### Hobbes NC

#### Presumption and permissibility negate – a. the aff has to prove the resolution true, b. For every true statement there are infinite false ones, ie if something is a pen it isn’t a car, cat etc

#### The metaethic is perspectivism – objective appeals to ethics fail.

#### [1] Opacity – we can never access another person’s perspective because we can never fully understand who someone else is or what they think, as we can only ever perceive them from the outside.

#### [2] Relativism – we each have different experiences which affects our understanding of what is true and how we construct claims. For example, a person who grew up in a racist household would be more likely to believe racist things.

#### The state of nature leads to infinite violence – competing truth claims means conflicts cannot be resolved. Everyone can assert their own claims to be true and refuse contestation, and everyone wants their truth claims to be true since it benefits them.

Irwin ‘17

“Psychological Egoism and Self-Interest” William Irwin, King’s College, Wilkes-Barre, PA Reason Papers Vol. 39, no. 2 <https://reasonpapers.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/rp_392_5.pdf> Lindale PP

The first step in arguing for psychological egoism is to note that the I, the ego, is inescapable. The word “egoism” itself suggests that the subject is primary. The I can never do what the I does not want to do. Alas, the illusion that a person can do, and perhaps ought to do, what that person does not want to do in the interest of others is a mainstay in philosophical discourse. Michael Slote, for example, worries, “If there is no such thing as (human) altruism, then the altruistic demands of most social codes and most moral philosophies may be deeply undermined,” and he scolds defenders of psychological egoism for “show[ing] precious few signs of recognizing and regretting the destructively iconoclastic direction of their views and arguments.”10 I, for one, do recognize that psychological egoism is destructive and iconoclastic, but those are not reasons to deny a philosophical truth. As I shall argue below, embracing enlightened self-interest can alleviate Slote’s concerns about negative consequences. Of course, why the I wants to do x is often complex. People believe what they think is true, and people do what they want to do. It does not make sense to say, “I believe the cat is on the mat, but I do not think it is true.”11 If you did not think it was true, you would not believe it (at least not anymore). Likewise, it does not make literal sense to say, “I do not want to exercise, but I am now going to exercise.” This, however, sounds more reasonable and less contradictory than the claim about the cat, the mat, belief, and truth. We can have competing desires. We can want and not want to do the same thing at the same time in the sense that our emotions and intellect may be in conflict. For example, a prudential, rational decision to do something unpleasant, like exercise, may override a strong emotional desire for something with more short-term pleasure, like lying on the couch. So it can make non-literal, hyperbolic sense to say “I do not want to do this at all” and yet do it in the next moment. But what is being expressed, in the exercise example, by “I do not want to do this at all” is that there is no emotional desire to do the action. The subsequent action attests, however, that there is a strong rational desire, which in this case trumped the emotional desire. In Human, All Too Human, Friedrich Nietzsche says, “No man has ever done anything that was done wholly for others and with no personal motivation whatever; how, indeed, should a man be able to do something that had no reference to himself, that is to say lacked all inner compulsion (which would have its basis in personal need)? How could the ego act without the ego?”12 The buck has to stop somewhere. It stops with the ego.13 The ego ultimately does what it wants to do; it is foundational. At the ultimate level, why you want to do something for someone else is because you want to. Thus, all actions are ultimately rooted in the desire of the ego to do what it wants. The “my own-ness” of the action, the desire that motivates it, makes it egoistic and self-interested, just not necessarily in an ugly, selfish way. Joel Marks argues: What we do is always an action, and an action is always motivated, and another name for motivation is ‘desire’. Thus, even a moralist who always strove consciously to do the right thing, even when this meant acting in opposition to other things she would much rather be doing, would, in the last analysis, be doing what she wanted to do, simply in virtue of being motivated to do the right thing.14 Marks believes that we always do what we want to do, but he also believes that what we want to do is not always what we perceive to be in our self-interest. That sounds reasonable at first, but it raises a question: If it is not in my perceived self-interest, then why do I want to do it? The easy answer is, “For the benefit of someone else.” However, that raises the question: “Why do I want to benefit someone else?” The answer then comes down to “because I want to,” and that desire may be bound up with love, guilt, duty, or what have you. But if I am doing it because I want to, then that is tantamount to acting out of self-interest. Clearly, I am acting out of an interest, and just as clearly that interest is my own. My loves, guilts, and sense of duty are my own, and I act to address them. Addressing them is my self-interest. I cannot act purely out of love, duty, or anything else. Foundational or ultimate egoism is inescapable. Foundational or ultimate or pure altruism is impossible because it would require what is impossible: doing what I ultimately do not want to do.15 This is important to recognize because it dismantles an impossible ideal that sets people up for perpetual failure and the feelings that attend the failure. To be clear, we should not equate egoism or self-interest with hedonism. For example, when you make a sacrifice to help your child, this does not necessarily mean that you are doing something you will enjoy or feel great pleasure in, but it does mean that you are choosing to do what you ultimately want to do. Satisfying that most basic desire is tantamount to serving self-interest as we have articulated it. Selfinterest cannot be defined solely in terms of pleasure, happiness, or even advantage, but only in terms of desire to make a person’s life go best. Talk of sacrifice calls to mind the well-worn example of the soldier who throws herself on a grenade to save her friends. This example is typically offered as a counterexample to disprove psychological egoism. The counterexample is ineffective, however, because it could be that, seeing the opportunity, the soldier decides she would not be able to live with allowing her friends to die.16 Or it could be that she sees this as a moment of glory that will allow her memory to live on. Or it could be that she believes there will be a heavenly reward, and so she will benefit after all. What is impossible is that the soldier does something that she does not want to do. In other words, an ultimately altruistic motivation is impossible.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the will of the sovereign. Outweighs on bindingness: only the sovereign is able to get everyone to follow its rule and enforce the law, it creates motivations for any moral rules we create. They’ll say it’s impact-justified but the state of nature is more than just physical violence – it’s also a state of war which prevents genuine truth, since genuine truth requires cooperation.

