### 1

**Interpretation: If the affirmative defends anything other than the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust then they must provide a counter-solvency advocate for their specific advocacy in the 1AC. *(To clarify, you must have an author that states we should not do your aff, insofar as the aff is not a whole res phil aff)***

**Violation:**

**Standards:**

**[1] Fairness – This is a litmus test to determining whether your aff is fair –**

**[A] Limits – there are infinite things you could defend outside the exact text of the resolution which pushes you to the limits of contestable arguments, even if your interp of the topic is better, the only way to verify if it’s substantively fair is proof of counter-arguments. Nobody knows your aff better than you, so if you can’t find an answer, I can’t be expected to.**

**[2] Research – Forces the aff to go to the other side of the library and contest their own view points, as well as encouraging in depth-research about their own position. Having one also encourages more in-depth answers since I can find responses. Key to education since we definitionally learn more about positions when we contest our own.**

#### [3] Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

#### [4] Drop the debater – a) the 1AR is too short for theory and covering substance so a ballot implication is key, b) only dropping the debater deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

#### [5] Use competing interps – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter and collapses, youy use an offense-defense paradigm

#### [6] No RVI’s – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) they can stick me with 6min of answers to a short arg and make the 2AR impossible, c) topic ed – incentivizes negs to bait theory and read 2N scripts which avoids substance

#### No 1AR Theory, its aff biased because they get to line by line 2nr counterstandards with new responses that I can’t answer which is irresolvable

#### Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is crazy aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to– reasonability checks 2AR sandbagging by preventing crazy abusive 1NCs while still giving the 2N a chance.

#### DTA on 1AR shells - They can blow up a blippy 20 second shell to 3 min of the 2AR while I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention and means 1AR theory is irresolvable so you shouldn’t stake the round on it.

#### RVIs on 1AR theory – 1AR being able to spend 20 seconds on a shell and still win forces the 2N to allocate at least 2:30 on the shell which means RVIs check back time skew – ows on quantifiaiblity

### 2

#### Agents must be practical reasoners:

#### First, inescapability – the exercise of practical rationality requires that one regards it as intrinsically good – that justifies a right to freedom.

#### Second, practical reason – ethical principles must be derived from the structure of reason and begin a priori, meaning they can’t be derived from our experiences. Regress – we can always ask why we should follow a theory, so they aren’t binding because they don’t have a starting point. Practical reason solves – When we ask why we should follow reason, we demand a reason, which concedes to the authority of reason itself, so it’s the only thing we can follow

#### Practical reason means we all have a unified perspective: What can be justified to me can be justified to everyone who is a practical reasoner. If I can conclude that 2+2 is 4, then I understand not only that I know 2+2 is 4, but that everyone around me can arrive at the same conclusion. These things are temporally consistent: I know that me adding two numbers now and taking that sum will not result in me adding the same two numbers in the future and getting a different sum.

#### But, willing an action that violates the freedom of others is a contradiction: If I decide to kill someone, that action is not universalizable because that would justify other people killing me too. If I die, I cannot exercise my freedom to kill someone else. This is a contradiction: I both justify extending my freedom to kill others and limiting my own freedom.

#### Thus, the standard is respecting freedom.

#### Impact calculus –

#### [1] Ethics are based on intent, but the state does not have intentions and cannot know the intentions of other agents. Instead, the state acts a procedural mechanism to punish those who violate rights claims. Those rights are derived from the structure of intent.

**Interpretation: The affirmative debater must not contest the negative contention, read turns under our framework, advocate that you affirm under our framework, to clarify they must not say you affirm under a standard of respecting freedom**

**1] strat skew: lets them kick every other off in the 1ar and just straight ref our framework which makes negating impossible since they get akk 4 minutes in the 1ar where as we’ve split time on other offs creating a 7-6 skew**

**2] clash: the competing values of framework debates are valuable and force us to refine philosophical skills and justify our frameworks in the real world, solely contention debates detract from the nuances of learning different ethical theories which we take out of round**

#### Negate:

#### Acquisition of property can never be unjust – to create rights violations, there must already be an owner of the property being violated, but that presupposes its appropriation by another entity.

Feser 1, (Edward Feser, 1-1-2005, accessed on 12-15-2021, Cambridge University Press, "THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN UNJUST INITIAL ACQUISITION | Social Philosophy and Policy | Cambridge Core", Edward C. Feser is an American philosopher. He is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at Pasadena City College in Pasadena, California. [https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)[brackets](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)%5bbrackets) for gen lang]//phs st

