#### Case

### I negate resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

### Framework

#### The standard is: Maximizing Negative Utilitarianism

**Prefer this because:**

**1] Negative Util is how the world functions**

**Herran 19**[Manu Herran, programmer and associate at OPIS; <https://manuherran.com/thoughts-on-negative-utilitarianism/>] To me, negative utilitarianism is not just a normative ethical theory, but **a response to the world as it really is**. For example, [here](https://www.facebook.com/groups/OMfCT/permalink/2586304598351109/?comment_id=2586442025004033&reply_comment_id=2586483648333204) some wonder about how many ice creams are needed to equal the value of a life. But I do not think that people buy ice creams to enjoy, but they do (or they should) to prevent suffering, to be “above zero”. In my opinion, to be far above zero is just a precaution people take to prevent to be below zero. When someone is below zero in just one dimension (sex, money, frienship, health…) and above in the others, they will divert all necessary resources from the other positive indicators to the negative indicator, trying to be above zero in all of them. If they dont (if they keep trying to increase one positive indicator while others remain negative) it will end very very bad. Negative Utilitarianism works in just one individual (with the different indicators) as the normative moral theory of Negative Utilitarianism works with several individuals: the priority is to be above zero (or at least zero), in each possible dimension (if we speak of a single individual), or in each individual (if we speak of several individuals).

**2] Increasing happiness is not morally relevant - if one is already happy, increasing their pleasure matters much less than reducing the suffering of one who is not.**

**Contention 1 - Private entities are the only option for necessary space appropriation[3:27]**

1. **Space Appropriation is necessary for long term survival**

**Zarkadakis 19**[ George; PhD, Senior Fellow @ Atlantic Center; https://www.georgezarkadakis.com/abandoning-the-metropolis-space-colonisation-as-the-new-imperative/]

Space colonization is not only the subject of fiction but of serious science too. The late physicist Stephen Hawking argued that unless colonies were established in space the **human race would become extinct**. There are **several natural phenomena** beyond our control that could spell our obliteration. Over a long enough period of time our planet is vulnerable to catastrophic meteorite strikes, or getting exposed to the **deadly radiation** of a nearby supernova explosion. As our Sun burns its fuel it will start to expand and, in a few million years, will scorch Earth. We can also self-destruct by waging nuclear war, or by tilting our planet’s **climate** towards a runaway greenhouse effect. Space colonization is therefore the ultimate insurance policy of **long-term human survival**.

**Prefer:**

**a~ Prerequisite – if we're all dead then no conception of moral value can exist and this debate is meaningless**

**b~ Magnitude – existential catastrophes causes massive amounts of pain to every person on the planet which outweighs all other impacts under neg util**

Thus, space colonization is a moral priority and must be done with the most just action.

1. **Private entities are preferable to governments for appropriating**

#### Government appropriation of space leads to oppression

#### Peter Nelson & Walter Block, 2018, Space Capitalism, Mr. Nelson is a professional engineer in the state of Colorado; Walter is an American Austrian School economist and anarcho-capitalist theorist.[1] He currently holds the Harold E. Wirth Eminent Scholar Endowed Chair in Economics at the School of Business at Loyola University New Orleans, and is a senior fellow of the non-profit think-tank Ludwig von Mises Institute ﻿ We eschew state power in space because we want to restrict governmental inhumanity to the narrowest sphere possible if not eliminate this scourge altogether. We hope free adventurers will lead the way into the deep. On the other hand, we ﻿do not advocate state subsidies of space exploration. Bureaucratic meddling inevitably results in mal-investment .19 Furthermore, in exchange for the “aid,” the tyrants demand[ing] free benefits and, more seriously, cooperation in achieving political goals. Far from being a boon to the enterprise, the recipients are often saddled with heavy moral and financial burdens. The worst part of this is that poor folks who cannot afford it, as well as people with no interest in the project, are forced to pay. Space exploration funded by the private sector is self-financing and does not involve oppression. The concerned individual does it for one of three reasons.21 Either he is, one, curious and explores out of personal enjoyment; two, expects to make a profit ; or three, is a humanitarian and agrees with the thesis of this book (or all three). If the state stays away, far away, he is free to pursue his dreams as he sees fit. If he is mistaken about the efficacy of the project, he alone, along with his voluntary partners, suffers the loss. No one is shot either. No one is oppressed under laissez-faire capitalism since it necessarily involves volitional commercial acts between consenting adults. A further advantage follows when governments keep out. Historically, private exploration initiatives tend to encourage liberty in the old world as well as in the new. From the seventeenth through the nineteenth centuries, based on the private settlements on the frontier in North ﻿America, a new commitment to freedom spread worldwide. At first it consisted of small gradual steps. Settlers, on their own far away from their place of birth, figured out how to live in their new environments. Lacking the ready resources of their homeland, they could not afford misguided political theories. As a result, they quickly learned the advantages of liberty ; or they perished (Rothbard 1975a, b). With this liberty , and without their former rulers micro-managing their every act, they prospered and became the envy of the world.22 In a kind of symbiotic relationship with the pioneers, others in the old world emulated these freedom -loving people. Observing these realities, philosophers wrote treatises explaining how freedom works. Liberty spread into many lands wherein previously the people had been terribly oppressed. That is in stark contrast to state exploration initiatives. Starting with Columbus (financed by Queen Isabella), Spanish and Portuguese conquistadores despoiled native lands, killed inhabitants, and stole their valuables. The writers of this book hope that the tyrants will stay at home, that the free spirits will explore the planets and the stars as they see fit, and that the new-found freedom will spread back throughout the Earth. We look forward to the day when the space initiative will mightily reduce man’s inhumanity to man by limiting governments and inspiring liberty. If not, then with colonization of other heavenly bodies, at least some people will escape. In the following chapters, we explore how this ingenuity might unfold.