#### Vote neg – the will of the sovereign is to expand the private space industry, the aff rejects that.

Ben-Itzhak 2022 Svetla Ben-Itzhak (professor in the Political Science department at Kansas State University specializing in space and IR). January 11, 2022. Washington Post. "Companies are commercializing outer space. Do government programs still matter?". https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/01/11/companies-are-commercializing-outer-space-do-government-programs-still-matter/

2021 was a big year for private companies and space travel, and 2022 will probably be just as busy. Last year, three companies — SpaceX, Blue Origin and Virgin Galactic — achieved key feats in space travel previously reserved to countries. They transported astronauts to the International Space Station, flew space enthusiasts into space, delivered cargo to low Earth orbit and developed reusable booster rockets.

In November, Elon Musk announced that his company’s Starship project may launch as early as this month. Developed by SpaceX, the Starship system is seen by many as a game-changer for space travel and exploration. When operational, the fully reusable transport system will be capable of carrying up to 100 people to Mars, marking the next step in the commercialization of outer space.

Will commercial ventures replace national governments in space travel and exploration? My research suggests it is not very likely. While private companies have made considerable strides in popularizing space, national governments dictate the rules and provide much of the funding, securing their central role in space endeavors.

Over the last 15 years, commercial activity in space more than tripled, growing from $110 billion in 2005 to nearly $357 billion in 2020. Commercial activity in 2020 accounted for about 80 percent of the estimated $447 billion global space economy that year. Morgan Stanley projects that the sector will rocket to more than $1 trillion by 2040, with growth concentrated in the commercial space sector.

Commercial space operations kicked off in 1962 with the launch of the first transatlantic communication satellite, Telstar 1. In the United States, the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 affirmed the right of private companies to own and operate commercial satellites. Other major milestones include the Commercial Space Launch Act in 1984, a more independent U.S. Office of Commercial Space Transportation and the 2015 US SPACE Act aimed at encouraging the commercial exploration and exploitation of space.

