Phase_II/Sustainable_Human_Exploration/)). It’ll just take more time.¶ Effectively, we’ve just made our first mark at the base of the first space mineshaft. And there’s more to come in 2020 when Hayabusa 2 returns to Earth bearing samples. If its buckets of sand contain a modicum of gold dust, tiny chunks of platinum or pebbles of compressed carbon — aka diamonds — then the Duchy of Luxembourg won’t be the only deep-pocketed investor to sit up and take notice.¶ The possibility of private missions to asteroids, with or without a human crew, is almost here. The next step in the process that takes us from here to where you are? Tell us an inspiring story about it, one that makes people believe, and start to imagine themselves mining in space. How would you explain the world-changing nature of the internet to 1945? How would you persuade them that there was gold to be mined in Vannevar Bush’s idea? You’d let the new economy and its benefits play out in the form of a novel.¶ As Hayabusa dropped a bomb on Ryugu, Daniel Suarez was making the exact same asteroid the target of his fiction. Suarez is a tech consultant and developer turned New York Times bestselling author. His novels thus far have been techno-thrillers: his debut, [Daemon](https://www.amazon.com/dp/B003QP4NPE/ref=dp-kindle-redirect?_encoding=UTF8&btkr=1), a novel of Silicon Valley’s worst nightmare, AI run rampant, made more than a million dollars.¶ So it was a telling shift in cultural mood that Suarez’s latest thriller is also a very in-depth description of — and thinly-disguised advocacy for — asteroid mining. In [Delta-v](https://www.amazon.com/Delta-v-Daniel-Suarez-ebook/dp/B07FLX8V84/ref=sr_1_1?crid=UMNUUSR3NCBX&keywords=delta-v&qid=1556930756&s=digital-text&sprefix=delta-v%2Cdigital-text%2C204&sr=1-1), published in April, a billionaire in the 2030s named Nathan Joyce recruits a team of adventurers who know nothing about space — a world-renowned cave-diver, a world-renowned mountaineer — for the first crewed asteroid mission.¶ Elon Musk fans might expect this to be Joyce’s tale, but he soon fades into the background. The asteroid-nauts are the true heroes of Delta-v. Not only are they offered a massive payday — $6 million each for four years’ work — they also have agency in key decisions in the distant enterprise. Suarez deliberately based them on present-day heroes. The mission is essential, Joyce declares, to save Earth from its major problems. First of all, the fictional billionaire wheels in a fictional Nobel economist to demonstrate the actual truth that the entire global economy is sitting on a [mountain of debt](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-247-trillion-global-debt-bomb/2018/07/15/64c5bbaa-86c2-11e8-8f6c-46cb43e3f306_story.html?noredirect=on&utm_term=.5fb3ff1155d9). It has to keep growing or it will implode, so we might as well take the majority of the industrial growth off-world where it can’t do any more harm to the biosphere.¶ Secondly, there’s the climate change fix. Suarez sees asteroid mining as the only way we’re going to build [solar power satellites](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Space-based_solar_power). Which, as you probably know, is a form of uninterrupted solar power collection that is theoretically more effective, inch for inch, than any solar panels on Earth at high noon, but operating 24/7. (In space, basically, it’s always double high noon). ¶ The power collected is beamed back to large receptors on Earth with large, low-power microwaves, which researchers think will be harmless enough to let humans and animals pass through the beam. A space solar power array like [the one China is said to be working on](https://www.forbes.com/sites/scottsnowden/2019/03/12/solar-power-stations-in-space-could-supply-the-world-with-limitless-energy/#2d3f78a54386) could reliably supply 2,000 gigawatts — or over 1,000 times more power than the largest solar farm currently in existence. ¶ “We're looking at a 20-year window to completely replace human civilization's power infrastructure,” Suarez told me, citing the report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change on the coming catastrophe. Solar satellite technology “has existed since the 1970s. What we were missing is millions of tons of construction materials in orbit. Asteroid mining can place it there.”