**Government space programs are rife with waste and inefficiencies.**

**Earle ’21**, Peter C. Earle (is an economist and writer who joined AIER in 2018 and prior to that spent over 20 years as a trader and analyst in global financial markets on Wall Street), “Three – No, Four – Cheers for Space-Travelling Billionaires,” Capitalism Magazine, August 3, 2021, https://www.capitalismmagazine.com/2021/08/three-no-four-cheers-for-space-travelling- billionaires/

Government space programs don’t leave much for admonishers to point to. As Federal debt levels have soared, increased scrutiny of US agencies and programs has revealed that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) is as subject to the same spendthrift tendencies as every other tax-supported state enterprise. As a Purdue University study (one of many) summarizes, An outgrowth of [the general tendency toward] fiscal profligacy is the presence of wasteful and duplicative programs within NASA that prevent this agency from achieving its space science and human spaceflight objectives. These programs occur due to mismanagement of these programs by NASA and from creation of these programs by the US Congress and congressional committees. This occurs because congressional appropriators tend to be more concerned with economically enhancing their states and districts and promoting their reelections instead of providing effectively targeted funding and oversight of their programs to ensure they meet national space policy goals and provide tangible value for taxpayers. The report goes on to cite “multifaceted waste and duplication,” “unused and ineffectively used facilities” and specific programs including the Constellation/Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle (MPCV), the James Webb Space Telescope, as emblematic of the squandering. Space agencies losing taxpayer support and being taken up by private sources is a step in the right direction. Perhaps the visceral disdain for the recent feats of Blue Origin, Virgin Galactic, and SpaceX stems from the unwelcome acknowledgment that at a fraction of the expense and waste of bureaucratic state agencies, billionaires are pushing the human race a step closer to a stellar future. Inequality dogma has increasing numbers of Americans in its grasp, and busybodies eager to dictate how strangers should spend their money are rarely in short supply. Expecting public magnanimity was probably foolish.

#### Governments should not take the risk with taxpayer money - Nelson & Block 2

﻿Pretty much **anything touched by government comes with fatal flaws starting with corruption** and compulsion. Eliminating state involvement in space frees people rather than limits them. Besides, the ruling powers notoriously mismanage all enterprises.5 It becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy, because that very incompetence makes the venture appear far more expensive than it really needs to be. The record of “picking winners” on the part of governing establishments does not engender much confidence in government’s capacity to promote this goal. Nor is “contracting out” to private interests likely to provide efficiency in this context. If government cannot do the job itself, there is no reason to believe it will be effective in choosing and funding collaborators. In addition, we believe that even if the state could be effective in promoting such tasks, it would still be improper for it to do so, since its funds are mulcted, unwillingly, from their rightful owners, the long-suffering taxpayers (Rothbard, M. 1998). Nelson, Peter Lothian; Block, Walter E.. Space Capitalism (Palgrave Studies in Classical Liberalism) (pp. 21-22). Springer International Publishing. Kindle Edition.

