## **Off 1**

**Interp: The AFF must defend policy action in a plan text in the 1AC.**

**"Resolved:" the appropriation of outer space by private entities is "unjust" entails policy action:**

**1---Resolved.**

**Parcher 1 [Jeff; former debate coach at Georgetown; Feb 26, 2001;** [**https://web.archive.org/web/20020929065555/http://www.ndtceda.com/archives/200102/0790.html**](https://web.archive.org/web/20020929065555/http:/www.ndtceda.com/archives/200102/0790.html)**] brett**

(1) Pardon me if I turn to a source besides Bill. American Heritage Dictionary: Resolve: 1. To make a firm decision about. 2. **To decide or express by formal vote**. 3. To separate something into constiutent parts See Syns at \*analyze\* (emphasis in orginal) 4. Find a solution to. See Syns at \*Solve\* (emphasis in original) 5. To dispel: resolve a doubt. - n 1. Frimness of purpose; resolution. 2. A determination or decision.

(2) The very nature of the word "resolution" makes it a question. American Heritage**: A course of action determined** or decided on. A formal statemnt of a deciion, as **by a legislature.**

(3) The resolution is obviously a question. Any other conclusion is utterly inconcievable. Why? Context. The debate community empowers a topic committee to write a topic for ALTERNATE side debating. The committee is not a random group of people coming together to "reserve" themselves about some issue. There is context - they are empowered by a community to do something. In their deliberations, the topic community attempts to craft a resolution which can be ANSWERED in either direction. They focus on issues like ground and fairness because they know the resolution will serve as the basis for debate which will be resolved by determining the policy desireablility of that resolution. That's not only what they do, but it's what we REQUIRE them to do. We don't just send the topic committtee somewhere to adopt their own group resolution. It's not the end point of a resolution adopted by a body - it's the prelimanary wording of a resolution sent to others to be answered or decided upon.

(4) Further context: the word resolved is used to emphasis the fact that it's policy debate. Resolved comes **from the adoption of resolutions by legislative bodies**. A resolution is either adopted or it is not. It's a question before a legislative body. Should this statement be adopted or not.

**2---Unjust.**

**Black’s Law [The Law Dictionary Featuring Black's Law Dictionary Free Online Legal Dictionary 2nd Ed. No Date.** [**https://thelawdictionary.org/unjust/**](https://thelawdictionary.org/unjust/)**] brett**

What is 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 dont have a plan text**

**Prefer:**

**1---Ground---absent meeting precise words in the res, we lose all the pre-round prep we did around the resolution, killing neg ground.**

**2---Vagueness---debates inevitably involve the AFF defending something, but only our interp lets them to clearly define that from the start. Their model leads to late-breaking debates that destroy ground, for example we won’t know if asteroid mining or space exploration are offense until the 1AR, which skews neg prep.**

**3---Topic ed---specific policies lets us go deep into the topic, uniquely important given the evolving character of space law. outweighs bc we only have 2 month topics, and phil ed is solved by free textbooks.**

**CI bc reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention**

**DTD to deter future abuse**

**No RVIs: 1] illogical, you shouldn’t win for being topical, 2] good theory debaters will read abusive positions to bait theory and dump on an RVI, 3] trades off with substance since we can’t kick out of T**

**Neg theory first because AFF abuse made it impossible to engage so any neg abuse was to get back in the game.**

## **Off 2**

#### **CP: The appropriation of outer space by private entities except for Large Satellite Constellations in Lower Earth Orbit is unjust.**

#### **Terrestrial Internet Cables are vulnerable now – risks access.**

**Griffiths 19** James Griffiths 7-26-2019 "The global internet is powered by vast undersea cables. But they’re vulnerable."<https://www.cnn.com/2019/07/25/asia/internet-undersea-cables-intl-hnk/index.html> (CNN Analyst)//ELmer