There is a serious difficulty with this criticism of Nozick, however. It is just this: There is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition of resources; therefore, there is no case to be made for redistributive taxation on the basis of alleged injustices in initial acquisition. This is, to be sure, a bold claim. Moreover, in making it, I contradict not only Nozick’s critics, but Nozick himself, who clearly thinks it is at least possible for there to be injustices in acquisition, whether or not there have in fact been any (or, more realistically, whether or not there have been enough such injustices to justify continual redistributive taxation for the purposes of rectifying them). But here is a case where Nozick has, I think, been too generous to the other side. Rather than attempt —unsatisfactorily, in the view of his critics—to meet the challenge to show that initial acquisition has not in general been unjust, he ought instead to have insisted that there is no such challenge to be met in the first place. Giving what I shall call “the basic argument” for this audacious claim will be the task of Section II of this essay. The argument is, I think, compelling, but by itself it leaves unexplained some widespread intu- itions to the effect that certain specific instances of initial acquisition are unjust and call forth as their remedy the application of a Lockean proviso, or are otherwise problematic. (A “Lockean proviso,” of course, is one that forbids initial acquisitions of resources when these acquisitions do not leave “enough and as good” in common for others.) Thus, Section III focuses on various considerations that tend to show how those intuitions are best explained in a way consistent with the argument of Section II. Section IV completes the task of accounting for the intuitions in question by considering how the thesis of self-ownership itself bears on the acqui- sition and use of property. Section V shows how the results of the previ- ous sections add up to a more satisfying defense of Nozickian property rights than the one given by Nozick himself, and considers some of the implications of this revised conception of initial acquisition for our under- standing of Nozick’s principles of transfer and rectification. II. The Basic Argument The reason there is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition of resources is that there is no such thing as either a just or an unjust initial acquisition of resources. The concept of justice, that is to say, simply does not apply to initial acquisition. It applies only after initial acquisition has already taken place. In particular, it applies only to transfers of property (and derivatively, to the rectification of injustices in transfer). This, it seems to me, is a clear implication of the assumption (rightly) made by Nozick that external resources are initially unowned. Consider the following example. Suppose an individual A seeks to acquire some previously unowned resource R. For it to be the case that A commits an injustice in acquiring R, it would also have to be the case that there is some individual B (or perhaps a group of individuals) against whom A commits the injustice. But for B to have been wronged by A’s acquisi- tion of R, B would have to have had a rightful claim over R, a right to R. By hypothesis, however, B did not have a right to R, because no one had a right to it—it was unowned, after all. So B was not wronged and could not have been. In fact, the very first person who could conceivably be wronged by anyone’s use of R would be, not B, but A himself, since A is the first one to own R. Such a wrong would in the nature of the case be an injustice in transfer—in unjustly taking from A what is rightfully his—not in initial acquisition. The same thing, by extension, will be true of all unowned resources: it is only after some- one has initially acquired them that anyone could unjustly come to possess them, via unjust transfer. It is impossible, then, for there to be any injustices in initial acquisition.7

### 3

#### Presumption negates – A] If we deny the truth of the aff then you negate – textuality B] resolved in the resolution denotes certainty which means if they aren’t determined and uncertain then you can’t affirm

#### Permissibility negates

#### 1] Obligations- the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove an obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation

#### 2] Falsity- Statements are more often false than true because proving one part of the statement false disproves the entire statement. Presuming all statements are true creates contradictions which would be ethically bankrupt.

#### 3] Negating is harder – A] Aff gets first and last speech which control the direction of the debate B] Affirmatives can strategically uplayer in the 1ar giving them a 7-6 time skew advantage, splitting the 2nr C] They get infinite prep time

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement – anything else moots 7 minutes of the nc – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that a world is better than another before you adopt it.

#### They justify substantive skews since there will always be a more correct side of the issue but we compensate for flaws in the lit.

#### Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – T/F binary is descriptive and technical.

#### a priori’s 1st – even worlds framing requires ethics that begin from a priori principles like reason or pleasure so we control the internal link to functional debates.

#### Negate because either the aff is true meaning its bad for us to clash with it, or its not which means it’s a lie you cant vote on because its fake news.

#### Negate –

#### A private entity is “There are a few groups that can be considered a private entity in the business world. A partnership, corporation, individual, nonprofit organization, company, or any organized group that is not government-affiliated can be considered a private entity.”

That’s QT Company 20 [“What Are Private Entities?”. Quest Trust Company (custodian of self-directed IRAs located in Houston, Austin, and Dallas, Texas with clients Nationwide. Quest Trust Company, is the leading provider of self-directed retirement account administration services. Quest Trust Company has been in business since 2003 with over $2 Billion in assets under management. As a neutral party, Quest Trust Company does not offer any investments and therefore has no conflicts of interest with what our clients want to do with their IRAs). September 28, 2020. Accessed 12/17/21. <https://www.questtrustcompany.com/2020/09/28/what-are-private-entities/> //Xu]

#### Doesn’t exist with outer space appropriation –

FRANKOWSKI 17 [Paweł FRANKOWSKI (Assistant Professor at the Chair of International Relations and Foreign Policy, Institute of Political Science and International Relations of the Jagiellonian University). “OUTER SPACE AND PRIVATE COMPANIES: CONSEQUENCES FOR GLOBAL SECURITY”. Politeja. No. 50/5, GLOBAL AND REGIONAL SECURITY CHALLENGES (2017), pp. 131-148 (18 pages). Accessed 12/17/21. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26564288?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents> //Xu]