**Since space appropriation is essential, we have the obligation to choose the best actor. The action of appropriation must be just, since it is the only way for future human survival. Private entities can ensure freedom from oppression, efficiently appropriate when governments cannot, and do not have to risk taxpayer dollars.**

**Contention 2:**

**Privatization is fastest way to get to space[0:15]** Rand **Simberg**, author, analyst and consultant in space policy, February **2020** "Socialists in Space," Reason, https://reason.com/2020/01/12/socialists-in-space-2/ (accessed 12/12/21)

Most important of all, two versions of an all-new fully reusable spaceship are being assembled by SpaceX in Texas and Florida; their designs will eventually converge into a single one combining the best features of each. On September 28 at the Texas site, the company's founder, Elon Musk, described a vehicle almost 400 feet tall that would deliver 100 people to various destinations in space, with the initial capability of achieving orbit within six months, at very low marginal cost. The work is moving at a pace unseen since the 1960s, and it could result in a true spaceflight revolution, driving the cost of orbital access down to a few tens of dollars per kilogram of payload, rather than the thousands per kilogram it's been since the dawn of the Space Age. That would open vast new off-planet opportunities for humanity.

**Contention 3:[0:30]**

**Appropriation is beneficial for developing countries**

**Reinstein 99**[Ezra J. Reinstein (JD, Associate at Kirkland & Ellis), Owning Outer Space, 20 Nw. J. Int’lL. & Bus. 59 (1999). JDN. https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/njilb/vol20/iss1/7]

The changes to the OST proposed in this essay would encourage and hasten the conver‐ sion of potential wealth‐in‐space into actual wealth‐on‐Earth. As already argued, bringing wealth into a system is an absolute good, aiding all humanity (however indirectly), including developing nations.But there is another, more direct way in which low‐tech nations can benefit. As ownership rights boost the incentive to exploit outer space’s resources, more developers will jump at the chance. And the more people jumping at the chance and flying up into space to glean the space‐borne profits, the cheaper and safer it will become to carry out such space projects. That is, the more profitable it becomes to exploit space, the greater the impetus will be to develop new technology that permits easier access to space. And among the prime beneficiaries of more accessible space travel will be those nations ‐‐ the developing, low‐tech nations ‐‐ who are currently not space‐capable.This, of course, will work with, and be facilitated by, the openness of plans under the UNSER system. We should not force the space‐capable nations to share their wealth (as is required by the Moon Treaty, and as developing nations are pushing for in interpreting the OST), for to do so would discourage exploitation and space travel, and thus make space projects less regular, and thus less affordable and safe. Instead, by supporting the development of new technology in an efficient, free market environment, we thereby give developing nations the chance to go into space on their own. In this way we can increase everyone’s access to space. And that’s one of the designated goals of the OST itself.

**Hence, I negate**

**2**

1. **Interpretation: The affirmative must not defend an actor**
2. **Violation: They do**
3. **Standards:**

**1] Topicality - Rez asks if approp is just or not, actors are extra-t**

**2] Semantics first – they’re the only stable starting point for the round.**

**Nebel 18** [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor at University of Southern California, School of Philosophy. “The Meaning of the Resolution by Jake Nebel” Victory Briefs September/October 2018 LD Brief. Citing: “Reporters and Correspondents”, https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes273022.htm ]

Unlike direct appeals to desirable consequences, **the actual meaning of the res**olution **provides a more salient**—**and** therefore more **predictable**—focal **point upon which debaters** could more reliably **expect each other to converge** given a good-faith effort. Even if it would be better, in some sense, if everyone took the resolution to mean something other than what it actually means, the probability of everyone identifying anything like the same proposition as the one that would be best to debate is so small as to be easily outweighed by the value of coordinating on a shared proposition at all; this coordination can only happen if debaters at least try to debate the resolution under its most accurate interpretation. Even if some disagreements would remain, there would at least be an impartial basis for resolving them. That is why debate would be better if debaters tried to debate the proposition actually expressed by the resolution, rather than whichever nearby proposition they think would be better to debate.

