### Framework

#### The value is justice- defined by Aristotle as giving each his due. Prefer justice because just is the term in the resolution.

#### Thus, the standard and role of the ballot is to promote social inclusion. Social inclusion undoes social exclusion, the method by which power structures disadvantage people today.

**UN 16** [United Nations, “Leaving no one behind: the imperative of inclusive development- Report on the World Social Situation 2016,” Department of Economic and Social Affairs, <https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/rwss/2016/chapter1.pdf>, rpHS-VM]

Social exclusion is a multidimensional phenomenon not limited to material deprivation; poverty is an important dimension of exclusion, albeit only one dimension. Accordingly, social inclusion processes involve more than improving access to economic resources. Social inclusion is defined as the process of improving the terms of participation in society, particularly for people who are disadvantaged, through enhancing opportunities, access to resources, voice and respect for rights. Measuring social exclusion is challenging due to its multidimensional nature and the lack of standard data sources across countries and for all social groups at highest risk of being left behind. Despite limitations, the existing data allow for a meaningful analysis of key aspects of exclusion. The report presents these data while illustrating data gaps.

#### Social inclusion is necessary for justice

**Collins 01**[Hugh Collins, Discrimination, Equality and Social Inclusion, The Modern Law Review, Vol. 66, No. 1 (Jan., 2003), pp. 16-43]

Social inclusion is an aim or principle of justice. It is often mistaken for an egalitarian notion of distributive justice. This mistake is understandable, because the demands of social inclusion may require help to be given to the same groups such as the poor who are favoured by laws based upon egalitarian justifications. Social inclusion and egalitarian ideals share a concern about outcomes or distributive patterns. Yet there is also a fundamental difference. Social inclusion does not seek the same or broadly equivalent outcomes **for citizens.** It concentrates its attention not on relative disadvantage between groups, but rather on the absolute disadvantage of particular groups in society. The objective is not some notion of equality of welfare, but one of securing a minimum level of welfare for every citizen. Its typical targets are ‘child poverty’, ‘unemployed youth’, or ‘racial minorities in deprived neighborhoods’, not a more general equalisation of welfare.

#### Politics devoid of moral obligations collapses into wide scale atrocity

**Parsons 09** [John, accessed 9/14/2009 (the basis for the date), Deconstructing Mr. Farah: The Fallacy of a Utilitarian Ethic]

Utilitarian reasoning will attempt to solve the problem by determining the relative worth of the persons involved, understood in terms of their social utility. In the end, throwing the least desirable person overboard becomes an actual moral imperative, since by this action the greatest good for the greatest number of people will be served... In fact, it would be considered immoral if one of the socially "useful" persons altruistically decided to give up their life for the sake of the undesirable, since this would impugn the supposed calculus for good that the system is predicated upon. Though prima facie this line of thinking may seem to be plausible, in light of recent policies that wink at the torture of "terrorists" in order to serve the "greater good" (i.e., the safekeeping of present-day American culture), I think it is fair to question whether this pragmatic/utilitarian way of thinking is to be accepted in an unreflective manner. This exhortation should especially be heeded by those who profess to serve the Living God, the Father, Creator, and Savior of all mankind. An advocate of a utilitarian ethic claims that an act is right if it is useful; but "useful" for what? Or useful to what end? If someone argues that by "useful" he means "bringing about a desirable or good end," he[they] is[are] merely begging the question, since he[they] has[have] yet to define what he considers to be a "good end." Here we have multiple options, based on the agenda of the one who is arbitrating the meaning of the good.... The Nazis had one view of a "good end," and by means of their odious "Final Solution" rationalized their vision of das Vaterland as the summon bonum to which the individual must be sacrificed. The American ideal of a society that is enabled to pursue personal fulfillment and a hedonistic lifestyle is another vision of a good end. And so on. In a worldview devoid of appeal to transcendental value, all the utilitarian has recourse to is some sort of probability calculus to determine the distribution of perceived good among a given population. This approach is almost absurd in its audacity and foolishness, since it ascribes idealized powers to reason to perform such calculations in a dispassionate way - while it disingenuously pretends to be able to transcend such limitations. In the last analysis, the utilitarian principle is nothing less than a sophistical means to justify the "might makes right" fallacy: If more people prefer some outcome and think that it is useful to their goals, then it is ipso facto right - even if that happens to violates the rights of others who are relegated to minority status (or deemed to be "undesirable"). In practice, utilitarianism becomes a consensus-based "bully ethic" that enjoins a Socrates to quickly quaff the hemlock for the sake of the body politic. The individual, and the individual's passion for the truth, is invariably considered undesirable for the sake of the collective. The LORD Jesus was crucified by a group of craven paleo-utilitarians.... Without the admission of moral absolutes such as "do not torture others," "do not rape women," "do not commit genocide," etc. etc., we do not have an overarching framework for intelligible discussion about the sanctity and worth of individual human life, and we are therefore confronted with raw appeals to force and to the dishonest appeal to promote the "greater good" at the expense of the sanctity of the individual (i.e., consensus thinking). In practice, this amounts to the "Nazification" of ethical reasoning that is used to justify euthanasia, abortion on demand, and other means of social engineering.

