## queer pess k

#### Heteronormativity and the hyperfocus on the future places the figurative child and queer people in opposition and demonizes queer people

Edelman 04 (Lee Edelman, Duke University Press, 2004, Durham and London, “No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive”, December 6, 2004, 978-0-8223-8598-1, [https:/](https://bagelabyss.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/no_future__queer_theory_and_the_death_drive.pdf)[bagelabyss.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/no\_future\_\_queer\_theory\_and\_the\_death\_drive.pdf](http://bagelabyss.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/no_future__queer_theory_and_the_death_drive.pdf), pg 20-22) SJ

Thus, while lesbians and gay men by the thousands work for the right to marry, to serve in the military, to adopt and raise children of their own, the political right, refusing to acknowledge these comrades in reproductive futurism, counters their efforts by inviting us to kneel at the shrine of the sacred Child: the Child who might witness lewd or inappropriately intimate behavior; the Child who might find information about dangerous ‘‘lifestyles’’ on the Internet; the Child who might choose a pro-vocative book from the shelves of the public library; the Child, in short, who might find an enjoyment that would nullify the figural value, itself imposed by adult desire, of the Child as unmarked by the adult’s adulterating implication in desire itself; the Child, that is, made to image, for the satisfaction of adults, an Imaginary fullness that’s considered to want, and therefore to want for, nothing. As Lauren Berlant argues force-fully at the outset of The Queen of America Goes to Washington City, ‘‘a nation made for adult citizens has been replaced by one imagined for fetuses and children.’’22On every side, our enjoyment of liberty is eclipsed by the lengthening shadow of a Child whose freedom to develop undisturbed by encounters, or even by the threat of potential encounters, with an ‘‘otherness’’ of which its parents, its church, or the state do not ap-prove, uncompromised by any possible access to what is painted as alien desire, terroristically holds us all in check and determines that political discourse conform to the logic of a narrative wherein history unfolds as the future envisioned for a Child who must never grow up. Not for nothing, after all, does the historical construction of the homosexual as distinctive social type overlap with the appearance of such literary creations as Tiny Tim, David Balfour, and Peter Pan, who enact, in an imperative most evident today in the uncannily intimate connection between Harry Potter and Lord Voldemort, a Symbolic resistance to the unmarried men(Scrooge, Uncle Ebenezer, Captain Hook) who embody, as Voldemort’s name makes clear, a wish, a will, or a drive toward death that entails the destruction of the Child. That Child, immured in an innocence seen as continuously under seige, condenses a fantasy of vulnerability to the queerness of queer sexualities precisely insofar as that Child enshrines, in its form as sublimation, the very value for which queerness regularly finds itself condemned: an insistence on sameness that intends to re-store an Imaginary past. The Child, that is, marks the fetishistic fixation of heteronormativity: an erotically charged investment in the rigid same-ness of identity that is central to the compulsory narrative of reproductive futurism. And so, as the radical right maintains, the battle against queers is a life-and-death struggle for the future of a Child whose ruin is pursued by feminists, queers, and those who support the legal avail-ability of abortion. Indeed, as the Army of God made clear in the bomb-making guide it produced for the assistance of its militantly ‘‘pro-life’’ members, its purpose was wholly congruent with the logic of reproductive futurism: to ‘‘disrupt and ultimately destroy Satan’s power to kill our children, God’s children.

#### The drive to prevent extinction is a form of heteronormative survivalism where gendered bodies become the unwilling tools to sustain humanity.

