## **Off 1**

#### **Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all constructive positions on open source with highlighting on the 2021-22 NDCA LD wiki after the round in which they read them.**

#### **Violation: they haven’t opensourced Harvard Round 2 or 5- see screenshots.**



#### **Standards:**

#### **1] Evidence ethics – open source is the only way to verify before round that cards aren’t miscut – otherwise you could have highlighted unethically. That’s a voter – maintaining ethical ev practices is key to being good academics and we should be able to verify you didn’t cheat.**

#### **2] Clash—allows for nuanced evidence comparison instead of guessing what was highlighted which promotes more in-depth debates. Lack of all opensource docs supercharges b/c I have to prep in the complete dark– incentivizes abusive and bad theory debates because you can just change the aff and bait.**

#### **Drop the debater to deter future abuse and cuz the round was already skewed – there’s no arg to drop so it doesn’t solve our offense.**

#### **CI – reasonability invites judge intervention and a race to the bottom**

#### **No RVI – A) illogical b) good theory debaters will violate just to bait theory and win on RVI’s**

## **Off 2**

**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 don’t 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,**

**3---Topic ed---specific policies teaches 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 3**

#### **Counterplan: Space-faring governments except for the Federative Republic of Brazil will ban appropriation of outer space by private entities. Brazil will increase funding for space activities.**

#### **Brazil’s commercial space industry is flourishing.**

**Nakahodo 21** [Sidney Nakao Nakahodo, Sidney Nakao Nakahodo is a Lecturer at Columbia University where he specializes in Political, Social, and Economic Development in Brazil. In parallel to his academic responsibilities he is currently involved in a number of technology startups, both as co-founder and advisor. Previously he was based in Washington DC and worked in private sector development and low carbon projects at the World Bank. Prior to joining the Bank he served as senior researcher for a major think tank in Brazil and consulted for the United Nations Development Programme. Sidney holds a Master of International Affairs from Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs and a Bachelor of Materials Science and Engineering from the University of Sao Paulo (Brazil). He is also a graduate of the Advanced Studies Program in International Economic Policy at the Kiel Institute for the World Economy (Germany). 03-19-2021, "Should Space Be Part of a Development Strategy? Reflections Based Upon the Brazilian Experience," New Space, [http://doi.org/10.1089/space.2021.0002 accessed 12/14/21](https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/full/10.1089/space.2021.0002%20accessed%2012/14/21)] Adam

- AEB – Brazilian Space Agency

- AIAB – Aerospace Industries Association of Brazil

Lately, there has been a surge of interest in commercial space in Brazil due to institutional development, private sector engagement, and entrepreneurial activities. A Committee of Development of the Brazilian Space Program (CDPEB) was established in 2018 and comprises representatives of several Ministries. The CDPEB has the mandate to advise the President on the implementation of the Brazilian Space Program. Among its primary responsibilities is the elaboration of the General Law of Space, which is expected to provide the guidelines for commercial space activities.[13](https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/full/10.1089/space.2021.0002#B13) In May 2020, Brazilian Space Agency (AEB) issued a public call inviting local and foreign companies to use its civilian launch facilities.[14](https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/full/10.1089/space.2021.0002#B14)

The private sector has been actively promoting commercial space. An industrial cluster now constitutes a “Space Valley” around the Sao Jose dos Campos Technology Park (PqTec), with spin-off companies impacting both space and nonspace sectors. The Aerospace Industries Association of Brazil (AIAB) is a trade organization of traditional space companies and defense contractors such as Avibras, Akaer (Opto), Atech, Fibraforte, Orbital, and SIATT. According to its website, AIAB has 30 members working in small satellites, satellite structures, payloads, satellite equipment, ground systems, propulsion, sounding rockets, and launchers.[15](https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/full/10.1089/space.2021.0002#B15) Braskem, the world's leading biopolymer producer, has partnered with Silicon Valley-born startup Made in Space to produce recyclable plastic objects in the ISS.[16](https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/full/10.1089/space.2021.0002#B16)

Since 2017, AEB has organized the Brazilian Space Industry Forum, an annual event that congregates stakeholders, fosters the exchange of ideas, and promotes collaboration between domestic and international participants. The U.S.-Brazil CEO Forum, which brings together 12 U.S. and 12 Brazilian CEOs to develop joint recommendations for both governments on how to increase bilateral trade, proposed the development of a framework for joint space research programs in 2019.

