## 1

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose open source all aff docs including analytics on the 2021-2022 NDCA LD Wiki at least one hour before the round.

#### Violation – they don’t – insert this screenshot.

#### Graphical user interface, text Description automatically generated

#### Saying “analytics aren’t needed” in disclosure is wrong and a double turn with their method – people still disclosure analytic standards on phil ACs and this implies analytic arguments are “inferior” to carded arguments.

#### Vote neg:

#### 1 – Research skills – open sourcing allows small schools to research better and get back in the game.

#### 2 – Clash – open source allows substantive engagement of positions through preparation rather than ad-hoc generics – that turns their method because refinement of methods through nuanced clash allows for truth testing their arguments and building advocacy skills that are the portable impact to debate.

#### Drop the debater –

#### 1] It’s the same thing as dropping the argument in this case since the argument is the entire case that wasn’t disclosed

#### 2] It’s not what you do, it’s what you justify—voting for me sets a precedent in favor of a positive model of debate—wins and losses determine the direction of activity

#### 3] Deterrence—Dropping the debater will be best because it shows that they can’t run positions that could spread through the community and harm debate as a whole.

#### 4] Drop the debater specifically for not disclosing because there’s no way to rectify the abuse—going and forcing them to disclose now won’t fix the lack of education we get from this round.

## 2

#### Interpretation – resolved means “certain”.

USCADCC 20 [United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, “Gov't of Guam v. United States, 950 F.3d 104 No. 19-5131,” 02/14/20, LexisNexis, EA]

We begin with CERCLA's text. HN13 The phrase "resolved its liability" is nowhere defined in the statute, meaning our interpretation of these words should start "with their ordinary meaning." BP American Production Co. v. Burton, 549 U.S. 84, 91, 127 S. Ct. 638, 166 L. Ed. 2d 494 (2006). The word "resolve" usually means "to deal with successfully," "reach a firm decision about," or "work out the resolution" of something. Resolve, Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary 997 (10th ed. 1997). Our sister circuits have likewise concluded that in the context of section 113(f)(3)(B), "resolved" means "decided, determined, or settled-finished, with no need to revisit," Bernstein, 733 F.3d at 211, that is, a "firm decision" that is no longer "susceptible to further dispute or negotiation," Asarco, 866 F.3d at 1122 (internal quotation marks omitted). The word "[l]iability," in turn, means an "obligat[ion] according to law or equity." Liability, Merriam-Webster's [\*\*\*23] Collegiate Dictionary 670 (10th ed. 1997); see also Liability, Black's Law Dictionary (11th ed. 2019) ("the quality, state, or condition of being legally obligated or accountable; legal responsibility to another or to society, enforceable by civil remedy or criminal punishment."); Asarco, 866 F.3d at 1124 ("a settlement agreement must determine a PRP's compliance obligations") (emphasis added). HN14 Taking the phrase "resolved its liability" as a whole, we think it clear that "a PRP's liability must be decided, determined, or settled, at least in part, by way of agreement with the EPA." Bernstein, 733 F.3d at 212 (emphasis in original removed).

#### Violation – they don’t certainly determine that the private appropriation of outer space is unjust – [explain]

#### Vote neg –

#### 1 – Ground – not knowing what their aff results in makes it impossible to have stable link ground. All neg generics are predicated off a certain defense of the resoltuion.

#### 2 – Truth Testing – if they don’t always result in resolutional action, their method can’t logically affirm the question of the resolution.

#### Drop the debater – abusive advocacies skew substance – 1AR restart doesn’t check 1NC construction.

#### Competing interps – offense proves they’re not reasonable and anything else encourages arbitrary judge intervention.

#### No RVIs – leads to baiting T and chilling checks on abusive AFFs – causes substance crowdout.

#### Interpretation – resolved means “certain”.

USCADCC 20

resolved means finished no longer "susceptible to further dispute

## Util

### 1NC – Util

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing.

#### 1 – Pleasure and pain *are* intrinsic value and disvalue – everything else *regresses* – robust neuroscience.

Blum et al. 18

Kenneth Blum, 1Department of Psychiatry, Boonshoft School of Medicine, Dayton VA Medical Center, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, USA 2Department of Psychiatry, McKnight Brain Institute, University of Florida College of Medicine, Gainesville, FL, USA 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA 5Department of Precision Medicine, Geneus Health LLC, San Antonio, TX, USA 6Department of Addiction Research & Therapy, Nupathways Inc., Innsbrook, MO, USA 7Department of Clinical Neurology, Path Foundation, New York, NY, USA 8Division of Neuroscience-Based Addiction Therapy, The Shores Treatment & Recovery Center, Port Saint Lucie, FL, USA 9Institute of Psychology, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary 10Division of Addiction Research, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC. North Kingston, RI, USA 11Victory Nutrition International, Lederach, PA., USA 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA, Marjorie Gondré-Lewis, 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA 13Departments of Anatomy and Psychiatry, Howard University College of Medicine, Washington, DC US, Bruce Steinberg, 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA, Igor Elman, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, David Baron, 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA, Edward J Modestino, 14Department of Psychology, Curry College, Milton, MA, USA, Rajendra D Badgaiyan, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, Mark S Gold 16Department of Psychiatry, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA, “Our evolved unique pleasure circuit makes humans different from apes: Reconsideration of data derived from animal studies”, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, 28 February 2018, accessed: 19 August 2020, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6446569/>, R.S.

**Pleasure** is not only one of the three primary reward functions but it also **defines reward.** As homeostasis explains the functions of only a limited number of rewards, the principal reason why particular stimuli, objects, events, situations, and activities are rewarding may be due to pleasure. This applies first of all to sex and to the primary homeostatic rewards of food and liquid and extends to money, taste, beauty, social encounters and nonmaterial, internally set, and intrinsic rewards. Pleasure, as the primary effect of rewards, drives the prime reward functions of learning, approach behavior, and decision making and provides the **basis for hedonic theories** of reward function. We are attracted by most rewards and exert intense efforts to obtain them, just because they are enjoyable [10].

Pleasure is a passive reaction that derives from the experience or prediction of reward and may lead to a long-lasting state of happiness. The word happiness is difficult to define. In fact, just obtaining physical pleasure may not be enough. One key to happiness involves a network of good friends. However, it is not obvious how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to an ice cream cone, or to your team winning a sporting event. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure [14].

Pleasure as a hallmark of reward is sufficient for defining a reward, but it may not be necessary. A reward may generate positive learning and approach behavior simply because it contains substances that are essential for body function. When we are hungry, we may eat bad and unpleasant meals. A monkey who receives hundreds of small drops of water every morning in the laboratory is unlikely to feel a rush of pleasure every time it gets the 0.1 ml. Nevertheless, with these precautions in mind, we may define any stimulus, object, event, activity, or situation that has the potential to produce pleasure as a reward. In the context of reward deficiency or for disorders of addiction, homeostasis pursues pharmacological treatments: drugs to treat drug addiction, obesity, and other compulsive behaviors. The theory of allostasis suggests broader approaches - such as re-expanding the range of possible pleasures and providing opportunities to expend effort in their pursuit. [15]. It is noteworthy, the first animal studies eliciting approach behavior by electrical brain stimulation interpreted their findings as a discovery of the brain’s pleasure centers [16] which were later partly associated with midbrain dopamine neurons [17–19] despite the notorious difficulties of identifying emotions in animals.