**Mitchell 15** (Audra Mitchell, Audra Mitchell is a settler scholar who lives and works on the Ancestral and treaty lands of the Neutral (Attawandaron), Haudenosaunee and Mississaugas of the New Credit (please see Honouring the Land). She currently holds the the Canada Research Chair in Global Political Ecology at Wilfrid Laurier University. From 2015-18 she held the CIGI Chair in Global Governance and Ethics at the Balsillie School of International Affairs Audra is an Associate Professor at Wilfrid Laurier University, Canada, 8-3-2015, "Gendering extinction," Worldly, <https://worldlyir.wordpress.com/2015/08/03/gendering-extinction/>, JKS)

**The reproduction of survival/ the survival of reproduction**

Extinction is almost always understood against the horizon of survival and the imperative to sustain it – at least for life forms deemed to be of value to humans. In many cases, this imperative takes the form of deliberate strategies for enforcing existence. Donna Haraway’s influential book When Species Meet devotes considerable attention to the logics, practices and politics of Species Survival Plans. These plans monitor and enforce reproduction amongst ‘endangered’ species, not least by collecting data on populations, genetic profiles and genetic materials to enable selective breeding. This strategy assumes that all organisms can, should, and can be made to exercise their reproductive capacities in order to resist extinction, and it actively mobilizes members of ‘endangered species’ into this project. In so doing, it helps to entrench norms regarding gender, sexuality and reproductive labour that are deeply entrenched in modern, Western human cultures. Attention to these programmes highlights an important way in which extinction is gendered in dominant scientific and policy frameworks. Specifically, strategic breeding programmes share in the belief that reproduction is an imperative for those capable of reproducing if ‘the species’ is at risk’. This belief is directly related to Western norms of the reproductive imperative for women. Indeed, Haraway points out that it is precisely “‘woman’s’ putative self-defining responsibility to ‘the species’ as this singular and typological female is reduced to her reproductive function”. In a similar sense, within SSPs and other strategies of enforced survival, entire life forms are reduced to their reproductive capacities. Moreover, programmes of enforced survival can, in the context of sexual reproduction, disproportionately burden female organisms with the task of avoiding extinction. This logic is particularly fraught in discussions of the possibility of human extinction, in which female fertility (captured in the standard policy language of ‘births per woman’) is framed simultaneously as a threat to survival, and the only hope for escaping extinction (see, for instance, Alan Weisman’s comments on this). In these ways, the securitization of survival entrenches the intersectional categories of gender, species and race discussed above. Dominant discourses of extinction and conservation also entrench and privilege sexual reproduction, in ways that entrench heteronormative assumptions and norms. This is reflected in the way that the subjects of extinction and conservation are framed. The standard object of conservation is the biological ‘species’, a term which is defined by the ability of organisms to reproduce sexually. As Myra Hird has pointed out, this conception of ‘species’ makes it appear as if sexual reproduction is the ‘best’ means of sustaining the existence of a life form. However, Hird’s work demonstrates that Earthly life forms actually engage in myriad forms of reproduction, from the free exchange of DNA between bacteria to the hermaphroditic practices of some fish. The upshot of these arguments is that Earthly life is sustained through a huge variety of reproductive activities that do not conform to biological understandings of life processes or species. Crucially, Hird argues that there is no necessary hierarchy between forms of reproduction. In Darwinian terms, all species that manage to survive are equally successful. However, by conflating survival with sexual reproduction, existing discourses of extinction embed hetero-normative frameworks that devalue other forms of reproduction. They also reduce reproduction to the imperative to survive, ignoring the myriad cultural, political, aesthetic, sensual and other dimensions of reproduction.

#### Queer violence is constantly erased. Every moment that passes more lives are being purged from our history by heterosexual rejections of the notion of queer violence.

**Stanley 11** Eric Stanley (assistant professor in the Department of Gender and Sexuality Studies at the University of California, Riverside) “Near Life, Queer Death Overkill and Ontological Capture” *Duke University Press Vol 29 No 2* Summer 2011 p. 7 <https://queerhistory.files.wordpress.com/2011/06/near-life-queer-death-eric-stanley.pdf> DOA: 8.30.17 BAO

