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#### **Space debris is rising to dangerous levels**

Choudhury 18’ – Saheli Roy Choudhury, Saheli Roy Choudhury is a reporter for CNBC.com. She reports on technology news in Asia Pacific, with a focus on artificial intelligence, 5G and cybersecurity. She also covers India and writes on market moves in the region, “Space junk is a big problem and it’s going to get worse”, CNBC, 09/18/18 [<https://www.cnbc.com/2018/09/18/wef-tianjin-space-junk-is-a-big-problem-and-its-going-to-get-worse.html>] Accessed 12/12/21 AHS//AP

Space debris has become a huge problem. Their accumulation in Earth’s orbit has become a hindrance and can endanger future missions to the moon or Mars, according to the chief of a company that’s trying to solve the issue. A surge in aggressive space ventures in recent years has seen a build-up of space junk, and they are set to grow exponentially, Nobu Okada, founder and CEO of Astroscale, told CNBC at the [World Economic Forum’s](https://www.cnbc.com/tianjin--world-economic-forum/) Annual Meeting of the New Champions in Tianjin, [China](https://www.cnbc.com/china/). “Over the last 5 to 7 years, we saw (about) 2,000 space ventures in the world. Their plans are so aggressive, they’re going to launch 10,000 to 20,000 satellites over the next 5 to 10 years,” he said. “We see the exponential growth of objects in space.” There are [more than 500,000 pieces of junk](https://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/station/news/orbital_debris.html) floating around Earth’s orbit, including defunct satellites, rocket boosters, nuts and bolts, all of which pose a substantial threat to astronauts and spacecraft, according to U.S. space agency NASA. [The European Space Agency said](https://www.esa.int/Our_Activities/Operations/Space_Debris/Space_debris_by_the_numbers) that as of January 2018, there are about 29,000 objects larger than 10 centimeters, around 750,000 objects that range between 1 cm to 10 cm and about 166 million objects between 1 millimeter to 1 cm in size. Okada said that pieces of debris fly around the Earth throughout the day, and there are plenty of near-miss situations where two objects almost collide. When they do hit each other, those collisions end up creating even more debris. “Even the small particle caused by the collision has enough power to blow up a satellite,” he said. “If we continue the chain reactions of the collisions, we won’t be able to put our space assets into space. So it’s now (that) we have to remove large objects from space.”

#### Private companies are key to cleanup

Moore and Burken 21’ – Adrian Moore and Rebecca van Burken, Adrian Moore is vice president and Rebecca van Burken is a senior policy fellow at Reason Foundation, where they are authors of the report, “U.S. Space Traffic Management And Orbital Debris Policy.”, “It's time for US to get serious about cleaning up space junk”, The Hill, July 27th, 2021, [https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/564945-its-time-for-us-to-get-serious-about-cleaning-up-space-junk] Accessed 12/14/21 AHS//AP

Urgency means committing to better space traffic management, and tracking and removing orbital debris. Orbital debris management is not well organized within the government. Right now, the Department of Defense (DOD) does most tracking of space debris for the U.S. out of the need to protect military satellites and national security interests. NASA has its own less advanced systems for tracking debris. However, orbital debris management is not just about tracking debris anymore. It is also about forming collision warning systems and safely managing traffic in space. To do this efficiently, we need a civil repository for all orbital debris components, [something that many commercial space companies have already created on their own](https://www.axios.com/space-junk-tracking-business-a365462b-a82e-4926-849b-5f292dd1b164.html) to stay aware of orbital debris and help protect their satellites in space. Tracking debris may be a national security priority, but providing space traffic control is not really in the Defense Department’s mission. We should be utilizing the private sector’s expertise and advancements in this area. For example, Astroscale has contracts with both the Japanese and European space agencies to develop orbital debris removal capability. And responsibility for developing collision warnings and space traffic management [would be best suited for the Office of Space Commerce](https://reason.org/policy-brief/u-s-space-traffic-management-and-orbital-debris-policy/), an office with existing connections to the commercial space industry, NASA and DOD. Partnering with the debris tracking and removal systems private companies are developing while freeing up DOD to focus on military awareness and NASA to focus on research and development would be the most efficient way forward. If government works with private industry through strategic public-private partnerships, the U.S. can best address the threats posed by orbital debris and create sustainable policies for safe space exploration.