### Innovation

#### Space exploration and appropriation has practical innovative benefits in public health, transportation, biomedicine, and conservation

**Thales 20** [Thales Group, “Exploring Space to Prepare for Earth’s Future,” <https://www.thalesgroup.com/en/group/journalist/magazine/exploring-space-prepare-earths-future>, November 25, 2020, Accessed on 12/18/21, rpHS-VM]

Does space exploration have any more practical benefits? Many innovations in fields ranging from metals and alloys to biology and medicine are the result of space exploration. Some applications — like ceramic coatings in our kitchens, air purification systems, smoke detectors and scratch-resistant glass — are already part of our daily lives. Materials tested in space, under unique conditions that are difficult to replicate on Earth, can help us to develop stronger, lighter, higher-performance products. One of the experiments conducted by French ESA astronaut Thomas Pesquet on the International Space Station (ISS2), for example, involved testing innovative materials designed to prevent bacterial growth. These new materials have considerable potential for public health and safety applications in hospitals, public transport and the food industry. The current COVID-19 pandemic brings the importance of this kind of research into sharp focus. Let me give you another practical example. Long-duration missions are tough on the human body. Astronauts suffer loss of muscle mass and bone density, as well as accelerated wear and tear on the circulation system. Monitoring them in space and after they return to Earth is a chance to learn about the effects of ageing and support research into conditions like osteoporosis. Drawing on our experience in pressurised modules and orbital infrastructure, we’re currently working on a habitation module that could be used in remote or hostile locations like polar bases, desert camps, military outposts and offshore oil and gas platforms. So space is a crucible for innovation? Yes, but it’s much more than that. Space exploration is a driving force in our efforts to address the major challenges facing society today. It’s educating us about our responsibilities to the Earth and its resources. How is it doing that? Astronauts have to survive on limited food, raw materials, sunlight, energy, water and oxygen. Most of the water consumed on the ISS, for example, is derived from urine and other recycled wastewater. So new techniques had to be developed to make sure it’s completely safe to drink. In 2015, for example, a Cygnus3 cargo spacecraft carried a 3D printer into orbit to conduct tests under zero-gravity conditions. With this kind of printer, astronauts could eventually produce any spare parts they need directly aboard ship. In October 2020, a Cygnus craft delivered essential supplies to the ISS, including food, water, oxygen, propellant, and space parts. One of the many scientific experiments contained in the cargo module involves the testing of a drug that could be used for the treatment of leukemia. All these experiments being handled by astronauts inside the ISS will be re-used in the near future to improve not only the medical sectors, but many others as well. The EDEN ISS project, meanwhile, aims to develop ways to cultivate food crops in extraterrestrial environments in order to provide food for the ISS and, eventually, for space exploration vehicles and planetary outposts. Space travel is a great opportunity to test the circular economy. Based on the experience of astronauts, humanity can learn how to better conserve the planet’s resources.