This gradual deregulation in the United States resulted in tremendous growth of commercial space initiatives. The first privately funded rocket, the Conestoga, was launched in 1982 by Space Services. In 2004, the first private, suborbital human spaceflight took place on board SpaceShipOne. In 2012, SpaceX, a private company, began transporting cargo to and from the International Space Station. And in 2020, SpaceX flew American astronauts from U.S. soil for the first time since 2011, when NASA’s space shuttle missions ended.

Commercial space ventures picked up in 2021

Commercial ventures in space made global headlines last year when SpaceX flew two additional space station missions: Crew-2 and Crew-3, and launched Inspiration4, the first all-civilian mission to orbit Earth. Virgin Galactic launched two suborbital human spaceflights from Spaceport America, and Blue Origin conducted two spaceflights close to the 62-mile Kármán line, demarcating the beginning of outer space (Jeff Bezos, Blue Origin’s founder, owns The Washington Post).

Virgin Galactic and Blue Origin announced additional spaceflights, while SpaceX is preparing to go to the moon, Mars and beyond. NASA partnered with Blue Origin, Nanoracks and Northrop Grumman to develop commercial destinations in low-earth orbit. Bigelow, Nanoracks and Axiom Space are designing human habitats in space; Maxar and Northrop Grumman are working on the future Gateway lunar space station, Orbital Assembly plans to open the first space hotel in 2027, and Japan’s Obayashi Corp. aims to create a space elevator by 2050.

Why the commercial space sector won’t replace governments’ role

Three factors help explain why the role of national space initiatives will continue. First, countries dictate the rules in space. The 1967 Outer Space Treaty, which provides the basic legal framework of international space law, gives countries full responsibility (Article 6), liability (Article 7) and ownership (Article 8) of any commercial entity and object in space. Governments have written and signed into effect current space laws, and this means governments will continue to have primacy in space affairs. While companies may operate in space, the current system remains centered around national governments.

Second, national governments continue to play a major role in commercial space activities, often by providing substantial funding. Under NASA’s 2008 Commercial Resupply Services, for example, the U.S. agency awarded $5.9 billion in the first round of commercial resupply contracts, and up to $14 billion in the second. And under its 2011 Commercial Crew Program, NASA invested billions of dollars in a number of companies, with the goal of developing a safe and reliable U.S. commercial crew space transportation capability.

#### 1AC sample 19 proves it applies specifically to the aff

#### Also, the aff forces the sovereign to be held to external standards set by international bodies, which is a restriction on the will of the sovereign.

### Can’t spec appropriation

#### Interpretation: The aff may not defend a subset of appropriation of outer space by private entities being unjust.

#### Violation – they only defend lunar heritage

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Limits – they can pick any form of appropriation from internet satellites to asteroid mining to moon basing to Mars colonization and there’s no universal disad since they’re all different and require different uses space – explodes neg prep and leads to random appropriation of the week affs which makes cutting stable neg links impossible.

#### 2] TVA – read the aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff.

#### Fairness is a voter since the winner can’t be decided if the round was skewed and education too since it’s the point of the activity

#### Drop the debater – key to preventing future abuse since if they get dropped for unfair arguments they’re disincentivized from reading them

#### Prefer Competing interps – reasonability collapses since it’s just two brightlines justified under an offense defense paradigm, which is better because it creates a clear method for deciding the winner of the theory debate

#### No RVIs- a) illogical, you don’t win for being fair b) having the 2ar means you can sit on an RVI for 3 minutes to moot all NC offense which dissuades people from pointing out abuse.

## Case

### O/V On util – short (0:20)

#### 1] Aggregation fails – no way to compare harms, for example 50 bullet wounds to 15 cases of torture which means it’s impossible to calculate properly.

#### 2] Induction is circular – the only warrant for it is that it’s always worked in the past.

#### 3] Infinite consequences – each consequence causes another consequence which goes on infinitely – any cutoff point is arbitrary and means we can’t decide if an action is good or bad.

#### 4] Subjectivity – each person experiences pleasure and pain differently, in different amounts, and from different sources which effectively makes calculation under util impossible.