¶ The Earth-centric early 21st century can’t really wrap its brain around this, but the idea is not to bring all that building material and precious metals down into our gravity well. Far better to create a whole new commodities exchange in space. You mine the useful stuff of asteroids both near to Earth and far, thousands of them taking less energy to reach than the moon. That’s something else we’re still grasping, how relatively easy it is to ship stuff in zero-G environments. ¶ Robot craft can move 10-meter boulders like they’re nothing. You bring it all back to sell to companies that will refine and synthesize it in orbit for a myriad of purposes. Big pharma, to take one controversial industry, would [benefit by taking its manufacturing off-world](https://medium.com/fitch-blog/why-is-big-pharma-interested-in-the-space-economy-c078ac1bf67c). The molecular structure of many chemicals grows better in microgravity.¶ The expectation is that a lot of these space businesses — and all the orbital infrastructure designed to support them — will be automated, controlled remotely via telepresence, and monitored by AI. But Suarez is adamant that thousands if not millions of actual human workers will thrive in the space economy, even as robots take their jobs in old industries back on Earth.¶ “Our initial expansion into space will most likely be unsettled and experimental. Human beings excel in such environments,” he says. “Humans can improvise and figure things out as we go. Robots must be purpose-built, and it's going to take time and experience for us to design and build them.”¶ Which is another way startups back on Earth will get rich in the new economy: designing and building those robots, the nearest thing to selling picks and shovels to prospectors in the space gold rush. Thousands of humans in space at any one time will also require the design and construction of stations that spin to create artificial gravity. Again, this isn’t a great stretch: Using centrifugal force to simulate gravity in space was first proposed by scientists in the 19th century. NASA has had workable designs for spinning cislunar habitats called [O’Neill cylinders](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/O%27Neill_cylinder) since the 1970s. We just haven’t funded them. ¶ But the trillionaires clearly will.¶ In short, Suarez has carefully laid out a vision of the orbital economy that offers something for everyone in our divided society. For Green New Deal Millennials, there’s the prospect of removing our reliance on fossil fuels at a stroke and literally lifting dirty industries off the face of the planet. For libertarians and other rugged individualists, there’s a whole new frontier to be developed, largely beyond the reach of government. ¶ For those who worry about asteroids that could wipe out civilization — though luckily, [this isn't likely to happen any time soon](https://mashable.com/article/armageddon-asteroid-threat) — here is a way for humanity to get proficient in moving them out of the way, fast. Indeed, the National Space Society has offered [a proposal](https://space.nss.org/technologies-for-asteroid-capture-into-earth-orbit/) to capture the asteroid Aphosis (which is set to miss Earth in the year 2029, but [not by a very comfortable margin](https://www.space.com/asteroid-apophis-2029-flyby-planetary-defense.html)), keep it in orbit, and turn it into 150 small solar-power satellites, as a proof of concept. ¶ For the woke folks who