Where statistics fail, scars rise to tell other histories. From the phenomenological vault of growing up different, to the flickers of brutal details, one would not have to dig deep to uncover a corpse. Yet even with the horrific details, antiqueer violence is written as an outlaw practice, a random event, and an unexpected tragedy. Dominant culture’s necessity to disappear the enormity of antiqueer violence seems unsurprising. Yet I suggest that mainstream LGBT discourse also works in de-politicized collusion with the erasure of a structural recognition. Through this privatization the enormity of antiqueer violence is vanished. Thinking violence as individual acts versus epistemic force works to support the normative and normalizing structuring of public pain. In other words, privatizing antiqueer violence is one of the ways in which the national body and its trauma are heterosexualized, or in which the relegation of antiqueer violence, not unlike violence against women, racist violence, violence against animals (none of which are mutually exclusive), casts the national stage of violence and its ways of mourning as always human, masculinist, able-bodied, white, gender-conforming, and hetero- sexual. For national violence to have value it must be produced through the tangled exclusion of bodies whose death is valueless. To this end, as mainstream LGBT groups clambe for dominant power through attachment of a teleological narrative of progress, they too reproduce the argument that antiqueer violence is something out of the ordinary.

#### Cisheteronormativity actively constrains education and expression in debate - challenging it is key to accessing education. Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best combats structures of cisheteronormativity

**Farrell and Gupta 2004** (Farrell, Kathleen, Honors B.A. in sociology from Trinity College; M.A. and Ph.D. in sociology from Syracuse University. Professor Farrell's primary research and teaching interests include gender and sexualities, with an emphasis on inequality studies. In her courses, Professor Farrell focuses on the interdisciplinary and practical implications of sociology and Nisha Gupta, Assistant Proffessor of Psychology at University of West Georgia, "Interrupting heteronormativity: Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender pedagogy and responsible teaching at Syracuse University." (2004)) SJ

Should discussions of sexuality be included in the classroom?1 The easy answer might be no: it is not ‘relevant’ to the subject matter of most courses except perhaps to those that explicitly engage with human sexuality, such as Child and Family Studies, Sociology, or Women’s Studies. Moreover, this reasoning might go, given estimates that within the general population less than ten percent identify as non-heterosexual, there’s a good chance that in a class of sixty students everyone is straight. It is this kind of perspective, however, that not only contributes to the invisibility of LGBT students, but it also constructs and reinforces heteronormativity in our classrooms and across campus.2 LGBT students (and teachers) ARE present in our classrooms—whether we choose to see them or not—and it is their very invisible presence that demonstrates the power of heteronormativity to mask that which does not conform, and to naturalize that which does. This is a problem for both LGBT and heterosexual students and teachers alike. Heteronormative assumptions and practices regulate the beliefs, behaviors, and desires of ALL of us, restricting the range of possibilities of identification and expression for ALL of us, to such an extent that even momentary and joyful expressions (e.g. the heterosexual man singing “I feel like a woman” in the Chevy commercial discussed by Susan Adams) become sources of discomfort and fear. Practices of regulation and restriction are integral to creating and maintaining hierarchies of power, which in turn limit the kinds of learning and teaching that can happen in our classrooms. As responsible teachers, we know that our pedagogical theories and practices need to expand the kinds of learning opportunities we provide students, not restrict them. In fact, the administration of this university recognizes the importance of this by emphasizing the link between a rich intellectual climate and a diversity of perspectives and people: “[. . .] diversity in our student body, faculty, and staff has far-ranging and significant educational benefits for all nonminorities and minorities alike” (Syracuse University Academic Plan, 2001). Particular strategies to create more inclusive curricula have been developed and implemented in programs and departments university-wide because “[s]tudents in diverse learning environments learn more, and have higher levels of satisfaction and greater degrees of civic engagements. They are better able to appreciate the ideas of others and they are better prepared to enter the world they will lead” (SU Academic Plan, 2001). This diversity of students, faculty, and ideas includes: “race, ethnicity, gender, age, religious beliefs, sexual orientation, and physical and mental ability” (Syracuse University Human Resources, emphasis added). In principle, then, SU values diversity. Taking a closer look at what diversity means and how it is “practiced,” however, exposes some gaps between these principles and actual, everyday classroom procedures, particularly when that “diversity” topic is sexual orientation. It’s important to note that sexual orientation is a term that does not reference a particular set of people; it’s not only about LGBT people, but also non-LGBT, or heterosexual, people. Why is this broader definition of sexual orientation important? Because the sexual orientation of heterosexuality is simultaneously institutionalized and naturalized to the extent that it becomes the invisible norm against which all other sexual orientations, identifications, or expressions are named “abnormal.” The issue of “invisibility,” then, isn’t just about LGBT students and teachers; it’s about the ways in which our assumptions about (hetero)sexuality are invisible to us. And we carry these assumptions into our classrooms. As a result, heteronormativity is reproduced, most often unconsciously, through our own everyday classroom practices. Rather than expanding the kinds of learning opportunities we create space for, we inadvertently reinforce a regulated and restrictive framework for understanding the complexity of human sexuality.