Hong Kong (CNN) - On July 29, 1858, two steam-powered battleships met in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean. There, they connected two ends of a 4,000 kilometer (2,500 mile) long, 1.5 centimeter (0.6 inch) wide cable, linking for the first time the European and North American continents by telegraph. Just over two weeks later, the UK’s Queen Victoria sent a congratulatory message to then US President James Buchanan, which was followed by a parade through the streets of New York, featuring a replica of a ship which helped lay the cable and fireworks over City Hall. In their inaugural cables, Queen Victoria hailed the “great international work” by the two countries, the culmination of almost two decades of effort, while Buchanan lauded a “triumph more glorious, because far more useful to mankind, than was ever won by conqueror on the field of battle. The message took over 17 hours to deliver, at 2 minutes and 5 seconds per letter by Morse code, and the cable operated for less than a month due to a variety of technical failures, but a global communications revolution had begun. By 1866, new cables were transmitting 6 to 8 words a minute, which would rise to more than 40 words before the end of the century. In 1956, Transatlantic No. 1 (TAT-1), the first underwater telephone cable, was laid, and by 1988, TAT-8 was transmitting 280 megabytes per second – about 15 times the speed of an average US household internet connection – over fiber optics, which use light to transmit data at breakneck speeds. In 2018, the Marea cable began operating between Bilbao, Spain, and the US state of Virginia, with transmission speeds of up to 160 terabits per second – 16 million times faster than the average home internet connection. Today, there are around 380 underwater cables in operation around the world, spanning a length of over 1.2 million kilometers (745,645 miles). **Underwater cables** are the invisible force **driving** the **modern internet**, with many in recent years being funded by internet giants such as Facebook, Google, Microsoft and Amazon. They **carry almost all our communications** and yet – in a world of wireless networking and smartphones – we are barely aware that they exist. Yet as the internet has become more mobile and wireless, the amount of data traveling across undersea cables has increased exponentially. “Most people are absolutely amazed” by the degree to which the internet is still cable-based, said Byron Clatterbuck, chief executive of Seacom, a multinational telecommunications firm responsible for laying many of the undersea cables connecting Africa to the rest of the world. “People are so mobile and always looking for Wi-Fi,” he said. “They don’t think about it, they don’t understand the workings of this massive mesh of cables working together. “They only notice when it’s cut.” Network down In 2012, **Hurricane Sandy slammed** into the US East Coast, causing an estimated $71 billion in damage and knocking out several key exchanges where **undersea cables** linked North America and Europe. “It was a major disruption,” Frank Rey, director of global network strategy for Microsoft’s Cloud Infrastructure and Operations division, said in a statement. “The **entire network between North America and Europe was isolated for a number of hours.** For us, the storm **brought to light a potential challenge** **in the consolidation of transatlantic cables** that all landed in New York and New Jersey.” For its newest cable, Marea, Microsoft chose to base its US operation further down the coast in Virginia, away from the cluster of cables to minimize disruption should another massive storm hit New York. But most often when a cable goes down nature is not to blame. There are about **200** such **failures each year** and the **vast majority are caused by humans**. “**Two-thirds** of cable failures are **caused by accidental human activities,** fishing nets and trawling and also ships’ anchors,” said Tim Stronge, vice-president of research at TeleGeography, a telecoms market research firm. “The next largest category is natural disaster, mother nature – sometimes earthquakes but also underwater landslides.” A magnitude-7.0 earthquake off the southwest coast off Taiwan in 2006, along with aftershocks, cut eight submarine cables which caused internet outages and disruption in Taiwan, Hong Kong, China, Japan, Korea and the Philippines. Stronge said the reason most people are not aware of these failures is because the whole industry is designed with it in mind. Companies that rely heavily on undersea cables spread their data across multiple routes, so that if one goes down, customers are not cut off. How a cable gets laid Laying a cable is a years-long process which costs millions of dollars, said Seacom’s Clatterbuck. The process begins by looking at naval charts to plot the best route. Cables are safest in deep water where they can rest on a relatively flat seabed, and won’t rub against rocks or be at risk of other disturbances. “The deeper the better,” Clatterbuck said. “When you can lay the cable down in deep water you rarely have any problems. It goes down on the bottom of the seabed and just stays there.” Things become more difficult the closer you get to shore. A cable that is only a few centimeters thick on the bottom of the ocean must be armored from its environment as reaches the landing station that links it with the country’s internet backbone. “Imagine a long garden hose, inside of which are very small tubes that house a very, very thin fiber pair,” Clatterbuck said. That hose is wrapped in copper, which conducts the direct current that powers the cable and its repeaters, sometimes up to 10,000 volts. “The fibers are wrapped in urethane and wrapped in copper and wrapped again in urethane,” he said. “If we’re going to have to put that cable on a shoreline that is very shallow and has a lot of rocks, you’re now going to have to armor coat that cable so no one can hack through it.” Cables in less hospitable areas can be far thicker than garden hoses, wrapped in extra plastic, kevlar armor plating, and stainless steel to ensure they can’t be broken. Depending on the coast, cable companies might also have to build concrete trenches far out to sea, to tuck the cable in to protect it from being bashed against rocks. “Before the cable-laying vessels go out they send out another specialized ship that maps the sea floor in the area when they want to go,” said TeleGeography’s Stronge. “They want to avoid areas where there’s a lot of undersea currents, certainly want to avoid volcanic areas, and avoid a lot of elevation change on the sea floor.” Once the route is plotted and checked, and the shore connections are secure, huge cable laying ships begin passing out the equipment. “Imagine spools of spools of garden hose along with a lot of these repeaters the size of an old travel trunk,” Clatterbuck said. “Sometimes it can take a month to load the cable onto a ship.” The 6,600 kilometer (4,000 mile) Marea cable weighs over 4.6 million kilograms (10.2 million pounds), or the equivalent of 34 blue whales, according to Microsoft, which co-funded the project with Facebook. It took more than two years to lay the entire thing. Malicious cuts The blackout came without warning. In February 2008, a whole swath of North Africa and the Persian Gulf suddenly went offline, or saw internet speeds slow to a painful crawl. This disruption was eventually traced to damage to three undersea cables off the Egyptian coast. At least one – linking Dubai and Oman – was severed by an abandoned, 5,400 kilogram (6-ton) anchor, the cable’s owner said. But the cause of the other damage was never explained, with suggestions it could have been the work of saboteurs. That raises **the issue of another threat to undersea cables: deliberate human attacks**. In a 2017 paper for the right-wing think tank Policy Exchange, British lawmaker Rishi Sunak wrote that “**security remains a challenge” for undersea cables**. “Funneled through exposed choke points (often with minimal protection) and their isolated deep-sea locations entirely public, the arteries upon which the Internet and our modern world depends have **been left highly vulnerable**,” he said. “The threat of these vulnerabilities being exploited is growing. A successful attack would deal a crippling blow to Britain’s security and prosperity.” However, with more than 50 cables connected to the UK alone, Clatterbuck was skeptical about how useful a deliberate outage could be in a time of war, pointing to the level of coordination and resources required to cut multiple cables at once. “If you wanted to sabotage the global internet or cut off a particular place you’d have to do it simultaneously on multiple cables,” he said. “You’d be focusing on the hardest aspect of disrupting a network.”