care about the bloody history of diamond production, there’s the likelihood that space mining would wipe out Earth’s entire diamond industry. “They will be found in quantities unattainable on Earth,” claims Suarez, with good reason. We are starting to discover that there is more crystalized carbon in the cosmos than we ever suspected. Astronomers have identified one [distant planet made entirely of diamond](https://www.nationalgeographic.com/science/phenomena/2014/06/24/diamond-the-size-of-earth/); there may be more, but they are, ironically, hard to see. ¶ We don’t have diamond planets in our solar system (and we can’t do interstellar missions), but we do have diamond-studded asteroids. Mine them for long enough and you will wear diamonds on the soles of your shoes.¶ For investors and entrepreneurs, there is the thrill of racing to be the first member of the four-comma club. ([Neil deGrasse Tyson believes that the first trillionaire will be an asteroid mining mogul](https://www.nbcnews.com/science/space/neil-degrasse-tyson-says-space-ventures-will-spawn-first-trillionaire-n352271); Suarez isn’t sure whether they’ll be the first, but he suspects that asteroid mining “will mint more trillionaires than any industry in history.”) ¶ For the regular guy or gal with a 401K, there’ll be a fast-rising stock market — inflated not by financial shenanigans this time, but an actual increase in what the world counts as wealth.¶ For workers, there is the promise of sharing in the untold riches, both legally and otherwise. It would be hard to stop miners attaining mineral wealth beyond their paycheck, under the table, when your bosses are millions of miles away. Then there’s the likelihood of rapid advancement in this new economy, where the miners fast gain the knowledge necessary to become moguls.¶ “After several tours in space working for others, perhaps on six-month or year-long contracts, it's likely that some workers will partner to set up their own businesses there,” says Suarez. “Either serving the needs of increasing numbers of workers and businesses in space, marketing services to Earth, or launching asteroid mining startups themselves.” All in all, it’s starting to sound a damn sight more beneficial to the human race than the internet economy is. Not a moment too soon. I’ve written encouragingly about asteroid mining several times before, each time touting the massive potential wealth that seems likely to be made. And each time there’s been a sense of disquiet among my readers, a sense that we’re taking our rapacious capitalist ways and exploiting space.¶ Whereas the truth is, this is exactly the version of capitalism humanity has needed all along: the kind where there is no ecosystem to destroy, no marginalized group to make miserable. A safe, dead space where capitalism’s most enthusiastic pioneers can go nuts to their hearts’ content, so long as they clean up their space junk. ¶ ([Space junk](https://mashable.com/category/space-junk) is a real problem in orbital space because it has thousands of vulnerable satellites clustered closely together around our little blue rock. The vast emptiness of cislunar space, not so much.)¶ And because they’re up there making all the wealth on their commodities market, we down here on Earth can certainly afford to focus less on growing our stock market. Maybe even, whisper it low, we can afford a fully functioning social safety net, plus free healthcare and free education for everyone on the planet.¶ It’s also clearly the area where we should have focused space exploration all along. If we settle on Mars, we may disturb as-yet-undiscovered native bacteria — and as the character Nathan Joyce shouts at a group of “Mars-obsessed” entrepreneurs in Delta-V, Mars is basically filled with toxic sand and is thus looking increasingly impossible to colonize. (Sorry, Mark Watney from The Martian, those potatoes would probably kill you.)