#### The alt is embracing queer negativity as a method of resistance against cisheteronormativity and a coping mechanism for queer people

Edelman 04 (Lee Edelman, Duke University Press, 2004, Durham and London, “No Future: Queer Theory and the Death Drive”, December 6, 2004, 978-0-8223-8598-1, [https:/](https://bagelabyss.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/no_future__queer_theory_and_the_death_drive.pdf)[bagelabyss.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/no\_future\_\_queer\_theory\_and\_the\_death\_drive.pdf](http://bagelabyss.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/no_future__queer_theory_and_the_death_drive.pdf), pg 6-7 ) SJ

Truth, like queerness, irreducibly linked to the ‘‘aberrant or atypical,’’ to what chafes against ‘‘normalization,’’ finds its value not in a good susceptible to generalization, but only in the stubborn particularity that voids every notion of a general good. The embrace of queer negativity, then, can have no justification if justification requires it to reinforce some positive social value; its value, instead, resides in its challenge to value as defined by the social, and thus in its radical challenge to the very value of the social itself.8 For by figuring a refusal of the coercive belief in the paramount value of futurity, while refusing as well any backdoor hope for dialectical access to meaning, the queer dispossesses the social order of the ground on which it rests: a faith in the consistent reality of the social—and by extension, of the social subject; a faith that politics, whether of the left or of the right, implicitly affirms. Divesting such politics of its thematic trappings, bracketing the particularity of its various proposals for social organization, the queer insists that politics is always a politics of the signifier, or even of what Lacan will often refer to as ‘‘the letter.’’ It serves to shore up a reality always unmoored by signification and lacking any guarantee. To say as much is not, of course, to deny the experiential violence that frequently troubles social reality or the apparent consistency with which it bears—and thereby bears down on—us all. It is, rather, to suggest that queerness exposes the obliquity of our relation to what we experience in and as social reality, alerting us to the fantasies structurally necessary in order to sustain it and engaging those fantasies through the figural logics, the linguistic structures, that shape them. If it aims effectively to intervene in the reproduction of such a reality—an intervention that may well take the form of figuring that reality’s abortion— then queer theory must always insist on its connection to the vicissitudes of the sign, to the tension between the signifier’s collapse into the letter’s cadaverous materiality and its participation in a system of reference wherein it generates meaning itself. As a particular story, in other words, of why storytelling fails, one that takes both the value and the burden of that failure upon itself, queer theory, as I construe it, marks the ‘‘other’’ side of politics: the ‘‘side’’ where narrative realization and derealization overlap, where the energies of vitalization ceaselessly turn against themselves; the ‘‘side’’ outside all political sides, committed as they are, on every side, to futurism’s unquestioned good. The rest of this book attempts to explain the implications of this assertion, but first, let me sketch some connections between politics and the politics of the sign by establishing the psychoanalytic context within which my argument takes shape.