#### Space privatization prevents war and ensures sustainably sourced space projects for public good

Frankowski 17 [(Paweł, assistant Professor at the Chair of International Relations and Foreign Policy, Institute of Political Science and International Relations, Jagiellonian University) “Outer Space and Private Companies: Consequences for Global Security,” 2017, pg. 144-145] TDI

To conclude, privatization of space security can develop in unexpected way, but in today’s space environment private actors would rather play the role of security regulators than security providers. When investment in space technologies is less profitable than other areas of economy, private actors would focus on soft law and conflict prevention in space, and new private initiatives will appear. For example, apart from important space companies, as SpaceX or Blue Origin active in outer space, other private actors as Secure World Foundation (SWF), who focus on space sustainability, will play more important role in crafting international guidelines for space activities.38 This path the way for future solutions and projects, as cleaning the space debris, extracting resources from asteroids and planetoids, refuelling satellites, providing payload capabili-ties for governmental entities on market-based logic, will be based on activity non-state actors, providing soft law and regulatory solutions, where space faring states are unable to find any compromise. Therefore private companies will be in fact global (or space) regulators, as part of UNCOPUS, being involved in space activities.39 The last argument for private involvement in space security comes from an approach based on common good and resilience of space assets, emphasized by the Project Ploughshares, as an important part of space security. As of 2017 there are more than 700,000 man-made objects on the Earth’s orbit bigger than 1 cm, while 17,000 of them are bigger than 10 cm.40 Some of them are traced by SSA systems, both American and European, but these systems are public-military owned, and private operators are not granted any access to this data. Any collision of space object with space debris, even with small particles, might result in a chain reaction, called Kessler’s syndrome, and not only private but public, and military assets will be destroyed or impaired. In such conditions, a reluctant cooperation between the public and private sector, and unwillingness to share vulnerable data by public actors seem to confirm that private space activity is more than necessary. This is an apparent case when logic of mistrust between state powers must be overcome by private actors, perhaps by suggesting common preferences for debris mitigation, and space situational awareness. In the case of space debris, Space Data Association, an initiative supported by private sector, with its main aim to enhance data sharing between commercial satellite operators, could be an example of nascent public good provided by private actors for the sake of global security.

#### It also allows for innovation in issues of military

Frankowski 17 [(Paweł, assistant Professor at the Chair of International Relations and Foreign Policy, Institute of Political Science and International Relations, Jagiellonian University) “Outer Space and Private Companies: Consequences for Global Security,” 2017, pg. 133-134] TDI

Literature on privatization of military services has expanded, especially after 2002 and involvement of private companies in Iraqi operation. When appreciating an outlook of different scholars dealing with private military companies it is worth to follow Prado7 and argue that transferring provisions of services to private hands or acquiring from private entities without developing independent system on state’s behalf can be beneficial for the state for at least four reasons. First reason is price, and cost of private provisions could be lower because private companies can provide services with fewer people, with outsourced services, also to third countries. Price of military service, to far extent depends on costs of trained personnel, when private companies hire former soldiers, with completed training before. Moreover, the cost of public security services is based on the benefits coming to soldiers after their years of service. For example for overall military budget of the United States (1 trillion USD), more than 200 billion USD, has been spent for pensioners, veterans’ benefits or retiree health services. Secondly, the push for private security may result in more efficient usage of financial and human resources, and soldiers may perform more valuable duties.8 Therefore, PMCs can provide better service for the same price or the same services lowering the price. This will allow moving financial resources to another public service or arguing that public money has been better spent. Thirdly, with private security providers, states can avoid lengthy red tape procedures, with for example standardization of military procurements, time for mobilization and deployment. While such problems are important during armed conflict, they have also become more and more important during the planning of infrastructure, using assets, and regulating activity. The demand for more flexible and less troublesome activity in security realm is constantly increasing, both in Europe and in the Western Hemisphere. Finally, governments may turn for private resources for the lack of choice, when the state does not have necessary technical or material capabilities to provide security services in a timely fashion.9 However, some authors suggest that looking for private solutions in security cannot be analysed in isolation from pressure coming from political processes in larger scale.10 Nevertheless, distinguishing between economic power of private actors, and lack of capacity on behalf of the state, as driving factors for privatization of security services not necessarily answers the question why space assets, crucial for power of any important state in the world politics, are developed by private actors, being to some extent neglected by governments.

