### T – Global Commons

#### Interpretation – the affirmative debater must only defend the resolution.

-The resolution is Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust

#### Unjust refers to a negative action or contrary.

Black Laws, What is Unjust? https://thelawdictionary.org/unjust/

Contrary to right and justice, or to the enjoyment of his rights by another, or to the standards of conduct furnished by the laws.

#### Violation

They advocate for a global commons – this is res plus – it stops private entities in space BUT it also creates shared ownership ideas – those shared ownership ideas are NOT related to the resolution which ONLY talks about INJUSTICE

In other words they’re an argument for why that system is good and not why the present system is unjust. The Aff is a positive action – the resolution NEEDS ONLY NEGATIVE ACTION

CX proves the violation – they say global commons means that money is shared – that’s NOT AT ALL related to the injustices of space appropriation

#### Standards

#### Ground

Extra topical action allow the affirmative to moot all negative possible ground which is terminally unfair. My arguments justifying property rights in incoherent against an aff that reconceptualizes property ownership in the Global Commons whereas the res rejects property in space wholesale. My arguments about China space focus toward military with no option of a civilian sector focus is pre-empted when they a system to govern conflicts between states and actors. My US Heg disad is equally pre-empted. These are core positions. And the norm allows multiple plank aff’s to move out of any negative argument – ground k2 fair prep and clash which controls the internal link to nuanced education in round

#### Precision

The resolution doesn’t allow for a positive action which they defend, nor does the res allow for you making an ENTIRE NEW SYSTEM for conceptualizing space – res precision k2 stasis point – the topic is NEEDED for debate and it’s the only thing both of us have going into the round – otherwise we’re two ships passing in the night which decks in round education

#### TVA

Read a plan aff which advocates a Ban instead of a Global Commons – it would solve debris and tech companies in space without making a whole new system of the Global Commons

#### Voting Issues

#### Fairness is a voter:

1. Debate is a competitive activity- means any decision you render in an unfair round is arbitrary because unfairness skews the evaluation of a round
2. People see different things as educational but everyone can see blatant structural abuse

#### Education is a voter:

1. Debate is an educational activity- key to schools funding debate
2. Education is the only long term impact to debate

#### Drop the debater:

1. The abuse has already been committed- dropping the argument gives no incentive to not be abusive- drop the debater to promote good in round norms
2. ]drop the arg on T means you drop their advocacy which is basically drop the debater

#### Competing interps:

1. Reasonability is arbitrary- I don’t know what you think is reasonable so competing interps is the only way to render a decision on theory
2. Resolvability- clear and concise rules make theory easier to adjudicate

#### No RVIs:

1. If you win a counterinterp it just means your practice isn’t abusive- doesn’t justify voting for you
2. Chilling effect- if we give debaters RVIs other debaters will be too afraid to check abuse because good theory debaters will beat them on it- no way to check abuse

### DA

1. **Link Story**

**Aff claims to prevent orbital debris collision which would halts the economy---stops multiple key industries**

Thomas Junghyun Yoo 19, The Wharton School bachelor of business administration, January 2019, “House of Representatives: Save Vital Industries by Cleaning Up Orbital Debris”, https://www.change.org/p/save-vital-industries-call-for-subsidies-on-orbital-debris-removing-satellites