**uv**

**Fiat is utopian – when the debate round is over, their aff won’t be passed in the real world – but how frame their impact spills over and affects their view of the world, which means their exaggerated impacts they obscure the systemic inequalities present in the status quo**

## Ptd t

#### Interpretation: the affirmative must only garner offense from PTD

#### Violation: they garner offense from [insert]

#### PTD is the simplest method + solves the majority of impacts

**Babcock 2019** (Hope M. Babcock, “The Public Trust Doctrine, Outer Space, and the Global Commons: Time to Call Home ET,” Syracuse Law Review, Vol. 69, No. 2, 2019, <https://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3219&context=facpub>) //neth

The doctrine also appears to be infinitely malleable. Original uses of the doctrine were restricted to only that “aspect of the public domain below the low-water mark on the margin of the sea and the great lakes, the waters over those lands, and the waters within rivers and streams of any consequence,”520 and covered only traditional uses of those lands, like fishing and navigation.521 Over time, the scope and application of the doctrine broadened to protect more public resources and different uses.522 Thus, the doctrine expanded to protect new trust resources, such as dry sand beaches, inland lakes, groundwater, dry riverbeds, and wildlife,523 and passive uses of those resources, like scientific study.524 The original link to navigable water and tidelands disappeared.525 Supporters of the doctrine successfully advocated that it be applied to “wildlife, parks, cemeteries, and even works of fine art,”526 while arguing more recently its application to the atmosphere.527 A doctrine that imposes a perpetual duty on the sovereign to preserve trust resources, prevents their alienation for private benefit, assures public access to them, and can be invoked by anyone seems particularly useful as a management tool in outer space.528 The fact that public access to trust resources is so central to the doctrine makes it reflective, not contradictory, of international space law’s bar against appropriation of outer space and of the principle of space being the “province of all mankind.”529 It avoids the problems of alienation and exclusion associated with any of the management approaches associated with some form of private property and requires neither the creation of a new administrative authority nor the presence of a close-knit group of like-minded people.530 Members of the public, both rich and poor, can invoke and enforce the doctrine as easily as the sovereign.531 It is cost effective to the extent that no separate apparatus is required to implement it, and the doctrine has shown itself to be highly adaptable and innovative as different needs arise.532 It could also fill the gap in international law with respect to managing celestial property. Therefore, of all the management approaches studied here, the PTD seems the most suited to keep order in space until a regulatory regime is imposed. However, the doctrine provides no incentives for development of trust resources; rather, it might be used to limit or curtail that development, making it an imperfect, perhaps even counter-productive solution by itself to the extent that such development might be beneficial.533 Modifying the doctrine to allow limited use of private property management approaches, like tradable development claims, might buffer that effect—a form of overlapping hybridity between one type of property, a commons, and a management regime from another, private property, enabled by application of the PTD. CONCLUSION “Only a legal system that accommodates both the human need for resources and the necessary preservation of mankind’s common heritage can fulfill these criteria.”534 The future is now with regard to the development of outer space and its resources—it is no longer a question of whether humans will engage in these activities, but how soon they will. Technically advanced countries and private commercial enterprises are probing outer space and preparing for landing on an asteroid or the moon to extract their resources.535 Speculators are selling deeds to the moon’s surface and preparing to exploit the tourism potential that space offers.536 But, the legal framework for managing these initiatives is almost nonexistent.537 International treaties came into being before all this activity began in earnest and national laws that might apply are stunted by jurisdictional quandaries like the absence of national boundaries in outer space.538 Thus, there is an urgency to figure out how to control what happens in outer space before its resources are irreparably damaged or permanently monopolized by powerful countries and individuals. In the absence of regulation, much of the current debate centers on what property regime should be applied in outer space.539 The assumption is that by only allowing private property rights in space, countries and commercial enterprises will undertake the risks and costs of space development.540 However, unless international space law changes, it may prevent this from happening. If it changes, strong management controls will be necessary to prevent destruction or over-consumption of celestial resources, as well as monopolization and competitive behavior by participants, which could lead to hostilities and inequities. This Article examines various private property regimes, including those of less than full fee ownership, to see if any would avoid the conflict with the international prohibition on appropriation of outer space and its resources. It concludes that none will because each retains the right to exclude and each is insensitive to the treaties’ equity concerns. In contrast, considering outer space to be common is consistent with international space law in both respects. Hypothesizing that private property in outer space may yet prevail, this Article investigates different private property management approaches, such as the right of first possession, lotteries, and tradable development rights, to see if any would be cost effective, easy to implement and equitable, and would also prevent over-consumption, monopolization or the slide into rivalrous behavior. The Article concludes that each comes up short in some respect. Social norms as a management tool for property held in common, although compliant with international law, are also not up to the task. Instead, although ancient, the PTD, with its malleability, easy and cost-effective implementation and enforcement, non-consumption principle, and consistency with the goals that animate international space treaties, seems best suited to the task of protecting the public’s interests in the global commons that is outer space as it has done for centuries in Earth-bound commons. But, as its principal terrestrial use has been to protect trust resources from development, the doctrine needs some modification to encourage development of celestial resources. Hence, this Article suggests that modifying the PTD to allow the application of private property management tools, like tradable development rights, will not only allow development, but also will assure that when it happens, it will not be just profitable for a few, but will also be sustainable and equitable.