#### **Mega-constellations provide fast, affordable internet that bridges digital divide – independently, competition lowers prices across the board.**

**Novo 21** Paula Novo 3-31-2021 "Will Starlink Change the Internet?'<https://www.highspeedoptions.com/resources/insights/will-starlink-change-the-internet> (With over four years of broadband experience, Paula Novo is the Site Editor and Senior Writer for HighSpeedOptions. She has helped develop the criterion by which HighSpeedOptions reviews and recommends internet service providers, striving to simplify and guide the user’s decision toward the best communications services. Paula also leads HighSpeedOptions coverage of the digital divide, ISP reviews, and broadband policy.)//Elmer

While it’s not the first – and won’t be the last – company to test low Earth orbit satellites, **Starlink**, the satellite internet division of SpaceX, is **making waves in** the **telecommunications** industry for its residential beta program launched in 2020. **As the first U.S.-based firm to successfully bring LEO internet to market, Starlink shows promise where others have heroically failed**. Every satellite company in history to launch a low Earth orbit (LEO) constellation has gone bankrupt, except for Starlink, that is. Said best in a tweet by Elon Musk, founder and CEO of this venture, “Starlink is a staggeringly difficult technical and economic endeavor. However, if we don’t fail, the cost to end-users will improve every year.” In the span of a decade, broadband moved from a “nice-to-have” to a “must-have” – the COVID-19 pandemic simply speeding up the clock on its shift towards a utility. Yet, we’re a far cry away from total connectivity. Due to availability and cost issues (to name a few), **millions** of Americans **don’t have access to reliable internet**, which further widens the education and wealth gaps. If successful, **Starlink** – **and LEO satellite internet** as a whole – **may be the first real solution for billions of people missing out on the benefits of broadband.** Current State of the Telecom Industry Despite advances in technology, the **telecom** industry is **lagging behind**. And, contrary to what internet service providers and the media report, the United States’ internet options are still very limited. The three biggest hurdles standing in the way of real progress include access, affordability, and lack of competition. Access According to the Federal Communications Commission’s (FCC) 2020 Broadband Deployment Report, **roughly 6% of all Americans have zero access to fixed broadband at home**. And, of those without access, a majority live in rural areas. That’s about 19 million people who, even if they could afford to subscribe to internet service, are out of luck. The FCC defines broadband speeds as just 25 Mbps down and 3 Mbps up, which may be fast enough to check emails but won’t reliably support your Breaking Bad marathon. You can see how living in an underserved area, then, can severely limit a person’s job prospects, schooling, and social connections. Still, we can’t rate internet access without also looking at affordability. While some 19 million Americans do not have access at all, as many as **one in three Americans** **choose to not subscribe to internet** service, **citing cost** as a leading factor. Affordability FCC data shows that nearly 35% of Americans, or about 114 million people, do not subscribe to broadband service at their homes. Affordability – or lack thereof – is often cited as the main driver for this decision. Despite government intervention via efforts like the FCC Lifeline Program and ISP subsidies to incentivize network expansions, America still seems to lag behind other developed countries when it comes to internet cost. In a 2020 study by New America, it turns out that we pay quite a bit more for internet service than most developed countries in Asia and Europe, regardless of speed. Before factoring in data caps and other ancillary ISP fees, we pay “nearly twice as much as European countries for high-speed internet.” Naturally, the ballooning question pops up – How did we fall behind? Lack of Competition The **lack of competition** today may be the **single greatest obstacle preventing the telecom industry** (read: ISPs and consumers) **from thriving**. A long history of privately-owned infrastructures and government regulations has enabled **monopolies** to **quash competition** in the marketplace and **ignore the demand for innovation**. Unsurprisingly, the Institute of Self-Reliance released a new report finding that two of the largest broadband companies in the U.S. – Comcast and Charter Spectrum – maintain a monopoly over 47+ million American households. It also sheds light on an additional 33 million homes only serviceable by one or two DSL providers. While these are just a few examples of the current market, you can easily see how large segments of the population lack the competitive supply needed to drive down costs and push for more development. What if there was a solution to address these pitfalls with the internet? What if Americans (or, really, anyone in the world) could circumvent some of the physical and political barriers stopping us from connecting from seemingly anywhere? These are questions Starlink is attempting to answer. Ways Starlink May Change the Internet First, what is Starlink and how is it different from other internet providers? It’s an Elon Musk satellite internet company bringing life to the telecom industry. In the last year, Starlink launched over 1,000 satellites into low orbit with the goal of offering a new type of broadband. If successful, this **LEO service** **could** not only **supersede** **traditional satellite internet** like HughesNet or Viasat but also **rival** the likes of **fiber internet in rural and remote communities**. Unlike GEO satellite providers who use a few hundred large satellites orbiting over 35,000 kilometers from Earth, Starlink plans to use up to 42,000 small satellites in low orbit no higher than 1,200 kilometers. Because of these key differences, Starlink is anticipated to offer reliable speeds up to 1 Gbps with lower latency of 20ms to 40ms worldwide. Essentially, **it’d combine** the **performance of grounded internet with** the **geographical freedom** of traditional satellite internet so people can live anywhere on Earth while staying connected. In general, LEO satellite service **represents a real chance at solving connectivity issues for anyone outside city limits**. Starlink may also **pave the way for tangible changes to the industry** as a whole, **including** **lower prices**, **faster speeds**, and better economic opportunities. Pricing of Internet As Starlink enters new markets, the **added competition** has the potential to **drive down** the **cost of internet** over time. In a study by the Analysis Group, they calculated that when just one new competitor joins a designated market area (DMA), the price of plans with speeds ranging from 50 Mbps to 1 Gbps sees a monthly decline of $1.50. That’s it? McDonald’s saves me more than that. Not so fast, though. Remember how we said Starlink isn’t the only company testing low orbit satellites? With **other** ventures like Blue Origin, OneWeb, and Telesat itching to launch their own **LEO constellations,** it won’t be long before new players enter the market. At which point, the Analysis Group guesstimates an **8% reduction in monthly broadband prices**, or about $7.50. For low-income households, that may be the difference needed to break even on bills. And, even though Starlink itself is quite expensive, **its presence in the market has the potential to still benefit consumers who could choose a (now) cheaper internet provider**. Internet Speeds Similarly, the buzz around LEO internet speeds has industry heads raising their eyebrows as well. While Starlink is only testing speeds of 50 Mbps to 150 Mbps right now, in time it’s expected to **offer speeds up to 1 Gbps** with low latency. Normally these speeds are reserved for grounded connections like fiber or cable internet. So, if Starlink manages to deliver, we may no longer be limited by our geography. Even further, the Analysis Group reports that the **availability** of higher internet speeds in a DMA “**increases** the **likelihood** that **other providers** will **introduce high-speed plans** to match […] their competition.” In particular, they found that broadband providers are 4 to **17 percent more likely** to increase their speeds on an annual basis **because of competition**. This goes to show that a little healthy rivalry in the marketplace first and foremost benefits the consumer. Economic Opportunity If Starlink is successful, we expect to see economic opportunity improve for billions with a B as well. With global availability, more people will have the means to compete for jobs in today’s digital age. To put things into perspective, consider the world population. Of the current 7.8 billion people, a little under half of them (40%) lack regular internet access. That’s nearly one out of every two people. If LEO satellite service can make it to where geography, price, and speeds aren’t roadblocks anymore, what happens? In general, more people with internet access equates to more job access. And, as jobs continue to transition online, it’s safe to assume that people won’t be as limited by obstacles such as disabilities, poor education, and wealth disparities when they compete for openings. In these ways, Starlink has the potential to help offset poverty where many governments have failed.