## Case

# CASE

### AT: solvo

#### Their plantext is absolutely incoherent - how can the existence of private companies violate the non-appropriation principle?

#### the plan text would ban all private companies, which means economic collapse + even if the plan text is only about private space companies, it makes no sense because companies don't appropriate OS in the squo

#### THEIR SINGULAR SOLVENCY CARD DOESN’T SAY ANYTHING THEY CLAIM IT SAYS, their solvo is contingent on the CSLA licensing program which their whole card argues is a violation of the OST

#### Disregard the whole debris contention, it talks about all launches not just to appropriate and all priv companies not just US

### Solvency

#### NASA’s own study proves that public sector can’t clean up the orbit and is not slowing launch nearly enough. Private cleanup is NECCISSARY to solve.

**NASA** Office of Inspector General**, 21** - ("NASA’S EFFORTS TO MITIGATE THE RISKS POSED BY ORBITAL DEBRIS," Nasa office of audits Jan 27, 2021, 1-2- https://oig.nasa.gov/docs/IG-21-011.pdf/)//AW

Given the rapid increase of space activity worldwide and the current state of orbital debris in LEO, international space agencies and the scientific community agree that mitigation-only activities focused solely on prevention are not sufficient to stabilize the orbital debris environment. Rather, to effectively address the orbital debris issue, global mitigation and strategic remediation efforts are necessary. Multiple studies have found that the growth of debris in LEO can be slowed by ensuring that at least 90 percent of all spacecraft are removed from orbit within 25 years of the end of their mission, and at least five defunct spacecraft (that will not deorbit on their own) are actively removed from orbit every year. NASA’s consistent position is that preventing future debris will have greater impact on mitigating orbital debris risks than pursuing development of costly remediation technologies. Although NASA’s compliance rate for end-of-mission disposal within 25 years stands at approximately 96 percent over the last decade, the global compliance rate has only averaged between 20 to 30 percent—much lower than the 90 percent required to slow the rate at which debris is generated in LEO. Despite presidential and congressional directives to NASA over the past decade to develop active debris removal technologies, the Agency has made little to no progress on such efforts. Moreover, debris removal technologies from international agencies and commercial entities are in the early stages of development and testing. We found that NASA models of the orbital debris environment lack sufficient data, putting the Agency at risk of underor over-protecting spacecraft from debris. For objects larger than 3 mm, ODPO’s data is limited by the decreasing amount of time available on the three radars it uses to detect and statistically estimate debris due to funding, inoperable equipment, and competing priorities from multiple users. ODPO has also been unsuccessful in securing a source of measurement data on debris 3 mm and smaller in the 400 to 1,000 km range of LEO with failed missions and others canceled due to a lack of funding, a shortcoming particularly concerning because millimeter-sized orbital debris represents the highest penetration risk to most missions operating in LEO. In addition, NASA does not have the ability to track debris smaller than 10 cm in the range of LEO where the International Space Station resides and plans to rely on DOD’s Space Fence to track such debris. However, this ground-based radar system has not yet reached full operational capability, leaving the Station’s critical elements vulnerable to damage from this size debris. Finally, NASA evaluates ODARs and EOMPs to ensure programs and projects are complying with Agency orbital debris requirements, such as limiting the generation of debris and disposing of spacecraft safely. While the Agency has made improvements to this evaluation process, we found that ODARs and EOMPs were not consistently submitted to the Office of Safety and Mission Assurance in a timely manner (with some submitted nearly a year late), and the process used to route the reports for approval was laborious. Delays in providing the documentation for review could result in a missed opportunity for alternative or low-cost fixes to address mitigation issues.

### Multilat

#### Nonuq - Countries engage in multilateralism all the time—climate change negotiations, trade, WHO, UN—which means either a) the squo solves or b) the collapse of multilateralism is inevitable

#### They only have one card that vaguely gives one example, there are tons of others

### No Solvo

#### 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.

### Multilateralism Defense

#### Multilateralism fails—*diverging interests* and a *lack of faith* guarantee cooperation is at best superficial

Heribert Dieter 14, Senior Associate at the German Institute for International and Security Affairs, Non-Resident Senior Fellow, Chongyang Institute for Financial Studies, Visiting Professor for International Political Economy at Zeppelin University, Doctorate in Political Science and Economics, Free University of Berlin, 1/31/14, The G-20 and the Dilemma of Asymmetric Sovereignty – Why Multilateralism Is Failing in Crisis Prevention, International Relations and Security Network, <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/Digital-Library/Articles/Detail/?lng=en&id=176145>

Yet, tightening the rules for financial market regulation is not the only field where the G-20 is failing. Despite the mantra-like repetition of memoranda of understanding, the trade ministers of the G-20 have not been able to overcome their conflicts of interest and reach a settlement in the Doha Round of the World Trade Organization (WTO). What are the reasons for this failure?Although the G-20 managed to prevent a revival of protectionist measures on a broad front in the midst of the crisis, there is a large gap between the announcements of the G-20 and quantifiable results in trade policy. There is not one final communiqué that lacks a clear statement stressing the importance of the WTO and the necessity to conclude the Doha Round. Nonetheless, the reality of trade policy looks very different. All the states that are preventing the conclusion of the Doha Round through their vetoes are members of the G-20.