On blum – not motivational – things like smoking, doing hard drugs, and masochists disprove

Aspec is ought

### A2 Extinction First (0:20)

#### 1] Freezes action – anything has at least a 1% chance of causing extinction so we could never act

#### 2] Assumes consequences cause extinction

#### 3] It means people will only ever go for extinction level arguments, means reject it even if theoretically true – A] it kills education and argument diversity. B] it kills inclusion and safety – critiques of oppression and arguments based around people’s identities which they extend in an attempt to spread awareness about the importance of an issue through the ballot will always become irrelevant because uh oh no extinction impact.

### Util Bad

#### Util is morally repugnant:

#### Util excludes people who can’t feel happiness, which results in their manipulation.

**Peter 7**. “Utilitarianism Is Unjust.” *On Philosophy*, N.P, 8 Sept. 2007, onphilosophy.wordpress.com/2007/09/08/utilitarianism-is-unjust/.

According to this principle **utilitarianism** is unjust because it **treats people differently based on their capacity for happiness;** although utilitarians can appeal to their principles to justify this different treatment, so can racists, and like the racist the utilitarian arguments are not based on objective facts. But before we get into the details allow me to give **examples of some groups** of people who would be treated unfairly in a purely utilitarian system. The first are **those who have no capacity for happiness or unhappiness. There are rare people born without this ability**, and we can easily imagine possible species (such as the Vulcans from Star Trek) or conscious computers (such as Data, also from Star Trek) who lack it as well. **Utilitarianism cares only about maximizing happiness or pleasure, and so these people effectively wouldn’t count; their treatment would be invisible to the system**. Since **we can’t make the Vulcans unhappy we would be free to exploit them, turn them into slaves, or whatever else would make us happy.** **And since we can’t make them happy there is no reason for the system to give them any of the rights or privileges that make us happy.** Since they aren’t made unhappy by this treatment the total amount of happiness may be increased, and hence utilitarianism as a system would endorse it. Also treated unfairly are people who are in a permanent state of unhappiness. It isn’t inconceivable that someone might have a condition that prevents them from being happy, and, although many such people might choose to end their lives, there would probably be some who would still choose life. A utilitarian system would take that choice away from them, and to execute them immediately, since they will always be unhappy (negative happiness) eliminating them would increase the total amount of happiness. If such actions could be considered just it would only be if we could somehow convince these people that abusing them on the basis of their capacity for happiness is reasonable, which means convincing them of the validity of utilitarianism. This may be impossible, and not just because utilitarianism advocates acting against their interests. Consider an alien species who is rational, and has emotions, but whose emotions don’t correspond to human emotions. While we are naturally motivated to try to be as happy as possible these aliens are naturally motivated to bring the strength of their Zeb and Geb emotions into balance. Could we convince these aliens that maximizing happiness is reason for them to be treated differently? I am sure that we could make them understand that we are motivated by happiness, and that we wish to maximize it. But they won’t see that as a good reason to let themselves be abused, just as we don’t see another’s desire to steal as good reason to let them steal. No, we will reply that we have interests of our own that stealing from us hurts, and there is no good reason to favor the desire to steal over the desire to be stolen from, and every reason to do the opposite. Similarly, the aliens will reply to us that maximizing total happiness is also against their interests, and that they can’t see a reason to systematically favor happiness over a balance of Zeb and Geb.

#### There are also disabilities that prevent people from feeling pain, which means their suffering wouldn’t matter under util

MedlinePlus, n.d. US national library of medicine, https://medlineplus.gov/genetics/condition/congenital-insensitivity-to-pain-with-anhidrosis/.

Congenital insensitivity to pain with anhidrosis (CIPA) has two characteristic features: the inability to feel pain and temperature, and decreased or absent sweating (anhidrosis). This condition is also known as hereditary sensory and autonomic neuropathy type IV. The signs and symptoms of CIPA appear early, usually at birth or during infancy, but with careful medical attention, affected individuals can live into adulthood.