For over half a century, our world’s living standards have drastically improved because of satellites; they provide us with many great benefits including our smartphones’ telecommunications systems, **GPS** in airplanes, live international news, and **real-time stock updates**. Through all these benefits, satellites contribute **billions of dollars to our global economy**. However, we are at risk of losing all these benefits if we do not act soon because of orbital debris: out-of-control pieces of debris orbiting the Earth that can easily destroy satellites. We will be unable to use our **smart phones**, be forced to rely on **paper maps**, and be forced to live without the weather prediction systems we have today. For these reasons, we need to clean up orbital debris. Sign, promote, and share this petition to demand the US government to start subsidizing satellite manufacturers who demonstrate plans to build orbital debris-removing satellites. Even tiny pieces of orbital debris are devastating to satellites because they travel at speeds of 17,500mi/h. In fact, in 2011, we have lost about $600 million due to damages from orbital debris collisions. Our losses will certainly increase if we do not act on this problem because every time a satellite is destroyed via orbital debris, the destroyed satellite’s remains become even more orbital debris, which can then cause the destruction of even more satellites. Thomas Junghyun Yoo and Juwon Albert Moon are starting this petition because orbital debris has the potential to make our Earth’s orbit unsuitable for satellite and rocket launches- thus having the potential to cause **billions of dollars of damage to our global economy**. If we fail to act on this problem, the loss of our GPS systems will lead to disruptions in many industries such as **banking**, **power grids**, and **transportation.**

#### And, Satellite destruction is *good* – they’re *key to fossil-fuel driven capitalism* – collapse makes *extraction impossible*

Rothe 17 PhD, postdoctoral researcher at the IFSH (Delf, “Seeing like a satellite: Remote sensing and the ontological politics of environmental security,” Security Dialogue, https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010617709399)

Commercial satellite intelligence enacts environmental security on the basis of digitized and commoditized immutable mobiles circulated in the global economy of remote sensing. This global economy builds upon a ‘highly capital-intensive space infrastructure [that] is monopolized by a few national space agencies as well as a few multinational corporations’ (Parks, 2009: 541). So, while the commercialization of satellite remote sensing led to an expansion of the visual assemblage and an increased circulation of satellite images, access to the latter continues to be restricted. Instead of military secrecy, property-rights regimes and the heavy price tag on satellite images are now regulating access (Brannon, 2013: 289). At the same time, ‘“shutter control” remains firmly in the hands of powerful government institutions and unaccountable corporations’ (Dodge and Perkins, 2009: 498). In sum, following Dalby and others, I would argue that the visual commodities of this expanding assemblage represent a crucial new resource in a market-based risk management of environmental problems (Oels, 2013), seeking to secure the global fossil-fuels-based capitalist system from its toxic local excesses (Dalby, 2015: 431–433).

#### Impact Story

#### Stopping economic recovery key to cause sustainable transition—avoids extinction

**Heinberg 10—**journalist, teaches at the Core Faculty of New College of California, on the Board of Advisors of the Solar Living Institute and the Post Carbon Institute (Richard Life After Growth, 04 March 2010, http://www.countercurrents.org/heinberg040310.htm, AMiles)