### Agriculture

#### Private entities include any corporation, person, or non-profit

**Law Insider No Date** [“Private entity definition,” <https://www.lawinsider.com/dictionary/private-entity>, rpHS-VM]

Private entity means any natural person, corporation, general partnership, limited liability company, limited partnership, joint venture, business trust, public benefit corporation, nonprofit entity, or other business entity. Private entity means any entity other than a State, local government, Indian tribe, or foreign public entity

#### Global agriculture is killed by climate change – specifically small farmers suffer

**Cartier 21** [Kimberly M. S. Cartier, News and Features Writer, “Global agriculture will be drastically altered by climate change,” <https://www.greenbiz.com/article/global-agriculture-will-be-drastically-altered-climate-change>, February 18, 2021, Accessed on 12/14/21, rpHS-VM]

In much of the world, climate change is altering regional growing conditions and making them more unpredictable. Farmers are finding it harder to consistently grow enough food to meet increasing demand. Securing the world’s food supply for the future, experts assert, requires us to tally the good and the bad in the current agricultural structure, including the infrastructure and technology in food distribution systems. Small farms, which account for about 90 percent of the world’s 570 million farms, are particularly vulnerable to changes in seasonal climate. Land tended by families for generations suddenly may become nonarable. A change in the timing or intensity of yearly rainy seasons or the El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO), for example, could bring rains or drought that wipe out a family’s crops. In early May, the Nzoia River burst its banks. The floods that resulted in western Kenya capped off particularly heavy long rains that killed 237 people and adversely affected more than 800,000. Floods and landslides destroyed homes, schools, roads, bridges and more than 8,000 acres of Kenyan farmland. Kenya’s March-May rainy season (the long rains, as opposed to the short rains of October-December) provides vital moisture to the country’s croplands — indeed, maize production was at least 10 percent above average in 2020 — but most Kenyans continue to face some level of food insecurity. In the past few years especially, climate change has caused a geographical shift in which areas receive rain and which suffer drought. "Normally, we know where the flood areas are, but the rains the past few years have been unprecedented," said Ruth K. Oniang’o, founder of the Rural Outreach Africa Program and a 2017 Africa Food Prize Laureate. "We have rain falling in areas that never used to have rain. I used to write all the time about famines and drought … but right now is something different. We can say, ‘OK, climate variability, it changes every year.’ No. This is different right now." The differences extend beyond Africa. Farmers in Iran, for example, share similar problems anticipating cycles of drought and floods despite being separated from their Kenyan counterparts by more than 4,350 miles. "The recent harsh droughts and heavy floods in the [Middle East] region ruined a major part of food resources," explained Mohanna Zarei, a water resources engineer at the University of Kurdistan in Sanandaj, Iran. Sporadic precipitation cycles not only reduce crop yields but also can lead to secondary impacts that worsen food security, such as the wildfires that have ravaged the western United States, Australia, Brazil and elsewhere. Financial and social inequality compound climate-related food security issues. Many of the world’s smallholder farmers are poor and food insecure; even one lost season can push them from struggling to failing. "Climate change plays a key role as a catalyzer" in amplifying preexisting resource problems and "will influence the quality and quantity of food we produce and our ability to distribute it equitably," Zarei said. "It’s not quite as simple as moving into less climate-affected areas. It remains an issue of climate and socioeconomic and technological development," said Weston Anderson, a hydroclimatologist at the International Research Institute (IRI) for Climate and Society at Columbia University. Understanding how agricultural practices and policies need to change along with the warming climate and then sowing the seeds of that change could be the difference between farmers thriving where they are or migrating to greener pastures. Stressing the climate system A region’s agricultural stability depends on reliable, natural climate variations to bring seasonal shifts in weather. Large-scale climate modes such as ENSO and the Indian Ocean Dipole govern a region’s temperature, precipitation and storm activity for months at a time. Climate modes also causally connect distant regions, something increasingly important as agricultural trade has become more global: A climate shift in one food-growing region also can affect crops half a world away. Maize farmers around the world felt the impacts of climate teleconnections during one of the strongest El Niños of the past 150 years. The 1983 El Niño coincided with the largest global synchronous failure of maize crops in modern record, and recent research has shown that ENSO played a major role in causing that failure. Often you see climate change acting on top of this climate variability and exacerbating stresses that are already existing in our food system. "The El Niño-Southern Oscillation, because it organizes global weather and global precipitation, provides structure on the risk of global agriculture by rearranging where we get more drought and less drought in the year," Anderson explained. "It’s not necessarily creating more drought over the entire year, but it might be arranging those droughts in a way that disproportionately affects some of our crop growing regions." Anderson’s team found that ENSO is the only mode of climate variability that can affect maize, wheat and soybean crop production on a global scale. Other large-scale climate modes have more localized influence on certain crop yields. The tropical Atlantic variability, for instance, influences maize production in western Africa and wheat and soy production in southeastern South America simultaneously, but the North Atlantic Oscillation affects only wheat production in northern Africa and Europe. "Climate will largely continue to affect our food system through climate variability," Anderson said. "Often you see climate change acting on top of this climate variability and exacerbating stresses that are already existing in our food system." For example, he said, a regional crop might withstand a normal ENSO-related drought but could fail if climate change-induced drought worsens, too.