A small but vibrant New Space startup community is rapidly forming. The Alliance of Brazilian Space Startups was launched in 2020. Although some companies target low earth orbit and beyond, others are creating solutions to our planet using space technologies. PION has commercial products focusing on space and education. CRON and EMSIS have developed software and hardware for CubeSat missions, whereas Alya Nanosatellites aims to launch a constellation and tap into the earth's observation market. DeltaV, a spin-off from INPE, specializes in propulsion systems. ACRUX and VSAT are working on small satellite launchers. Airvantis sent multiple educational experiments to the ISS and has partnerships with companies and space agencies worldwide. The startup is carrying out Brazil's first lunar mission.[17](https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/full/10.1089/space.2021.0002#B17) In parallel, Agrosmart, Solinftec, and Strider are harnessing the power of space assets to provide remote sensing, weather forecast, and image processing services to the agricultural sector.[18](https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/full/10.1089/space.2021.0002#B18) Data companies such as Storm have incorporated open source algorithms developed by NASA for security applications.[19](https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/full/10.1089/space.2021.0002#B19)

#### **Strong space sector cements Brazilian prestige and international influence AND solves alt causes**

Dr. Robert C. **Harding 17**, Professor of Political Science at Valdosta State University, PhD in Political Science from the University of Miami, MA from the University of Louisville, Space Policy in Developing Countries: The Search for Security and Development on the Final Frontier, Paperback Edition, p. 1-4

Change in the post-Cold War period has become the standard of our time. Whether it be the changing power structure of the international system, climate change, the speed of technological innovation, or changes within our societies, the current international situation is one of constant, accelerating transformation. One area that has certainly **evolved** is the **importance** and **priority** given to **space**-related programs by a growing number of countries around the world. As the various captains of Star Trek fame have somberly declared, space really is the **final frontier**. But while it has been the basis for engaging science fiction, outer space nonetheless has a very down-to-Earth feature—it has become the **ultimate venue** for the **growth** of **national power** and **socioeconomic development** among a number of the world’s **emergent states**.

This new paradigm of international relations has been evolving for over 50 years. From the Soviet Union’s launch of Sputnik in 1957, many states began to include space-based security concerns in their foreign policies, which forced them to consider what the then-new operations in space meant for national security; they also began to integrate space-based assets into their approaches to a wide range of national development challenges, from agriculture to health improvement to the development of natural resources. Though the importance of space to national power, prestige, and potential has been less obvious in the intervening years since the heady days of the Cold War’s space race, its **significance has never waned** and continues to increase as many states increase national space budgets. **Space** has, in fact, earned a **permanent place at the table** in matters of international conflict, peace, national and **international development**, and international law.

Space was at one time the sole domain of the wealthiest developed countries. The United States and the Soviet Union/Russia, and to some extent the European Union, dominated the use of space and the associated technology in the first decades after World War II. But the last couple of decades of the twentieth century and the first decade of the twenty-first witnessed an increase in the number of countries with state-supported space programs. At this writing, no fewer than 25 developing states, including the rapidly emerging economic powers of **Brazil** (the sixth largest), China (second largest), and India (fourth largest), possess active national space programs with proven independent launch capability or concrete plans to achieve it soon. Space programs and their related technologies are now an **integral part** of the strategic and developmental policies of many relatively wealthy developing states that aspire to elevate their **international status**, security, and economic future. A multitude of other developing states as diverse as Mexico, Nigeria, and Malaysia have established and elevated their own space policy through the creation of national space agencies and the purchase and/or production of satellites and related space technology either through state, private, or joint efforts. For these smaller and rising middle powers, the acquisition of space capabilities is now an integral component of their national policies.