#### Drop the debater – a] it’s a teachable moment and creates norming towards less abhorrent arguments in debate which makes the space safer and makes people less likely to take abhorrent beliefs into the real world. b] this is also an independent reason to dtd on the AFC argument bc forcing me to go by an abhorrent theory is bad and might make many people uncomfortable or feel unsafe which is a prior question to debating

### AFC bad (0:35)

#### CI: The negative may contest the affirmative’s framework

#### 1. Prevents us from having to accept morally abhorrent frameworks which is psychologically violent, which obviously outweighs on active violence and because a debate can never be fair if one person is suffering violence

#### 2. Better for clash because we derive philosophical clash over determining the best fw to use—phil ed o/ws and turns topic education—we only derive skills from the topic if we are debating the topic in the most moral way and phil is applicable to our daily lives but we won’t all be policymakers

#### 3. Key to neg ground – the framework is almost entirely unpredictable so it’s impossible to get offense for every framework which makes it near impossible to debate without being able to contest the framework which controls the internal link to engagement and is also a voter for inclusion since small schools can’t prep offense vs every framework.

No time skew you get to weigh the aff fwk – that’s like saying making a response to the aff = timeskew

Yes topic ed – there’s still coverage of case

Prep skew nonuq – I can’t predict every aff fwk

Plus u get stuff like ext first, and you can weigh your fwk

Also no impact – I read this earlier this tournament

### 1NC – Warming

#### Lunar observation fails and interplanetary space observation solves

Siegel 18. Ethan Siegel (Siegel is a Ph.D. astrophysicist, author, and science communicator, who professes physics and astronomy at various colleges. He has won numerous awards for science writing since 2008), 10-25-2018, "Why Don't We Put A Space Telescope On The Moon?," Forbes, https://www.forbes.com/sites/startswithabang/2018/10/25/why-dont-we-put-a-space-telescope-on-the-moon/?sh=78be159a777f sean!

Yet observatories like Hubble, Chandra, Fermi, Spitzer and more have showcased how remarkably effective a space telescope can be. The views and data they've returned to Earth have taught us more than any similar observatory could have revealed from the ground. So why not put a telescope on the Moon, then? Believe it or not, it's a terrible idea in all ways except one. Here's why. The transmittance or opacity of the electromagnetic spectrum through the atmosphere. Note all the... [+] absorption features in gamma rays, X-rays, and the infrared, which is why they are best viewed from space. Over many wavelengths, such as in the radio, the ground is just as good, while others are simply impossible. The transmittance or opacity of the electromagnetic spectrum through the atmosphere. Note all the... [+] NASA The Moon, at first glance, seems like the ideal location for a telescope. There's practically no atmosphere at all, which removes all the light pollution concerns. It's far away from the Earth, which should greatly reduce the interference from any signals that humans produce. The ultra-long nights mean that you can observe the same target, continuously, for as long as 14 days at a time with no interruptions. And because you have solid ground to brace yourself against, you don't need to rely on gyroscopes or reaction wheels for pointing. It sounds like a really good deal. But if you start thinking about the way the Moon orbits the Earth, with the entire Moon-Earth system orbiting the Sun, you might start to realize some of the problems that a setup like this would inevitably encounter. First, if you put your telescope on the Moon, which side do you pick: the near side or the far side? Either one has drawbacks. If you place your telescope on the near (Earth-facing) side of the Moon, you will always have a view of the Earth. This means you can send-and-receive signals, control your telescope, and download-upload data in nearly real-time, with only the light-travel-time of signals across space limiting you. But it also means that Earth-produced interference, like radio broadcast signals, will always be a problem you need to shield yourself from. On the other hand, if you're on the far side of the Moon, you shield yourself from everything coming from Earth quite effectively, but you also have no direct path for data transfer or signal transmittance. There would have to be an additional mechanism set up, like a lunar orbiter or a link to a transmitter/receiver on the near side, just to operate it. The near and far sides of the Moon, as reconstructed with imagery from NASA's Clementine mission. The near and far sides of the Moon, as reconstructed with imagery from NASA's Clementine mission. NASA / CLEMENTINE MISSION / LUNAR & PLANETARY INSTITUTE / USRA Either way, you're going to have a slew of problems to contend with that you wouldn't encounter simply from going into the lonely abyss of interplanetary space. The two biggest are: Moonquakes. You think the Moon's a big deal because it's responsible for Earth's tides? The tidal forces that the Earth exerts on the Moon are more than 20 times greater than the Moon's tidal forces on Earth, enough to cause the Moon to experience considerable moonquakes. Temperature extremes. Because of the Moon's tidal locking to Earth and its extremely slow rotation, it's bathed in sunlight constantly for 14 days at a time, followed by 14 days of total darkness. Daytime temperatures can reach over 200 °F (nearly 100 °C), while night brings cold down to -280 °F (-173 °C). While a space-based telescope can control its temperature through either active or passive cooling (or a combination of both), a telescope must cool down below the temperature of the wavelengths it's trying to observe, or noise will swamp your intended signal. This would be a tremendous drawback for ultraviolet, optical, or infrared astronomy, all of which would have severe problems on the Moon for anything other than the goal of Earth (or Sun) observing. Engineering a telescope that can survive those temperature extremes and still function optimally is an extraordinary challenge. It's no wonder that the only lunar-based telescope we have, at present, is a UV-telescope on the Moon's near side, at wavelengths where the Earth's atmosphere absorbs almost all of the light. For most applications, going to space is going to be a superior option to going to the Moon. The lunar surface, in terms of temperature extremes and difficulties communicating with Earth, offers more drawbacks than having a surface to push against/build on offers.