By saying this, I am not suggesting that we should all simply give up and accept an inevitable, awful fate. Even though the collapse of the world's financial and industrial systems has started, effort now at minimizing further dire consequences is essential. Collapse does not mean extinction. A new way of life will almost certainly emerge **from the wreckage of the fossil-fueled growth era. It is up to those of us who have some understanding of what is happening, and why, to help design that new way of life so that it will be sustainable, equitable, and fulfilling for all concerned. We all need practical strategies and tools to weather the collapse and to build the foundation of whatever is to come after. Journey to a New Economy The propositions described above, and my personal journey, are the starting points for a search that can be summarized in a single question: What are the guideposts toward a livable, inviting post-growth society? This search has in many instances entailed a literal, geographic journey. During the past few years, as I traveled the lecture circuit, I met thousands of people who had already concluded on their own that the global stage was being set for an economic crash of epic proportions. They had passed through the psychological stages of grief—denial, anger, bargaining, depression, and acceptance. They were thinking creatively, building new lives, and experimenting with a wide range of strategies for meeting basic human needs while using much less of just about everything. Some of these folks, like me, had been thinking along these lines for a long time—since the 1970s. Many were much younger, though, had learned about Peak Oil or climate change just within the past few years, and had recently decided to devote their lives to building a post-hydrocarbon world. Some were clearly members of what was known in the 1970s as the "counterculture." Others were mainstream citizens—investment bankers, real estate sellers, high school teachers, small business owners, corporate middle managers—who had chanced upon information that awakened them forcibly from their routines. Many of these folks lived in large cities, but others in small towns or on farms; some were rich, some poor (a few by choice); some were devout, others agnostic or atheist; some were working alone on survivalist projects, while others were building community organizations; some saw the transition as a business opportunity while others were working through non-profit organizations. Here are just three examples that stand out. In 2005, while on a lecture tour in Ireland, I met a young college teacher named Rob Hopkins who believed that life could be better without fossil fuels. He had led his students in developing an "Energy Descent Action Plan" for their town, and believed he had the seed for something larger and more significant. He soon moved back to his native England to earn his Ph.D., and designed his thesis project around helping the village of Totnes begin a cooperative, phased process of transitioning away from its dependence on fossil fuels. This project in turn led to the start of a series of Transition Initiatives in villages, towns, and neighborhoods throughout the U.K. In 2007, a version of Rob's written Ph.D. thesis was published as a book (The Transition Handbook) that quickly began inspiring others to take up this strategy. Today there are hundreds of Transition Initiatives at various stages of development in a dozen countries (including over 50 in the U.S.). While in Montana for a speaking engagement at the University of Montana in Helena in spring 2009, some local Peak Oil activists drove me to the town of Ronan and introduced me to Billie Lee, who had helped start Mission Mountain Food Enterprise Center. The Center is housed in a fairly small, non-descript building and features medium-scale food processing equipment that local small food producers can rent at reasonable rates. This enables small farmers to produce value-added products (everything from canned soups to herbal tea bags) that are profitable and are price-competitive with those made by industrial food companies located hundreds or thousands of miles from Ronan. Local food has become an obsession for the sustainability-minded during the past few years, and local food systems will be a necessary pillar of post-growth economies. Yet aspiring small-scale farmers often have a hard time getting started because they cannot afford the equipment to enable them to produce profitable value-added products. Here in the tiny hamlet of Ronan was an ingenious solution to the problem, and one that deserves to be replicated in every agricultural county in the nation. On a trip to New England in 2007, I met Lynn Benander, a community energy activist and entrepreneur who had started a project called Co-op Power to bring renewable energy to low-income and multi-ethnic communities throughout the Northeast. Typically, renewable energy projects cost more to get going than conventional coal or gas power projects, and so they tend to be found in wealthier communities and regions. Conversely, the most polluting energy projects tend to be sited in or near poor neighborhoods or regions. Co-op Power aims to change that imbalance of power—in a way that any community can copy. A typical project: You help four people put up a solar hot water system and everyone comes to help you put up yours; you save 40 to 50 percent off your total system price, get to know your neighbors, and learn how your system works. Co-op Power had also pioneered a cooperative financing method that cuts through the usual roadblocks to renewable energy projects in poorer neighborhoods by leveraging member equity.** Individually, these initiatives and projects may seem to be on too small a scale to make much of a difference. But multiplied by thousands, with examples in nearly every community, they represent a quiet yet powerful movement. Few of these efforts have gained national media attention. Most media commentators who address economic issues are focused on the prospects—positive or negative—of the existing growth-based economy. These projects don't seem all that important within that framework of thinking. But in the new context of the no-growth economy, they may mean the difference between ruinous poverty and happy sufficiency. The trends are already in evidence: as the financial crisis worsens, more people are planting gardens, and seed companies are working hard to keep up with the demand. More young people are taking up farming now than in any recent decade. In 2008, more bicycles were sold in the U.S. than automobiles (not good news for the struggling car companies, but great news for the climate). And since the crisis started, Americans have been spending much less on non-essentials—repairing and re-using rather than replacing and adding. Many economists assume these trends are short-term and that Americans will return to consumerism as economic crisis shifts into recovery. But if there is no "recovery" in the usual sense, then these trends will only grow. This is what the early adopters are assuming. They believe that the nation and the world have turned a corner. They understand something the media either ignore or deny. They're betting on a future of local food systems, not global agribusiness; of community credit co-ops rather than too-big-to-fail Wall Street megabanks; of small-scale renewable energy projects, not a world-spanning system of fossil-fuel extraction, trade, and consumption. A future in which we do for ourselves, share, and cooperate. They're embarking on a life after growth.