Evolutionary theories of pleasure: The love connection BO:D

Charles Darwin and other biological scientists that have examined the biological evolution and its basic principles found various mechanisms that steer behavior and biological development. Besides their theory on natural selection, it was particularly the sexual selection process that gained significance in the latter context over the last century, especially when it comes to the question of what makes us “what we are,” i.e., human. However, the capacity to sexually select and evolve is not at all a human accomplishment alone or a sign of our uniqueness; yet, we humans, as it seems, are ingenious in fooling ourselves and others–when we are in love or desperately search for it.

It is well established that modern biological theory conjectures that **organisms are** the **result of evolutionary competition.** In fact, Richard Dawkins stresses gene survival and propagation as the basic mechanism of life [20]. Only genes that lead to the fittest phenotype will make it. It is noteworthy that the phenotype is selected based on behavior that maximizes gene propagation. To do so, the phenotype must survive and generate offspring, and be better at it than its competitors. Thus, the ultimate, distal function of rewards is to increase evolutionary fitness by ensuring the survival of the organism and reproduction. It is agreed that learning, approach, economic decisions, and positive emotions are the proximal functions through which phenotypes obtain other necessary nutrients for survival, mating, and care for offspring.

Behavioral reward functions have evolved to help individuals to survive and propagate their genes. Apparently, people need to live well and long enough to reproduce. Most would agree that homo-sapiens do so by ingesting the substances that make their bodies function properly. For this reason, foods and drinks are rewards. Additional rewards, including those used for economic exchanges, ensure sufficient palatable food and drink supply. Mating and gene propagation is supported by powerful sexual attraction. Additional properties, like body form, augment the chance to mate and nourish and defend offspring and are therefore also rewards. Care for offspring until they can reproduce themselves helps gene propagation and is rewarding; otherwise, many believe mating is useless. According to David E Comings, as any small edge will ultimately result in evolutionary advantage [21], additional reward mechanisms like novelty seeking and exploration widen the spectrum of available rewards and thus enhance the chance for survival, reproduction, and ultimate gene propagation. These functions may help us to obtain the benefits of distant rewards that are determined by our own interests and not immediately available in the environment. Thus the distal reward function in gene propagation and evolutionary fitness defines the proximal reward functions that we see in everyday behavior. That is why foods, drinks, mates, and offspring are rewarding.

There have been theories linking pleasure as a required component of health benefits salutogenesis, (salugenesis). In essence, under these terms, pleasure is described as a state or feeling of happiness and satisfaction resulting from an experience that one enjoys. Regarding pleasure, it is a double-edged sword, on the one hand, it promotes positive feelings (like mindfulness) and even better cognition, possibly through the release of dopamine [22]. But on the other hand, pleasure simultaneously encourages addiction and other negative behaviors, i.e., motivational toxicity. It is a complex neurobiological phenomenon, relying on reward circuitry or limbic activity. It is important to realize that through the “Brain Reward Cascade” (BRC) endorphin and endogenous morphinergic mechanisms may play a role [23]. While natural rewards are essential for survival and appetitive motivation leading to beneficial biological behaviors like eating, sex, and reproduction, crucial social interactions seem to further facilitate the positive effects exerted by pleasurable experiences. Indeed, experimentation with addictive drugs is capable of directly acting on reward pathways and causing deterioration of these systems promoting hypodopaminergia [24]. Most would agree that pleasurable activities can stimulate personal growth and may help to induce healthy behavioral changes, including stress management [25]. The work of Esch and Stefano [26] concerning the link between compassion and love implicate the brain reward system, and pleasure induction suggests that social contact in general, i.e., love, attachment, and compassion, can be highly effective in stress reduction, survival, and overall health.

Understanding the role of neurotransmission and pleasurable states both positive and negative have been adequately studied over many decades [26–37], but comparative anatomical and neurobiological function between animals and homo sapiens appear to be required and seem to be in an infancy stage.

Finding happiness is different between apes and humans

As stated earlier in this expert opinion one key to happiness involves a network of good friends [38]. However, it is not entirely clear exactly how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to a sugar rush, winning a sports event or even sky diving, all of which augment dopamine release at the reward brain site. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure.

Remarkably, there are pathways for ordinary liking and pleasure, which are limited in scope as described above in this commentary. However, there are **many brain regions**, often termed hot and cold spots, that significantly **modulate** (increase or decrease) our **pleasure or** even produce **the opposite** of pleasure— that is disgust and fear [39]. One specific region of the nucleus accumbens is organized like a computer keyboard, with particular stimulus triggers in rows— producing an increase and decrease of pleasure and disgust. Moreover, the cortex has unique roles in the cognitive evaluation of our feelings of pleasure [40]. Importantly, the interplay of these multiple triggers and the higher brain centers in the prefrontal cortex are very intricate and are just being uncovered.

Desire and reward centers

It is surprising that many different sources of pleasure activate the same circuits between the mesocorticolimbic regions (Figure 1). Reward and desire are two aspects pleasure induction and have a very widespread, large circuit. Some part of this circuit distinguishes between desire and dread. The so-called pleasure circuitry called “REWARD” involves a well-known dopamine pathway in the mesolimbic system that can influence both pleasure and motivation.

In simplest terms, the well-established mesolimbic system is a dopamine circuit for reward. It starts in the ventral tegmental area (VTA) of the midbrain and travels to the nucleus accumbens (Figure 2). It is the cornerstone target to all addictions. The VTA is encompassed with neurons using glutamate, GABA, and dopamine. The nucleus accumbens (NAc) is located within the ventral striatum and is divided into two sub-regions—the motor and limbic regions associated with its core and shell, respectively. The NAc has spiny neurons that receive dopamine from the VTA and glutamate (a dopamine driver) from the hippocampus, amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex. Subsequently, the NAc projects GABA signals to an area termed the ventral pallidum (VP). The region is a relay station in the limbic loop of the basal ganglia, critical for motivation, behavior, emotions and the “Feel Good” response. This defined system of the brain is involved in all addictions –substance, and non –substance related. In 1995, our laboratory coined the term “Reward Deficiency Syndrome” (RDS) to describe genetic and epigenetic induced hypodopaminergia in the “Brain Reward Cascade” that contribute to addiction and compulsive behaviors [3,6,41].

Furthermore, ordinary “liking” of something, or pure pleasure, is represented by small regions mainly in the limbic system (old reptilian part of the brain). These may be part of larger neural circuits. In Latin, hedus is the term for “sweet”; and in Greek, hodone is the term for “pleasure.” Thus, the word Hedonic is now referring to various subcomponents of pleasure: some associated with purely sensory and others with more complex emotions involving morals, aesthetics, and social interactions. The capacity to have pleasure is part of being healthy and may even extend life, especially if linked to optimism as a dopaminergic response [42].

Psychiatric illness often includes symptoms of an abnormal inability to experience pleasure, referred to as anhedonia. A negative feeling state is called dysphoria, which can consist of many emotions such as pain, depression, anxiety, fear, and disgust. Previously many scientists used animal research to uncover the complex mechanisms of pleasure, liking, motivation and even emotions like panic and fear, as discussed above [43]. However, as a significant amount of related research about the specific brain regions of pleasure/reward circuitry has been derived from invasive studies of animals, these cannot be directly compared with subjective states experienced by humans.