As mentioned earlier, when some space assets and services, like telecommunication services, from the very beginning of space exploration, have been in private hands, for other sector like space imagery or synchronizing services it was not an easy path. However, strategies geared towards more private involvement are intrinsically similar to strategies and justifications in other public services. John Donahue referring to the privatization of public services argues that the political choice between public and private services basically has two dimensions. The first concerns finance, and focuses on the questions whether or not individuals should pay for services individually, or maybe the same services should be provided by the state, with funds raised from taxation. Apart from financing, the second dimension focuses on performance, flexibility, and ability to adapt to changing circumstances. In general, this dimension should be analysed if services should be delivered from governmental level or provided by nonstate entity, with lesser attachment to procedures, red tape and managerial style of governing.4 Nevertheless, privatization of security and military services follows a slightly different logic, because after private companies acquired contracts to provide security services, provisions of such services will be still financed by public money. Therefore individuals’ rights, transferred to the state, who is main security provider, have been shifted back to private entities, able and willing to provide such services. Already it should be obvious that the main source of income for private space industry are public actors, and space companies hardly can find other clients. For example 66% of European space industry is coming from public sector,5 and only in 2015 European companies provided goods worth as much as 534 mln EUR for military customers EUR.6

#### 1] the[[1]](#footnote-1) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but appropriation isn’t a disease

#### 2] appropriation[[2]](#footnote-2) is “a sum of money or total of assets devoted to a special purpose” but the rez doesn’t spec a purpose.

#### 2] Paradox of tolerance- to be completely open to the aff we must exclude perspectives that wouldn’t be open to it which makes complete tolerance impossible.

#### 3] Decision Making Paradox- We need a decision-making procedure to enact the aff, but to choose a procedure requires another meta level decision-making procedure and so forth leading to infinite regress.

### 4

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose affirmative frameworks, advocacy texts, and advantage areas thirty minutes before round if they haven’t read the affirmative before

#### Violation: They didn’t

#### Standards:

#### 1] Clash- Not disclosing incentivizes surprise tactics and poorly refined positions that rely on artificial and vague negative engagement to win debates. Their interpretation discourages third- and fourth-line testing by limiting the amount of time we have to prepare and forcing us to enter the debate with zero idea of what the affirmative is. Negatives are forced to rely on generics instead of smart contextual strategies destroying nuanced argumentation.

#### 2] Reciprocity – They get an infinite amount of time to frontline their aff to write the most efficient and effective answers to anything we could say against it while we get only four minutes in round. This gives them a tremendous advantage over us that makes it impossible to win substance.

### 5

#### Consequentialism is morally repugnant and is a voting issue

#### 1. It justifies atrocities by allowing us to harm some for the benefit of others

#### 2. It can’t justify intrinsic wrongness – We can’t know whether our action was good until its consequences

#### 3. Anything could be justified if its better than another outcome. Thus, Util would justify the holocaust as long as it’s better than extinction.

#### 4. Everything is subjective so aggregation attempts to homogenize perspectives leaves out others which creates static hierarchies

#### DTD - ~1~ Reversibility: once oppressive rhetoric is used it cannot be taken back

#### ~2~ Norm setting: we are part of a larger debate community with extensive norms – letting bad discourse run rampant kills that

### 6

## Case

### Framework

1 – induction fails, relies on the past which relies on the past and is infinitely regressive meaning theres no terminal end point

2 – consequences fail, each consequence has a butterfly effect into a new consequence and theres no non arbitrary end point

3 – extinction focus is bad because it freezes action, always a 1 percent risk of an existential impact to escalate

4 – pleasure and pain are arbitrary, each person has a different conception of it which means theres no way to weigh between different interpretations of pleasure and pain, all trigger permissibility

### Advantage

### OST Collapse

#### OST collapse good --- sovereign territory claims are key to catalyze investment in space development

Hickman 7 [John Hickman is an associate professor in the Department of Government and International Studies at Berry College in Mt. Berry, Georgia, “Still crazy after four decades: The case for withdrawing from the 1967 Outer Space Treaty,” *The Space Review,* Sept 24, 2007, https://www.thespacereview.com/article/960/1]

This year is the 40th anniversary of the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration of Outer Space Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, more commonly known as the 1967 Outer Space Treaty. Born out of anxiety about the Cold War and excitement about the Space Age, the agreement is a tribute to the ability of diplomats to draft international law that is simultaneously effective but bad. Successful in preventing states from claiming sovereign territory in outer space the treaty also hobbled space exploration and development. Today, human activity in outer space is confined to low Earth orbit and unmanned space exploration of the solar system proceeds at a leisurely pace. The Space Age has sputtered to a crawl and the 1967 Outer Space Treaty deserves a large measure of the blame.