#### Space debris damages lead to war and economic collapse

**Blatt 20 -** Talia M. Blatt, I am a rising sophomore at Harvard, considering a joint concentration in Social Studies and Integrative Biology with a citation in Chinese. I specialize in East Asian geopolitics and security issues, "Anti-Satellite Weapons and the Emerging Space Arms Race," Harvard International Review, May 26th, 2020, [https://hir.harvard.edu/anti-satellite-weapons-and-the-emerging-space-arms-race/] Accessed 12/12/21 recut AHS//AP

ASAT testing, rather than deployment, risks the exponential accumulation of debris, which endangers satellites and creates a host of other problems. KE-ASATs rely on smashing satellites into thousands of pieces, so each test adds tremendous amounts of space debris. The 2007 Chinese KE-ASAT test alone increased the number of objects in orbit by 20 percent, producing more than two thousand pieces of debris large enough to be tracked and likely thousands more too small to be counted that will remain in orbit for centuries. Even the smallest pieces of debris can do great damage; traveling at more than 15,000 miles per hour, they can crash into other debris in a proliferation known as the Kessler Syndrome. The situation in space could approach a critical mass in which collision cascading occurs even if all launches were halted, choking orbits with debris until all satellites are destroyed and spaceflight rendered impossible. Compared to the negligible debris created during commercial launches, ASAT tests—especially if the arms race continues to escalate and countries with less developed space programs join with cruder designs—may accelerate the debris in space closer and closer to this critical mass. If debris knocks out a satellite, an increasingly likely possibility in a world with ASAT tests, then the aforementioned conflict scenarios become more likely. Conflict aside, ASAT-based debris clouds are terrifying in their own right. Public health, transportation, climate science, and a litany of other crucial infrastructures are dependent on satellites that are now at risk. Satellite GPS is a cornerstone of the modern economy; some pundits believe that the slightest glitch in GPS satellites could shock the stock market and further destabilize an unstable global economy. During the pandemic, satellites are playing a crucial role in geospatial data collection for infectious disease modeling.

#### Conflict scenarios escalate to nuclear war 0 leads to extinction.

**Van der Meer 19:** Sico van der Meer: Drs. Sico van der Meer is a Research Fellow at the Clingendael Institute. His research is focussing on non-conventional weapons like Weapons of Mass Destruction and cyber weapons from a strategic policy perspective. He graduated from the Radboud University Nijmegen in 1999 with a Master’s in History. Before joining the Clingendael Institute, he worked as a journalist and as a Fellow of a think tank on civil-military relations. In 2016 he was seconded to the Taskforce International Cyber Policies of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs. “NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL: THE END OF AN ERA?” [https://spectator.clingendael.org/en/publication/nuclear-arms-control-end-era] NPR recut ahs//emi