Despite there being little public information available on the reasons for the deadlock in the Doha Round, it is known that the US, Brazil, and China are blocking its conclusion. The emerging economies Brazil and China oppose the US’s demand for the complete elimination of tariffs on industrial goods. Conversely, the US resists the request to comprehensively abandon subsidies to the agricultural sector.Thus, the Doha Round is not concluded because three important members of the G-20 no longer believe in multilateral solutions and would rather engage in preferential agreements. For experts in the field of international trade, this is a paradox. There is a broad consensus that a single rulebook for international trade would facilitate economic growth and contribute to a worldwide increase in prosperity. This, however, cannot be said for the currently popular free trade agreements. So why are the countries in the G-20 incapable of further developing the common rules for international trade? One explanation is the lack of a hegemonic power that is willing to guarantee compliance with the rules of the game, but at the same time establish a system that provides member countries with sufficient economic benefits. In any event, this is how the postwar economy emerged: The US enforced the system of Bretton Woods and made sure that the participation in this economic regime remained attractive. Of course, the Bretton Woods regime never was a truly global system, since member countries of the Council on Mutual Economic Assistance did not participate. Still, within the bipolar order of the Cold War, the US managed to keep the system open and stable.¶ After the collapse of the USSR and the following short-lived “unipolar moment” (Charles Krauthammer) of complete hegemony of the US, the multilateral order was being advanced until 1995, the founding year of the WTO. Since the turn of the millennium and the parallel emergence of a multipolar order, nearly all attempts to organize cooperation without hegemony (Bob Keohane) have failed. The present multipolar world is characterized by superficial cooperation. Global Governance, whether in policies to prevent further climate change or in economic policy, remains on hold. Even worse: The world is returning to regulation on the level of the nation-state and non-cooperation. The American political scientist Ian Bremmer refers to the resulting situation as “G-Zero,” an era in which groups such as the G-20 will no longer play a vital role. The negative perception of the international division of labor¶ Apparently, there is no such thing as an identity of interests of individual states, as assumed by the advocates of global regulation and global governance. In other words: The gap between the preferences of individual states is widening rather than narrowing. However, governments must respect the preferences of their societies in the formulation of policies if they do not wish to lose legitimacy. Then again, the different preferences of societies are the immediate result of severely diverging perceptions of the international division of labor. Even in the G-20, individual societies have very different perceptions of the effects of globalization and its economic effects.¶ In Europe and the US, many people are increasingly critical of the international division of labor, if not outright hostile to globalization. According to a number of surveys, only about one-fifth to one-third of the respondents in OECD countries see greater opportunities than risks in globalization. Even in Germany, numerous politicians and citizens have been critical of globalization, although Germany strongly benefits from open markets and the resulting intensification of international trade.¶ Without a political anchoring in the member states, the G-20 has no future¶ The unfavorable perceptions of globalization and the outlined asymmetric sovereignty have resulted in a standstill in the G-20. Instead of a further development of the multilateral order, at best the status quo will be preserved. This is why we can expect nothing substantial – at least in terms of economic policy and financial regulation – from the G-20 summit in St. Petersburg on September 5 and 6. The structural impediments to successful financial regulation and trade policies on a supranational level cannot be overcome by the heads of government and state of the G-20. At least there is some hope in those areas where the countries of the G-20 have identical interests. This applies primarily to measures to close down tax loopholes. In 2008, ambitious expectations of a comprehensive reorganization of international trade relations through the G-20 were raised. Unfortunately, the G-20 cannot and will not deliver on crisis prevention. Today, more modest goals will have to be set. The key obstacle to success in the further development of global rules in trade and finance can be found in the G-20 societies themselves. Perceptions about globalization need to be addressed by policy makers at the national level, as do the widespread reservations about the international division of labor in the OECD countries. If societies continue to show diverging preferences, the development of comprehensive global economic governance in the G-20 will be all but impossible

### Turns

#### Competition in space increases cooperation and decreases conflict.

Cobb 20 [Whitman, Cobb, Wendy N.. Privatizing Peace : How Commerce Can Reduce Conflict in Space, Taylor & Francis Group, 2020. ProQuest Ebook Central, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/marlboroughschool-ebooks/detail.action?docID=6228909>.] CT

The value of competition

As noted in the first chapter, a subsidiary argument offered here is that, even if a space race should break out, military or civilian in nature, competition is not necessarily a bad thing. Much of the technological development noted previously that arose from space investment came at the height of the space race as both the US and the USSR were pouring billions of dollars into a race to the moon. The race itself had a civilian face with a military undertone, but its benefits were on the whole, positive. No overt military conflict arose, there was a significant investment in research, development, and technology, and the two space powers realized that they needed some sort of international framework to preserve their ability to operate in space. Both of these elements continue to be present today.