#### **It's comparably faster than current competitors.**

**Lumanlan 21** August Dominic M Lumanlan 8-14-2021 "How Elon Musk’s Starlink will be the future of the Internet"<https://medium.com/@augustlumanlan2017/how-spacexs-starlink-will-be-the-future-of-the-internet-8f07adb4eb2> (Engineering Author)//Elmer

Internet speeds, satellite equipment, and user feedback **Starlink** has **very high internet speeds**, **higher than** the **speed of internet** we currently have in our homes. **Speeds average** around 100 mbps but it could go as far as 200 mbps, or even **300 mbps**. It has a **latency of 20 milliseconds**. Latency just means the time it takes for the satellite to transmit the data packets (YouTube videos, Facebook messages, Google searches, etc.) from the ground station, to the nearest Starlink satellite, which then transmits it to other nearby satellites and whichever one is closest above the user will transmit it downward to the Starlink dish that receives the data packets, which can finally reach your home router and now you’re connected to the internet and received the data packets. The process can repeat vice versa. This means that the internet connection with Starlink is much **faster than** our **current** internet **connection which has** around **60 milliseconds** **of latency**. A lot of **beta testers** have shared their experiences online and have been picked up by the media to know more about the Starlink internet program’s capabilities and the user’s feedback about them. What they say is true: They are so **happy** about it, they think it’s worth it. Because its so **fast and reliable** to many places **around the world**, you can easily connect to the internet and be able to do multiple things like watch YouTube or Google search, or even work conveniently anywhere you wish, as long as you have a ground Starlink dish with you.

#### **Internet solves extinction**

**Eagleman 10** [David Eagleman is a neuroscientist at Baylor College of Medicine, where he directs the Laboratory for Perception and Action and the Initiative on Neuroscience and Law and author of Sum (Canongate). Nov. 9, 2010, “ Six ways the internet will save civilization,”

http://www.wired.co.uk/magazine/archive/2010/12/start/apocalypse-no]