In an attempt to resolve the controversy regarding the causal contributions of mesolimbic dopamine systems to reward, we have previously evaluated the three-main competing explanatory categories: “liking,” “learning,” and “wanting” [3]. That is, dopamine may mediate (a) liking: the hedonic impact of reward, (b) learning: learned predictions about rewarding effects, or (c) wanting: the pursuit of rewards by attributing incentive salience to reward-related stimuli [44]. We have evaluated these hypotheses, especially as they relate to the RDS, and we find that the incentive salience or “wanting” hypothesis of dopaminergic functioning is supported by a majority of the scientific evidence. Various neuroimaging studies have shown that anticipated behaviors such as sex and gaming, delicious foods and drugs of abuse all affect brain regions associated with reward networks, and may not be unidirectional. Drugs of abuse enhance dopamine signaling which sensitizes mesolimbic brain mechanisms that apparently evolved explicitly to attribute incentive salience to various rewards [45].

Addictive substances are voluntarily self-administered, and they enhance (directly or indirectly) dopaminergic synaptic function in the NAc. This activation of the brain reward networks (producing the ecstatic “high” that users seek). Although these circuits were initially thought to encode a set point of hedonic tone, it is now being considered to be far more complicated in function, also encoding attention, reward expectancy, disconfirmation of reward expectancy, and incentive motivation [46]. The argument about addiction as a disease may be confused with a predisposition to substance and nonsubstance rewards relative to the extreme effect of drugs of abuse on brain neurochemistry. The former sets up an individual to be at high risk through both genetic polymorphisms in reward genes as well as harmful epigenetic insult. Some Psychologists, even with all the data, still infer that addiction is not a disease [47]. Elevated stress levels, together with polymorphisms (genetic variations) of various dopaminergic genes and the genes related to other neurotransmitters (and their genetic variants), and may have an additive effect on vulnerability to various addictions [48]. In this regard, Vanyukov, et al. [48] suggested based on review that whereas the gateway hypothesis does not specify mechanistic connections between “stages,” and does not extend to the risks for addictions the concept of common liability to addictions may be more parsimonious. The latter theory is grounded in genetic theory and supported by data identifying common sources of variation in the risk for specific addictions (e.g., RDS). This commonality has identifiable neurobiological substrate and plausible evolutionary explanations.

Over many years the controversy of dopamine involvement in especially “pleasure” has led to confusion concerning separating motivation from actual pleasure (wanting versus liking) [49]. We take the position that animal studies cannot provide real clinical information as described by self-reports in humans. As mentioned earlier and in the abstract, on November 23rd, 2017, evidence for our concerns was discovered [50]

In essence, although nonhuman primate brains are similar to our own, the disparity between other primates and those of human cognitive abilities tells us that surface similarity is not the whole story. Sousa et al. [50] small case found various differentially expressed genes, to associate with pleasure related systems. Furthermore, the dopaminergic interneurons located in the human neocortex were absent from the neocortex of nonhuman African apes. Such differences in neuronal transcriptional programs may underlie a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders.

In simpler terms, the system controls the production of dopamine, a chemical messenger that plays a significant role in pleasure and rewards. The senior author, Dr. Nenad Sestan from Yale, stated: “Humans have evolved a dopamine system that is different than the one in chimpanzees.” This may explain why the behavior of humans is so unique from that of non-human primates, even though our brains are so surprisingly similar, Sestan said: “It might also shed light on why people are vulnerable to mental disorders such as autism (possibly even addiction).” Remarkably, this research finding emerged from an extensive, multicenter collaboration to compare the brains across several species. These researchers examined 247 specimens of neural tissue from six humans, five chimpanzees, and five macaque monkeys. Moreover, these investigators analyzed which genes were turned on or off in 16 regions of the brain. While the differences among species were subtle, **there was** a **remarkable contrast in** the **neocortices**, specifically in an area of the brain that is much more developed in humans than in chimpanzees. In fact, these researchers found that a gene called tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) for the enzyme, responsible for the production of dopamine, was expressed in the neocortex of humans, but not chimpanzees. As discussed earlier, dopamine is best known for its essential role within the brain’s reward system; the very system that responds to everything from sex, to gambling, to food, and to addictive drugs. However, dopamine also assists in regulating emotional responses, memory, and movement. Notably, abnormal dopamine levels have been linked to disorders including Parkinson’s, schizophrenia and spectrum disorders such as autism and addiction or RDS.

Nora Volkow, the director of NIDA, pointed out that one alluring possibility is that the neurotransmitter dopamine plays a substantial role in humans’ ability to pursue various rewards that are perhaps months or even years away in the future. This same idea has been suggested by Dr. Robert Sapolsky, a professor of biology and neurology at Stanford University. Dr. Sapolsky cited evidence that dopamine levels rise dramatically in humans when we anticipate potential rewards that are uncertain and even far off in our futures, such as retirement or even the possible alterlife. This may explain what often motivates people to work for things that have no apparent short-term benefit [51]. In similar work, Volkow and Bale [52] proposed a model in which dopamine can favor NOW processes through phasic signaling in reward circuits or LATER processes through tonic signaling in control circuits. Specifically, they suggest that through its modulation of the orbitofrontal cortex, which processes salience attribution, dopamine also enables shilting from NOW to LATER, while its modulation of the insula, which processes interoceptive information, influences the probability of selecting NOW versus LATER actions based on an individual’s physiological state. This hypothesis further supports the concept that disruptions along these circuits contribute to diverse pathologies, including obesity and addiction or RDS.

#### 2 – Key to fairness – it matters – it preserves our value in winning, which demanding the ballot proves we have – the 2NR gets new weighing since the 1AC hasn’t shown its hand. TJFs outweigh on specificity – every framework is a question of how the judge should frame the round – normative warrants can’t explain why judges, specifically, should use them.

#### Their ROB is arbitrary and self-serving – how is it predctable or logical for a ballot to “embrace disability drive” – they’ll shift the goalposts to auto-affirm.

### 1NC – LBL

**1) On Mollow – if we’re epistemologically confused, then err towards a world in which we actually have a chance of figuring it out.**

**MacAskill 14** [William MacAskill, Associate Professor in Philosophy and Research Fellow at the Global Priorities Institute, University of Oxford, “Normative Uncertainty,” 2014, University of Oxford PhD Thesis, http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.677.4121&rep=rep1&type=pdf]

However, **even if we believe in a moral view according to which human extinction would be** a **good** thing, we still have **strong** **reason** to **prevent** near-term human **extinction**. To see this, we must note three points. First, we should note that the extinction of the human race is an **extremely high stakes** moral issue. Humanity could be around for a very long time: if humans survive as long as the median mammal species, we will last another two million years. 188 On this estimate, the number of humans in existence in the future, given that we don’t go extinct anytime soon, would be 2×10^14. 189 So if it is good to bring new people into existence, then it’s very good to prevent human extinction.

Second, human extinction is by its nature an **irreversible** scenario. If we continue to exist, then we always have the option of letting ourselves go extinct in the future (or, perhaps more realistically, of considerably reducing population size). But if we go extinct, then we can’t magically bring ourselves back into existence at a later date.

Third, we should expect ourselves to **progress, morally**, over the next few centuries, as we have progressed in the past. So we should expect that in a few centuries’ time we will have better evidence about how to evaluate human extinction than we currently have.

**2) Case proves social exclusion isn’t inevitable – util starting by considering all people valuable and implementing policies that assumes it can break down those oppressive structures.**

**4) Consequences good**

**1 – Predictions are good enough – if I drop a pencil, I have a pretty good chance of knowing the outcome is that it will fall. If they’re right, vote NEG on presumption because one outcome of their aff could be worse than the squo.**

## Counterplan

#### We affirm the entirety of the 1AC absent their advocacy of the resolution.

#### 1 – No such thing as a general principle.

#### a) advocacies are points of offense – if your offense is sourced from your advocacy, then we get to prove that your advocacy is bad. Ask yourself what voting aff means if the aff is hypothetically bad.