#### Extinction – capitalism is unsustainable and the root cause of all violence and environmental destruction

Robinson 14 [William I. Robinson, Professor of Sociology, Global and International Studies, and Latin American Studies at UC-Santa Barbara, 2014, “Global capitalism and the crisis of humanity.” Cambridge University Press, https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/global-capitalism-and-the-crisis-of-humanity/5E69D07E53766BDCFBB9DF48C530267E]

Cyclical, Structural, and Systemic Crises Most commentators on the contemporary crisis refer to the “Great Recession” of 2008 and its aftermath. Yet the causal origins of global crisis are to be found in over-accumulation and also in contradictions of state power, or in what Marxists call the internal contradictions of the capitalist system. Moreover, because the system is now global, crisis in any one place tends to represent crisis for the system as a whole. The system cannot expand because the marginalisation of a significant portion of humanity from direct productive participation, the downward pressure on wages and popular consumption worldwide, and the polarisation of income, has reduced the ability of the world market to absorb world output. At the same time, given the particular configuration of social and class forces and the correlation of these forces worldwide, national states are hard-pressed to regulate transnational circuits of accumulation and offset the explosive contradictions built into the system. Is this crisis cyclical, structural, or systemic? Cyclical crises are recurrent to capitalism about once every 10 years and involve recessions that act as self-correcting mechanisms without any major restructuring of the system. The recessions of the early 1980s, the early 1990s, and of 2001 were cyclical crises. In contrast, the 2008 crisis signaled the slide into a structural crisis*. Structural crises* reflect deeper contra- dictions that can only be resolved by a major restructuring of the system. The structural crisis of the 1970s was resolved through capitalist globalisation. Prior to that, the structural crisis of the 1930s was resolved through the creation of a new model of redistributive capitalism, and prior to that the struc- tural crisis of the 1870s resulted in the development of corpo- rate capitalism. A systemic crisis involves the replacement of a system by an entirely new system or by an outright collapse. A structural crisis opens up the possibility for a systemic crisis. But if it actually snowballs into a systemic crisis – in this case, if it gives way either to capitalism being superseded or to a breakdown of global civilisation – is not predetermined and depends entirely on the response of social and political forces to the crisis and on historical contingencies that are not easy to forecast. This is an historic moment of extreme uncertainty, in which collective responses from distinct social and class forces to the crisis are in great flux. Hence my concept of global crisis is broader than financial. There are multiple and mutually constitutive dimensions – economic, social, political, cultural, ideological and ecological, not to mention the existential crisis of our consciousness, values and very being. There is a crisis of social polarisation, that is, of *social reproduction.* The system cannot meet the needs or assure the survival of millions of people, perhaps a majority of humanity. There are crises of state legitimacy and political authority, or of *hegemony* and *domination.* National states face spiraling crises of legitimacy as they fail to meet the social grievances of local working and popular classes experiencing downward mobility, unemployment, heightened insecurity and greater hardships. The legitimacy of the system has increasingly been called into question by millions, perhaps even billions, of people around the world, and is facing expanded counter-hegemonic challenges. Global elites have been unable counter this erosion of the system’s authority in the face of worldwide pressures for a global moral economy. And a canopy that envelops all these dimensions is a crisis of sustainability rooted in an ecological holocaust that has already begun, expressed in climate change and the impending collapse of centralised agricultural systems in several regions of the world, among other indicators. By a crisis of humanityI mean a crisis that is approaching systemic proportions, threatening the ability of billions of people to survive, and raising the specter of a collapse of world civilisation and degeneration into a new “Dark Ages.”2 This crisis of humanity shares a number of aspects with earlier structural crises but there are also several features unique to the present: 1. The system is fast reaching the ecological limits of its reproduction. Global capitalism now couples human and natural history in such