Arms control appears to be in a state of crisis. This Clingendael Spectator series explores the different dimensions of this global challenge. In the second episode: the return of nuclear weapons in international politics. Investments in arsenals have increased, rhetoric on nuclear weapons returned and arms control agreements are in trouble. Is nuclear war becoming an actual option? While nuclear weapons may have disappeared from the attention of the general public after the end of the Cold War, they kept playing an important role in international relations. In the last few years they re-entered the spotlights: all nuclear-armed states are investing enormous amounts of money in modernising and expanding their arsenals, various nuclear arms control agreements are abandoned or under pressure and nuclear weapons are even back in political rhetoric by world leaders. What is happening? Weapons not for use Only two nuclear weapons have ever been used in war: the bombs destroying the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. Those two rather primitive nuclear bombs killed approximately 105,000 people immediately and many more people died later due to injuries.[1] Even today, survivors and their descendants suffer from health problems caused by the radiation released by the bombs. Simplified, the fact that nuclear weapons have not been used in warfare after 1945 has two reasons. Firstly, nuclear weapons proved to be so destructive that only threatening to use them was enough to make them effective policy tools. Attacks from other states could be deterred just by having the ability to use nuclear weapons, since any attack could result in a nuclear counter-attack which the attacking state would not survive. Next to this practical consideration, there is also an ethical aspect: nuclear weapons are generally considered to be too horrible to be used because of their humanitarian consequences. Apart from the potentially huge number of victims in nuclear war, the radiological fall-out causes long-term health consequences for survivors and their descendants. Moreover, climate scientists warn for serious climate problems resulting from nuclear war. The so-called ‘nuclear winter’ effect causes a drop in global temperature because ash and soot in the atmosphere would block the sunlight.[2] In case of a relatively limited nuclear war, this effect may already cause famine all over the world, and in case of **a large-scale nuclear war it may even extinct humankind**.[3] A recent scenario by Princeton University showed that a conflict between the US and Russia escalating to nuclear weapon use could cause more than 90 million people dead and injured within only the first few hours of the conflict.[4] Successes in arms control Soon after the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, politicians in many countries started urging for international agreements to prevent the production and use of nuclear weapons. This led to many decades of nuclear arms control negotiations with many impressive results. To mention only a few successes: Non-Proliferation Treaty The Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), dating from 1968, prohibits states from obtaining nuclear weapons. The five states that had already developed nuclear weapons by 1968 - the United States, the So iet Union, China, the United Kingdom and France - promised in the treaty to work towards elimination of their stockpiles. The treaty is very effective: it almost halted the proliferation of nuclear weapons over the world. After 1968 only five more states developed nuclear weapons: Israel, South Africa, India, Pakistan, and North Korea (South Africa dismantled its nuclear weapons in 1989). Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), dating from 1996, preceded by the Partial Test Ban Treaty (PTBT) of 1963, prohibits nuclear test explosions. Even though the treaty did not yet enter into force because some required ratifications are missing, it effectively set a broadly supported norm against nuclear testing. Bilateral arms control agreements Various bilateral arms control agreements between the US and the Soviet Union (and later Russia) were highly successful as well. Being by far the largest possessors of nuclear weapons (together these two states possess more than 90 percent of all nuclear weapons), agreements among them had a huge influence. Especially the series of treaties limiting the maximum number of deployed nuclear weapons in both countries caused the total number of nuclear weapons in the world to drop from almost 70,000 in the 1980s to some 15,000 nowadays.