#### b) resolvability – No bright-line for determining what proves something generally true or generally false.

#### 2 – Counterplans negate – they prove an opportunity cost to their advocacy, which means it’s bad.

#### Private actors solve space war and specifically ASAT restraint.

Cobb 21 [Wendy N. Whitman Cobb, Associate Professor of Strategy and Security Studies at the School of Advanced Air and Space Studies, “Privatizing Peace: How Commerce Can Reduce Conflict in Space,” 2021, Routledge, pp. 68-69, EA]

Finally, given the involvement of an ever-larger number of private actors in space, states also need to consider the lost opportunity costs if private actors choose to forego research, development, and deployment of new technologies because the danger in space is too high. As space becomes more commercialized, these private actors can exert pressure on states to behave peacefully in order to promote further economic development. Gartzke and Quan Li argue that this can happen through the movement of capital from conflict-prone states or areas to non-conflictual states.50 This is not necessarily applicable to space because there is no area in space which is formally protected, but commercial space actors may choose not to engage in new economic investment which can in turn affect a state’s economic performance. To date, the size of the space sector is comparatively small, so, arguably, the potential economic loss would not be that great. Where the harm comes from is state reliance on private actors for military and national security space services. As states contract out space services to a greater extent, private actors exert an even greater influence over the state by having a capability they do not.

Why might private companies want a more conflict-free space? If there is weaponized conflict in space, they could potentially benefit through new launches to send up replacement satellites; this is similar to an argument that war can actually be beneficial to an economy because companies are needed to create materiel and weapons.51 But, in a debris filled environment, sending replacements is more difficult and dangerous. Some private companies want to engage in human spaceflight; a conflictual or more dangerous orbital environment would likely prevent those activities or increase their costs to such an extent that it becomes economically infeasible. James Clay Moltz argues specifically that “the growing presence of space tourists in low-Earth orbit would greatly increase the incentives for restraint in any future [ASAT] test programs.”52 Those foregone development costs and commercial activities can have a similar cost to states simply by discouraging private actors from participating in the market.

#### Goes nuclear – extinction.

Blatt 20 [Talia M. Blatt, “Anti-Satellite Weapons and the Emerging Space Arms Race,” 05/26/20, *Harvard International Review*, https://hir.harvard.edu/anti-satellite-weapons-and-the-emerging-space-arms-race/, EA]

Nevertheless, a space race born from the Cold War continues to unfold. While the current space race may not have the same monopoly on the American imagination as the sprint to the moon held during the 1950s and 60s, it deserves our equal attention. We are now witnessing the rapid and increasingly international development of anti-satellite weapons. The race for these weapons not only increases the risk of global conflict—it could jeopardize all future space exploration.

What Are Anti-Satellite Weapons (ASATs)?

Difficult to define, ASATs occupy a gray zone in international arms control. On one level, they are exactly what the term suggests: weapons designed to destroy or limit satellites for military purposes, such as undermining the command and control centers of an adversary’s military. ASATs can function in several ways. For example, kinetic energy ASATs (KE-ASATs) destroy satellites by physically colliding with them at high velocities. Drones, ballistic missiles, and explosives detonated near satellites can all function as KE-ASATs.

Conversely, non-kinetic ASATs use any non-physical mechanism to render a satellite inoperative, such as blinding satellites with lasers, launching cyberattacks, or jamming frequencies.

But definitional issues arise because any technology that can physically or non-kinetically damage a satellite can be considered an ASAT weapon. For example, supposedly benign technology aimed at removing defunct satellites or other space junk—known as Active Debris Removal (ADR) technology—can also remove active satellites. With ostensibly civil but covertly military capabilities or functions, many space technologies, including ADR, are put in a category commonly known as “dual-use.” The dual-use nature of space infrastructure makes differentiating between weapon and non-weapon nearly impossible. As a result, regulating ASATs—and many other space-based weapons systems—is extremely difficult.

A Brief History of ASAT Proliferation

The earliest ASAT testing began during the Cold War, when the success of Sputnik I in October of 1957 catalyzed American fears about the Soviet Union’s potential goal of developing nuclear armed satellites capable of circling the globe. In response, the US developed its first ASAT: Bold Orion, an air-launched ballistic missile. The Soviet Union responded with its own ASAT program, developing weapons through the 1960s and 70s known as co-orbitals. Unlike previous KE-ASAT designs, these co-orbitals worked by syncing up with a target satellite’s orbit, then detonating.

The United States responded to Soviet co-orbitals in the 1980s with the ASM-135 weapon, an air-launched KE-ASAT distinguished by its hit-to-kill method. Unlike the Soviet co-orbitals, the hit-to-kill system did not require explosives; it just used the energy generated by the collision between the craft and the satellite, making delivery more stable. In a 1985 demonstration authorized by President Ronald Reagan, an ASM-135 successfully destroyed a defunct satellite.

Roughly 30 years later, China joined the space race. In 2007, China successfully tested a KE-ASAT, destroying an old weather satellite with a ballistic missile. And just last year, India also successfully tested an ASAT in what the Indian government referred to as Mission Shakti.

As of 2018, Russia and China were still developing more advanced non-kinetic ASATs. Russia is specifically developing an ASAT system known as Nudol, which operates in Lower Earth Orbit and can move between orbital paths, threatening more satellites than weapons limited to just one orbital path. So, despite the end of the Cold War era, more and more nations are jumping into a space arms race that is resulting in the rapid proliferation of advanced space weaponry.

The ASAT Appeal

A global fixation on anti-satellite weapons is arguably the logical end result of the main American project of the late 20th and early 21st century: the movement to digital communications. Via the telephone, computers, and eventually the internet, the United States pioneered the use of space-based communications for most civil and military functions. The benefits of satellite-based communications—namely increased efficiency, precision, and volume of information transmitted—are self-evident; however, the US lead in the transition to space-based systems posed a threat: relying on satellites for military use more than any other country created an asymmetric dependency. In other words, an unexpected denial of space-enabled information or capabilities would be more debilitating to the United States than to any other country because no other country is as dependent on satellite communications.

In an era of US hegemony, powers like Russia, China, and India are looking for arenas in which they can make the most gains against a conventionally stronger opponent. The space race has an asymmetric nature: the more the United States develops in space, the more it has to lose. Thus, space warfare provides an arena where emerging powers can gain a strategic advantage relative to the US.

More broadly, ASATs are also desirable because they can function as conflict deterrents. If a conflict arises, countries may be less likely to escalate if they believe their opponents are capable of essentially blinding their military. Just as two nuclear armed opponents risk mutually assured destruction (MAD), two ASAT armed countries risk mutual impotence. If they both can “turn off” each other’s militaries—or deny access to the satellites upon which their opponent’s conventional and nuclear forces rely—both countries are rendered close to defenseless, a risk they would be extremely reluctant to take.

A Uniquely Dangerous Arms Race

Despite their deterrent functions, ASATs are more likely to provoke or exacerbate conflicts than dampen them, especially given the risk they pose to early warning satellites. These satellites are a crucial element of US ballistic missile defense, capable of detecting missiles immediately after launch and tracking their paths.