#### Space agriculture solves

**UNOOSA 19** [United Nations: Office for Outer Space Affairs, “Benefits of Space: Agriculture,” <https://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/benefits-of-space/agriculture.html>, 2019, Accessed on 12/14/2021, rpHS-VM]

Agriculture forms the basis of the world's food supply. Soil conditions, water availability, weather extremes and climate change can represent costly challenges both to farmers and the overall food security of populations. Space-based technology is of value to farmers, agronomists, food manufacturers and agricultural policymakers who wish to simultaneously enhance production and profitability. Remote sensing satellites provide key data for monitoring soil, snow cover, drought and crop development. Rainfall assessments from satellites, for example, help farmers plan the timing and amount of irrigation they will need for their crops. Accurate information and analysis can also help predict a region's agricultural output well in advance and can be critical in anticipating and mitigating the effects of food shortages and famines.

#### Food justice is key to social inclusion and frames the round

**FP 21** [FoodPrint, GRACE Communications Foundation develops innovative strategies to increase public awareness of the critical environmental and public health issues created by our current industrial food system, and to advocate for more sustainable alternatives, “Food Justice,”, <https://foodprint.org/issues/food-justice/>, 3/11/21, Accessed on 12/14/21, rpHS-VM]

People of color are the most severely impacted by hunger, poor food access, diet-related illness and other problems with the food system. The food justice movement works not only for access to healthy food for all, but also examines the structural roots of these disparities — and works for racial and economic justice, too. This work isn’t new. What gets lost in the predominant narrative about urban white foodies obsessing over the latest food trend and statistics on poor health outcomes for minority groups is that people of color have been bringing historical injustices in the food system to light and have been working toward empowering alternatives. Why Food Justice Is Necessary The dominant food system, with its cheap, empty calories and ubiquitous fast food joints, leaves many Americans undernourished and unhealthy — and the brunt of those results are borne by low-income communities of color. Nationally, the rate of food insecurity for African-American households is more than double that of white households, while one in five Latinos are food insecure — compared with one in ten whites and one in eight Americans overall. 12 Heart disease, cancer, diabetes and stroke are among the most common causes of illness, disability and death in the US. The factors that lead to these chronic conditions, including lack of access to healthy food, can be more common for minority groups. For example, Native Americans are 60 percent more likely to be obese than US whites, and the rate of diagnosed diabetes is 77 percent higher among African-Americans, 66 percent higher among Hispanics, and 18 percent higher among Asians than among whites. 3 But we cannot look at these as isolated facts, separate from a larger context. Food insecurity and high rates of diet-related disease correlate with poverty, which disproportionately impacts people of color. This is no coincidence — a long legacy of discriminatory and inequitable policies has left historically-oppressed peoples to start off with less wealth, property and opportunity than white people. 4 In addition to the racialized roots of poverty, the food system itself is built on centuries of exploitation of people of color. The roots of today’s hunger and health inequities run deep.

