### Space Mining Bad

#### 1] Space mining causes conflicts on earth

Skibba 18- Skibba, Ramin. “Mining in Space Could Lead to Conflicts on Earth - Facts so Romantic.” Nautilus, 2 May 2018, https://nautil.us/blog/-mining-in-space-could-lead-to-conflicts-on-earth. VS

But it’s not clear that a pact between the commercial space mining industry and NASA would align with the public’s interest. NASA’s increasing collaboration with space mining companies could distort and divert efforts previously focused on space exploration and basic research, and discourage public interest and engagement in astronomy.

For example, Seager advocated for space mining at a science writing conference I attended in 2015. She’s part of a motley group of advisors for Planetary Resources, including the movie director James Cameron, a lawyer for a prominent Washington D.C. firm, and Dante Lauretta, another astronomer whom I respect. Seager seems to believe that encouraging private space mining will lead to more investments and technological innovation that would enable more scientific research. In a 2012 interview with The Atlantic, for instance, she said, “The bottom line is that NASA is not working the best that it could for space science right now, and so in order for people like me to succeed with my own research goals, the commercial space industry needs to be able to succeed independently of government contracts.”

But if the U.S. and U.S.-based companies lay claim to the richest and most easily accessible prospecting sites, not allowing other companies and nations to share in the wealth, economic and political relations could be damaged. That’s why this seems to be a dangerous path for space explorers. Once you’re on board with the commercial space industry, then you as a researcher must accept, if not support, everything that comes with it. Seager and a few other researchers may be willing to take this risk, but what about the rest of the space science community? Moreover, to succeed, these businesses will seek profitable missions, while science, exploration, and discovery—goals that stimulate public interest—will inevitably have lower priority. (Other commercial spaceflight companies, like Elon Musk’s SpaceX, do generate public interest, but they’re not directly involved in mining asteroids.) NASA may have its shortcomings, but at least its missions and research goals answer to the public. It’s not exactly a welcome thought to imagine more and more of our presence and activity in space being ceded, with NASA’s help, to private industry.

#### 2] Asteroid mining leads to existential resource conflicts

Khan 19- Sieeka Khan, “Providing the latest research, discoveries and scientific breakthroughs for science enthusiasts”, 5-15-2019, "Space Mining Could Ruin Our Solar System, Researchers Warn," Science Times, <https://www.sciencetimes.com/articles/21813/20190515/space-mining-could-ruin-our-solar-system-researchers-warn.htm> VS

The government has been passing laws regarding the protection of the Earth's most vulnerable places from the ravages of different industries, but a new study suggests that our planet is not the only one that needs protecting from human exploitation. A study published on April 16 in the journal Acta Astronautica makes a case for designating at least 85% of the solar system should be protected wilderness similar to the Earth's national parks. This leaves just 1/8th of moons, asteroids and eligible planets free to be mined or developed by human interest.In the study, it mention if the growth of space economy is similar to the exponential growth of terrestrial economies since the Industrial Revolution, then humans could deplete the solar system of all its iron, water and other resources that are mineable, in a matter of centuries. This could potentially leave the solar system all dried up in just 500 years. "On a timescale of less than a millennium we could have super-exploitation of the entire solar system out to its most distant edges," the authors wrote. "Then, we are done." Limiting the exploitation of resources on other planets now, before the space economy progresses, is needed to avoid what the authors call "a crisis of potentially catastrophic proportions". Limiting the galactic consumption to 1/8th of the available resources may sound like a bad deal, but space is a huge place and even a small fraction of our solar system's bounty could set humans up for generations."One-eighth of the iron in the asteroid belt is more than a million times greater than all of the Earth's currently estimated iron ore reserves," the authors wrote, "and it may well suffice for centuries." The researchers looked at the estimated iron use on Earth since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution and come up with the "1/8th principle". According to a survey in 1994 regarding the environmental impacts of the revolution, the global production of crude iron increased from half a million tons in 1800 to half a billion tons of steel produced in 1994. This rate is equivalent to the world's iron production doubling once every 20 years. The new data from the U.S Geological Survey supports this estimate as the world's iron production increased from 1 billion tons in 994 to 2.2 billion tons in 2016.If humans show the same level of industriousness when mining the resources on moons, asteroids and nearby planets, we could reach the hypothetical 1/8th point after 400 years. If the production continues to double every 20 years after that, all of the resources in the solar system would be depleted in just 60 years. This would give humans 60 years to change from a space resource-based economy to an unhopeful prospect, given the nonchalant response to the current environmental crises that we are facing, such as climate change and population growth.

"Worldwide, the present rate of planetary mission launches is 15 per decade," the authors wrote. "At this rate, even just the nearly 200 worlds of the solar system that gravity has made spherical would take 130 years to visit once."

#### ] Asteroid mining crushes the economy – kills global markets with influx of low prices

O’Neill 14

Ian O’Neill, PhD Solar Physics, “Mining Asteroids: Not Mankind's Silver Bullet,” Seeker. April 24, 2012. <https://www.seeker.com/mining-asteroids-not-mankinds-silver-bullet-1765750275.html>