Suppose a US early warning satellite goes dark, or is shut down. Going dark could signal a glitch, but in a world in which other countries have ASATs, it could also signal the beginning of an attack. Without early warning satellites, the United States is much more susceptible to nuclear missiles. Given the strategy of counterforcing—targeting nuclear silos rather than populous cities to prevent a nuclear counterattack—the Americans might believe their nuclear weapons are imminently at risk. It could be twelve hours before the United States regains satellite function, which is too long to wait to put together a nuclear counterattack. The United States, therefore, might move to mobilize a nuclear attack against Russia or China over what might just be a piece of debris shutting off a satellite.

Additionally, accidental warfare, or strategic miscalculation, is uniquely likely in space. It is much easier to hold an adversary’s space systems in jeopardy with destructive ASATs than it is to sustainably defend a system, which is expensive and in some cases not technologically feasible because of limitations on satellite movement. Space is therefore considered offense-dominant; offensive tactics like weapons development are prioritized over defensive measures, such as improving GPS or making satellites more resistant to jamming.

As a result, countries are left with poorly defended space systems and rely on offensive posturing, which increases the risk that their actions are perceived as aggressive and incentivizes rapid, risky counterattacks because militaries cannot rely on their spaced-based systems after first strikes.

There are several hotspots in which ASATs and offensive-dominant systems are particularly relevant. Early warning satellites play a central role in US readiness in the event of a conflict involving North Korea. News of North Korean missile launches comes from these satellites. Given North Korea’s history of nuclear provocations, unflinchingly hostile rhetoric towards the United States and South Korea, and diplomatic opacity, North Korea is always a threatening, unknowable adversary, but recent developments have magnified the risk. With the health of Kim Jong-un potentially in jeopardy, a succession battle or even civil war on the peninsula raises the chances of loose nukes. If the regime is terminal, traditional MAD risk calculus will become moot; with nothing to lose, North Korea would have no reason to hold back its nuclear arsenal. Or China might decide to seize military assets and infrastructure of the regime. If the US does not have its early warning satellites because they have been taken out in an ASAT attack, the US, South Korea, and Japan are all in imminent nuclear peril, while China could be in a position to fundamentally reshape East Asian geopolitics.

The South China Sea is another hotspot in which ASATs could risk escalation. China is developing Anti-Access Area Denial (A2/AD) in the South China Sea, a combination of long range radar with air and maritime defense meant to deny US freedom of navigation in the region. Given the disputed nature of territory in the South China Sea, the United States and its allies do not want China to successfully close off the region.

But the most effective way to break an A2/AD system would be with anti-satellite weapons. ASATs could neutralize the maritime surveillance China relies upon to deny access to the region and guide cruise missiles. Thus, China is extremely wary of US ASAT development: risks to Beijing’s South China Sea strategy are seen as threats to China itself because of territorial sovereignty claims that are deeply important to the regime and have only become more pronounced under President Xi Jinping. If a Chinese satellite went dark, Beijing might perceive it as a US ASAT designed to undermine the A2/AD approach, and escalate with conventional force.

An Even Greater Risk

Many of these conflict scenarios start with the loss of satellite function, which may seem unlikely. But ASATs threaten satellites through more than just direct attack. ASAT testing, rather than deployment, risks the exponential accumulation of debris, which endangers satellites and creates a host of other problems.

KE-ASATs rely on smashing satellites into thousands of pieces, so each test adds tremendous amounts of space debris. The 2007 Chinese KE-ASAT test alone increased the number of objects in orbit by 20 percent, producing more than two thousand pieces of debris large enough to be tracked and likely thousands more too small to be counted that will remain in orbit for centuries.

Even the smallest pieces of debris can do great damage; traveling at more than 15,000 miles per hour, they can crash into other debris in a proliferation known as the Kessler Syndrome. The situation in space could approach a critical mass in which collision cascading occurs even if all launches were halted, choking orbits with debris until all satellites are destroyed and spaceflight rendered impossible. Compared to the negligible debris created during commercial launches, ASAT tests—especially if the arms race continues to escalate and countries with less developed space programs join with cruder designs—may accelerate the debris in space closer and closer to this critical mass.

If debris knocks out a satellite, an increasingly likely possibility in a world with ASAT tests, then the aforementioned conflict scenarios become more likely. Conflict aside, ASAT-based debris clouds are terrifying in their own right. Public health, transportation, climate science, and a litany of other crucial infrastructures are dependent on satellites that are now at risk. Satellite GPS is a cornerstone of the modern economy; some pundits believe that the slightest glitch in GPS satellites could shock the stock market and further destabilize an unstable global economy. During the pandemic, satellites are playing a crucial role in geospatial data collection for infectious disease modeling.

#### Private property is key to transform short-term goals into settlement.

Jonckheere 18 [Evarist Jonckheere, Master of Laws, Ghent University, “The Privatization of Outer Space and the Consequences for Space Law,” 2018, Master’s Thesis, https://libstore.ugent.be/fulltxt/RUG01/002/479/330/RUG01-002479330\_2018\_0001\_AC.pdf, EA]

The reality is that private enterprises are already moving in a direction that will need a similar regime. So, the big legal uncertainties concerning space property should be dealt with sooner rather than later.194 Legal certainty on an international level would greatly benefit the space industry. The existing risks of space ventures would be minimized as private companies would know what they are up against. This could give a boost to private enterprises to be more technologically innovative and entrepreneurial when it comes to outer space exploration. The prospect of gaining property rights might push them to undergo more fully realized expeditions for larger and fixed rewards. The legal regime should however ensure fairness and order between the competing space entrepreneurs.195

#### That prevents other-wise inevitable extinction – independently creates massive tech spillover, global coop, and new resources.

Green 21 [Brian Patrick Green, director of technology ethics at the Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, Santa Clara University, “Space Ethics,” 2021, Rowman, pp. 4-5, EA]

In favor of going into space are such basics as gaining scientific knowledge and developing beneficial new technologies, both of which space exploration and use have already begun to accomplish with dramatic and sometimes unexpected effects for humankind. Scientific advancements include astronomical and cosmological knowledge from various orbiting experiments and telescopes that have let us gain unprecedented understanding about our universe. But space activities have also contributed to a great deal of scientific knowledge about our Earth, including measurements of environmental status, habitat conversion and destruction, detailed knowledge of anthropogenic climate change, and much about Earth’s chemistry and geology. We have also learned a great deal about our local planets, for example, that a runaway “greenhouse effect” in the atmosphere of Venus makes the surface scorchingly hot, while too little greenhouse effect on Mars leaves the surface quite cold. There have also been significant contributions made to medical science, especially concerning the behavior of the human body when subjected to radiation, microgravity, nutritional restrictions, and so on.

On the technological side, everything with American global positioning system (GPS), Russian Glonass, or other global navigation systems—from smartphones to military vehicles—relies on a network of satellites above us, placed there by rocketry and painstakingly tracked with instruments developed for the task. So many technologies have been pioneered by space exploration and use that it is hard to list them all, but some of the more important ones include weather satellites (which are not only convenient but also allow preparation for and evacuation from severe weather), communication satellites, solar photovoltaic (PV) cells, advances in electronics and computers, advances in materials science, and so on.