### Thesis Turn

#### We should fear government control of technological advancements in space, not corporations. They are the ones outlawing research and limiting innovation in order to keep power centralized.

Bailey 05 [(Ronald, the science correspondent for Reason) 5-11-2005 Trans-Human Expressway Reason https://reason.com/2005/05/11/trans-human-expressway/] TDI

Where Hughes goes wrong is in fetishizing democratic decision-making. He fails to recognize that the Enlightenment project that spawned modern liberal democracies began by trying to keep certain questions about the transcendent out of the public sphere. Questions about the ultimate meaning and destiny of humanity are private concerns. Worries about biotechnological progress must not to be used as excuses to breach the Enlightenment understanding of what belongs in the private sphere and what belongs in the public. Technologies dealing with the birth, death and the meaning of life need protection from meddling—even democratic meddling—by others who want to control them as a way to force their visions of right and wrong on the rest of us. Your fellow citizens shouldn't get to vote on whom you have sex with, what recreational drugs you ingest, what you read and watch on TV and so forth. Hughes understands that democratic authoritarianism is possible, but discounts the possibility that the majority may well vote to ban the technologies that promise a better world. However, even as he extols social democracy as the best guarantor of our future biotechnological liberty, Hughes ignores that it is precisely those social democracies he praises, Germany, France, Sweden, and Britain, which now, not in the future, outlaw germinal choice, genetic modification, reproductive and therapeutic cloning, and stem cell research. For example, Germany, Austria and Norway ban the creation of human embryonic stem cell lines. Britain outlaws various types of pre-implantation genetic diagnosis to enable parents to choose among embryos. (Despite worrisome bioconservative agitation against this type of biotech research, in the United States, private research in these areas remains legal.) Hughes also favors not only social democracy but global governance centered on the United Nations with the "authority to tax corporations and nations," and a "permanent standing international army," and with UN agencies "expanded into a global infrastructure of technological and industrial regulation capable of controlling the health and environmental risks from new technologies." This is the same UN that just voted for an ambiguous resolution calling on nations to ban all forms of human cloning which are incompatible with human dignity and the protection of human life. Fortunately, the resolution leaves some wiggle, but the next time the UN makes one of these democratic decisions, transhumanists may not like the result. Furthermore, Hughes's analysis is largely free of economics—he simply ignores the processes by which wealth is created and gets busy redistributing the wealth through government health care and government subsidized eugenics. After reading Citizen Cyborg, you might come away thinking that Hughes believes that corporations exist primarily to oppress people. While acknowledging that the last US government involvement in eugenics—a project that involved sterilizing tens of thousands of people—was a bad idea, Hughes fails to underscore that it was democratically elected representatives, not corporations, who ordered women's tubes tied and men's testicles snipped.