Though commercial enterprise is not a focus of this study, it must be noted that as the cost of space-related technology has decreased dramatically, the expanding number of national state actors in space has been paced by the equally impressive expansion in the number of strictly commercial space companies. Communications, geospatial information, and a wide variety of other services provided by commercial satellites affect much of modern life, and also provide vital information to governments, their agencies, and business interests worldwide. This information covers many of the same areas that national governments find important to national well-being, such as weather and climate monitoring, water management, environmental observation, topographic mapping, natural disaster planning, and crop management. These services are provided commercially by a growing cadre of companies that build satellites, create the associated technologies, and are beginning to provide basic launch services, all areas that were previously the exclusive domain of state-owned space agencies.

The growth of commercial space services has been a double-edged sword for states. By 2010, the global space industry was estimated to be worth US$276.52 billion, an 18 percent increase over 2009.2 Of this total, worldwide commercial satellite industry revenues rose 11 percent to US$160.9 billion in 2010.3 Despite sporadic attempts to control its proliferation, commercial satellite imagery has become so good and so broadly disseminated that many national governments, for example Israel, have complained that its existence endangers national security because potential terrorists now have access to the detailed satellite imagery necessary to plan precise attacks. Until the 1990s, such high-resolution satellite imagery was almost exclusively the domain of the militaries of developed space powers, which, for national security reasons, did not generally make their data public. And since there were a limited number of states with the capability to launch surveillance satellites, the potential sources were likewise limited.

Those civilian satellites that did operate before the 1990s provided imagery of a much lower spatial resolution than their military counterparts, typically not showing clear images of objects smaller than 10 meters across. However, that situation changed with the launch of the US company Lockheed Martin’s Ikonos satellite in 1999. Its spatial resolution of one meter meant that for the first time, no country could depend on geographic distance and national borders to ensure state secrets. The situation became even more fluid through the 1990s and into the 2000s as the transfer of space technology—satellites and associated technology— became a commercially viable avenue for major satellite producers. Today, imagery services such as Google Earth have revolutionized access to satellite imagery in the same way that cell phones have changed communications access for hundreds of millions of people around the world—they have democratized it.

Nonetheless, the growing actual importance of space policy stands in stark contrast to the popular perception of the significance of space in the modern world. Indeed, more than 50 years after the launch of Sputnik, the exploration of near space via the moon-landings, and various robotic missions to the solar system’s planets, surveys have shown that few people in the West still consider space as anything novel. The popular mindset has moved on to the wonders of the “information age” and the benefits (or detriments) of globalization. The generations of technology spawned by those earlier days of space exploration have been indispensable in the creation of our high-tech, instantaneous world, but space and its benefits are now so integrated into our daily infrastructure that most people do not give it a second thought. The reactions to the Challenger and Columbia space shuttle tragedies aside, public complacency toward the importance of space has become the rule, rather than the exception.

Despite these popular sentiments, the recent expansion of space programs in the developing world demonstrates that national governments have never altered their view of the importance of space for achieving and expanding national power—militarily or socioeconomically. This expansion of space programs is especially noteworthy because it reflects an emergent **democratization of space**, which is one of the **most important factors** in the **changing distribution of power** in the current international arena. Many countries now use satellites for communications and obtaining weather data, through ownership or simply purchase of the data. In fact, this broadening and expansion of the usage of space and the attendant transformation of power distribution is seen by some observers as leading to a new space race, albeit one that has yet to gain the high profile that the previous contest had during the Cold War. This competition is emerging as the catalyst for a new generation of space-related policies and innovations in both established and emerging space-faring countries. Consider how one recent space-related event affected the dynamic of interstate relations.