Space is also an important location for the contention of national interests in a geopolitical and military sense. As the ultimate “high ground” in battle, space allows certain asset classes such as spy satellites to exist in a position unassailable by many or most opponents. While permanent weapons stations and weapons of mass destruction are banned from space by the United Nations Outer Space Treaty (OST), 6 that has not stopped the development of weapons that are impermanent (such as missiles, missile interceptors, and antisatellite weapons) or the research and development of possible space-based weapons platforms, such as were envisioned by U.S. president Ronald Reagan’s Strategic Defense Initiative, nicknamed “Star Wars.” While military and political interests may ultimately seem to be a less noble reason to explore and use space, relative power, safety, and security certainly are very human interests and are valuable to those who feel they are being protected by them.

Space activities are also a key way of promoting international cooperation and global awareness. While the international competition of the “space race” fueled one nation all the way to the Moon, shortly afterward, the Apollo-Soyuz program announced a thawing of this competition and commenced a period of cooperation between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Currently the International Space Station continues this cross-national cooperation in space, with five space agencies (representing Canada, the European Space Agency nations, Japan, Russia, and the United States) participating. In addition to cooperation in space exploration itself, the perspective given from space has itself helped to produce some feelings of unity on Earth, with the famous “Blue Marble” and “Earthrise” pictures showing Earth’s oneness and scientific discoveries supported by space science, such as those related to climate change, helping to promote international cooperation to address these problems.

Gaining access to new critical resources may be another reason to go into space. Earth is a finite planet, and certain elements on Earth are very rare in the planetary crust, particularly platinum group metals that are very dense and siderophilic (iron-loving) and so have tended to sink toward the core over the natural history of the planet. However, asteroids and other objects in space (for example, planets, comets, and moons) can sometimes have these elements in abundance and in more available locations, making them potentially excellent sources for these valuable materials. Now-defunct asteroid-mining startup Planetary Resources once estimated that one “platinum-rich 500 meter wide asteroid contains . . . 1.5 times the known world-reserves of platinum group metals (ruthenium, rhodium, palladium, osmium, iridium, and platinum).” 7 In addition to returning elements to a resource-hungry Earth, further exploration and development of space will require access to resources that are not purely sourced from Earth. In particular, it will be necessary to gain access to water, which is relatively rare in the inner solar system and which would be far too costly to transport in any significant amounts from the Earth’s surface.

Another reason that humans may want to explore space would be to create a “backup Earth” to hedge against global catastrophic and existential risks (risks that may cause widespread disaster or human extinction, respectively) on our home planet. 8 Earth has always been a dangerous place for humans, with asteroid impacts, supervolcanic eruptions, pandemic disease, and other natural hazards threatening civilization. Now, in addition to these natural threats, human-made hazards such as nuclear weapons, climate change, biotechnology, nanotechnology, and artificial intelligence may threaten not only the viability of technological civilization but perhaps the survival of human life itself. A serious global-scale catastrophe could set back civilization many decades or centuries, and the worst disasters could cause human extinction. In one scenario, in which 100 percent of humanity dies, all of human effort for all of history would be for nothing. However, were the same global catastrophe to happen to Earth, yet humans were a multiplanetary species with just one self-sustaining settlement off-Earth, it would not result in the end of human civilization or human extinction. Instead while the same unimaginable fate would befall the Earth (certainly no mere triviality, with perhaps the deaths of 99.999 percent of all humans and possibly the destruction of the ecosphere and everything in it), at least all of human and planetory history would not be for nothing. Human life and culture would go on elsewhere, as well as other Earth species. This is a dire fate, but less terrible than the first.

#### Immeasurable expected value also outweighs.

Baum 16 – Executive Director of the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute [Seth D. Baum, “The Ethics of Outer Space: A Consequentialist Perspective,” 2016, Springer, pp. 115-116, EA]

Space colonization is notable because it may be able to bring utterly immense increases in intrinsic value. Early colonies might start small, given that other planets and moons have inhospitable environments. However, it may be possible to build large indoor colonies or create more hospitable outdoor environments (i.e., terraforming). Even just on other planets and moons in the Solar System, space colonies could multiply the total area available for human habitation. And there are many more planets around other stars, as ongoing research on exoplanets is now learning. One recent study estimates 22 % of Sun-like stars have Earth-like exoplanets (Petigura et al. 2013), implying billions to tens of billions of potentially habitable planets across the galaxy.

Opportunities at any given star may also be quite a bit greater than those available only on planets. Earth only receives about one two-billionth of the Sun’s radiation. To collect all the Sun’s radiation, humanity would need a Dyson swarm (named after Dyson 1960), which is a series of structures that surrounds a star, collecting its radiation to power a civilization. A Dyson swarm around the Sun could potentially enable a civilization a billion times larger than is possible on Earth. Likewise, Dyson swarms around one billion stars would bring humanity approximately 1018 (one billion–billion) times more energy per unit time.

Space colonies could also increase the amount of time available for human civilization. Earth will remain habitable for a few billion more years (O’Malley-James et al. 2014). Stars will continue shining for about 1014 more years (Adams 2008). That gives us an additional 105 times more energy, for a total of 1023 times more energy than is available on Earth. After the stars fade, other energy sources may be available. And even if our current universe eventually becomes uninhabitable, it may be possible to move to other universes (Kaku 2005). The physics here is speculative, but it cannot be ruled out, and hence there is a nonzero chance of a literally infinite opportunity for space colonization (Baum 2010a).

Whether the opportunity is infinite or merely, say, 1023 times larger than what can be done on Earth, the opportunity is clearly immense. As long as space colonization is an improvement (Sect. 8.3.1), then it would seem that the consequentialist should prioritize space colonization. The sooner space colonization begins, the more of its immense opportunity can be gained. Indeed, Ćirković (2002) estimates 5 × 1046 human lifetimes are lost for every century in which space colonization is delayed.

#### PIKs are good – test the 1AC to refine their method. Some exclusion is inevitable in an academic environment BUT it’s not theft of the intimate since to export their method it has to be portable. Reject the argument not the team worst-case.

## Case

#### 1] The disability drive is NOT logical, think of its application in debate if the OVERALL psyche claim was true then how do they get non-disabled ballots.

#### 2] Disability can’t be ontological, and progress is possible

#### A] It’s not static – conceptions of disability aren’t concrete but fluid over time – for example ADHD wasn’t diagnosed as disability until more recent medicine, and there’s no clear brightline or definition of disability.

#### b] Disability isn’t ontological – social context determines disability discrimination.

Anastasiou and Kauffman ’13 (DIMITRIS - Associate Professor and Program Coordinator, Ph.D., National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, 2004. JAMES M. - Professor Emeritus of education at UVA, Ed.D. in special education from University of Kansas. “The Social Model of Disability: Dichotomy between Impairment and Disability.” Journal of Medicine and Philosophy, 38: 441–459, 2013. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/James\_Kauffman/publication/249647375\_The\_Social\_Model\_of\_Disability\_Dichotomy\_between\_Impairment\_and\_Disability/links/02e7e521b55fa0504d000000.pdf)-JJN