[5] The latest treaty in this series is New START, signed in 2010. The US and the Soviet Union also negotiated agreements on banning specific types of nuclear weapons or related systems, such as anti-ballistic missile systems in the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty of 1972 and ground-launched intermediate-range missiles in the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty of 1987. Declining public attention For many years after the end of the Cold War, the risk of nuclear weapons seemed to be taken care of and faded from public attention. The various arms control agreements did their work, the number of nuclear arms decreased and almost no-one talked about using them anymore. Yet, something went wrong. The trend of decreasing numbers slowed down and nuclear deterrence continued to be a keystone of defence policies in the nuclear armed states and their allies. Moreover, of the five states that developed nuclear weapons after the NPT came into existence, three tested their first nuclear bombs several years after the end of the Cold War: India and Pakistan in 1998, North Korea in 2009. It is hard to pinpoint when the first clear cracks in the nuclear arms control system appeared. It may well have been the unilateral US withdrawal from the ABM Treaty in 2002, or maybe the enlargement of NATO in the late 1990s, which increased distrust in Russia about the intentions of the US and its European allies. Even though nuclear disarmament ideas got some new boost when President Barack Obama entered the White House in 2009, in practice he achieved very little. Trillions of dollars Slow and (for most people) hardly visible developments brought us to the current situation: all nine nuclear armed states are investing heavily in modernising and/or increasing their nuclear arsenals and related delivery systems, such as missiles.[6] The US modernisation programme alone is already estimated to cost between 1.2 and 1.5 trillion US dollars.[7] Some investments, for example in low-yield nuclear weapons and cruise missiles with nuclear warheads, are dangerously lowering the threshold for use as well as blurring the line between conventional and nuclear weapons. This may more easily lead to nuclear war because of misperceptions. Moreover, nuclear weapons are back in political rhetoric: leaders of nuclear armed states are openly boasting about their arsenals and threatening to use them.[8] Combined with other geopolitical developments, such as the Russian annexation of the Crimea and support of armed rebels in eastern Ukraine, tensions in the international strategic environment increased even further. While tensions grew, trust in nuclear arms agreements dropped. **Arms control under stress In 2018 the US withdrew unilaterally from the nuclear deal with Iran** (officially: the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or JCPOA). **President Donald Trump stated it was “a horrible, one-sided deal that should have never, ever been made”, especially because it still allowed Iran a residual (though very restricted) nuclear programme and did not include limits on Iran’s “other malign behaviour.”[**9] The US withdrawal came only after Iran had significantly downscaled its nuclear programme and was in full compliance with the deal. This is why the US withdrawal is expected to have a long-time negative influence on any diplomatic arms control and non-proliferation negotiations: many states will doubt whether they could trust any promise by the US. In 2019 both the US and Russia withdrew from the INF Treaty after accusing each other of violating it. The unwillingness of both sides to save the treaty was a clear show of distrust. Especially Europe, which is in the direct range of the missiles that were prohibited under the INF Treaty, expressed worries about its demise The US signalled that a new agreement on some categories of (nuclear) missiles could be negotiated, but only if China would be involved. Yet, China reiterated that it would only join any nuclear weapons-related negotiations after the US and Russia would have reduced their nuclear arsenals significantly; while China has some 290 nuclear weapons, the US and Russia possess more than 6000 each.[10] Meanwhile, the New START Treaty is due to expire in February 2021. Russia has expressed a wish to extend or renew the treaty several times, but so far the US has been reluctant to engage in any serious talks on the issue. Many experts fear that New START will not be extended or succeeded, which means that both the US and Russia are free to deploy as many nuclear weapons as they wish.[11] **This risks a new Cold War style arms race including increased instability and dangerous escalation potential.** Also in 2019, the US accused Russia of violating the CTBT by secretly conducting limited nuclear weapon testing. Even though the CTBT did never enter into force - one of the main reasons being the US’ unwillingness to ratify the treaty - this non-substantiated accusation could damage trust in the CTBT and sour US-Russian relations even more. Cornerstone under pressure In the meantime, the NPT, often called ‘the cornerstone of the global non-proliferation regime’, also faces increasing criticism. For several years, many non-nuclear armed states complain about the lack of nuclear disarmament by the five nuclear armed NPT-member states, who in Article 6 of the treaty promised to “to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.”[12] The investments and rhetoric described above are only fuelling this frustration further. The 2015 NPT Review Conference failed to reach any consensus document. The prospects for the next Review
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#### The Role of the Judge is to vote for whoever does the better debating – any other metric is arbitrary and self serving.