#### Standards

#### 1 – limits – there are infinite definitions of what private appropriations of outer space could. Your model justifies infinite affs and kills the neg’s ability to engage – we can’t be expected to prep for each of these affs – kills fairness bc big schools will always have access to more prep and kills education bc we wont be able to have substantive discussions on the aff.

#### 2 – predictability – PTD was a core aff when college policy debated a similar topic – proves that it’s at the core of the topic AND it’s what most debaters will prep against – teams use past instances of similar topics as a starting point for prep. And our model is better for small schools bc it means there’s already answers to the aff disclosed on the college policy wiki

#### Voters –

#### 1 -- Fairness – you need fairness to evaluate debate rounds – the judge needs to vote for the better debater not the better cheater. Unfair advantages in debate rounds make decisions illegitimate and hurt our ability to access real world skills.

#### 2 – education – it’s a voter because it’s the reason schools fund debate and the only portable skills we gain from debate are a result of education – knowing how to discuss the merits of broad policy options has more real world implications than knowing how to go for an rvi

#### Paradigm issues –

#### 1 – No RVIs

#### a] logic – you don’t get to win just for proving you’re topical

#### b] chilling effect – rvis disincentivize debaters from checking abuse

#### 2 – competing interpretations over reasonability

#### a] arbitrariness – reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention

#### b] brightlines mean competing interps – it becomes a debate of whose brightline is best which is the same thing as competing interps – you’re debating about whose model is best

#### 3 – drop the debater

#### a] logic – drop the argument doesn’t make sense – the shell indics their entire advocacy

#### b] severance – if they go for drop the argument it’s severance and an independent reason to negate – kicking out of the aff no-links all neg offense and forces us to restart and finish the debate in the 2nr

## case

**1] queer violence is actively erased means that even if they prove that consequentialism would give a care about queer violence it still doesn’t answer the question of if they even know it’s happening**

**2] consequentialism justify reallocation of resources away from queer bodies because they aren’t useful to reproductive futurity**

**3] value to life comes first it doesn’t matter if people die if their life isn’t worth living in the first place empirics prove transgender and other queer folk have some of the highest suicide rates because queer violence destroys value to life means we are a pre-req to their FW**

#### Aff fails – nobody to administer

**Mirzaee 2017** (Siavash Mirzaee, “Outer Space and Common Heritage of Mankind: Challenges and Solutions,” RUDN Journal of Law – December 2017, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317121083_Outer_Space_and_Common_Heritage_of_Mankind_Challenges_and_Solutions> | DOI: 10.22363/2313-2337-2017-21-1-102-114) //neth

Given that common heritage of mankind resources belongs to the international community as a whole, the second common heritage of mankind element is an inter- national management regime incorporating “representatives from all nations”. Because developed states often have greater access to common heritage of mankind resources, international management is intended to provide developing states with a measure of control over exploitation [18. P. 231]. At the present time, there is no international entity to administer the legal status of outer space strongly or dispute settlements among States. Disagreement of developed countries' and inefficiency of current entities are the main reasons for this shortage in outer space.