Anti-commons and arrogance

Fear gave birth to the international legal regime for outer space: the ever-present fear of a nuclear war between the United States and Soviet Union, the fear that either superpower would achieve a decisive military technological advantage over the other in outer space, the fear that competition for the best “real estate” on celestial bodies might itself result in war between the superpowers, and the fear that the superpowers might cooperate in a duopoly over all of outer space. That space exploration and development had much to offer humanity was largely a rhetorical rather than a practical imperative in drafting the agreement establishing the international legal regime. Instead the practical imperative was to prevent by denial.

The core legal principle of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty declared that everywhere beyond the atmosphere to be res communis, an international commons rather akin to the “international waters” of the open oceans on Earth, rather than terra nullius, the sort of territory that is unclaimed yet claimable by states as sovereign territory. In what was then stirring, and today preposterous, language of the agreement, all of outer space was declared the “Common Home of Mankind” to be explored and exploited by all countries and for the benefit of all humanity.

There are two patently obvious flaws in the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, one tragic and the other silly. The tragic flaw is that it created an “anti-commons.” The general problem is that establishing a commons runs the risk of creating perverse incentives. Where the commons is easy to exploit the likely result is the degradation of its renewable resources. That much has been understood by public policymakers at least since publication of Garret Hardin‘s influential essay “The Tragedy of the Commons.” Less appreciated is that establishing a commons can also establish an “anti-commons.” Eliminating the possibility of reaping rewards from a desired activity discourages that desired activity. When the 1967 Outer Space Treaty eliminated the possibility that states could claim territory on the final frontier it also extinguished an important motivation for states and private firms to engage in exploration and development. Had the policy purpose of the treaty been wilderness preservation in outer space then today it would be declared a smashing success. Beyond low Earth orbit, outer space remains a wilderness that benefits no one except astronomers and stargazing lovers. Yet the ostensible policy purpose of the agreement was to encourage space exploration and development in a manner that benefits humanity as a whole. As such, the 1967 Outer Space Treaty was an abysmal failure. While there are other reasons for the effective closing of the space frontier beyond low Earth orbit with the last Apollo Missions to the Moon—the relaxation of Cold War tensions in the 1970s gave the superpowers less reason to compete and their other budget priorities competed with space programs—the diplomats and politicians who foisted the treaty onto an unwitting humanity in 1967 deserve much of the credit. Their negotiations resulted in a near-quarantine of humans on Earth and low Earth orbit and only anemic efforts to explore our solar system via unmanned space programs.

Depriving states of the right to claim sovereign national territory on solid celestial bodies has discouraged more energetic space exploration and development in the same manner that depriving property developers of the right to purchase real property would discourage their investment. One need to not applaud each and every property development project to recognize the economic value of property development to society, and the same may be said of the efforts of states in claiming and governing new territories. That idea that states are no longer interested in claiming new territory is belied by the Russian Federation’s recent claim under the Convention on the Laws of the Sea to the 1.2 million square kilometers of the Lomonosov Ridge in the Arctic.

#### Extinction.

Collins 10 [Patrick Collins, \*Professor of Life & Environmental Science at Azabu University & Systems Engineer at Andromeda Inc., Italy, and Adriano Autino, Expert in the economics of energy supply from space, “What the growth of a space tourism industry could contribute to employment, economic growth, environmental protection, education, culture and world peace,” *Acta Astronautica* 66 (2010) 1553–1562]