a way as to threaten to bring about what would be the sixth mass extinction in the known history of life on earth.3 This mass extinction would be caused not by a natural catastrophe such as a meteor impact or by evolutionary changes such as the end of an ice age but by purposive human activity. According to leading environmental scientists there are nine “planetary boundaries” crucial to maintaining an earth system environment in which humans can exist, four of which are experiencing at this time the onset of irreversible environmental degradation and three of which (climate change, the nitrogen cycle, and biodiversity loss) are at “tipping points,” meaning that these processes have already crossed their planetary boundaries. 2. The magnitude of the means of violence and social control is unprecedented, as is the concentration of the means of global communication and symbolic production and circulation in the hands of a very few powerful groups. Computerised wars, drones, bunker-buster bombs, star wars, and so forth, have changed the face of warfare. Warfare has become normalised and sanitised for those not directly at the receiving end of armed aggression. At the same time we have arrived at the panoptical surveillance society and the age of thought control by those who control global flows of communication, images and symbolic production. The world of Edward Snowden is the world of George Orwell; *1984 has arrived;* 3. Capitalism is reaching apparent limits to its extensive expansion. There are no longer any new territories of significance that can be integrated into world capitalism, de-ruralisation is now well advanced, and the commodification of the countryside and of pre- and non-capitalist spaces has intensified, that is, converted in hot-house fashion into spaces of capital, so that *intensive* expansion is reaching depths never before seen. Capitalism must continually expand or collapse. How or where will it now expand? 4. There is the rise of a vast surplus population inhabiting a “planet of slums,”4 alienated from the productive economy, thrown into the margins, and subject to sophisticated systems of social control and to destruction - to a mortal cycle of dispossession-exploitation-exclusion. This includes prison-industrial and immigrant-detention complexes, omnipresent policing, militarised gentrification, and so on; 5. There is a disjuncture between a globalising economy and a nation-state based system of political authority. Transnational state apparatuses are incipient and have not been able to play the role of what social scientists refer to as a “hegemon,” or a leading nation-state that has enough power and authority to organise and stabilise the system. The spread of weapons of mass destruction and the unprecedented militarisation of social life and conflict across the globe makes it hard to imagine that the system can come under any stable political authority that assures its reproduction. Global Police State How have social and political forces worldwide responded to crisis? The crisis has resulted in a rapid political polarisation in global society. Both right and left-wing forces are ascendant. Three responses seem to be in dispute. One is what we could call “reformism from above.” This elite reformism is aimed at stabilising the system, at saving the system from itself and from more radical re- sponses from below. Nonetheless, in the years following the 2008 collapse of the global financial system it seems these reformers are unable (or unwilling) to prevail over the power of transnational financial capital. A second response is popular, grassroots and leftist resistance from below. As social and political conflict escalates around the world there appears to be a mounting global revolt. While such resistance appears insurgent in the wake of 2008 it is spread very unevenly across countries and regions and facing many problems and challenges. Yet another response is that I term *21st century fascism*.5 The ultra-right is an insurgent force in many countries. In broad strokes, this project seeks to fuse reactionary political power with transnational capital and to organise a mass base among historically privileged sectors of the global working class – such as white workers in the North and middle layers in the South – that are now experiencing heightened insecurity and the specter of downward mobility. It involves militarism, extreme masculinisation, homophobia, racism and racist mobilisations, including the search for scapegoats, such as immigrant workers and, in the West, Muslims. Twenty-first century fascism evokes mystifying ideologies, often involving race/culture supremacy and xenophobia, embracing an idealised and mythical past. Neo-fascist culture normalises and glamorises warfare and social violence, indeed, generates a fascination with domination that is portrayed even as heroic.