#### The standard and role of the ballot is to maximize expected well-being because pleasure is intrinsically good and pain is intrinsically bad

#### ] Util is a lexical pre-requisite to any other framework-threats to bodily security and life preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively utilize and act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis that inhibit the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose – so, util comes first and my offense outweighs theirs under their own framework.

#### ] Ethical frameworks must be theoretically legitimate since they are functionally topicality interpretations of the word ought.

#### Prefer–

#### a] Ground: Both debaters are guaranteed access to ground – Aff gets plans and advantages, while Neg gets disads and counterplans. Anything functions as an impact as long as an external benefit is articulated, so all your offense applies.

#### ] Extinction outweighs

Pummer 15 [Theron, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford. “Moral Agreement on Saving the World” Practical Ethics, University of Oxford. May 18, 2015] AT

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)

#### ] Policy education is key to portable advocacy

Nixon 2KMakani Themba-Nixon, Executive Director of The Praxis Project. “Changing the Rules: What Public Policy Means for Organizing.” Colorlines 3.2, 2000.

Getting It in Writing Much of the work of framing what we stand for takes place in the shaping of demands. By getting into the policy arena in a proactive manner, we can take our demands to the next level. Our demands can become law, with real consequences if the agreement is broken. After all the organizing, press work, and effort, a group should leave a decision maker with more than a handshake and his or her word. Of course, this work requires a certain amount of interaction with "the suits," as well as struggles with the bureaucracy, the technical language, and the all-too-common resistance by decision makers. Still, if it's worth demanding, it's worth having in writing-whether as law, regulation, or internal policy. From ballot initiatives on rent control to laws requiring worker protections, organizers are leveraging their power into written policies that are making a real difference in their communities. Of course, policy work is just one tool in our organizing arsenal, but it is a tool we simply can't afford to ignore. Making policy work an integral part of organizing will require a certain amount of retrofitting. We will need to develop the capacity to translate our information, data, stories that are designed to affect the public conversation [and]. Perhaps most important, we will need to move beyond fighting problems and on to framing solutions that bring us closer to our vision of how things should be. And then we must be committed to making it so.
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#### 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>] 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/>] 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: There’s no plan, they defend the res as a general rule.

#### Prefer:

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

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

#### 3---Topic ed---specific policies 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.

#### 4 – some education analytic

#### TVA- This aff with a global commons advocacy- allows legit the same aff, and you still center you method

#### Fairness – 1) Intrinsic good 2) args assume it’s good or throw args out

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

#### DTD to deter future abuse, especially since it’s whole advocacy

#### 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

# Case

#### The case double-turns itself massively — they talk about colonialism but don’t mention indigenous people ONCE

#### Talk about frontiers without recognizing the indigenous people whose land we stand on and profit over

#### “Colonialist capitalism” but never ONCE mentions the tribes that were in CANZUS or other colonialist nations

#### Jones 4 – made the active choice to highlight all futurism except Aoteroa (Maori) futurism, showing a footnoting of indigenous peoples

#### Economic growth key to check every world crisis

**Ferrara 14** [Peter, Director of Entitlement for the Heartland Institute, “Why economic growth is exponentially more important than income inequality”, published 2014, accessible online at <https://www.forbes.com/sites/peterferrara/2014/01/14/why-economic-growth-is-exponentially-more-important-than-income-inequality/#4b4f36b91483>] // BBM