Many **great civilisations have fallen, leaving nothing but cracked ruins and scattered genetics. Usually this results from: natural disasters, resource depletion, economic meltdown, disease, poor information flow and corruption. But we’re luckier than our predecessors because we command a technology that no one else possessed: a rapid communication network that finds its highest expression in the internet. I propose that there are six ways in which the net has vastly reduced the threat of societal collapse. Epidemics can be deflected by telepresence** One of our more dire prospects for collapse is an infectious-disease epidemic**. Viral and bacterial epidemics precipitated the fall of the Golden Age of Athens,** the Roman Empire and most of the empires of the Native Americans. **The internet can be our key to survival because the ability to work telepresently can inhibit microbial transmission by reducing human-to-human contact. In the face of an otherwise devastating epidemic, businesses can keep supply chains running with the maximum number of employees working from home. This can reduce host density below the tipping point required for an epidemic. If we are well prepared when an epidemic arrives, we can fluidly shift into a self-quarantined society** in which microbes fail due to host scarcity. Whatever the social ills of isolation, they are worse for the microbes than for us. **The internet will predict natural disasters We are witnessing the downfall of slow central control in the media**: news stories are increasingly becoming user-generated nets of up-to-the-minute information. **During the recent California wildfires,** locals went to the TV stations to learn whether their neighbourhoods were in danger. But the news stations appeared most concerned with the fate of celebrity mansions, so Californians changed their tack: they uploaded geotagged mobile-phone pictures, updated Facebook statuses and tweeted. The balance tipped: **the internet carried news about the fire more quickly and accurately than any news station could.** In this grass-roots, decentralised scheme, there were embedded reporters on every block, and the news shockwave kept ahead of the fire. This head start could provide the extra hours that save us. If the Pompeiians had had the internet in 79AD, they could have easily marched 10km to safety, well ahead of the pyroclastic flow from Mount Vesuvius. **If the Indian Ocean had the Pacific’s networked tsunami-warning system, South-East Asia would look quite different today. Discoveries are retained and shared** Historically, **critical information has required constant rediscovery**. Collections of learning -- from the library at Alexandria to the entire Minoan civilisation -- have fallen to the bonfires of invaders or the wrecking ball of natural disaster. Knowledge is hard won but easily lost. And information that survives often does not spread. **Consider smallpox inoculation**: this was under way in India, China and Africa centuries before it made its way to Europe**. By the time the idea reached North America, native civilisations who needed it had already collapsed. The net solved the problem. New discoveries catch on immediately;** information spreads widely. In this way, societies can optimally ratchet up, using the latest bricks of knowledge in their fortification against risk. **Tyranny is mitigated Censorship of ideas** was a familiar spectre in the last century, with state-approved news outlets ruling the press, airwaves and copying machines **in the USSR**, Romania, Cuba, China, Iraq **and elsewhere**. In many cases, such as Lysenko’s agricultural despotism in the USSR, it **directly contributed to the collapse of the nation**. Historically**, a more successful strategy has been to confront free speech with free speech -- and the internet allows this in a natural way.** It democratises the flow of information by offering access to the newspapers of the world, the photographers of every nation, the bloggers of every political stripe. Some posts are full of doctoring and dishonesty whereas others strive for independence and impartiality -- but all are available to us to sift through. Given the attempts by some governments to build firewalls, it’s clear that this benefit of the net requires constant vigilance. **Human capital is vastly increased Crowdsourcing brings people together to solve problems.** Yet far fewer than one per cent of the world’s population is involved. We need expand human capital. Most of the world not have access to the education afforded a small minority. For every Albert Einstein, Yo-Yo Ma or Barack Obama who has educational opportunities, uncountable others do not. This squandering of talent translates into reduced economic output and a smaller pool of problem solvers. **The net opens the gates education to anyone with a computer. A motivated teen anywhere on the planet can walk through the world’s knowledge -- from the webs of Wikipedia to the curriculum of MIT’s OpenCourseWare. The new human capital will serve us well when we confront existential threats we’ve never imagined before. Energy expenditure is reduced** Societal collapse can often be understood in terms of an energy budget: **when energy spend outweighs energy return, collapse ensues**. This has taken the form of deforestation or soil erosion; **currently, the worry involves fossil-fuel depletion. The internet addresses the energy problem with a natural ease**. Consider the massive energy savings inherent in the shift from paper to electrons -- as seen in the transition from the post to email. **Ecommerce reduces the need to drive long distances to purchase products. Delivery trucks are more eco-friendly** than individuals driving around, not least because of tight packaging and optimisation algorithms for driving routes. Of course, there are energy costs to the banks of computers that underpin the internet -- but these costs are less than the wood, coal and oil that would be expended for the same quantity of information flow. **The tangle of events that triggers societal collapse can be complex, and there are several threats the net does not address. But vast, networked communication can be an antidote to several of the most deadly diseases threatening civilisation.** The next time your coworker laments internet addiction, the banality of tweeting or the decline of face-to-face conversation, you may want to suggest that the net may just be the technology that saves

## **Case**

#### **The Standard is Util**

**1] Effective debate necessitates a primary focus on material**

#### **violence— anything else ignores oppression.**

Dr. Tommy J. **Curry 14**, [Dr. Curry is a Prof of Philosophy at Texas A&M University,

Ray A. Rothrock Fellow 13'-16' and currently the USC Shoah Foundation 2016-17

A.I. and Manet Schepps Foundation Teaching Fellow, first Black JV National

Debate champion (for UMKC) and half of the first all-Black CEDA team to win Pi

Kappa Delta] 2014, “The Cost of a Thing: A Kingian Reformulation of a Living

Wage Argument in the 21st Century,”<http://www.academia.edu/9798210/The_Cost_of_a_Thing_A_Kingian_Reformulation_of_a_Living_Wage_Argument_in_the_21st_Century> \*\*Brackets in original