The biggest hurdle facing any hopeful space mining company is that we don't have the ability to refine precious metals and rare minerals in a microgravity environment. Every asteroid mining plan in the past has come with a huge caveat: we don't have the technology. This may not seem like a huge hurdle - especially considering the amazing feats of human ingenuity in space technology over the past six decades - for investors who actually want to see a return on their investment, it's probably a deal breaker. Perhaps it's not desirable to refine asteroids in situ - might it make sense to capture asteroids in Earth orbit and use them as a near-Earth smorgasbord of resources, cutting off chunks as needed? In this case, I'm highly skeptical that there would be any international agreement about steering potential city-killer asteroids near Earth. That's one Planetary Health and Safety meeting I'd love to sit in on. PHOTOS: Asteroids and Near-Earth Objects Also, Planetary Resources specifically single out near-Earth asteroids (NEAs) as their target. "Of the approximately 9,000 known NEAs, there are more than 1,500 that are energetically as easy to reach as the Moon," says the press release. This may be true, but NEAs don't hang around. They orbit the sun just like the Earth. So is the plan to jump on board, set up a mining platform and then watch billions of dollars of equipment zoom off into deep space until it comes back a year (or ten, or a hundred years) in the future? Or are we going to slow the small NEAs sufficiently so they can be parked in Earth orbit? Once again, messing with an asteroid's trajectory is a huge technological unknown. During the announcement, Diamandis kept referring to "risk tolerant investors" investing their "smart money" in the biggest opportunity ever. He also emphasized that Planetary Resources' goals would enrich humanity as a whole and that their goals were in alignment with NASA's aims to push humanity into space. Bold words for sure, but, again, there are problems with this vision. Countering the "Gee Whiz" factor, as my cohort and business/space analyst Greg Fish would put it, there's a thick forest of formidable red tape an asteroid mining company would have to wade through. ANALYSIS: Asteroid Forensics May Point to Alien Space Miners For starters, mining and refining materials on Earth is a costly and risky endeavor. Can you imagine trying to insure an extraterrestrial mining outfit? If the refinery is totally automated, at least you don't have to worry about workers' benefits, health and safety. But humanity would need to have mastered our solar system to an incredible degree to assure the safety of in-space assets. Losing a multi-billion dollar robotic mining operation wouldn't look so good at the end of the next quarter's budget report. But the biggest selling point for asteroid mining is, of course, all the gazillions of dollars we stand to make from sucking precious metals like platinum from asteroids. As Diamandis kept emphasizing, by exploiting the solar system we would enrich the entire planet with huge wealth. How a profit-making industry became a world-wide charity, I'm not too sure. Last time I checked, BP wasn't busy enriching the world with the profits from their oil drilling. And, as Fish has pointed out countless times, flooding the world's economy with much-fabled trillions of dollars-worth of "cheap" platinum and other rare minerals could kill global markets. On the basis of supply and demand, the price of platinum group metals could collapse as supply routes from asteroids become common. However, to set up and maintain an asteroid mining industry, it would be unimaginatively expensive - perhaps the price of asteroid material would be naturally high due to the sheer risk and overheads required. In short, we have no idea about how an influx of asteroid resources could impact the world. But to say it would benefit mankind as a whole? That's as speculative as predicting the world's economy in 50 years time. ANALYSIS: Capturing Lazy Asteroids to Plunder In short, the only thing that seems unique about today's announcement is that a group of very well respected and smart entrepreneurs and billionaires have clubbed together and thought asteroid mining seemed cool. Sadly, the plan is deliberately vague (who knows how many technological iterative steps are needed before a sustainable mining operation can begin anyway?), there is no realistic timescale and as far as I can tell, there's been only limited analysis as to how much investment will be needed. Regardless of how "risk tolerant" Google's investment may be, the corporation certainly isn't stupid with their investments. Seed money may be very forthcoming in the early stages (and that's all that may be needed if Planetary Resources turns rapidly into a profit making space technology company), but in the long term, hinging this enterprise on making vast wads of imaginary cash from mining asteroids will leave any investor looking for a way out. While I'm personally very excited to hear about any enterprise that can drive innovation in space and invigorate private investment into building a sustainable space infrastructure, I don't believe that getting all hot and heavy over mining asteroids is the way to do it. Although I hope asteroid mining is an industry of the future, we'll have to wait some time before it becomes a realistic proposition. Setting unachievable goals for an undefined future - regardless of the amazing technological advances this will inevitably generate - leaves the plan open to criticism and ultimately rapid loss of interest. I think I'll wait until one of the big oil companies starts to launch rockets before I go getting too excited about yet another plan to pillage asteroids. Image: The double asteroid 90 Antiope - what riches are inside? Credit: ESO, edit by Ian O'Neill The opinions expressed here do not necessarily represent the official views of Discovery Communications.

#### 2] Turn– asteroid mining kills research incentive and decks innovation

Bharmal 18- Bharmal, Zahaan, “The Case against Mars Colonisation.” *The Guardian*, The Guardian, 28 Aug. 2018, www.theguardian.com/science/blog/2018/aug/28/the-case-against-mars-colonisation. VS

If humans do eventually land on Mars, they would not arrive alone. They would carry with them their earthly microbes. Trillions of them.

There is a real risk that some of these microbes could find their way onto the surface of Mars and, in doing so, confuse – perhaps irreversibly so – the search for Martian life. This is because we wouldn't be able to distinguish indigenous life from the microbes we'd brought with us. Our presence on Mars could jeopardise one of our main reasons for being there – the search for life.

#### Furthermore, there is no one way of knowing how our microbes may react with the vulnerable Martian ecosystem. In [Cosmos, the late Carl Sagan](https://www.theguardian.com/science/2012/mar/26/science-writing-cosmos-carl-sagan) wrote, “If there is life on Mars, I believe we should do nothing with Mars. Mars then belongs to the Martians, even if the

# 1AC

## 1AC—Plan

#### Plan: The appropriation of outer space through asteroid mining by private entities should be banned.

#### We’ll defend normal means as the signatories of the OST adding an optional protocol under Article II.

Tronchetti 7[Fabio Tronchetti is a professor at the International Institute of Air and Space Law, Leiden University, The Netherlands, 2007, <https://iislweb.org/docs/Diederiks2007.pdf>, 12-15-2021 amrita]

ARTICLE II OF THE OUTER SPACE TREATY: A MATTER OF DEBATE The legal content of Article II of the Outer Space Treaty is one of the most debated and analysed topic in the field of space law. Indeed, several interpretations have been put forward to explain the meaning of its provisions. Article II states that: “Outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means”. **The text of Article II represents** the final point of a process, formally initiated with Resolution 1721, aimed at conferring to outer space the status of res communis omnium, namely a thing open for the **free exploration** and use by all States **without the possibility of being appropriated**. By prohibiting the possibility of making territorial claims over outer space or any part thereof based on use or occupation, Article II **makes clear that** the customary procedures of **i**nternational **law allowing** subjects to obtain **sovereignty rights over un-owed lands**, namely discovery, occupatio and effective possession, **do not apply to** outer **space.** This prohibition was considered by the drafters of the Outer Space Treaty the best guarantee for preserving outer space for peaceful activities only and for stimulating the exploration and use of the space environment in the name of all mankind. What has been the object of controversy among legal scholars is the question of whether both States and private individuals are subjected to the provisions of Article II. Indeed, **while Article II forbids** expressis verbis the national **appropriation by** claims of **sovereignty**, by means of use and occupation or other means of outer space, **it does not** make **a**ny explicit **mention** **to** its **private** appropriation. Relying on this consideration, some authors have argued that the private appropriation of outer space and celestial bodies is allowed. For instance, in 1968 Gorove wrote: “Thus, at present an individual acting on his own behalf or on behalf of another individual or private association or an international organisation could lawfully appropriate any parts of outer space…”6 . The same argument is used today by the enterprises selling extraterrestrial acres. They base their claim to the Moon and other celestial bodies on the consideration that Article II does not explicitly forbid private individuals and enterprises to claim, exploit or appropriate the celestial bodies for profit7 . However, it must be said, that nowadays there is a general consensus on the fact that **both national appropriation and private** property rights **are denied** under the Outer Space Treaty. Several way of reasoning have been advanced to support this view. Sters and Tennen affirm that the argument that Article II does not apply to private entities since they are not expressly mentioned fails for the reason that they do not need to be explicitly listed in Article II to be fully subject to the non-appropriation principle8 . **Private entities are allowed to carry out** space **activities but**, according to Article VI of the Outer Space Treaty, they **must be authorized** to conduct such activities **by the** appropriate **State** of nationality. But if the State is prohibited from engaging in certain conduct, then it lacks the authority to license its nationals or other entities subject to its jurisdiction to engage in that prohibited activity. Jenks argues that “States bear international responsibility for national activities in space; it follows that what is forbidden to a State is not permitted to a chartered company created by a State or to one of its nationals acting as a private adventurer”9 . It has been also suggested that **the prohibition of national** appropriation **implies prohibition of private** appropriation because the latter cannot exist independently from the former10. In order to exist, indeed, private property requires a superior authority to enforce it, be in the form of a State or some other recognised entity. In outer space, however, this practice of State endorsement is forbidden. Should a State recognise or protect the territorial acquisitions of any of its subjects, this would constitute a form of national appropriation in violation of Article II. Moreover, it is possible to use some historical elements to support the argument that both the acquisition of State sovereignty and the creation of private property rights are forbidden by the words of Article II. During the negotiations of the Outer Space Treaty, the Delegate of Belgium affirmed that his delegation “had taken note of the interpretation of the non-appropriation advanced by several delegations-apparently without contradiction-as covering both the establishment of sovereignty and the creation of titles to property in private law”11. The French Delegate stated that: “…there was reason to be satisfied that three basic principles were affirmed, namely: the prohibition of any claim of sovereignty or property rights in space…”12. The fact that the accessions to the Outer Space Treaty were not accompanied by reservations or interpretations of the meaning of Article II, it is an evidence of the fact that this issue was considered to be settled during the negotiation phase. Thus, summing up, we may say that **prohibition of appropriation of outer space** and its parts is a rule which **is valid for both private and public entity**. The theory that private operators are not subject to this rule represents a myth that is not supported by any valid legal argument. Moreover, it can be also added that if any subject was allowed to appropriate parts of outer space, the basic aim of the drafters of the Treaty, namely to prevent a colonial competition in outer space and to create the conditions and premises for an exploration and use of outer space carried out for the benefit of all States, would be betrayed. Therefore, **the need to protect the non-appropriative nature o**f outer **space emerges** in all its relevance.