Such **econ**omic **growth has produced dramatic improvements** in personal health as well. Throughout most of human history, a typical lifespan was 25 to 30 years, as Moore and Simon report. But “from the mid-18th century to today, life spans in the advanced countries jumped from less than 30 years to about 75 years.” Average life expectancy in the U.S. has grown by more than 50% since 1900. Infant mortality declined from 1 in 10 back then to 1 in 150 today. Children under 15 are at least 10 times less likely to die, as one in four did during the 19th century, with their death rate reduced by 95%. The maternal death rate from pregnancy and childbirth was also 100 times greater back then than today. Moore and Simon further recount, “Just **three infectious diseases** – tuberculosis, pneumonia, and diarrhea – accounted for almost half of all deaths in 1900.” Today, we **have virtually eliminated** or drastically reduced these and other scourges of infectious disease that have killed or crippled billions throughout human history, such as typhoid fever, cholera, typhus, plague, smallpox, diphtheria, polio, influenza, bronchitis, whooping cough, malaria, and others. Besides the advances in the development and application of modern health sciences, this has resulted from the **drastic reduction in** filthy and **unsanitary living conditions that economic growth has made possible** as well. More recently, great progress is being made against heart disease and cancer. Also greatly contributing to the well-being of working people, **the middle class, and the poor in America has been the dramatically declining cost of food** resulting from economic growth and **soaring productivity in agriculture**. As Moore and Simon report, “Americans devoted almost 50 percent of their incomes to putting food on the table in the early 1900s compared with 10 percent in the late 1900s.” While most of human history has involved a struggle against starvation, today in America the battle is against obesity, even more so among the poor. Moore and Simon quote Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation, “The average consumption of protein, minerals, and vitamins is virtually the same for poor and middle income children, and in most cases is well above recommended norms for all children. Most poor children today are in fact overnourished.” That cited data comes from the U.S. Census Bureau. As a result, poor children in America today “grow up to be about 1 inch taller and 10 pounds heavier than the GIs who stormed the beaches of Normandy in World War II.” That has resulted from a U.S. agricultural sector that required 75% of all American workers in 1800, 40% in 1900, and just 2.5% today, to “grow more than enough food for the entire nation and then enough to make the United States the world’s breadbasket.” Indeed, today, “The United States feeds three times as many people with one-third as many total farmers on one-third less farmland than in 1900,” in the process producing “almost 25 percent of the world’s food.” Moreover, it is **economic growth** that has **provided the resources enabling us to** dramatically **reduce pollution and improve the environment**,without trashing our standard of living. Moore and Simon write that at the beginning of the last century, “Industrial cities typically were enveloped in clouds of black soot and smoke. At this stage of the industrial revolution, factories belched poisons into the air—and this was proudly regarded as a sign of prosperity and progress. Streets were smelly and garbage-filled before the era of modern sewage systems and plumbing.” Not any of these truly dramatic advances for the poor, working people and the middle class could have been achieved by redistribution from “the rich.” **Only economic growth could achieve these results.** Nor would it have been worth sacrificing any of these world shattering gains for greater economic “equality.” And Barack Obama’s leftist protestations to the contrary notwithstanding, economists have long recognized the conflict between economic equality and maximizing economic growth. Put most simply, penalizing investors, successful entrepreneurs, and job creators with higher taxes, to reward the less productive with government handouts, to make everyone more equal, is a sure fire way to get less productivity, fewer jobs, lower wages, and reduced economic growth. The above history, and the future prospects below, are why to most benefit the poor, working people, and the middle class, our nation’s overriding goal must be to maximize economic growth. Consider, if total real compensation, wages and benefits, grow at just 1% a year, after 20 years the real incomes of working people would be only 22% greater. After 40 years, a generation, real incomes would be 50% more. But with sustained real compensation growth of 2%, after just 20 years the real incomes and living standards of working people would be nearly 50% greater, and after 40 years they would be 120% greater, more than doubled. At sustained 3% growth in wages and benefits, after 20 years **the living standards of working people** will have almost doubled, and after 40 years they will **have more than tripled**. The U.S. economy sustained a real rate of economic growth of 3.3% from 1945 to 1973, and achieved the same 3.3% sustained real growth from 1982 to 2007. (Note that this 3.3% growth rate for the entire economy includes population growth. Real wages and benefits discussed above is a per worker concept). It was only during the stagflation decade of 1973 to 1982, reflecting the same Keynesian economics that President Obama is pursuing today, that real growth fell to only half long term trends. If we could revive and sustain that same 3.3% real growth for 20 years, our total economic production (GDP) would double in that time. After 30 years, our economic output would grow by 2 and two-thirds. After 40 years, our prosperity bounty would grow by 3 and two-thirds. If we are truly following growth maximizing policies, we could conceivably do even better than we have in the past. At sustained real growth of 4% per year, our economic production would more than double after 20 years. After 30 years, GDP would more than triple. After 40 years, a generation, total U.S. economic output would nearly quadruple. America would by then have leapfrogged another generation ahead of the rest of the world. **Achieving and sustaining such economic growth** should be the **central focus** of national economic policy**,** for it **would solve every problem** that plagues and threatens us today. Such booming economic growth would produce surging revenues that would make balancing the budget so much more feasible. Surging GDP would reduce the national debt as a percent of GDP relatively quickly, particularly with balanced budgets not adding any further to the debt. Sustained, **rapid economic growth is** also **the ultimate solution to poverty,** as after a couple of decades or so of such growth, the poor would climb to the same living standards as the middle class of today. **W**ith sustained, robust, economic growth, maintaining the most powerful military in the world, and thereby ensuring our nation’s security and national defense, will require a smaller and smaller percentage of GDP over time. That **security itself** will promote **capital investment and economic growth** in America. **The booming economy will produce new technological marvels** that will make our defenses all the more advanced. **With the economy rapidly advancing, there will be more than enough funds for education**. There will also be more than enough to **clean up and maintain a healthy environment.**