7.2. High return in safety from extra-terrestrial settlement Investment in low-cost orbital access and other space infrastructure will facilitate the establishment of settlements on the Moon, Mars, asteroids and in man-made space structures. In the first phase, development of new regulatory infrastructure in various Earth orbits, including property/usufruct rights, real estate, mortgage financing and insurance, traffic management, pilotage, policing and other services will enable the population living in Earth orbits to grow very large. Such activities aimed at making near-Earth space habitable are the logical extension of humans’ historical spread over the surface of the Earth. As trade spreads through near-Earth space, settlements are likely to follow, of which the inhabitants will add to the wealth of different cultures which humans have created in the many different environments in which they live. Success of such extra-terrestrial settlements will have the additional benefit of **reducing** the danger of human extinction due to planet-wide or cosmic accidents [27]. These horrors include both man-made disasters such as nuclear war, plagues or growing pollution, and natural disasters such as super-volcanoes or asteroid impact. It is hard to think of any objective that is more important than preserving peace. Weapons developed in recent decades are so destructive, and have such horrific, long-term side- effects that their use should be discouraged as strongly as possible by the international community. Hence, reducing the incentive to use these weapons by rapidly developing the ability to use space-based resources on a large scale is surely equally important [11,16]. The achievement ofthisdepends on low space travel costswhich, at the present time, appear to be achievable only through the development of a vigorous space tourism industry. 8. Summary. As discussed above, if space travel services had started during the 1950s, the space industry would be enor- mously more developed than it is today. Hence the failure to develop passenger space travel has seriously distorted the path taken by humans’ technological and economic development since WW2, away from the path which would have been followed if capitalism and democracy operated as intended. Technological know-how which could have been used to supply services which are known to be very popular with a large proportion of the population has not been used for that purpose, while waste and suffering due to the unemployment and environmental damage caused by the resulting lack of new industrial opportunities have increased. In response, policies should be implemented urgently to correct this error, and to catch up with the possibilities for industrial and economic growth that have been ignored for so long. This policy renewal is urgent because of the growing dangers of unemployment, economic stagnation, environmental pollution, educational and cultural decline, resource wars and loss of civil liberties which face civilisation today. In order to achieve the necessary progress there is a particular need for collaboration between those working in the two fields of civil aviation and civil space. Although the word ‘‘aerospace’’ is widely used, it is largely a misnomer since these two fields are in practice quite separate. True ‘‘aerospace’’ collaboration to realise passenger space travel will develop the wonderful profusion of possibilities outlined above. 8.1. Heaven or hell on Earth? As discussed above, the claim that the Earth’s resources are running out is used to justify wars which may never end: present-day rhetoric about ‘‘the long war’ ’or ‘‘100 years war’’ in Iraq and Afghanistan are current examples. If political leaders do not change their viewpoint, the recent aggression by the rich ‘‘Anglo-Saxon’’ countries, and their cutting back of traditional civil liberties, are ominous for the future. However, this ‘‘hellish’’ vision of endless war is based on an assumption about a single number—the future cost of travel to orbit—about which a different assumption leads to a ‘‘heavenly’’ vision of peace and ever-rising living standards for everyone. If this cost stays above 10,000 Euros/kg, where it has been unchanged for nearly 50years, the prospects for humanity are bleak. But if humans make the necessary effort, and use the tiny amount of resources needed to develop vehicles for passengers space travel, then this cost will fall to 100 Euros/kg, the use of extra-terrestrial resources will become economic, and arguments forresource wars will evaporate **entirely**. The main reason why this has not yet happened seems to be lack of understanding of the myriad opportunities by investors and policy-makers. Now that the potential to catch up half a century of delay in the growth of space travel is becoming understood, continuing to spend 20 billion Euro-equivalents/year on government space activities, while continuing to invest nothing in developing passenger space travel, would be a gross failure of economic policy, and strongly contrary to the economic and social interests of the public. Correcting this error, even after such a costly delay, will ameliorate many problems in the world today. As this policy error is corrected, and investment in profitable space projects grows rapidly in coming years, we can look forward to a growing world-wide boom. Viewed as a whole, humans’ industrial activities have been seriously underperforming for decades, due to the failure to exploit these immensely promising fields of activity. The tens of thousands of unemployed space engineers in Russia, America and Europe alone are a huge waste. The potential manpower in rapidly developing India and China is clearly vast. The hundreds of millions of disappointed young people who have been taught that they cannot travel in space are another enormous wasted resource.

#### OST collapse wouldn’t cause war or wreck i-law

Hickman 7 [John Hickman is an associate professor in the Department of Government and International Studies at Berry College in Mt. Berry, Georgia, “Still crazy after four decades: The case for withdrawing from the 1967 Outer Space Treaty,” *The Space Review,* Sept 24, 2007, <https://www.thespacereview.com/article/960/1>, note: [brackets] mark change from original text, where likely OCR typo (word “any” in original text) was replaced with “only” – doesn’t change meaning, only fixes grammatical error to make sentence comport]

Arguments against withdrawal answered

Several arguments are advanced against withdrawal from the treaty, seven of which are neatly summarized by Wayne White in an essay in the 2000 book Space: The Free-Market Frontier. The first argument is that the treaty has become customary international law, in effect that other states have come to rely on the terms of the treaty to such an extent that it is now established law among states regardless of the wishes of individual states that might wish to withdraw. The rejoinder to this argument is that while forty years may have passed since the treaty entered into effect, states have come to rely on it in [only] the most abstract sense. No state has undertaken activities even remotely capable of asserting a claim to national sovereignty over any celestial body since the end of the Apollo Program and there are only five spacefaring powers currently capable of unmanned missions to other celestial bodies: the United States, Russia, the European Space Agency, China, and Japan.

The second argument is that competition for territory in space could cause military conflict as it did competition between the powers on Earth in previous centuries. The argument misunderstands history and thus makes a poor analogy. In fact, the gunpowder empires found more reasons and locations to wage war close to home much more often than in distant colonial possessions. Imperial competition for vast amounts of the Earth’s surface was often resolved peacefully. In the late 18th century and continuing into the 19th century Britain, the Netherlands, France, Germany, and the United States divided Australasia and the central island Pacific without war. Britain, the United States, and Imperial Russia successfully negotiated a resolution of their claims to northwestern North America in the mid 19th century without war. During the “Scramble for Africa” Britain, France, Belgium, Germany, Portugal, and Italy divided sub-Saharan Africa without fighting one another, the results of which were recognized at the Congress of Berlin. To be sure, wars were fought in these new colonial territories but they were wars between colonizers and the colonized. Thus, any future competition for sovereign territory on celestial bodies is highly unlikely to lead to war because spacefaring states are capable of negotiating their different claims and because there are no extraterrestrial natives anywhere else in the Solar System who might object to national appropriation. Our solar system would be a more interesting place if Martians did exist but they are conspicuous by their absence.