## 1AC—Advantages

### Advantage – Collisions

#### Unregulated mining is existential and causes collisions – multiple scenarios

#### Scenario 1 is deflection

#### Unregulated mining causes asteroid deflection and astroterror

Drmola and Mareš 15 - Jakub Drmola is a PhD student and Miroslav Mareš professor, at the Divison of Security and Strategic Studies, Masaryk University, Czech Republic, "Revisiting the deflection dilemma", *Astronomy & Geophysics*, Volume 56, Issue 5, October 2015, Pages 5.15–5.18, <https://academic.oup.com/astrogeo/article/56/5/5.15/235650>

There are two basic ways to go about moving the resources contained within a given asteroid to the Earth. They can be extracted from the asteroid during its natural orbit and then transported to the Earth, or the entire asteroid might be moved closer to a more convenient location before starting mining. Thus repositioned, it might even be used as a shielded habitat, once hollowed out (Ostro 1999). There are different speculative costs and benefits associated with either option, which would vary with the size, orbit and composition of the asteroid. But, crucially, the second option would entail putting asteroids into orbit around the Earth, the Moon or possibly at one of the Earth’s Lagrangian points. Indeed, NASA has already planned a mission to capture a small asteroid and place it in a high cislunar orbit, where it would serve as a destination for future manned missions and experiments. This “Asteroid Redirect Mission” is to take place in the next decade and is being pitched mainly as a stepping stone towards a future mission to Mars (see box “NASA’s Asteroid Redirect Mission”; Brophy et al. 2012, Burchell 2014, Gates et al. 2015). Programmes to redirect asteroids and, especially, plans to mine asteroids on an industrial scale essentially resurrect the deflection dilemma. But it is no longer a matter of superpowers intentionally misusing technology designed to prevent dangerous impacts. It becomes an issue of proliferation among private entities. Once private mining companies acquire the technical ability to redirect suitable NEOs (Baoyin et al. 2011) in order to extract platinum or water from them, perilous inflections become more likely. The probability of accidents will rise with the number of asteroids whose trajectories we decide to manipulate. Such accidents might be very unlikely, but even a tiny technical or human error in the execution of an inflection meant to place an asteroid into the lunar or geocentric orbit might send it crashing into the Earth with potentially devastating consequences. And while we might find solace in the low probabilities associated with such an accident, even contemporary industries which are considered very safe suffer from unlikely tragedies. Despite being dependable and reliable, airliners do crash; there are a lot of them flying and very improbable accidents do happen if the dice are rolled often enough. Undoubtedly, we will not be steering as many asteroids as we steer planes any time soon, but industries tend to be more accident-prone during their infancy. Furthermore, a single asteroid can do a lot more damage than a single plane. And who is to say how much metal or water we are going to need in space over the course of the 21st century, or the next? The second source of risk is the intentional misuse, similar to the original deflection dilemma. But the entry barrier for asteroid weaponization gets much lower if mining them and moving them around becomes a common industrial activity. This is in stark contrast to the original scenario which envisioned this technology to be used solely for planetary defence and under control of a very small number of the most powerful countries (Morrison 2010). If such a powerful technology becomes widely and commercially available, even rogue states and wellfunded terrorist groups might be tempted to use it for an unexpected and devastating attack. In addition, an active asteroid mining industry would make it more difficult to detect any hostile inflection attempts among the number of legitimate and benign ones. Policy implications Considering these possible future dangers, it seems prudent to consider what to do about them sooner rather than later. The most obvious “solution” would be a blanket ban on the development of any technology that might lead to artificially inflected asteroids crashing into the Earth. However, such a ban would be incompatible with the dream of increased presence of humans in the solar system. It would stymie both scientific exploration and economic development here on Earth, which is increasingly dependent on precious metals and spacebased technologies. Furthermore, this approach would leave us more vulnerable to natural impacts which, in the long view, seems less than desirable. Another approach might be similar to the current regime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, aiming to support peaceful civilian use of nuclear power while at the same time prohibiting the spread of weapons of mass destruction. The regime mostly works (with caveats, see Wood et al. 2008) because these applications require different infrastructures and fissile materials enriched to different levels of purity. This makes it possible, at least in principle, to tell apart operations meant for the production of electricity and those designed to create weapons. Unfortunately, the difference between legitimate and hostile trajectory modification would lie only in the acceleration imparted on the asteroid and not in the technical means to do it. As the spacecraft launched with the intent to cause impact with the Earth might be identical to those sent off to retrieve resources, telling them apart would be nearly impossible, until it was too late. And this approach makes no difference to the chances of an industrial accident. If monitoring equipment on Earth is unhelpful, the focus changes to space. In other words, all asteroid movement missions should be constantly monitored. For an attacker, it would make most sense to delay the final course adjustment for as long as possible in order to give the least warning and make the timeframe for reaction as short as possible. So an asteroid might head towards a safe orbit fit for resource extraction for most of its altered flight time, but be further accelerated at the last possible moment onto an impact trajectory, perhaps mere days before it hits a major city. Our current programmes cataloguing NEOs (such as CSS or Pan-STARRS), which look for new, previously unknown objects, are not ideally suited for the task of constantly tracking a number of different, already known asteroids. New instruments would be needed to track them in order to immediately detect any hazardous inflection, whether intentional or accidental. Once such a detection is made, emergency measures to evacuate the population or, preferably, to “re-deflect” the incoming object can be executed right away, regardless of the cause. Accidents and hostilities could be treated the same way and countered by the same system (initially, at least). Such a system would be more akin to an air traffic control than a non-proliferation regulation, offering security through vigilance, rather than absence. Additionally, development of a system able to deflect incoming objects at relatively short notice would be beneficial in case of an impending natural impact. Conclusion Perhaps none of these concerns will become relevant. Maybe the idea of asteroid mining will soon fizzle out because we will discover cheaper and more efficient local alternatives. Maybe humanity will lose the will or the capability to explore space any further. Or perhaps manipulating asteroid trajectories will prove impractical or too costly. Certainly, it would not be the first time that a promising and seemingly obvious future does not come about. In the 1960s it seemed almost self-evident that by the second decade of the 21st century we would have flying cars and a base on the Moon. Yet we do not. Asteroid mining might be a similar case of unfulfilled promises and misplaced visions. On the other hand, there are examples of industries that developed surprisingly fast despite being considered unrealistic, not too long ago: air travel, nuclear power generation, or commercial satellites. The spread of the internet and the accompanying digital information revolution is another example; hardly anyone anticipated having virtually the entire repository of human knowledge at our fingertips at all times (except Douglas Adams). Whether the deflection dilemma forever remains an unmaterialized threat or it becomes a palpable problem, it is something to be mindful of now, as the foundations of the prospective asteroid mining industry are being laid. In the end, the purpose of this paper is not to predict the future. Instead it aims to merely update a conscientious warning which called for our diligence more than 20 years ago. While the world has changed somewhat, the basic idea remains valid. Whether the danger comes from warring superpowers, terrorists or negligent corporations, we must be aware of the realistic risks in order to avoid being either stumped by unforeseen catastrophes or paralysed by unwarranted fear. Either extreme would be harmful for our future.●