In January 2007, the news that China had successfully tested an anti-satellite ballistic missile sent shockwaves around the world’s foreign policy community. By shooting down one of its own aging satellites from low Earth orbit, China—a country that only a generation before was seen as poor by most measures—demonstrated its intent to join the existing space powers, thus attracting attention, if not commanding respect as a potential world power. China plans to land a nuclear-powered unmanned rover on the moon by 2013, and to have in place an orbital military space station later in the second decade of this century.4

But while China’s space policy is more ambitious and better funded than those of other developing states, it is by no means unique. The next year of this twenty-first century space race saw India following up on the Chinese success by launching its own successful probe to the moon. Around the world, increasing numbers of developing countries are investing in space-related technologies, seeking partners for space projects, and even constructing launch facilities that may one day rival the established space powers of the United States, Russia, the European Union, and more recently Japan.

But what motivates a developing country, which by definition is relatively poor, to spend the comparatively large amounts of money required for these space adventures? The short answer is that, like the United States and the Soviet Union before them, developing countries pursue active space policies because of the recognition that **space is**, in many ways, the **ultimate measure** of **national power**, **international prestige**, and **demonstrated national potential**. Moreover, space-based assets allow states to **more fully utilize** their **national resources** and to **expand the reach of domestic socioeconomic programs** into areas as diverse as **agriculture**, **education**, **medicine**, and **economic development**. Thus a space program figures as an **integral facet** of **any** capable state’s **national security** and **development**al policies. The benefits of a successful space program include advanced communications, a platform for technology improvement, greatly enhanced geographic information, and, for some, expanded defensive and intelligence capabilities. Equally important, space programs can provide the host state with **increased international prestige**, which **accrues both domestic and international advantages**. Hence, developing countries are merely being rational state actors and following the path pioneered by those space-faring states that preceded them.

#### **It's key to project success AND overcome historical domination**

Dr. Robert C. **Harding 17**, Professor of Political Science at Valdosta State University, PhD in Political Science from the University of Miami, MA from the University of Louisville, Space Policy in Developing Countries: The Search for Security and Development on the Final Frontier, Paperback Edition, p. 23

**Space** programs bestow equally **important soft power**, especially those that involve human space flight. Every major space power has spent considerable funds to achieve the ability to put humans in space for both tangible and **intangible benefits**. Logsdon (2007) has argued that human space flight ranks among the most intensely patriotic symbols of modern times.27 Some of the emerging space actors have pursued or are pursuing human space flight as a **demonstration** of their programs’ sophistication, and their astronauts are held up by their governments as national patriotic icons. As will be discussed in Chapter 3, for the largest EMSAs—**Brazil**, China, and India—their space programs have been touted not only as **national accomplishments** but as a **national catharsis** to **overcome histories of direct and indirect domination** by outside powers and to **project to others** a **sense of greatness**.

#### **Brazilian leadership solves multiple existential threats**

**Huck 20** [Luciano Huck, from the Law School of the University of São Paulo, Host of Rede Globo, Founder of Joá Investments 1/15/2020, "This country is vital to 'global survival'," World Economic Forum,<https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/01/what-happens-next-in-brazil-has-global-consequences-here-are-three-priorities-for-the-next-decade/> accessed 12/14/21] recut Adam

From spiralling geopolitical tensions in the Middle East to raging forest fires in Australia, 2020 certainly started with a bang. A shortlist of some of our **biggest existential threats** includes **accelerating climate change**, **staggering inequalities** and the **failure of nation-states to cooperate** to **mitigate shared global risks**. With all the bad news, it is hard to see the **incredible possibilities** on the horizon, not least advances in **health**, **education** and the boundless potential of **new technologies**. A growing number of businesses including huge asset managers like BlackRock are also becoming greener. All of these challenges and opportunities are apparent in **Brazil**, the world’s fourth-largest democracy and its ninth biggest economy.

**Brazil will play a leading role in how the next decade unfolds**. A big reason for this is its immense **natural resources** - including over **40% of the world’s tropical forests** and **20% of the planet's fresh-water supply**. The Amazon is often described as the **"lungs of the world"** - for good reason. But the **lungs are collapsing** as a result of man-made fires and runaway deforestation. With more than 210 million citizens, Brazil also has an impressive stock of human resources. But it is also convulsed by breathtaking inequality and grinding poverty. Complicating matters, we are facing a crisis of political leadership and shirking our international responsibilities.