**3] Limits – Thousands of affs permissible if we don’t accept my interp, - limits are k2 fairness since we can’t prep a million affs**

**4] Ground - if the affirmative can defend anything, then they could defend things everyone agrees with like racism is bad or 2+2 = 4**

1. **Voter - Fairness**

**1] Fairness promotes impartial judging of a round. Without fairness, judges will intervene and vote subjectively off arguments they have a bias towards.This is bad because it means that debaters don‘t have an equal chance of winning the round**

**Drop the debater -**

**1] K2 deterring abuse**

**2] Their abuse irreversibly skews the round bc their advocacy excluded my ability to structure 1NC offense.**

**No RVI — Theory as an RVI would justify debaters running any amount of abusive positions and collapse the debate to a technical debate between who can defend RVIs being good. This is bad for debate because it means that fairness no longer has any bearing on the round, it‘s only a question of whether or not theory should be a reverse voting issue.**

**Responses**

**Philips: Not adv for mars approp non-topical**

**Public Approp:**

**Private companies will actually be held more accountable than governments when accidents in space occur.**   
**Al-Rodhan 21**, Nayef. “The Privatization Of Space: When Things Go Wrong.” CSS (ETH Zurich). August 14, 2015. Web. December 11, 2021. /AC  
The most cited benefit of the shift to private space exploration is cost. These companies must bid for NASA contracts, which lowers the taxpayer cost of these missions, as some research and development R&D costs are absorbed by the company. Governments and private companies also function differently in terms of the different interest groups to whom they are responsible. NASA is beholden to the government and the taxpayer, while private companies must deal with a more complex web of investors/shareholders, the bottom line, and the need to keep a secure contract. Yet with these benefits, there are new challenges that must be addressed; perhaps the greatest of which is “what happens when something goes wrong”? Rocket missions and space travel are inherently difficult and risky; it’s only a matter of time before this becomes a bigger issue. **Government space programs are no strangers to failed launches, or to human casualties.** In fact, the only space program which has no known casualties to date is China’s. **Private companies have yet to amass significant casualties, with the only death occurring during a failed Virgin Galactic test flight in 2014.** But because that flight was not part of a mission to the ISS and was not tied to any government contract, the implications were different. If an astronaut from NASA were killed in a launch orchestrated by a private company, there may be far-reaching effects both for NASA and for the company in question. As aforementioned, governments are most likely not held accountable to the same degree as private companies are, as a government can control to some degree how transparent it wants to be. Furthermore, because there were no alternatives to government space programs, accidents were seen to some degree as par for the course. For instance, while the Challenger and Columbia disasters affected NASA’s operations (including an over two year hiatus form launching shuttles), it did not halt the space program. By comparison, private companies actually have a far more difficult set of issues to face in the case of a mishap. In a worst case scenario, a private company could make an easy scapegoat if ever a government’s legitimacy were to be threatened due to a mishap.

**Public appropriation does not change the basic coordinates of capitalism---the logic of profit will limit Aff solvency.**   
**Lovell 21**, Josh. “Asteroid Mining, Scarcity, Science And Socialism: Responding To Aaron Bastani.” Workers' Liberty. January 05, 2021. Web. December 12, 2021. . /AC  
Finally, for a book filled with Marx’s writings, it falls short of offering a Marxist understanding of economics. For example, some basic analysis of economic and social use and exchange of mining resources would have been pertinent, given this entire section appears to take place in the realm of capitalist exchange. Bastani readily points at the market exchange value of all the resources locked up in asteroids, but there is little discussion of their potential use. Will future societies be as dependent on iron, gold, palladium and other rare metals? Bastani makes no projection. Since capitalism has a tendency to expand to maximize profit, this may be directly at odds with the needs of a future socialist society. It is therefore possible that left to its own devices, capitalism gears mining missions, technology and research to maximize extraction of less socially useful products (for example gems for jewelry sales), despite humanity being better served socially if this was focused on different resources (for example on palladium for medical and electronic devices). A text on communism should have devoted more time to discuss how this expansion may instead take place, comparing how a socialist society might instead utilise space mining, and in the here and now, what socialists should be arguing for under capitalism.

**AT: Edwards, arbatov No ‘space war’ – Insurmountable barriers and everyone has an interest in keeping space peaceful**

**Dobos 19** [(Bohumil Doboš, scholar at the Institute of Political Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic, and a coordinator of the Geopolitical Studies Research Centre) “Geopolitics of the Outer Space, Chapter 3: Outer Space as a Military-Diplomatic Field,” Pgs. 48-49] TDI