#### Major collisions cause extinction

Baum ’19 - executive director of the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute, Ph.D in Geography

Seth Baum, “Risk-Risk Tradeoff Analysis of Nuclear Explosives for Asteroid Deflection,” SSRN Scholarly Paper (Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, May 31, 2019), <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3397559>.

The most severe asteroid collisions and nuclear wars can cause global environmental effects. The core mechanism is the transport of particulate matter into the stratosphere, where it can spread worldwide and remain aloft for years or decades. Large asteroid collisions create large quantities of dust and large fireballs; the fire heats the dust so that some portion of it rises into the stratosphere. The largest collisions, such as the 10km Chicxulub impactor, can also eject debris from the collision site into space; upon reentry into the atmosphere, the debris heats up enough to spark global fires (Toon, Zahnle, Morrison, Turco, & Covey, 1997). The fires are a major impact in their own right and can send additional smoke into the stratosphere. For nuclear explosions, there is also a fireball and smoke, in this case from the burning of cities or other military targets. While in the stratosphere, the particulate matter blocks sunlight and destroys ozone (Toon et al., 2007). The ozone loss increases the amount of ultraviolet radiation reaching the surface, causing skin cancer and other harms (Mills, Toon, Turco, Kinnison, & Garcia, 2008). The blocked sunlight causes abrupt cooling of Earth’s surface and in turn reduced precipitation due to a weakened hydrological cycle. The cool, dry, and dark conditions reduce plant growth. Recent studies use modern climate and crop models to examine the effects for a hypothetical IndiaPakistan nuclear war scenario with 100 weapons (50 per side) each of 15KT yield. The studies find agriculture declines in the range of approximately 2% to 50% depending on the crop and location.11 Another study compares the crop data to existing poverty and malnourishment and estimates that the crop declines could threaten starvation for two billion people (Helfand, 2013). However, the aforementioned studies do not account for new nuclear explosion fire simulations that find approximately five times less particulate matter reaching the stratosphere, and correspondingly weaker global environmental effects (Reisner et al., 2018). Note also that the 100 weapon scenario used in these studies is not the largest potential scenario. Larger nuclear wars and large asteroid collisions could cause greater harm. The largest asteroid collisions could even reduce sunlight below the minimum needed for vision (Toon et al., 1997). Asteroid risk analyses have proposed that the global environmental disruption from large collisions could cause one billion deaths (NRC, 2010) or the death of 25% of all humans (Chapman, 2004; Chapman & Morrison, 1994; Morrison, 1992), though these figures have not been rigorously justified (Baum, 2018a). The harms from asteroid collisions and nuclear wars can also include important secondary effects. The food shortages from severe global environmental disruption could lead to infectious disease outbreaks as public health conditions deteriorate (Helfand, 2013). Law and order could be lost in at least some locations as people struggle for survival (Maher & Baum, 2013). Today’s complex global political-economic system already shows fragility to shocks such as the 2007- 2008 financial crisis (Centeno, Nag, Patterson, Shaver, & Windawi, 2015); an asteroid collision or nuclear war could be an extremely large shock. The systemic consequences of a nuclear war would be further worsened by the likely loss of major world cities that serve as important hubs in the global economy. Even a single detonation in nuclear terrorism would have ripple effects across the global political-economic system (similar to, but likely larger than, the response prompted by the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001). It is possible for asteroid collisions to cause nuclear war. An asteroid explosion could be misinterpreted as a nuclear attack, prompting nuclear attack that is believed to be retaliation. For example, the 2013 Chelyabinsk event occurred near an important Russian military installation, prompting concerns about the event’s interpretation (Harris et al., 2015). The ultimate severity of an asteroid collision or violent nuclear conflict use would depend on how human society reacts. Would the reaction be disciplined and constructive: bury the dead, heal the sick, feed the hungry, and rebuild all that has fallen? Or would the reaction be disorderly and destructive: leave the rubble in place, fight for scarce resources, and descend into minimalist tribalism or worse? Prior studies have identified some key issues, including the viability of trade (Cantor, Henry, & Rayner, 1989) and the self-sufficiency of local communities (Maher & Baum, 2013). However, the issue has received little research attention and remains poorly understood. This leaves considerable uncertainty in the total human harm from an asteroid collision or nuclear weapons use. Previously published point estimates of the human consequences of asteroid collisions12 and nuclear wars (Helfand, 2013) do not account for this uncertainty and are likely to be inaccurate. Of particular importance are the consequences for future generations, which could vastly outnumber the present generation. If an asteroid collision or nuclear war would cause human extinction, then there would be no future generations. Alternatively, if survivors fail to recover a large population and advanced technological civilization, then future generations would be permanently diminished. The largest long-term factor is whether future generations would colonize space and benefit from its astronomically large amount of resources (Tonn, 1999). However, it is not presently known which asteroid collisions or nuclear wars (if any) would cause the permanent collapse of human civilization and thus the loss of the large future benefits (Baum et al., 2019). Given the enormous stakes, prudent risk management would aim for very low probabilities of permanent collapse (Tonn, 2009). It should be noted that the severity of violent nuclear conflict could depend on more than just the effects of nuclear explosions, because the overall conflict scenario could include non-nuclear violence. Indeed, it is possible for the nuclear explosions to constitute a relatively small portion of the total severity, as was the case in World War II. 4.4 Risk of Violent Non-Nuclear Conflict Finally, it is necessary to discuss the risk of violent non-nuclear conflict. Only a small portion of violent non-nuclear conflicts are applicable, specifically the portion affected by nuclear weapons. More precisely, this section discusses non-nuclear conflicts involving one or more countries that possess nuclear weapons at some point during the lifetime of a nuclear deflection program. Nuclear deterrence theory predicts that nuclear-armed adversaries will not initiate major wars against each other because both sides could be destroyed in a nuclear war. However, the theory does permit limited, small-scale violent conflicts between nuclear-armed countries. These conflicts likely would not involve nuclear weapons. Indeed, nuclear deterrence may even make small violent conflicts more likely, because the countries know that neither side wants to escalate the conflict into major war. This idea is known as the stability-instability paradox: nuclear deterrence brings stability with respect to major wars but instability with respect to minor conflicts. Empirical support for the stability-instability paradox has been found by some research (Rauchhaus, 2009),while other research has found no significant effect of the possession of nuclear weapons on the probability of conflicts of any scale (Bell & Miller, 2015; Gartzke & Jo, 2009). If countries fully disarm their nuclear arsenals, such that they would never have nuclear weapons again, then there would be no nuclear deterrence to prevent the onset of major wars. A simple risk analysis could assume that the risk of major wars would be comparable to the risk prior to the development of nuclear weapons. The two twentieth century World Wars combined for around 100 million deaths in 50 years,13 suggesting an annualized risk of two million deaths. However, two World Wars do not make for a robust dataset. Indeed, the robustness of these two data points is called into question by historical analysis finding that both world wars might not have occurred in the reasonably plausible event that the 1914 assassination of Archduke Ferdinand had failed (Lebow, 2014). Similarly, another historical analysis finds that the U.S. and Soviet Union would probably not have waged major war against each other even in the absence of nuclear deterrence (Mueller, 1988). Furthermore, these past events are not necessarily applicable to the future conditions of a post-nuclear-disarmament world. To the best of the present author’s knowledge, no studies have analyzed the risk of major wars in a post-nucleardisarmament world.