V. Disabilities in Social Context Proponents of a social model seem to support the idea that disability is a product of wrong interpretation of impairments (Reindal, 1995) related to disabling social structures. Our question is very simple: Assuming that we have an ideal, perfect, caring society, will disabilities no longer exist? If we followed the arguments of the social model, in an ideal society we would have only impairments but not disabilities! Unfortunately, we do not think that it would be possible to eradicate disabilities by changing only the sociopolitical context. Why? Because the dichotomy between impairment and disability is methodological; it is not ontological. The names we give to physical or mental conditions do not create disabilities or turn disabilities into abilities (Kauffman et al., 2008; Kauffman, 2011). Of course, names have their importance, because they circulate in a social context and turn back on the named people. Also, a much better social context can substantially improve the quality of life of people with disabilities, and this is not a trivial matter. But whatever names we use in our societies, the most profound restrictions related to intrinsic factors will remain for the vast majority of people with disabilities. Nevertheless, the discussion about social context is an important issue. Disabilities should be viewed as embedded in their social context in many different ways. First, a certain disability is conceptualized within a specific social context and characterized by a discrepancy between the individual’s performance and the expectations or demands of the social group to which the person belongs. This brings social values into the appreciation of disabilities. Any conceptualization of disability, whether physical or mental, is inevitably value-laden. Disabilities naturally arouse children’s curiosity, but social perceptions can change. The recognition of disabilities can take different directions according to social values. Zola, an American sociologist, has eloquently described it: “Children spontaneously express an interest in wheelchairs and leg braces, but as they grow older they are taught that . . . it’s not nice to ask [about] such things” (1982, 200). Values and attitudes exert profound influence on the way nondisabled people perceive others with disabilities, as Zola stated: When the “able-bodied” confront the “disabled,” they often think with a shudder, “I’m glad it’s not me” . . . The threat to be dispelled is the inevitability of one’s own failure. The discomfort that many feel in the presence of the aged, the suffering, and the dying is the reality that it could just as well be them. (1982, 202) Second, social decisions about the border between disability and normality are difficult because of the statistical phenomena involved. In many cases, the border is both vague and rather arbitrary (Kauffman and Hallahan, 2005; Anastasiou and Kauffman, 2011; Kauffman and Lloyd, 2011 ). Defining the qualitative differences we call disabilities by making binary decisions (yes or no, has or does not have) requires making judgments about people, even though the quantitative data are continuous statistical distributions. The identification of a disability depends on judgment, and judgment means that one arrives at a cutpoint on continuously distributed abilities. Inevitably social values are linked to the judgmental identification of disabilities. However, not making such a judgment precludes the kind of assistance we consider necessary for social justice (Anastasiou and Kauffman, 2011). Third, although categorizing and labeling have become major issues in disability and special education debates, the debate is often misguided. Kauffman (2002, 2011) and Kauffman et al. (2008) have argued analytically for the inevitability of labeling, given that we really want to offer special services and benefits to specific individuals. We simply cannot offer extra or better services to individuals without speaking about difference or special needs, and this is as true for disabilities as it is for economic assistance or any social program. For this reason, an individual-based perspective is necessary for identifying people with special needs for certain services (Reindal, 1995). Without a definition based on individual criteria of disability, the rights of people with disabilities cannot be fully guaranteed (see Kauffman and Landrum, 2009). Even in Norway, a country with an extended safety net of social welfare services, the identification of benefits to be received is based on judgment of individual need (Reindal, 1995). Antilabelists imagine services without labels. But even in an ideal communitarian society with enough resources, we cannot offer excellent services according to the old socialistic principle “from each according to his/her ability, to each according to his/her needs” without any need identification process. Perhaps the process is more obvious in an antagonistic society with a plurality of interests and unequal distribution of power, status, and wealth. Those who want to avoid all labels commit a great mistake in confusing the relationship between education and social change. Public education, by its nature, is a rather conservative institution that reflects the mainstream values of society and represents an adopted social agenda. It is a trailer and not a leader in political, economic, and social change. Historically great social changes precede important educational changes. Imagining the opposite relationship and neglecting today’s predominant sociopolitical forces is a political fallacy. The danger is that without labels the needs of individuals with disabilities will be ignored (see Kauffman, 2011). Surely labeling is not trivial, because labels are used to describe human beings as well as things. Labels often carry unintended stigma to receivers of services. And in many cases, the experiences of being disabled are socially constructed, mirroring the thoughts, feelings, and values of the social milieu. Indeed, the institutional response to disabilities is difficult. The “dilemma of difference” has been underlined in special education’s literature. If we emphasize existing differences (including disabilities), then we are in danger of unjustified discrimination; if we ignore the existence of disabilities or pretend that they do not exist, then we are in danger of leaving critical humans’ needs untreated (Hallahan and Kauffman, 1994; Kauffman and Badar, forthcoming). Fourth, disabilities are defined in a specific sociopolitical context and a system of social relations. Many dimensions of disabilities are part of the social process by which the social meanings of disability are negotiated (Zola, 1989). Public policy has a great impact on the lives of people with disabilities, and the formulation of disability strategy in education and public arena is of huge importance (Anastasiou and Kauffman, 2010, 2011). In summary, disabilities are sealed within their social context. And many concepts about disabilities, whether involving low-incidence disabilities (e.g., severe intellectual disabilities) or high-incidence disabilities (e.g., mild intellectual disabilities, specific learning disability), have socially constructed aspects. It is not accidental that they have been classified and reclassified, defined and redefined according to the status of scientific knowledge and social values (e.g., Bruno Bettelheim’s theory of “refrigerator mothers” as a cause of autism—that autism was caused by cold, distant, and unconsciously rejecting mothers). Using the reasoning of Hacking (1999), we could make a distinction between the idea of autism (and the surrounding conceptual context) as socially constructed and autistic behaviors, which are real. Social construction does not give us insight into the severely restricted communication and social interaction of children with autism. Recognizing the influence of social context does not mean that there are no other viable ideas about disabilities. Social factors such as biomedical technology and special education can interact with biological factors, codetermining the evolution of disabilities as atypical predicaments. Thus, social and individual explanations of disabilities should be seen not as mutually exclusive but as codeterminants of development of people who have disabilities (Williams, 1999).

#### 3] Vote neg on presumption

#### A] the reading of the ac was suff to rupture linguistic models of debate, nothing past the 1ac matters

#### Appropriation means having property rights.

* The definition is from Black’s Law Dictionary

Su 17 [Jinyuan Su, Professor and Assistant Dean at Xi'an Jiaotong University School of Law, China, “Legality of unilateral exploitation of space resources under international law,” 2017, *International & Comparative Law Quarterly*, Vol. 66, Issue 4, pp. 991-1008, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020589317000367, EA]

The Outer Space Treaty does not prohibit expressis verbis the extraction of space resources. However, there exists a possibility that the recognition of property rights by a State, which is a party to the Outer Space Treaty, over resources extracted in outer space may conflict with its international obligations under Article II of the treaty, which proscribes the national appropriation of outer space 'by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means'.26 The term 'appropriation' means '[t]he exercise of control over property; a taking of possession'.27

#### Which is distinct from use.

Harris No Date [Philip R Harris, Ph.D.; Visiting Professor in the California School of International Management, “Space Law and Space Resources,” No Date, *National Space Society*, https://space.nss.org/settlement/nasa/spaceresvol4/spacelaw.html, Accessed: 01/20/22, EA]

According to the present space law, all mining in space-lunar, asteroidal, or planetary-is treated alike. The operative treaty provisions are (1) that space is reserved for the benefit and is the province of all mankind; (2) that every nation shall have equal access to outer space; (3) that nations cannot appropriate space under any claim of national sovereignty; (4) nevertheless, that nations are free to explore and "use" outer space. The official positiion of the United States. clearly enunciated in the debates of UNCOPUOS, interprets these provisions to permit any nation or corporation to mine (Artist Pat Rawlings rendering of lunar mining and processing) and otherwise use the resources of outer space.

#### Space activities aren’t inherently ableist – we can accept that there is no such thing as a “natural human” while still appreciating the benefits of private space activites and the technology that allows for things like spacewalks.