#### Dust destroys moon basing before they can do research on it.

Niiler 21 Eric Niiler “The Next Big Challenge for Lunar Astronauts? Moon Dust” 08.19.2021 <https://www.wired.com/story/the-next-big-challenge-for-lunar-astronauts-moon-dust/> SM

AS NASA AND private space companies prepare to send equipment—and eventually astronauts—back to the moon, they are facing a nearly invisible threat to any future lunar outpost: tiny particles of dust. Ground-up lunar rock, known as regolith, clogs drills and other delicate instruments, and it's so sharp that it scratches space suits. Because the dust absorbs sunlight, it can also overheat sensitive electronics. Dust particles also pose a health risk. Even though Apollo-era astronauts only went outside during a few days on each mission, some reported burning eyes and stuffy nasal passages when they returned from moon walks and took off their dust-covered space suits inside the capsule. Images from the Apollo 17 mission, which focused on geology and featured seven-hour trips in the lunar rover, show astronaut Gene Cernan’s face covered in dust, like some outer space coal miner. During a technical briefing when he returned to Earth, Cernan told NASA officials that lunar dust was nothing to sneeze at. "I think dust is probably one of our greatest inhibitors to a nominal operation on the moon,” Cernan said. “I think we can overcome other physiological or physical or mechanical problems, except dust." The grit clogged the radiators that removed heat and carbon dioxide from space suits and wore a hole in the knee of Cernan’s outer space suit, according to Phil Abel, who researches moon dust as manager of the Tribology and Mechanical Components Branch at NASA’s Glenn Research Center. (Tribology is the study of wear and friction.) The Apollo 17 astronauts brought dust into the capsule, where it smelled like gunpowder and caused lunar module pilot Harrison Schmitt to have hay fever symptoms, according to a report from a NASA workshop on lunar dust in 2020. Here’s how one Apollo 12 astronaut described what happened when he returned to the lunar module after a walk on the moon: “The [module] was filthy dirty and had so much dust that when I took my helmet off, I was almost blinded. Junk immediately got into my eyes.” (The quote appears in a 2009 NASA report entitled “The Risk of Adverse Health Effects From Lunar Dust Exposure.”) Researchers at Stony Brook University exposed human lung and brain cells to lunar dust and found that it killed 90 percent of the cells, according to a study published in the journal GeoHealth in 2018. In fact, respiratory health is a top concern if and when humans return to the moon, according to Abel. “These particles get lodged down deep in your lungs, and that’s a long-term health risk,” Abel says. “There was some concern at the time that if we had needed to do more on the moon’s surface, some of the space suits would have started to leak at too high a rate. It’s something we have been working on to improve.”

### neutrino

#### The neutrino stuff

#### 1] nuclear deterrence solves – past 70ish years prove

#### 2] they don’t actually read any scenarios for conflict, means they have no impact

#### 3] Proliferation good, it expands deterrence which means there’s less war and less probability that other tech developed during wartime causes extinction