The third argument is that it would be difficult or impossible to draw territorial boundaries in outer space. The problem with this argument is that it makes no distinction between solid celestial objects like the planets, moons, or asteroids and the hard vacuum of space. Rather than treat all of outer space as res communis, solid celestial objects could be treated as terra nullius and the hard vacuum as res communis. Solid celestial objects could claimed as sovereign territory without claiming all of outer space just as islands or parts of islands have been claimed on Earth without claiming all of the oceans in which they rest.

#### OST prohibitions against weaponization fail answres the impact card.

Philip Yiannopoulos 18. "Inside the epic debate on rethinking our 50-year-old Outer Space Treaty." Fast Company. 9-24-2018. https://www.fastcompany.com/90240304/inside-the-epic-debate-on-rethinking-our-50-year-old-outer-space-treaty

That’s a lot of activity, fueling intense discussions and fiery debates about the commercialization and militarization of space, the proper role of humans in our galaxy, and the future of humanity. Yet it’s all guided by an outdated set of rules that were established a few years before Neil Armstrong took that first fateful step on the moon. The 1967 Outer Space Treaty was shaped by paranoia over the space race between the Soviets and the Americans, and even the brightest minds of the time couldn’t anticipate the complexities of now and tomorrow. In a long-overdue effort to prepare for that future, on Tuesday the UN will use the 50th anniversary of a Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space to “renew and strengthen its mandate” and to call attention to developing pertinent laws. As it stands, the current treaty bans the placement of WMDs in space, forbids any military action past the atmosphere, and declares the exploration of space for the benefit of all countries. But the 50-year-old treaty definitely needs some updating. While speaking as a U.S. Representative from Oklahoma, Jim Bridenstine said the treaty was mired in Cold War thought, and “now, almost every nation on Earth has some sort of presence in space, and we have to be concerned with threats like jamming, dazzling, spoofing, and hacking satellite constellations.” (Bridenstine was eventually tapped by Trump to head NASA, despite his lack of scientific experience.) AS BELOW, SO ABOVE So what kind of challenges should we expect going forward? Well, as below, so above. A look at the UN’s Convention on the Law of the Sea illustrates some current and potential problems. This treaty eventually established seabeds and ocean floor “beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.” The Law of the Sea proclaims such international spaces as the Common Heritage of Mankind, a phrase now applied to outer space. Unfortunately, humanistic rhetoric is no match for strategic military advantage. And worse, the UN has a track record of being toothless. Recently China started building islands near the Philippines, a clear violation of international law. The nation then flat-out lied about its intention to militarize these spaces. China simply did not attend its hearing at the International Court of Justice. Similar problems exist in today’s space race as different countries militarize in orbit. The EU’s Galileo satellite “proposes more civil-military synergies in European space systems,” two-thirds of Russia’s satellite force is military, and, of course, plans for the U.S.’s Space Force are proceeding apace. Legally, these actions fall within the Outer Space Treaty. Founder of the Global Space Law Center, Mark Sundahl, explains, “You can’t stop countries putting things into space for the purposes of self-defense.” Yet there are some lines that shouldn’t be crossed, he argues. In 2007 China destroyed one of its own satellites. Technically the event did not break the peaceful use clause, but arms controls experts considered the explosion a flex of military muscle. “I mean that kind of behavior can’t be tolerated,” Sundahl says. “But no one spoke up against it as being a violation of the law. And as far as international community says right now, those kinds of action are legal . . . which is ridiculous.” The Chinese actions prompted American response, and added to the biggest problem facing the developing space industry today: orbital junk. Raising awareness about the debris cluttering space takes up a lot of time at the Secure World Foundation, as well as its mission to promote “cooperative sustainability” in space. As project manager Josh Wolny says, its mission is to “help everyone realize they are invested in space and they have something to lose if the environment is damaged.” The foundation generates research and works with the UN as well as private companies to prepare for a successful space industry. Wolny refers to something called the Kessler Syndrome, an increasingly likely scenario in which space junk crashes into a satellite, and thus produces more debris to become part of an ever-growing spiral that inevitably makes it almost impossible to safely launch into space or satellite orbit. And given our current lack of action when it comes to the Texas-sized garbage patch of plastic floating in the Pacific, orbital cleanliness may be a pipe dream. You may assume it’s government’s job to protect the cosmos, but it’s not that simple. First of all, there are differing opinions about where in space all those hunks of metal are exactly located. And with tech tycoons like Elon Musk and Jeff Bezos funding development, they face little legal regulation. After orbit, companies will be within the jurisdiction of the country from which they chose to launch, similar to the high seas’ “flag of convenience.” But some are negotiating claims in advance per astronaut or even per specific mission, according to a recent article in The Atlantic. Things will get complicated. A COSMOS OF COMPLICATIONS At the Global Space Law Center, Mark Sundahl explains the difficulties of the developing space law field, especially when it comes to commercialization. “I’m trying to strike the right balance. We’re being prospective where it can help the industry,” he says. Before businesses invest in space, they need protection. “They’re actually begging for regulation,” he says, “to give investors peace of mind.” However, he also points out complications in things like safety regulations for tourist flights “because we don’t know what to regulate. We don’t know what a safe design is really like.” Similar questions exist for space mining, on-orbit refueling, servicing of satellites, private orbital space stations, or even the first hotel on the moon (which, as it stands, is totally illegal). In the United States, space diplomacy is in its nascent stages. Andrea Thompson, the U.S. Undersecretary for Arms Control and International Security, said discussions at the State Department are just getting under way to address the major questions, such as: “What is a responsible nation state’s behavior in space?” And while the U.S. Congress has struggled with the urgency of reforming space law, President Trump threw a wrench in the works by announcing the Space Force, which came as a surprise to many at NASA and in the space community after he signed a bill to reduce satellite clutter.