#### Scenario 2 is satellite collisions

#### An increase in space debris and dust from mining collides with key defense satellites

Scoles 15 Sarah Scoles [Freelance science writer, and a contributing writer at WIRED Science, with articles in places like Popular Science, the New York Times, Scientific American, Vice, Outside, and others.], 5-27-2015, "Dust from asteroid mining spells danger for satellites," New Scientist, <https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg22630235-100-dust-from-asteroid-mining-spells-danger-for-satellites/> DD AG

IF THE gold mine is too far from home, why not move it nearby? It sounds like a fantasy, but would-be miners are already dreaming up ways to drag resource-rich space rocks closer to home. Trouble is, that could threaten the web of satellites around Earth.

Asteroids are not only stepping stones for cosmic colonisation, but may contain metals like gold, platinum, iron and titanium, plus life-sustaining hydrogen and oxygen, and rocket-fuelling ammonia. Space age forty-niners can either try to work an asteroid where it is, or tug it into a more convenient orbit.

NASA chose the second option for its Asteroid Redirect Mission, which aims to pluck a boulder from an asteroid’s surface and relocate it to a stable orbit around the moon. But an asteroid’s gravity is so weak that it’s not hard for surface particles to escape into space. Now a new model warns that debris shed by such transplanted rocks could intrude where many defence and communication satellites live – in geosynchronous orbit.

According to Casey Handmer of the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena and Javier Roa of the Technical University of Madrid in Spain, 5 per cent of the escaped debris will end up in regions traversed by satellites. Over 10 years, it would cross geosynchronous orbit 63 times on average. A satellite in the wrong spot at the wrong time will suffer a damaging high-speed collision with that dust.

The study also looks at the “catastrophic disruption” of an asteroid 5 metres across or bigger. Its total break-up into a pile of rubble would increase the risk to satellites by more than 30 per cent (arxiv.org/abs/1505.03800).

That may not have immediate consequences. But as Earth orbits get more crowded with spent rocket stages and satellites, we will have to worry about cascades of collisions like the one depicted in the movie Gravity.

#### Mining creates space debris

Boley and Byers 20 (Arron, Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of British Columbia; Michael, Department of Political Science, University of British Columbia) U.S. policy puts the safe development of space at risk, SCIENCE, 9 Oct 2020, Vol 370, Issue 6513, pp. 174-175 <https://www.science.org/doi/full/10.1126/science.abd3402> EE

Mining can generate serious operational concerns. Lunar dust is a known challenge to operations on the Moon. Any surface activity could exacerbate lunar dust migration, including by lofting dust onto trajectories that cross lunar orbits, such as that of NASA's proposed Lunar Gateway (11). Moreover, without cooperation by all actors, the limited number of useful lunar orbits could quickly become filled with space debris.

On asteroids, low escape speeds will make it difficult to prevent the loss of surface material. Even if full enclosures are used, waste material may be purposefully jettisoned. Mining could also lead to uncontrolled outbursts of volatile sublimation after the removal of surface layers. Because the asteroids targeted for mining are likely to be those with small minimum orbit intersection distances, the resulting meteoroid debris streams could threaten lunar operations as well as satellites in Earth's orbit (12). In a worst-case scenario, a trajectory change resulting from mining could eventually lead to an Earth-impact emergency.

Space missions already provide some evidence of these risks. In 2019, during the course of Japan's Hayabusa2 mission, a small impactor was used to make a crater on (162173) Ryugu (13). Some of the resulting anthropogenic meteoroids could begin reaching Earth during the 2033 apparition. In 2022, NASA will test its ability to deflect an asteroid by striking (65803) Didymos B (Dimorphos) with the Double Asteroid Redirection Test spacecraft. This impact will produce anthropogenic meteoroids, with the possibility of immediate delivery to Earth (14). Although these risks are small, they demonstrate how easily human actions can change the near-Earth environment.

#### Laundry list of impacts – compromised communication, loss of military capability and more

Divorsky 15 George Divorsky [George P. Dvorsky (born May 11, 1970) is a Canadian bioethicist, transhumanist and futurist. He is a contributing editor at io9[1] and producer of the Sentient Developments blog and podcast. He was Chair of the Board for the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies (IEET)[2][3] and is the founder and chair of the IEET's Rights of Non-Human Persons Program], 6-4-2015, "What Would Happen If All Our Satellites Were Suddenly Destroyed?," Gizmodo <https://gizmodo.com/what-would-happen-if-all-our-satellites-were-suddenly-d-1709006681> DD AG

Given these grim prospects, it’s fair to ask what might happen to our civilization if any of these things happened. At the risk of gross understatement, the complete loss of our satellite fleet would instigate a tremendous disruption to our current mode of technological existence—disruptions that would be experienced in the short, medium, and long term, and across multiple domains.