Despite the pronouncement of debate as an activity

and intellectual exercise pointing to the real-world consequences of dialogue, thinking, and (personal) politics when addressing issues of racism, sexism, economic disparity, global conflicts, and

death, many of the discussions concerning these ongoing

challenges to humanity are fixed

to a paradigm which sees the adjudication of material disparities and

sociological realities as the conquest of one ideal theory over the other. In “Ideal Theory as Ideology,” Charles Mills outlines the

problem contemporary theoretical-performance styles in policy debate and

value-weighing in Lincoln-Douglass are confronted with in their attempts to get

at the concrete problems in our societies. At the outset, Mills concedes that

“ideal theory applies to moral theory as a whole (at least to normative ethics

as against metaethics); [s]ince ethics deals by definition with

normative/prescriptive/evaluative issues, [it is set] against

factual/descriptive issues.” At the most general level, the conceptual chasm between what emerges as actual problems in the world (e.g.: racism, sexism, poverty,

disease, etc.) and how we

frame such problems theoretically—the assumptions and shared ideologies we depend upon for our

problems to be heard and accepted as a worthy “problem” by an audience—is the most obvious call for an anti-ethical paradigm,

since such a paradigm insists on the

actual as the basis

of what can be considered normatively. Mills, however, describes this chasm as a problem of an

ideal-as-descriptive model which argues that for any

actual-empirical-observable social phenomenon (P), an ideal of (P) is

necessarily a representation of that phenomenon. In the idealization of a

social phenomenon (P), one “necessarily has to abstract away from certain

features” of (P) that is observed before abstraction occurs. This gap between what is actual (in the world), and what is represented by

theories and

politics of debaters proposed in rounds threatens

any real discussions about the

concrete nature of oppression and the racist economic structures which necessitate tangible

policies and reorienting changes in our value orientations. As Mills states: “What distinguishes ideal theory is the reliance on idealization to the exclusion, or at least marginalization, of the actual,” so what we are seeking to

resolve on the basis of “thought” is in fact incomplete, incorrect, or ultimately irrelevant to the actual problems which our “theories” seek to address. Our attempts to situate social disparity cannot simply appeal to the ontologization of social phenomenon—meaning we cannot suggest that the various complexities of social problems (which are constantly emerging and undisclosed beyond the effects

we observe) are

totalizable by any one set of theories within an

ideological frame be it our most cherished notions of Afro-pessimism, feminism, Marxism, or the like. At best, theoretical endorsements make us aware of sets of

actions to address ever developing problems in our empirical world, but even

this awareness does not command us to only do X, but rather do X and the other

ideas which compliment the material conditions addressed by the action X. As a

whole, debate (policy and LD) neglects the need to do X in order to remedy our

cast-away-ness among our ideological tendencies and politics.’ How then do we

pull ourselves from this seeming ir-recoverability of thought in general and in

our endorsement of socially actualizable values like that of the living wage?

It is my position that Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.’s thinking about the need for

a living wage was a unique, and remains an underappreciated, resource in our

attempts to impose value reorientation (be it through critique or normative gestures)

upon the actual world. In other words, King aims to reformulate the values

which deny the legitimacy of the living wage, and those values predicated on

the flawed views of the worker, Blacks, and the colonized (dignity, justice,

fairness, rights, etc.) used to currently justify the living wages in under our

contemporary moral parameters.

#### **2] Actor spec—**

**a. governments have to aggregate since all collective actions**

**incur tradeoffs that help some and hurt other, means based side constraints**

#### **freeze action.**

**b. no intent foresight distinction— governments can’t have intent**

**since they’re made up of multiple actors with separate motivations, ie some**

**congress people might vote for something to gain votes while other actually**

#### **think the bill is good.**

**3] Weighability— only consequentialism explains degrees of wrongness— you can only explain why breaking a promise to take a dying person**

**to the hospital is worse than breaking a promise to meet for lunch by appealing**

#### **to consequences.**

**Evaluate consequences – not**

#### **doing so is morally bankrupt**

**Daase and Friesendorf 10** (Daase; Christopher Daase; professor at the Goethe University

Frankfurt and head of the program area International Organizations and

International Law at the Peace Research Institute Frankfurt; Friesendorf;

Cornelius Friesendorf; lecturer at the Goethe University Frankfurt and research

fellow at the Peace Research Institute Frankfurt; “Rethinking Security

Governance: the problem of unintended consequences”; Routledge; 2010; pp

205-207;<http://202.166.170.213:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/1343/Rethinking%20Security%20Governance%20The%20problem%20of%20unintended%20consequences%20by%20Christopher%20Daase.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y#page=99>) [DTD]

Avoiding negative unintended consequences of security governance

This book largely reflects an analytical understanding of security governance,

not a normative one. Scholars like Anne-Marie Slaughter laud security

governance as the most viable way of dealing with today’s problems (Slaughter 2004). This book, in contrast, started off from an

agnostic point of view, describing security governance as a new mode of

problem-solving and leaving open the question as to whether security governance

efforts fulfill or frustrate policy objectives, and whether unintended

consequences are positive or negative. But now, with the empirical results at

hand, we move from the analytical to the normative. The chapters of this book

have shown that many unintended

consequences are negative, undermining the security of states, groups, and

individuals (while at

the same time creating new winners). This section briefly explores ways of avoiding negative unintended consequences

of security governance. **Not doing so would be the equivalent of researching climate change, nuclear technology, tourism, and many other issues that have negative**