First, the increased threat of conflict in space could, coming as it does with an increased number of public and private actors and a greater economic threat, impress upon space participants the need to reign in dangerous actions and rhetoric. While it took an atmospheric nuclear test on the part of the Soviets to encourage both the US and USSR to come to the table in the 1960s, increasing awareness of economic and military dependence and the consequences arising from conflict in space could increase the enthusiasm to pursue new international agreements. For its part, the US military increasingly recognizes the dangers and the need to mitigate them, however, mitigation efforts have largely concentrated on offensive rather than defensive capabilities. 59 A focus on offensive weapons can only aggravate the situation and there are still significant technological hurdles in developing on-orbit offensive weapons. As such, a move away from such rhetoric, like Johnson-Freese argues for, is necessary.

Competition can also increase technological capabilities and those technological capabilities can in turn enable cooperation. 60 China is a case in point. In the 1990s and early 2000s when they were beginning to restart a human spaceflight program, Chinese officials often stated their desire to work with other powers in space, particularly the United States. China did in fact forge ties with other countries via space, in particular Brazil. However, as Chinese spaceflight technology advanced, the rhetoric of cooperation was pulled back some over a desire to enter into a partnership on equal footing. Once the Chinese could establish their abilities in space, they would be able to cooperate with potential partners as an equal, rather than junior, partner. 61

As more countries develop space technologies, the ability to help one another out also increases. The Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts obligates signatories to “take all possible steps to rescue and assist astronauts in distress and promptly return them to the launching state.” 62 More states with the ability to conduct crewed operations in space will only facilitate this type of help and cooperation. While fictional, this is just the type of scenario that played out in the book (and later movie) The Martian . When a supply rocket blows up on launch, NASA turns to China for a replacement that enables a Mars crew to return to Mars to rescue a stranded astronaut. These types of cooperative activities can in turn foster greater cooperation in areas other than space and science. In fact, one of the causal mechanisms through which the economic peace is hypothesized to act is via increased connections between people and private actors which can foster communication and mutual trust. 63 Similarly, sociological liberalism embraces the importance of links among people to create more peaceful global relations. 64 As greater cooperation emerges in space, it can spill over into other areas of interstate relations.

To return to the discussion of space as a global commons, the increased competition and potentially increased cooperation could lead to the type of situation that Ostrom finds powerful in fostering collective action. Increased ties, diplomatically and/or economically, can reduce the costs of engaging in collective action. Historically, space itself has been used to monitor and verify international agreements, thereby lowering the information costs for participants. The openness of space and the vulnerability of space infrastructure makes it an arena that is easily monitored; it takes a fairly low level of technology to track satellites in their orbits. States can provide the means through which private actors are coordinated and norms enforced. Private actors, given their increasing role in the commercial and military aspects of space can also be empowered and lend considerable weight to the discussions. Thus, while the commercial space peace theory presented here may seem rather pessimistic about the possibility of cooperation among states, it can also be seen as an optimistic vision where increased economic ties between space and among actors, state and non-state alike, bring countries to the negotiating table and create the conditions needed to ensure collective action.

The remainder of this book will take up various aspects related to this argument. The next chapter examines military and geopolitical considerations in space conflict while Chapter 6 discusses the various actors involved. Chapter 6, in particular, focuses on the new non-state actors that are driving significant change in earth’s relationship to space. Finally, Chapter 7 looks at the possibility of space races in the future given this new space environment with its proliferation of players. It ends with several policy suggestions that could be pursued to reduce the level of tension among space powers and create a scenario that recognizes both the dangers and promises of space.