### Advantage 2

#### No correlation between food shortages and war.

**Bier citing Pinker ’11** – Steven Pinker, an experimental cognitive psychologist and a popular writer on language, mind, and human nature. [“Steven Pinker: Resource Scarcity Doesn’t Cause Wars,” Global Warming, 11/28/2011, http://www.globalwarming.org/2011/11/28/steven-pinker-resource-scarcity-doesnt-cause-wars/] KS

Once again it seems to me that the appropriate response is “**maybe, but maybe not**.” Though climate change can cause plenty of **misery**… it will **not** **necessarily** lead to **armed conflict**. The political scientists who track war and peace, such as Halvard Buhaug, Idean Salehyan, Ole Theisen, and Nils Gleditsch, are skeptical of the popular idea that people fight wars over scarce resources. Hunger and resource **shortages** are **tragically** **common** in sub-Saharan countries such as Malawi, Zambia, and Tanzania, but **wars** involving them **are not**. Hurricanes, floods, droughts, and tsunamis (such as the disastrous one in the Indian Ocean in 2004) **do not** **generally** **lead to conflict**. The American dust bowl in the 1930s, to take another example, caused plenty of deprivation but **no** **civil** **war**. And **while temperatures** **have been rising** steadily in Africa during the past fifteen years, **civil wars and** **war** **deaths** **have been** **falling**.

Pressures on access to land and water can certainly cause local skirmishes, but a **genuine war** **requires** that **hostile** **forces** be **organized** and armed, and that **depends** **more** on the influence of **bad** **governments**, **closed** **economies**, and **militant** **ideologies** than on the sheer availability of land and water. Certainly any connection to terrorism is in the imagination of the terror warriors: **terrorists** tend to be **underemployed** **lower-middle-class** **men**, **not** subsistence **farmers**. As for genocide, the Sudanese government finds it convenient to blame violence in Darfur on desertification, distracting the world from its own role in tolerating or encouraging the ethnic cleansing.

In a regression analysis on armed conflicts from 1980 to 1992, Theisen found that conflict was more likely if a country was poor, populous, politically unstable, and abundant in oil, but not if it had suffered from droughts, water shortages, or mild land degradation. (Severe land degradation did have a small effect.) Reviewing analyses that examined a large number (N) of countries rather than cherry-picking one or toe, he concluded, “**Those who foresee doom**, because of the relationship between resource scarcity and violent internal conflict, have very **little support** from the **large-N literature**.”

#### No disease impact

**Adalja 16** (Amesh, American University medicine MD, American College of Physicians fellow, “Why Hasn't Disease Wiped out the Human Race?” 6/17/16, **http://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2016/06/infectious-diseases-extinction/487514** ]

**I’m not afraid of this apocalyptic scenario**, but I do understand the impulse. Worry about the end is a quintessentially human trait. Thankfully, **so** **is** **our** **resilience**. For most of [humankind’s] history, infectious diseases were the existential threat to humanity—and for good reason. They were quite successful at killing people: The 6th century’s Plague of Justinian knocked out an estimated 17 percent of the world’s population; the 14th century Black Death decimated a third of Europe; the 1918 influenza pandemic killed 5 percent of the world; malaria is estimated to have killed half of all humans who have ever lived. And yet, of course, humanity continued to flourish. **Our species’** **recent explosion in lifespan is** **almost exclusively** **the** **result of** **the** **control** **of infectious diseases** through sanitation, vaccination, and antimicrobial therapies. Only in the modern era, in which many infectious diseases have been tamed in the industrial world, do people have the luxury of death from cancer, heart disease, or stroke in the 8th decade of life. Childhoods are free from watching siblings and friends die from outbreaks of typhoid, scarlet fever, smallpox, measles, and the like. So **what would it take for a disease to wipe out humanity** now? In Michael Crichton’s The Andromeda Strain, the canonical book in the disease-outbreak genre, an alien microbe threatens the human race with extinction, and humanity’s best minds are marshaled to combat the enemy organism. Fortunately, outside of fiction, there’s no reason to expect alien pathogens to wage war on the human race any time soon, and **my analysis suggests** that any real-life domestic microbe reaching an extinction level of threat probably is just as unlikely.