What happens next in Brazil has **far-reaching consequences** for **global survival**. The decisions adopted by Latin America's largest country - whether in relation to protecting the Amazon, reducing inequality or strengthening multilateral cooperation - will help determine whether this is the world's best century or its last one. The sheer scope of the challenges facing Brazilians can feel overwhelming. Without a transformative vision and narrative, a renewal of political leadership, and tangible improvement, people feel rudderless and afraid.

For the past 20 years, I've been taking the pulse of Brazil. I produce and present a popular television program reaching roughly 30 million Brazilians every week. Most of the time, I travel across the country listening to the inspiring and heartbreaking stories of my countrymen and women. They remind me every day why I need to contribute to building a better Brazil. So here are three challenges that I firmly believe Brazilians can turn into opportunities.

Amazon 4.0

Dramatic fires and deforestation in the Amazon made global headlines in 2019. Despite the best efforts of the Brazilian authorities to conceal the problem, the Science Ministry's own satellite data showed that deforestation rates were at the highest levels in two decades. While falling out of the international news cycle, the destruction continues. If **defo**restation persists at current rates, **irreversible die-off** could convert the world’s largest tropical forests into its **largest savannah**. This would release up to 140 billion tons of stored carbon into the atmosphere, effectively scuppering efforts to meet the Paris Agreement targets.

A radical new paradigm is needed to ensure the sustainable stewardship of Brazil's stunning cultural and biodiversity. It must harness the Amazon's most powerful resource - the 25 million people who live there. For one, there has to be zero tolerance for deforestation and a concerted focus on improving the productivity of areas where forests have already been cut down. Roughly 90% of deforestation in the Amazon is illegal and at least two-thirds of the 80 million hectares of cleared land are under-used, degraded and abandoned. Just as important as sustainable agri-business, the expansion of eco-tourism, investment in biotechnology research and the development of fairly-traded rainforest products.

In a survey conducted in August of 2019, the majority of Brazilians thought that the Amazon rainforest was a reason for national pride. At that time, up to 68 percent of respondents in Brazil strongly agreed with the sentence

Reducing inequality

Deepening social and economic inequality within countries is fundamentally reconfiguring domestic and international politics. In some cases, governments are **retreat**ing from **multilateral cooperation** and reverting to **reactionary nationalism** and **protectionism**. These dynamics are apparent in Brazil, among the world’s most unequal countries. Although Brazil made important advances in reducing poverty since the 2000s, inequality remained stubbornly high. And in recent years, per capita income plunged and the gap between the rich and poor started rising, wiping out many social gains of the previous three decades. Today, the average monthly income of the wealthiest one per cent is more than 33 times the income of the poorest 50%. Inequality not only hinders economic growth, but it also fuels polarization and populism.

Brazil needs to put inequality reduction at the top of the national agenda in 2020. A combination of common-sense interventions are required: ensuring the fairer collection of taxes, reducing subsidies for the wealthy, rolling-out more equal opportunity policies, and stimulating opportunities for the most vulnerable. Most important of all is dramatically improving the quality of basic public education, especially early childhood schooling. Brazil's education system is failing poorer families. Wealth inequality is reinforcing inequality of opportunity for the next generation. To win the war on inequality, Brazil needs an inclusive growth strategy, one that is not limited to growing income and smart deregulation but also ensures that quality public services delivering security, education, health, sanitation and transportation reach all citizens, not just those who pay a premium for them.

Restoring leadership

After years of corruption and stagnation, Brazil is suffering from sharp societal divisions and simmering tensions. In 2013, well before the street protests that flared up in Bolivia, Chile, Colombia and Ecuador, Brazil experienced the largest demonstrations since the restoration of democracy in 1985. The impeachment of President Dilma in 2016, the unprecedented unpopularity of the Temer administration and the election of far-right Jair Bolsonaro in 2018 revealed the extent of dissatisfaction with the status quo. Bolsonaro was partly elected because the credibility of Brazil's political establishment was demolished by ongoing “Car Wash” investigations into government corruption. Exhausted by scandal and stagnation, Brazilians voted for change.