#### Psychoanalysis is pseudoscience – none of this is real

Paris 17

[Dr Paris is Professor, Department of Psychiatry, McGill University, and Research Associate, Department of Psychiatry, Jewish General Hospital. "Is Psychoanalysis Still Relevant to Psychiatry?" https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5459228/]

In an era in which psychiatry is dominated by neuroscience-based models, psychological constructs tend to be neglected and may be taken seriously only when they have neural correlates.37 Some psychoanalysts have sought to link their model with neurobiological research and to claim that newer methods of studying the brain can validate their theories.5,6

Mark Solms, a South African neuropsychologist, is the founder of “neuropsychoanalysis.” This new field, with its own society and its own journal, proposes to use neuroimaging to confirm analytic theories. Its key idea is that subjective experience and the unconscious mind can be observed through neuroimaging.5 It is known that brain processes can be seen on brain imaging even before they have entered consciousness.38 However, claims that neuroimaging validate Freud’s model of the unconscious can be based only on “cherry-picking” the literature. The observed correspondences are superficial and hardly support the complex edifice of psychoanalytic theory.

Solms39 has also suggested that Freud’s ideas about dreams are consistent with neuroscience research based on rapid eye movement (REM) activity. This attempt to rescue a century-old theory met with opposition from dream researchers who consider Freud’s clinical speculations to be incompatible with empirical data.40,41

The proposal to establish a discipline of neuropsychoanalysis also met with a mixed reception from traditional psychoanalysts, who did not want to dilute Freud’s wine with neuroscientific water.42 Neuroscientists, who are more likely to see links to psychology as lying in cognitive science,43 have ignored this idea. In summary, neuropsychoanalysis is being used a way to justify long-standing models, without attempting to find something new or to develop an integration of perspectives on psychology.

However, Eric Kandel,44 influential in the light of his Nobel Prize for the study of the neurochemistry of memory, has taken a sympathetic view of the use of biological methods to study psychoanalytic theory. Kandel had wanted to be an analyst before becoming a neuroscientist.45 But Kandel, who does not actively practice psychiatry, may be caught in a time warp, unaware that psychoanalysis has been overtaken by competitors in the field of psychotherapy.

Another attempt to reconcile psychoanalysis with science has come from the literature on neuroplasticity.46 It is now known that neurogenesis occurs in some brain regions (particularly the hippocampus) during adulthood and that neural connections undergo modification in all parts of the brain. There is also evidence that CBT can produce brain changes that are visible using imaging.47 These findings have not been confirmed

# Accessibility formatting

## T

#### Interpretation – resolved means “certain”.

USCADCC 20

resolved means finished no longer "susceptible to further dispute

## NC

#### 1 – Pleasure and pain *are* intrinsic value and disvalue – everything else *regresses* – robust neuroscience.

Blum et al. 18

**Pleasure** **defines reward.** reason why particular stimuli are rewarding due to pleasure. provides the **basis for hedonic theories** of reward **organisms are** **result of evolutionary competition.** rewards increase fitness foods, drinks, mates, and offspring are rewarding. **many brain regions** **modulate** **pleasure or** **the opposite** liking something represented by regions in the limbic system researchers examined neural tissue **there was** **remarkable contrast in** **neocortices** area of the brain more developed in humans dopamine plays role in ability to pursue rewards that are years away

#### Moral substitutability – every obligation’s endpoint involves intermediary steps that only util explains.

Sinott-Armstrong 92

**I can't feed my child** **without going home** **and going home** **will enable me to feed her** Therefore, there is reason for me to go home This assumes substitutability I have reason to help a friend **I cannot do so if I play golf** Not playing golf will enable me to help my friend. So I have a moral reason not to play golf **moral reason** **affect the morality of an act** **by making a** **morally neutral act** **good or** **an** **immoral act moral.** **failure** **to explain** **substitutability** **is a reason to reject all deontological** **theories.** if I promise to mow the grass, there is a moral reason for me to mow mowing fulfills my promise. **if I cannot mow the grass without starting my mower** **it still would not follow that I have** **reason to start my mower, since I did not promise to start my mower**

#### 1) Turns uncertainty in their first Mollow card – if we’re epistemologically confused, then err towards a world in which we actually have a chance of figuring it out.

MacAskill 14

even if we believe extinction would be good we have strong reason to prevent extinction extinction is extremely high stakes number would be 2×10^14 extinction is irreversible we always have letting ourselves go in the future we should expect progress morally in centuries we will better evaluate extinction

## Counterplan

#### Private actors solve space war and specifically ASAT restraint.

Cobb 21

commercialized actors exert pressure to behave peacefully to promote development actors may not engage in new investment As states contract out services private actors exert greater influence in a debris filled environment replacements is difficult and dangerous human spaceflight space tourists increase restraint in [ASAT] test programs foregone commercial activities have a similar cost to states by discouraging private actors

#### Goes nuclear – extinction.

Blatt 20

anti-satellite weapons increases risk of global conflict nations are jumping into a space arms race resulting in rapid prolif of space weaponry ASATs exacerbate conflicts given the risk to early warning satellites The U S might mobilize a nuclear attack over debris shutting off a satellite countries rely on offensive posturing, which increases risk that actions are perceived as aggressive and incentivizes rapid counterattacks testing risks debris, which endangers satellites 2007 test alone increased objects by 20 percent debris crash into other debris in proliferation known as Kessler Syndrome space approach critical mass until all satellites are destroyed and spaceflight rendered impossible. Compared to commercial launches, ASAT tests accelerate debris If debris knocks out a satellite conflict scenarios become more likely climate science, and crucial infrastructures are dependent on satellites glitch in GPS destabilize global economy

#### Private property is key to transform short-term goals into settlement.

Jonckheere 18

risks of space ventures would be minimized as private companies know what they are up against. This could boost to private enterprises to be more innovative gaining property rights might push them to undergo more fully realized expeditions for larger rewards

#### That prevents other-wise inevitable extinction – independently creates massive tech spillover, global coop, and new resources.

Green 21

Space activities promot international coop Apollo announced thawing competition perspective produce unity on Earth new resources asteroids have elements in abundance 1.5 times world-reserves of metals humans create a “backup Earth” against existential risks asteroid impacts, supervolcanic eruptions disease nuc s climate change, biotech nanotech and a i humans with just one settlement would go on

#### Immeasurable expected value also outweighs.

Baum 16

colonization bring immense value colonies multiply area for habitation Dyson swarm enable civilization a billion times larger colonies increase time for civilization gives 1023 more energy it may be possible to move to other universes there is a nonzero chance of infinite colonization The sooner the more opportunity 5 × 1046 human lifetimes are lost for every century delayed

## Case

#### Disability isn’t ontological – social context determines disability discrimination.

Anastasiou and Kauffman ’13

dichotomy between impairment and disability is methodological; it is not ontological Disabilities should be viewed as embedded in their social context social perceptions can change. the border between disability and normality is vague and arbitrary identification of a disability depends on judgme disabilities are defined in a specific sociopolitical context and a system of social relations

#### Especially since appropriation means having property rights.

* The definition is from Black’s Law Dictionary

Su 17

'appropriation' means exercise of control over property taking possession'

#### Which is distinct from use.

Harris No Date

nations cannot appropriate space nevertheless are free to "use" outer space

#### Psychoanalysis is pseudoscience – none of this is real

Paris 17

psychoanalysts link their model with neuro research The proposal met mixed reception Neuroscientists see links as lying findings have not been confirmed