Compromised Communications

Almost immediately we’d notice a dramatic reduction in our ability to communicate, share information, and conduct transactions.

“If our communications satellites are lost, then bandwidth is also lost,” Jonathan McDowell tells io9. He’s an astrophysicists and Chandra Observatory scientist who works out of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics.

McDowell says that, with telecommunication satellites wiped out, the burden of telecommunications would fall upon undersea cables and ground-based communication systems. But while many forms of communication would disappear in an instant, others would remain.

All international calls and data traffic would have to be re-routed, placing tremendous pressure on terrestrial and undersea lines. Oversaturation would stretch the capacity of these systems to the limit, preventing many calls from going through. Hundreds of millions of Internet connections would vanish, or be severely overloaded. A similar number of cell phones would be rendered useless. In remote areas, people dependent on satellite for television, Internet, and radio would practically lose all service.

“Indeed, a lot of television would suddenly disappear,” says McDowell. “A sizable portion of TV comes from cable whose companies relay programming from satellites to their hubs.”

It’s important to note that we actually have a precedent for a dramatic—albeit brief —disruption in com-sat capability. Back in 1998, there was a day in which a single satellite failed and all the world’s pagers stopped working.

The sudden loss of satellite capability would have a profound effect on the military.

The Marshall Institute puts it this way: “Space is a critical enabler to all U.S. warfare domains,” including intelligence, navigation, communications, weather prediction, and warfare. McDowell describes satellite capability as as the “backbone” of the U.S. military.

And as 21st century warfare expert Peter W. Singer from New America Foundation tells io9, “He who controls the heavens will control what happens in the battles of Earth.” Singer summarized the military consequences of losing satellites in an email to us:

Moreover, and as McDowell explains to io9, the loss of satellite capability would have a profound effect on arms control capabilities. Space systems can monitor compliance; without them, we’d be running blind.

“The overarching consideration is that you wouldn’t really know what’s going on,” says McDowell. “Satellites provide for both global and local views of what’s happening. We would be less connected, less informed—and with considerably degraded situational awareness.”

One great thing satellites have done for us is improve our ability to forecast weather. Predicting a slight chance of cloudiness is all well and good, but some areas, like India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh, are dependent on such systems to predict potentially hazardous monsoons. And in the U.S., the NOAA has estimated that, during a typical hurricane season, weather satellites save as much as $3 billion in lives and property damage.

There’s also the effect on science to consider. Much of what we know about climate change comes from satellites.

As McDowell explains, the first couple of weeks without satellites wouldn’t make much of a difference. But over a ten-year span, the lack of satellites would preclude our ability to understand and monitor such things as the ozone layer, carbon dioxide levels, and the distribution of polar ice. Ground-based and balloon-driven systems would help, but much of the data we’re currently tracking would suddenly become much spottier.

#### Collisions with high-value satellites guarantee nuclear escalation.

Egeli 21 [Sitki Egeli is an assistant professor in the Political Science and International Relations Department of Izmir University of Economics. He was previously a director for foreign affairs in Turkey’s Undersecretariat for Defense Industries (SSM) and vice president in charge of the defense and aerospace sectors of an international consulting firm.] “Space-to-Space Warfare and Proximity Operations: The Impact on Nuclear Command, Control, and Communications and Strategic Stability,” Published 25 Jun 2021, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/25751654.2021.1942681>, VM

“Amid increased tensions, perhaps even an imminent military confrontation between **two nuclear-armed adversaries**, a high-value (for example, early-warning or strategic communication) **satellite stops functioning** or communicating **instantly and inexplicably**. SSA sensors do not pick up any anomalies. **This may be the outcome of** a technical malfunction or a natural phenomenon, such as the impact of a collision with a meteoroid or piece of **space debris small enough to have evaded detection**. Alternatively, the satellite perhaps becomes the victim of a deliberate, undetected attack. Earth-to-space kinetic, electronic, or directed energy attacks would leave behind some trails. A cyberattack, which is harder to detect and attribute, is a strong possibility. So is a stealthy attack by hostile spacecraft. In fact, the adversary is known to have experimented with ominous small spacecraft that could easily conceal or disguise themselves until conducting a final maneuver to neutralize their targets. The victim would also be aware that, especially at distant GEO and HEO altitudes, SSA is not sufficiently comprehensive to detect and give warning of all suspicious or threatening movements as they happen. As suspicions abound, decision makers are faced with hard choices. Could this perhaps be the harbinger of a wider nuclear or nonnuclear **first strike**, along with which the attacker is seeking to eliminate the **possibility of retaliation** by degrading the defender’s capacity to command, control, and communicate with its forces? Should the defender react immediately before the remaining space-enabled NC3 elements are also compromised and its control over nuclear and nonnuclear forces degrades even further? In the absence of a clear-cut picture of what actually has happened, there is a risk that impending decisions will be made on the basis of insufficient and potentially **erroneous information**, and the climate will be ripe for unfounded presumptions and predispositions. The resulting ultimatums, responses, or counteractions could **set off a dangerous cycle of escalation** and tit-for-tat actions, whereby reactions and overreactions between adversaries lead to potentially catastrophic consequences. At a minimum, heightened tension in orbit would **have the outcome of spilling down to Earth** so as to further aggravate an already tense situation.?”

### Advantage– Resource Depletion

#### The West’s move to zero-emissions has made them really reliant on China for rare metals

Ings 21—Simon Ings [Simon Ings writes for New Scientist about books, films and all things culture.]; “Why using rare metals to clean up the planet is no cheap fix”; Jan 27 2021; *New Scientist*;<https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg24933190-400-why-using-rare-metals-to-clean-up-the-planet-is-no-cheap-fix/#ixzz7H1YlrNxo>. (AG DebateDrills)