#### Privatization is inevitable – 75% of space is already privatized

**Urrutia 2018** (Doris Elin Urrutia, October 12, 2018, “How Will Private Space Travel Transform NASA's Next 60 Years?” <https://www.space.com/42113-nasa-future-private-spaceflight.html>) //neth

First, people should understand that about 75 percent of the worldwide space enterprise is already commercial, said Scott Hubbard, an adjunct professor in the Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics at Stanford University. This includes the satellites belonging to DirecTV and Sirius XM radio. What's news is the extension of that into the human realm," said Hubbard, who also previously directed NASA's Ames Research Center in Silicon Valley. He served as the agency's "Mars czar," restructuring NASA's robotic Red Planet-exploration program after it suffered several failures in the 1990s. And if private companies can get the price of a suborbital flight down to about $50,000, "you get a lot of interest," Hubbard told Space.com. The highest-profile program currently in the works between NASA and the private sector is the agency's Commercial Crew Program, said Eric Stallmer, president of the nonprofit Commercial Spaceflight Federation. Commercial Crew is encouraging the development of U.S. spacecraft that will carry astronauts to and from the International Space Station (ISS). Toward this end, NASA has awarded multibillion-dollar contracts to both SpaceX and Boeing, which are building capsules called Crew Dragon and CST-100 Starliner, respectively. These craft are currently scheduled to start flying astronauts sometime next year. There's also the maturing commercial cargo program, which has given contracts to SpaceX and Northrop Grumman Corp. to fly robotic cargo missions to the ISS. Both of these companies have already completed numerous such flights. Both Hubbard and Stallmer said that NASA wins by relying on private industry to provide such services in low Earth orbit. Hubbard argued that this strategy allows the space agency to continue "exploring the fringe where there really is no business case."

C1

1—regulations to priv appropriation solves for harms—for example iss collab model results in gov monitoring so that they don’t led ot human rights abuses

C2

Reg solves

#### Space based mining is not likely to be cost effective due to costs involved in the process

**Dorminev 21** (Dorminev, Bruce. “Does Commercial Asteroid Mining Still Have A Future?.” Forbes. August 31, 2021. Web. December 13, 2021. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/brucedorminey/2021/08/31/does-commercial-asteroid-mining-still-have-a-future/?sh=17c18fef1a93>.) SJ

Kargel says note only will asteroid mining require additional new advances in both spacecraft technology and launch capability, it will need someone with deep pockets to fund serious space-mining development in a way that enables them to absorb losses of billions of dollars year after year until the technology and mining operations can be scaled up to be profitable. Then unless the metals mined from the asteroids are only used for offworld construction and resources, there’s a potential problem with the economics of importing innumerable quantities of PGMs back to Earth. Paradoxically, what was extraordinarily precious may become extraordinarily cheap. While that may lead to new ingenious and more economical uses of PGMs on earth, it would probably make a space-mining operation’s balance sheet insolvent. Paradoxically, what was extraordinarily precious may become extraordinarily cheap. While that may lead to new ingenious and more economical uses of PGMs on earth, it would probably make a space-mining operation’s balance sheet insolvent. If the PGM price per troy ounce is driven down on earth due to this new cornucopia of asteroid metals, says Kargel, prices for space metals would be driven down to such an extent that launch and space operational costs would again make space-mining untenable. “That to me is a conundrum,” said Kargel.