To tackle the big challenges of the next decade, Brazil needs to restore and renew its political leaders from the top to bottom. Accountable, responsible and representative leadership and public service are fundamental to revitalizing the social contract. This won't happen spontaneously. It requires a conscious effort to attract and invest in talent. it also demands that each and every Brazilian gets involved. In 2017, I joined Agora, one of several dynamic civic movements investing in a new generation of leaders committed to a more inclusive and sustainable Brazil. And in 2018, I co-founded RenovaBR, attracting over 4,600 submissions from people who'd never been involved in politics for training in governance and ethics. Of the 120 successful applicants, 17 were elected to federal office that year.

Brazil is a country of infinite possibility. It has achieved **breathtaking gai**ns over the last generation - bringing tens of millions of people out of poverty. But these improvements were **fragile**. As we’ve seen in other parts of the world, when societies and living standards start moving backwards, **social protest** and **unrest** are not far behind. This is **dangerous**. Irresponsible leaders can take advantage of the fear and uncertainty that result. But we can also **fight back**. We will start rewriting the Brazilian story in 2020, first by acknowledging our most intractable problems and then by leveraging our tremendous creativity, scientific prowess and expertise. This means stepping out of our comfort zones. Powered by civic and social entrepreneurs from across the political spectrum, we can rebuild a positive vision for the future in Brazil.

# **Case**

## **Framing**

#### **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

## **ROB**

#### **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 and anything else is leads to endless clarification that is a slippery slope to always concluding affirmative.**

#### **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)

#### **ON ROB proper**

1. **We disagree with the central premise in the 1AC which is that short term extinction is inevitable**
2. **If extinction is likely inevitable the 1AC does nothing to solve the problem they posit -> the counterplan solves extinction in the way we see the most pressing**
3. **On their 4th point: crossapply the Daase and Fransdorf ev. As well as the Curry evidence which tells you any ethical-moral theory prioritizes extinction and not doing so would be repugnant**
4. **On the 5th point: responding to conflict after it happens is impossible, and preemptively only works under a utilitarian calculus. Then, they are in a double bind insofar as util also focuses on the end result of actions based on their consequences just not in a pessimistic way -> i.e we believe saving the world and preventing extinction is possible**

**​​Space as a new frontier helps resolve issues of representation, sexism, and other issues on Earth**

**Denton 19 — (Adeene Denton, Planetary Scientist, “Untangling feminism, nationalism and space exploration in the age of Artemis“, Medium, 12-15-2019, Available Online at https://medium.com/swlh/untangling-feminism-nationalism-and-space-exploration-in-the-age-of-artemis-8752297861f4, accessed 1-28-2022, HKR-AR)**

**On May 14, 2019, Jim Bridenstine announced NASA’s newest human-centered space exploration program: Artemis, an aspirational successor to Apollo that would land “the first woman and the next man” on the Moon’s south pole by 2024. His announcement came two months after the agency’s failed attempt at an all-women spacewalk, awkwardly canceled as representatives hastily cited a lack of suits in the proper size. For many of us who had eagerly anticipated a woman-led spacewalk, its cancellation came as a sinking disappointment, and an uncomfortable reminder that an agency that specializes in thinking of all emergencies necessary to keep its astronauts safe stumbled once again on the hurdle of women’s bodies. Even as NASA put women at the center of space exploration’s future, it couldn’t seem to take care of the female space explorers it employed in the present.**

**But the story’s not over: on October 18, 2019, NASA finally made good on its promise of an all-women spacewalk. The recording-breaking Christina Koch and Jessica Meir spent over seven hours swapping out one of the ISS’s power controllers, performing a series of grueling tasks with the practiced efficiency of excellent astronauts. It was an honor to tune in to the spacewalk’s livestream from my desk; there’s truly nothing more invigorating than watching strong, capable women succeed. And yet, this piece isn’t about that. It’s about the hollow feeling I’ve had these past six months as I’ve watched the approach of NASA’s leaders (and, of course, its social media team) to the concept of women in space. By all accounts, the future is brighter than it’s ever been for women who want to slip the surly bonds of Earth — after all, women are the proclaimed centerpiece of the United States’ efforts to return to the Moon! If Artemis can leave the ground, a woman is guaranteed to set boots on lunar regolith.**