**consequences, without discussing opportunities for improvement**. Offering

clues is not the same as prescribing magic pills. For the issues discussed in

this book, and for many other pressing contemporary problems, no magic pills are

available, unfortunately. If traditional foreign policy causes negative

unintended consequences (one example is the security dilemma during the Cold

War), so does security governance. The chapters of this book may make sobering

reading for anyone espousing security governance as the best contemporary

policy mode. Even refined security governance tools such as targeted sanctions

are not immune to unintended consequences, as Mikael Eriksson shows. There are

many obstacles to avoiding costly unintended consequences of security

governance. As the double effect phenomenon illustrates, unintended

consequences are often the result of trade-offs. Also, analysts of unintended

consequences have the benefit of hindsight; it is always easy to criticize

afterwards. In contrast, policymakers must take

decisions under conditions of insufficient and/or contradictory information and

time pressure. Adding to

these difficulties, there are political constraints, including public opinion,

campaigns of opposition parties and transnational activist coalitions, and

diverging interests among security governance stakeholders. Not doing anything may sometimes be better than doing something. But policymakers cannot be completely

passive in the face of pressing problems, even if they wanted to. Also, one

cannot do nothing: not intervening in an ongoing war has numerous political,

economic, humanitarian, and normative unintended consequences. The “do no harm” principle

should inform not only development work,

but security governance as well (Aoi et

al. 2007b: 274–275). But translating this mantra into practice is anything but

easy. Complacency is another problem. **Future generations** in affluent countries **will feel the effects** of climate change, and poor people in poor countries are doing so

already. Yet, most governments and ordinary citizens are unwilling to take

drastic measures, such as change their lifestyles, in order to help slow down

climate change. Hence, the “tragedy of the commons” will continue to haunt

humanity (Hardin

1968). Short-term thinking and acting is not only, and not even primarily, a problem in “underdeveloped” countries. The short life cycle of

democratically elected governments provides incentives to prioritize short-term

gains over long-term costs – and many unintended consequences are visible

only in the long run. As this book shows, international interventions to reduce the

risk of violence, whether through sanctions, financial instruments, or the

deployment of international security forces, yield unintended consequences. To avoid such consequences, **preventing conflict in the first place would be the most logical approach**. However,

democratic systems provide few incentives for systematic conflict prevention

(Schnabel 2002). The same mistakes are therefore repeated time and again (on

the failure to learn from experience from past international rule of law

efforts, see Carothers 2006

#### **1. Vote neg on presumption –**

#### **A) Nothing spills over – there’s no connection between the ballot and chancing people’s attitudes. You encourage more teams to read framework which turns your offense and prevents the alteration of mindsets.**

#### **B) No warrant for a ballot – the competitive nature of debate coopts any ethical value of advocating the aff – winning rounds only makes it look like they just want to win which proves framework and means advocating by losing is more effective.**

#### **Ballot paradox – either they don’t care about winning and you should vote negative, or they want to win which proves that debate is competitive, and fairness is an impact**

#### **C) Debate – none of their evidence is specific to it – sets a high threshold for solvency and ignores how communicative norms operate.**

#### **D) Voting aff doesn’t access social change, but voting neg resolves our procedural impacts.**

**Ritter ‘13** (JD from U Texas Law (Michael J., “Overcoming The Fiction of “Social Change Through Debate”: What’s To Learn from 2pac’s Changes?,” National Journal of Speech and Debate, Vol. 2, Issue 1)

The structure of competitive interscholastic **debate renders any message communicated in a debate round virtually incapable of creating any social change,** either in the debate community or in general society. And to the extent that the fiction of social change through debate can be proven or disproven through empirical studies or surveys, **academics instead have analyzed debate with nonapplicable** rhetorical **theory that fails to account for the unique aspects** of competitive interscholastic debate. Rather, the current debate relating to activism and competitive interscholastic debate concerns the following: “What is the best model to promote social change?” But a more fundamental question that must be addressed first is: “Can debate cause social change?” Despite over two decades of opportunity to conduct and publish empirical studies or surveys, **academic proponents of the fiction that debate can create social change have chosen not to prove this fundamental assumption, which—as this article argues—is merely a fiction that is harmful in most, if not all, respects. The position** that competitive interscholastic debate can create social change is more properly characterized as a fiction than an argument. A fiction is an invented or fabricated idea purporting to be factual but is **not provable by any human senses or rational thinking capability or is unproven by valid statistical studies.** An argument, most basically, consists of a claim and some support for why the claim is true. If the support for the claim is false or its relation to the claim is illogical, then we can deduce that the particular argument does not help in ascertaining whether the claim is true. Interscholastic competitive debate is premised upon the assumption that debate is argumentation. Because fictions are necessarily not true or cannot be proven true by any means of argumentation, the competitive interscholastic debate community should be **incredibly critical** of those fictions and adopt them only if they promote the activity and its purposes.

#### **2. Framing Issue – there is no reason why any of their offense is intrinsic to debate – BUT there is a risk that by introducing that within debate creates a perverse incentive for violence to continue – so the moment of radicality can happen.**

#### **3. The ROB is To Vote for the better debater: anything else is arbitrary and self serving which is a voter for fairness because its impossible to predict**

#### **Reducing existential risks is the top priority in any coherent moral theory**

**Plummer 15** (Theron, Philosophy @St. Andrews http://blog.practicalethics.ox.ac.uk/2015/05/moral-agreement-on-saving-the-world/)

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, **whatever** general **moral view we adopt**: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous **catastrophe**, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try **to save the world.** According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), **it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists**. **But that is a huge mistake**. Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; **it is not the view that the latter don’t matter**. Even John **Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account** in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” **Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view**. They’d thus imply **very strong reasons** to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that **most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations** of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. **We should also take into account moral uncertainty.** What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) **who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken,** and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), **they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk**. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, **reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world**. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

​​

**They don’t define autopoiesis:**

**ScienceDirect**

**Autopoiesis describes the capacity of an entity to reproduce itself.** As a concept it was first introduced in theoretical biology to explain cognition and the essence of life (see Maturana and Varela 1980, 1987 and was then further developed in general systems theory (for example, von Förster 1984). It has been widely applied in mathematics, in the study of cognition, and in studies of the nervous system as well as in information systems, cognitive science, and artificial intelligence (see Mingers 1995).