Any apocalyptic pathogen would need to possess a very special combination of two attributes. First, it would have to be so unfamiliar that no existing therapy or vaccine could be applied to it. Second, it would need to have a high and surreptitious transmissibility before symptoms occur. The first is essential because any microbe from a known class of pathogens would, by definition, have family members that could serve as models for containment and countermeasures. The second would allow the hypothetical disease to spread without being detected by even the most astute clinicians. The three infectious diseases most likely to be considered extinction-level threats in the world today—influenza, HIV, and Ebola—**don’t meet** **these two** **requirements**. Influenza, for instance, despite its well-established ability to kill on a large scale, its contagiousness, and its unrivaled ability to shift and drift away from our vaccines, is still what I would call a “known unknown.” While there are many mysteries about how new flu strains emerge, from at least the time of Hippocrates, humans have been attuned to its risk. And in the modern era, a full-fledged industry of influenza preparedness exists, with effective vaccine strategies and antiviral therapies. HIV, which has killed 39 million people over several decades, is similarly limited due to several factors. Most importantly, HIV’s dependency on blood and body fluid for transmission (similar to Ebola) requires intimate human-to-human contact, which limits contagion. Highly potent antiviral therapy allows most people to live normally with the disease, and a substantial group of the population has genetic mutations that render them impervious to infection in the first place. Lastly, simple prevention strategies such as needle exchange for injection drug users and barrier contraceptives—when available—can curtail transmission risk. Ebola, for many of the same reasons as HIV as well as several others, also falls short of the mark. This is especially due to the fact that it spreads almost exclusively through people with easily recognizable symptoms, plus the taming of its once unfathomable 90 percent mortality rate by simple supportive care. Beyond those three, every other known disease falls short of what seems required to wipe out humans—which is, of course, why we’re still here. And it’s not that diseases are ineffective. On the contrary, diseases’ failure to knock us out is a testament to just **how resilient humans are**. Part of our evolutionary heritage is our **immune system**, one of the most complex on the planet, even without the benefit of vaccines or the helping hand of antimicrobial drugs. This system, when viewed at a species level, can adapt to almost any enemy imaginable. Coupled to **genetic variations** amongst humans—which open up the possibility for a range of advantages, from imperviousness to infection to a tendency for mild symptoms—this adaptability ensures that almost any infectious disease onslaught will leave a large proportion of the population alive to rebuild, in contrast to the fictional Hollywood versions. While the immune system’s role can never be understated, **an even more powerful protector is the faculty of consciousness**. Humans are not the most prolific, quickly evolving, or strongest organisms on the planet, but as Aristotle identified, **humans are** **the** **rational** **animals**—and it is this fundamental distinguishing characteristic that allows humans to form abstractions, think in principles, and plan long-range. These capacities, in turn, allow humans to modify, alter, and improve themselves and their environments. Consciousness equips us, at an individual and a species level, to make nature safe for the species through such technological marvels as antibiotics, antivirals, vaccines, and sanitation. When humans began to focus their minds on the problems posed by infectious disease, human life ceased being nasty, brutish, and short. In many ways, human consciousness became infectious diseases’ worthiest adversary.

#### Burnout checks disease

**York 14**—PhD in Immunology, T-Cell Immunobiologist [Ian, “Why don't diseases completely wipe out species?” 6/4/2014, https://www.quora.com/Why-dont-diseases-completely-wipe-out-species Accessed 7 July 2017]

But mostly diseases don't drive species extinct. There are several reasons for that. For one, the most dangerous diseases are those that spread from one individual to another. If the disease is highly lethal, then the population drops, and it becomes less likely that individuals will contact each other during the infectious phase. Highly contagious diseases tend to **burn** **themselves** **out**//

that way. Probably the main reason is variation. Within the host and the pathogen population there will be a wide range of variants. Some hosts may be **naturally resistant**. Some pathogens will be **less virulent**. And either alone or in combination, you end up with infected individuals who survive. We see this in HIV, for example. There is a small fraction of humans who are naturally resistant or altogether immune to HIV, either because of their CCR5 allele or their MHC Class I type. And there are a handful of people who were infected with defective versions of HIV that didn't progress to disease. We can see indications of this sort of thing happening in the past, because our genomes contain many instances of pathogen resistance genes that have **spread through the whole population**. Those all started off as rare mutations that conferred a strong selection advantage to the carriers, meaning that the specific infectious diseases were serious threats to the species.
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