C3

#### Climate change is a byproduct of oppression and heteronormativity, the affirmative is a first step to stop environmental exploitation

**Ourkiya 20** (Asmae Ourkiya, June 23, 2020, ecofeminist and human rights activist, “Queering Ecofeminism: Towards an Anti-Far-Right Environmentalism”, Niche, <https://niche-canada.org/2020/06/23/queering-ecofeminism-towards-an-anti-far-right-environmentalism/>) SJ

Sexism, racism, homophobia, and transphobia are systemic forms of oppression that shape our relationships with each other by designing a hierarchical pyramid. If you are a white, cisgender, straight male there is a high chance you are on top of that pyramid. This pyramid defines a person’s rights, freedom of movement, and access to resources. This translates into how natural spaces are accessed and exploited. When lands and what they have to offer are turned into a commodity by the oppressor, this system allows access to only to those willing to pay, creating an unequal distribution of the resources that are essential to the survival of the oppressed groups. These groups are usually unable to pay due to their socioeconomic backgrounds. They cannot compete with those coming from the global north and are forced to suffer the impacts of land-grabbing and capitalist exploitation of natural resources and labour. Those that exploit nature for profit assume nature to be heteronormative. The existence of queer species and queer environments was not explored by science until queer theory questioned it. Queer ecology has redefined scientific perspectives, changing what we perceive as ‘natural.’ It draws from multiple disciplines such as biology, environmental justice, and environmental humanities to contrast the dualisms that have shaped our understanding of nature, dualisms that have been used against queer people. A false heteronormative understanding long linked heterosexism to the ‘natural,’ dismissing, rejecting, and criminalising the existence of queerness. Even though homosexuality is no longer deemed ‘unnatural’ by some sectors of society,[[4]](https://niche-canada.org/2020/06/23/queering-ecofeminism-towards-an-anti-far-right-environmentalism/#Notes) the hierarchical pyramid is still gendered. Dismissing the existence of same-sex attractions among women is just an example of how misogynist societies perceive the female body: a means to pleasure heterosexual men and a biological machine meant for reproduction. Considering homosexuality and queerness as a heinous act against nature speaks of how strongly heteronormativity has fought to maintain norms that serve reproductivity: hetero-masculinities and hetero-femininities.

#### -Negative feedback loops check for warming

[**Singer**](https://www.heartland.org/sites/default/files/12-04-15_why_scientists_disagree.pdf) **et al 15**. (Dr. Siegfried Fred Singer is an Austrian-born American physicist and emeritus professor of environmental science at the University of Virginia. Dr. Robert Merlin Carter was an English palaeontologist, stratigrapher and marine geologist. Dr. Craig D. Idso is the founder, former president and current chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change. Why Scientists Disagree About Global Warming. December 4, 2015. <https://www.heartland.org/sites/default/files/12-04-15_why_scientists_disagree.pdf>)

A doubling of CO2 from pre-industrial levels (from 280 to 560 ppm) would likely produce a temperature forcing of 3.7 Wm-2 in the lower atmosphere, for about ~1°C of prima facie warming. # IPCC models stress the importance of positive feedback from increasing water vapor and thereby project warming of ~3–6°C, whereas empirical data indicate an order of magnitude less warming of ~0.3–1.0°C. # In ice core samples, changes in temperature precede parallel changes in atmospheric CO2 by several hundred years; also, temperature and CO2 are uncoupled through lengthy portions of the historical and geological records; therefore CO2 cannot be the primary forcing agent for most temperature changes. Atmospheric methane (CH4) levels for the past two decades fall well below the values projected by IPCC in its assessment reports. IPCC’s temperature projections incorporate these inflated CH4 estimates and need downward revision accordingly. # **The thawing of permafrost or submarine gas hydrates is not likely to emit dangerous amounts of methane at current rates of warming.** # **Nitrous oxide (N2O) emissions are expected to fall as CO2 concentrations and temperatures rise, indicating it acts as a negative climate feedback.** # **Other negative feedbacks on climate sensitivity that are either discounted or underestimated by IPCC include increases in low-level clouds in response to enhanced atmospheric water vapor, increases in ocean emissions of dimethyl sulfide (DMS), and the presence and total cooling effect of both natural and industrial aerosols.**