WE REAP seven times as much energy from the wind and 44 times as much energy from the sun as we did a decade ago. Is this good news? Guillaume Pitron, a French journalist and documentary maker, isn’t sure. He is neither a climate sceptic nor a fan of inaction. But as the world moves to adopt a target of net-zero carbon emissions by 2050, Pitron worries about the costs. The figures in his book The Rare Metals War are stark. Changing the energy model means doubling the production of rare metals about every 15 years, mostly to satisfy demand for non-ferrous magnets and lithium-ion batteries. “At this rate,” writes Pitron, “over the next 30 years we… will need to mine more mineral ores than humans have extracted over the last 70,000 years.” Before the Renaissance, humans had found uses for seven metals. During the industrial revolution, this increased to a mere dozen. Today, we have found uses for all 90-odd of them, and some are very rare. Neodymium and gallium, for instance, are found in iron ore, but there is 1200 times less neodymium and up to 2650 times less gallium than there is iron. Zipping from an abandoned mine in the Mojave desert to the toxic lakes and cancer-afflicted areas of Baotou in China, Pitron weighs the awful price of refining the materials, ably blending investigative journalism with insights from science, politics and business. There are two sides to Pitron’s story, woven seamlessly together. First, there is the economic story of how China worked to dominate the energy and digital transition. It now controls 95 per cent of the rare earth metals market, making between 80 and 90 per cent of the batteries for electric vehicles, says Pitron, and more than half the magnets in wind turbines and electric motors. Then there is the ecological story of the lengths China took to succeed. Today, 10 per cent of its arable land is contaminated by heavy metals, 80 per cent of its groundwater isn’t fit for consumption and air pollution contributes to around 1.6 million deaths a year there, according to Pitron (a recent paper in The Lancet says 1.24 million deaths in China a year are attributable to air pollution – but let’s not quibble). China freely entered into this Faustian bargain. Yet it wouldn’t have been possible had the Western world not outsourced its own industrial activities, creating a planet divided, as Pitron memorably describes it, “between the dirty and those who pretend to be clean”. The West’s comeuppance is at hand, as its manufacturers, starved of rare metals, must take their technologies to China. It should have seen how its reliance on Chinese raw materials would quickly morph into a dependence on China for the technologies of the energy and digital transition. By 2040, in our pursuit of ever-greater connectivity and a cleaner atmosphere, we will need to mine three times more rare earth metals, five times more tellurium, 12 times more cobalt and 16 times more lithium than we do now. China’s ecological ruination and global technological dominance advance in lockstep, unstoppably, unless the West and others start to mine for rare metals in Brazil, the US, Russia, Turkey, South Africa, Thailand and Pitron’s native France. Better that the West attains some shred of supply security by mining some of its own land, says Pitron. At least there consumers can fight (and pay) for cleaner processes. Nothing will change if we don’t experience “the full cost of attaining our standard of happiness”, he says. Read more: <https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg24933190-400-why-using-rare-metals-to-clean-up-the-planet-is-no-cheap-fix/#ixzz7H1YRP81n>

#### The impact is great power war—a space race sparked by need for rare metals pits China against the West

Butters 16—Julie Butters; “Elements of Conflict: The Scramble to Control the rare elements powering the modern world”; BU The Brink; <https://www.bu.edu/articles/2016/rare-earths/>. (AG DebateDrills)

The global prospecting sparked by China’s export restrictions isn’t purely about national security—or even keeping the world’s cell phones and x-ray machines switched on—according to Klinger. It’s about power. Setting up large-scale mining in the Amazon, for example, would allow the Brazilian government greater control over land currently managed by a federation of 28 indigenous ethnic groups. The federation’s power—even the military has to ask permission to cross their land, says Klinger—is “seen as an affront to Brazil’s sovereignty because there’s a perception among some, including in the Brazilian federal government and in the Senate, that indigenous people are the puppets of foreign governments because so much funding from northern nongovernmental organizations has gone to supporting these indigenous people and their causes.” The interstellar gold rush is little different. In November 2015, Congress passed the SPACE Act of 2015, granting citizens the right to mine and sell material from outer space. The legislation was cause for rejoicing among asteroid mining companies that stand to make a fortune plumbing space for water, industrial metals, and rare earths. These companies have already taken the first step toward mining: In July 2015, Planetary Resources launched a spacecraft to test control systems and other technologies necessary for asteroid prospecting. Klinger attended a 2015 space mining conference where private space industry representatives were “invoking the rarity of rare earth elements, and the fact that we’re running out of them here on Earth.” As Klinger sees it, the SPACE Act of 2015 is largely an attempt to place outer space under US jurisdiction. “And if you can cut through all of the fluff about outer space and the great frontier in the transcripts discussing this bill,” she says, “what you see is actually this directly undermines” the 1967 Outer Space Treaty signed by the United States, Russia, and other countries. That treaty “enshrines outer space as belonging to all of humankind,” she says, and “was explicitly organized to minimize conflict in respect to outer space.” She adds, “One of the rather potent and persuasive debates in the US surrounding the promotion and ultimate passage of this law was fear that China would ‘colonize’ the moon if we didn’t get there first.” Klinger hopes other countries won’t take the SPACE Act seriously, because their doing so could lead to a global conflict.

#### Space may seem like an infinite resource but that’s the problem. We overrely on it and it dries up quickly—speeding up prospects of war

Khan 19- Sieeka Khan, “Providing the latest research, discoveries and scientific breakthroughs for science enthusiasts”, 5-15-2019, "Space Mining Could Ruin Our Solar System, Researchers Warn," Science Times, <https://www.sciencetimes.com/articles/21813/20190515/space-mining-could-ruin-our-solar-system-researchers-warn.htm> VS

Limiting the galactic consumption to 1/8th of the available resources may sound like a bad deal, but space is a huge place and even a small fraction of our solar system's bounty could set humans up for generations."One-eighth of the iron in the asteroid belt is more than a million times greater than all of the Earth's currently estimated iron ore reserves," the authors wrote, "and it may well suffice for centuries." The researchers looked at the estimated iron use on Earth since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution and come up with the "1/8th principle". According to a survey in 1994 regarding the environmental impacts of the revolution, the global production of crude iron increased from half a million tons in 1800 to half a billion tons of steel produced in 1994. This rate is equivalent to the world's iron production doubling once every 20 years. The new data from the U.S Geological Survey supports this estimate as the world's iron production increased from 1 billion tons in 994 to 2.2 billion tons in 2016.If humans show the same level of industriousness when mining the resources on moons, asteroids and nearby planets, we could reach the hypothetical 1/8th point after 400 years. If the production continues to double every 20 years after that, all of the resources in the solar system would be depleted in just 60 years. This would give humans 60 years to change from a space resource-based economy to an unhopeful prospect, given the nonchalant response to the current environmental crises that we are facing, such as climate change and population growth.

"Worldwide, the present rate of planetary mission launches is 15 per decade," the authors wrote. "At this rate, even just the nearly 200 worlds of the solar system that gravity has made spherical would take 130 years to visit once."