#### **The aff is advocating for “disenchanting autopoiesis” but they aren’t advocating for an end to reproduction -> turns the aff**

Wynter’s esoterically written criticism of how we discuss humanity is inaccessible to the oppressed.

Horne 15 Leonard Horne (writer from Washington, D.C.). “Real Human Being.” The New Inquiry. March 12th, 2015. http://thenewinquiry.com/essays/real-human-being/

This is compounded by the fact that her prose is wilfully labyrinthine. Who is Wynter speaking to with her work? **Are her writings legible to those who need them most?** The simplest of assertions are cloaked in neologisms, asides, modifiers, and qualifiers. The mode in which she delivers her ideas often evokes **the intellectual smugness she critiques in Western philosophers** who have overrepresented their idea of the human. Academic writing is meant to demystify the world around us and dispense the findings, but is often impenetrable. Wynter’s theory relies on shifts in the way we talk about ourselves as a species—“the rewriting of descriptive statements”—**without considering how language itself can be inaccessible**; language and the ability to wield it is a domain of power and privilege. Radical academic theory seems **doomed never to reach and interact with the people** it wants to represent: the global underclass, the jobless, the overworked and un(der)waged, and the un(der)schooled. That is not to say that complex ideas should be stripped of nuance, but theory that doesn’t care for clarity is **unable to lend itself to praxis.** While there is excellent prose in the volume—particularly from Ansfield, Mignolo and Eudell—Wynter’s theories don’t seem to produce a lot of lucidity.

#### **Wynter’s theories are unable to change power structures – they over-represent the discursive and the categorical, which obscures institutional analysis of oppressive state practices**

**Henry 2** – Ph.D. in Sociology from Cornell University and Professor of Sociology and Africana Studies at Brown University (Paget, “Sylvia Wynter: Poststructuralism and Postcolonial Thought”, Chapter in the book “Caliban’s Reason: Introducing Afro-Caribbean Philosophy”, 2002)//CProst

The systematic underrepresenting of the economic introduces the second difficulty with Wynter’s position: **the relationship between categorical processes and institutional structures**. They **are blurred** in a way that is similar to the poststructuralist erasure of the difference **between praxis and deconstruction.** In theory, **Wynter’s position is one of equality and mutuality, but in practice this is consistently violated**. For example, in the legitimacy needs of institutional systems of power, Wynter sees “the equiprimordiality of structure and c’ultural conceptions in the genesis of power.”38 In other words, “the cultural aspects of power are as original as the structural aspects; each serves as a code for the other’s development.”39 However, the above repositioning of political economy is not in line with this position of equiprimordiality. This gap suggests that **in actual practice Wynter has not been able to control the discursive tendencies toward over-representing founding categories.** The underrepresenting of economic and other institutional structures is systematically related to the overrepresentation of language, sign systems, and discursive processes in Wynter’s approach. These factors take on both a centered and determinate significance that is inconsistent with the call for de-centered discourses. This tension between categorical processes and institutional structures raises the question of the autonomy of the latter. There is little in Wynter’s texts that supports a higher cybernetic ranking for epistemic and categorical processes. On the contrary, the evidence suggests a much greater degree of autonomy for institutional structures than her ranking would entail. The differences in the temporalities of categorical/discursive processes and institutional structures constitute a good case in point. There are many instances in which institutional structures (e.g., racism or capitalism) continue to grow long after their legitimating arguments have been deconstructed. There are also cases (e.g., African religions in the new world) where categorical foundations continue to exist long after their institutional support has been removed. These differences in temporality suggest that categorical processes have only limited influences over institutional structures and that the latter possess self-preservative dynamics of their own. This autonomy means that there is no simple route from the categorical to the economic or political. The consequences of this underrepresenting of institutional structures are very evident in Wynter’s analyses of state socialism. In the cases of both Grenada and the Soviet Union, the examination moves exclusively on the categorical level. It fails to address or adequately recognize the patterns of state domination of other institutions that were related to processes of economic and political accumulation. The principle of equiprimordiality disappears in these analyses as emphasis is placed on domination generated by the liminal status of owners of private property. If we take a glance at the long and violent struggle for democracy in Haiti, the need for a stronger institutional analysis is again quite clear. While the persistence of the Noirisme/Mulatrisme opposition in Haitian society provides good grist for Wynter’s categorical mill, **there can be no getting around the hegemony of the military as an institution, and the totalitarian manner** in which it penetrated the judiciary, the church, the schools, the press, and other institutions of civil society. The categorical (onto-epistemic) deconstructing of the above opposition and its deeper epistemic structures could at best weaken but not overthrow this military hegemony. In short, **greater attention to the institutional dynamics** of Caribbean societies **is needed if Wynter’s reformulation is to adequately address the postcolonial crisis.**