**As a woman and an aspiring astronaut, I certainly feel some joy at this news. And yet, at the risk of alienating my potential employers (oops…) and also tastelessly paraphrasing Shakespeare, I come not to praise NASA’s recent moves, but to question them. I am a firm believer in NASA’s mission and in space exploration as a whole; for me, space exploration is the most profound tool we have to explore the universe and our place in it. However, I am also resolutely committed to critiquing the things that I love so that they may improve. That’s where this (way too long) essay comes in. As I said above, women are the centerpiece of NASA’s lunar efforts — this same concept that gives me immense joy gives me cause for concern; when women are made centerpieces we are often unmade as people. Our presence becomes an end rather than a means. (Yes, yes this is not always true, but please consider that this statement is backed by both lived experience and a history’s worth of anecdotes).**

**Violence and extinction are not inevitable – human ingenuity**

**Peiser, 2007** (Benny, Ph.D. and Social Anthropologist at Liverpool John Moores University, “Existential Risks and Democratic Peace”, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/7081804.stm)

In recent years, leading scientists in the UK, such as Brandon Carter, Stephen Hawking and Sir Martin Rees, have advanced the so-called Doomsday Argument, a cosmological theory in which global catastrophes due to low-probability mega-disasters play a considerable role. This speculative theory maintains that scientific risk assessments have systematically underestimated existential hazards. Hence the probability is growing that humankind will be wiped out in the near future. Nevertheless, **there are many good and compelling reasons why human extinction is not predetermined or unavoidable**. According to a more optimistic view of the future, **all existential risks can be tackled, eliminated or significantly reduced through the application of human ingenuity, hyper-technologies and global democratisation.** From this confident perspective of emergent risk reduction, the resilience of civilisation is no longer restricted by the constraints of human biology. Instead, it is progressively shielded against natural and man-made disasters by hyper-complex devices and information-crunching technologies that potentially comprise boundless technological solutions to existential risks. Current advances in developing an effective planetary defence system, for example, will eventually lead to a protective shield that can safeguard life on the Earth from disastrous NEO impacts. The societal response to the cosmic impact hazard is a prime example of how technology can ultimately eliminate an existential risk from the list of contemporary concerns. A technology-based response to climate change impacts is equally feasible, and equally capable of solving the problem. Global democracy as a solution But while most natural extinction risks can be entirely eliminated by technological fixes, no such clean-cut solutions are available for the inherent potential threats posed by super-technologies. After all, the principal threat to our long-term survival is the destabilising and destructive violence committed by extremist groups and authoritarian regimes. Here, the solution can only be political and cultural. Fortunately, there is compelling evidence that the global ascent of democratic liberalism is directly correlated with a steep reduction of armed conflicts. A recent UN report found that the total number of wars and civil conflicts has declined by 40% since the end of the Cold War, while the average number of deaths per conflict has dropped dramatically, from 37,000 in 1950 to 600 in 2002. According to the field of democratic peace research, the growing number of democracies is the foremost reason for the pacification of many international conflicts. Democracies have never gone to war against each other, as democratic states adopt compromise solutions to both internal and external problems. As Rudolph J Rummel, one of the world's most eminent peace researchers, has stated: "In democracy we have a cure for war and a way of minimising political violence, genocide, and mass murder." On balance, therefore, I believe that the prophets of doom, including those predicting climate doom, are wrong. Admittedly, there is no guarantee that we can avoid major mayhem and disruption during our risky transition to become a hyper-technological, type 1 civilisation. Even so, societal evolution has now reached a level of complexity that renders the probability of human survival much higher than at any hitherto stage of history.

**LASTLY: its a good thing gatorade wasn’t created at florida state…. No one would buy Seminole Fluid**