#### Historically, resource shortages have been a primary reason for war—no reason to think space changes anything

Drake 20—Erin Drake; “Conflict and Resource Scarcity Around the World”; *SRM*; Jan 15 2020; <https://insights.s-rminform.com/conflict-and-resource-scarcity-across-the-world>; (AG DebateDrills)

Resource scarcity has historically contributed to – and prolonged – various conflicts, both between states, as well as between communities or groups within states. This trend continued in 2019, exacerbated by factors such as climate change, expanding populations, and resource shortages – including water, oil and land. Resource scarcity and worsening environmental conditions will continue to play a prominent role in driving conflict dynamics across the world in the coming years. WATER WARSPV Special Edition Water Icon SRM-1 Water scarcity has fuelled longstanding disputes, due the prominent role that water plays in various sectors such as agriculture and fishing. While Southeast Asian countries dispute maritime boundaries, communities in Sub-Saharan Africa clash over water access in drought-affected areas. Militant groups – such as the Houthis in Yemen – use water as a weapon to force compliance among populations and gain political leverage, while indigenous populations in Latin America oppose large extractive companies, which they accuse of diverting and polluting water resources. In 2019, the UN estimated that around 75,000 people die annually in conflicts over water. As global warming exacerbates water scarcity in the coming years, such conflicts will likely intensify. CASE STUDIES Amid severe drought and an ongoing water crisis in India, communities in Chennai, Tamil Nadu State, and Madhya Pradesh State, clashed over access to water in June and July 2019. Security personnel were deployed to guard water facilities and escort tanker drivers amid attacks, while clashes between residents in affected areas resulted in multiple injuries. An estimated 21 major cities could run out of water in 2020. With the ongoing impact of global warming, such shortages which will likely lead to further, widespread clashes in the coming years. China, the Philippines, Vietnam, Brunei, Taiwan and Malaysia have historically made overlapping claims to territory in the South China Sea (SCS) – a vital shipping route, also accounting for over 12 percent of global commercial fishing. Due to competing claims, fishing in the SCS has also historically driven clashes between Chinese vessels – often escorted by the Chinese coast guard – and other fishing vessels. Over-fishing and the destruction of marine life in the area will likely drive further clashes in the coming years, particularly as countries continue to expand their fisheries in disputed territories. This, in turn, may exacerbate geopolitical and military tensions already present in the region.

## 1AC — FW

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing.

#### Prefer it:

#### 1] Actor specificity:

#### A] Aggregation – every policy benefits some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action.

#### B] No act-omission distinction – choosing to omit is an act itself – governments decide not to act which means being presented with the aff creates a choice between two actions, neither of which is an omission

#### C] No intent-foresight distinction – If we foresee a consequence, then it becomes part of our deliberation which makes it intrinsic to our action since we intend it to happen

#### 2] Lexical pre-requisite: threats to bodily security preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis that inhibits the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose

#### 3] Only consequentialism explains degrees of wrongness—if I break a promise to meet up for lunch, that is not as bad as breaking a promise to take a dying person to the hospital. Only the consequences of breaking the promise explain why the second one is much worse than the first. Intuitions outweigh—they’re the foundational basis for any argument and theories that contradict our intuitions are most likely false even if we can’t deductively determine why.

#### 4] Substitutability—only consequentialism explains necessary enablers.

**Sinnott-Armstrong 92** [Walter, professor of practical ethics. “An Argument for Consequentialism” Dartmouth College Philosophical Perspectives. 1992.]

**A moral reason to do an act is consequential if and only if the reason depends only on the consequences of either doing the act or not doing the act.** For example, a moral reason not to hit someone is that this will hurt her or him. A moral reason to turn your car to the left might be that, if you do not do so, you will run over and kill someone. A moral reason to feed a starving child is that the child will lose important mental or physical abilities if you do not feed it. All such reasons are consequential reasons. All other moral reasons are non-consequential. Thus, **a moral reason** to do an act **is non-consequential if** and only if **the reason depends even partly on some property that the act has independently of its consequences. For example, an act can be a lie regardless of what happens as a result of the lie** (since some lies are not believed), and some moral theories claim that that property of being a lie provides amoral reason not to tell a lie regardless of the consequences of this lie. Similarly, the fact that an act fulfills a promise is often seen as a moral reason to do the act, even though the act has that property of fulfilling a promise independently ofits consequences. All such moral reasons are non-consequential. In order to avoid so many negations, I will also call them 'deontological'. This distinction would not make sense if we did not restrict the notion of consequences. If I promise to mow the lawn, then one consequence of my mowing might seem to be that my promise is fulfilled. One way to avoid this problem is to specify that the consequences of an act must be distinct from the act itself. My act of fulfilling my promise and my act of mowing are not distinct, because they are done by the same bodily movements.10 Thus, my fulfilling my promise is not a consequence of my mowing. A consequence of an act need not be later in time than the act, since causation can be simultaneous, but the consequence must at least be different from the act. Even with this clarification, it is still hard to classify some moral reasons as consequential or deontological,11 but I will stick to examples that are clear. In accordance with this distinction between kinds of moral reasons, I can now distinguish different kinds of moral theories. I will say that **a moral theory is consequentialist if and only if it implies that all basic moral reasons are consequential. A moral theory is then non-consequentialist or deontological if it includes any basic moral reasons which are not consequential**. 5. Against Deontology So defined, the class of deontological moral theories is very large and diverse. This makes it hard to say anything in general about it. Nonetheless, I will argue that no deontological moral theory can explain why moral substitutability holds. My argument applies to all deontological theories because it depends only on what is common to them all, namely, the claim that some basic moral reasons are not consequential. Some deontological theories allow very many weighty moral reasons that are consequential, and these theories might be able to explain why moral substitutability holds for some of their moral reasons: the consequential ones. But even these theories cannot explain why moral substitutability holds for all moral reasons, including the non-consequential reasons that make the theory deontological. The failure of deontological moral theories to explain moral substitutability in the very cases that make them deontological is a reason to reject all deontological moral theories. I cannot discuss every deontological moral theory, so I will discuss only a few paradigm examples and show why they cannot explain moral substitutability. After this, I will argue that similar problems are bound to arise for all other deontological theories by their very nature. The simplest deontological theory is the pluralistic intuitionism of Prichard and Ross. Ross writes that, when someone promises to do something, 'This we consider obligatory in its own nature, just because it is a fulfillment of a promise, and not because of its consequences.'12 Such deontologists claim in effect that, **if I promise to mow the grass, there is a moral reason for me to mow the grass, and this moral reason is constituted by the fact that mowing the grass fulfills my promise.** This reason exists regardless of the consequences of mowing the grass, even though it might be overridden by certain bad consequences. **However**, if this is why I have a moral reason to mow the grass, then, even **if I cannot mow the grass without starting my mower, and starting the mower would enable me to mow the grass, it still would not follow that I have any moral reason to start my mower, since I did not promise to start my mower**, and starting my mower does not fulfill my promise. Thus, **a moral theory cannot explain** moral **substitutability if it claims that properties** like this **provide moral reasons.**

## 1AC – Underview

#### 1] Aff RVIs—A] Topic ed – it deters friv violations and forces negs to think twice before skewing the 1AR since they know each shell is another split in the 2N – o/w on reversibility since every shell crowds out substance that we can’t get back, B] Reciprocity – T is a unique avenue to the ballot that the aff can’t access – makes T structurally unfair without the RVI

#### 2] 1AR theory – a) AFF gets it because otherwise the neg can engage in infinite abuse, making debate impossible, b) reject the debater – the 1AR is too short for theory and substance so ballot implications are key to check abuse, c) no RVIs – they can stick me with 6min of answers to a short arg and make the 2AR impossible, d) competing interps – 1AR interps aren’t bidirectional and the neg should have to defend their norm since they have more time, e) no 2NR theory – 2-to-1 time tradeoff makes it devastating for the 2AR