Despite the theorized potential for the achievement of the terrestrial dominance throughout the utilization of the ultimate high ground and the ease of destruction of space-based assets by the potential space weaponry, the utilization of space weapons is with current technology and no effective means to protect them far from fulfilling this potential (Steinberg 2012, p. 255). In current global international political and technological setting, the utility of space weapons is very limited, even if we accept that the ultimate high ground presents the potential to get a decisive tangible military advantage (which is unclear). This stands among the reasons for the lack of their utilization so far. Last but not the least, it must be pointed out that the states also develop passive defense systems designed to protect the satellites on orbit or critical capabilities they provide. These further decrease the utility of space weapons. These systems include larger maneuvering capacities, launching of decoys, preparation of spare satellites that are ready for launch in case of ASAT attack on its twin on orbit, or attempts to decrease the visibility of satellites using paint or materials less visible from radars (Moltz 2014, p. 31). Finally, we must look at the main obstacles of connection of the outer space and warfare. The first set of barriers is comprised of physical obstructions. As has been presented in the previous chapter, the outer space is very challenging domain to operate in. Environmental factors still present the largest threat to any space military capabilities if compared to any man-made threats (Rendleman 2013, p. 79). A following issue that hinders military operations in the outer space is the predictability of orbital movement. If the reconnaissance satellite's orbit is known, the terrestrial actor might attempt to hide some critical capabilities-an option that is countered by new surveillance techniques (spectrometers, etc.) (Norris 2010, p. 196)-but the hide-and-seek game is on. This same principle is, however, in place for any other space asset-any nation with basic tracking capabilities may quickly detect whether the military asset or weapon is located above its territory or on the other side of the planet and thus mitigate the possible strategic impact of space weapons not aiming at mass destruction. Another possibility is to attempt to destroy the weapon in orbit. Given the level of development for the ASAT technology, it seems that they will prevail over any possible weapon system for the time to come. Next issue, directly connected to the first one, is the utilization of weak physical protection of space objects that need to be as light as possible to reach the orbit and to be able to withstand harsh conditions of the domain. This means that their protection against ASAT weapons is very limited, and, whereas some avoidance techniques are being discussed, they are of limited use in case of ASAT attack. We can thus add to the issue of predictability also the issue of easy destructibility of space weapons and other military hardware (Dolman 2005, p. 40; Anantatmula 2013, p. 137; Steinberg 2012, p. 255). Even if the high ground was effectively achieved and other nations could not attack the space assets directly, there is still a need for communication with those assets from Earth. There are also ground facilities that support and control such weapons located on the surface. Electromagnetic communication with satellites might be jammed or hacked and the ground facilities infiltrated or destroyed thus rendering the possible space weapons useless (Klein 2006, p. 105; Rendleman 2013, p. 81). This issue might be overcome by the establishment of a base controlling these assets outside the Earth-on Moon or lunar orbit, at lunar L-points, etc.-but this perspective remains, for now, unrealistic. Furthermore, **no contemporary actor will risk full space weaponization in the face of possible competition and the possibility of rendering the outer space useless.** No actor is dominant enough to prevent others to challenge any possible attempts to dominate the domain by military means. To quote 2016 Stratfor analysis, "(a) war in space would be devastating to all, and preventing it, rather than finding ways to fight it, will likely remain the goal" (Larnrani 20 16). This stands true unless some space actor finds a utility in disrupting the arena for others.

#### MAD checks space escalation – nuclear response and debris

**Bowen 18 [Bleddyn Bowen, Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Leicester. The Art of Space Deterrence. February 20, 2018. https://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/commentary/the-art-of-space-deterrence/]**

Fourth, the **ubiquity** of **space infrastructure** and the **fragility** of the space environment may create a degree of **existential deterrence**. As space is **so useful** to modern economies and military forces, a large-scale disruption of space infrastructure may be so **intuitively escalatory** to decision-makers that there may be a **natural caution** against a wholesale assault on a state’s entire space capabilities because the consequences of doing so approach the mentalities of **total war**, or **nuclear responses** if a society begins tearing itself apart because of the collapse of optimised energy grids and just-in-time supply chains. In addition, the problem of **space debris** and the political-legal hurdles to conducting debris clean-up operations mean that even a handful of explosive events in space can render a region of Earth orbit unusable for everyone. This could **caution** a **country like China** from excessive kinetic intercept missions because its **own military** and **economy** is **increasingly reliant** on outer space, but perhaps not a country like North Korea which does not rely on space. The usefulness, sensitivity, and fragility of space may have some **existential deterrent effect**. China’s catastrophic **a**nti-**sat**ellite weapons test in 2007 is a valuable **lesson for all**on the potentially devastating effect of kinetic warfare in orbit.

**AT Sterling: Redistributive policies destroy space development**

**Reinstein 99** [Ezra J. Reinstein (JD, Associate at Kirkland & Ellis), Owning Outer Space, 20 Nw. J. Int’lL. & Bus. 59 (1999). JDN. https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/njilb/vol20/iss1/7]

This reading is not exclusive to developing nations. In fact, evidence indicates that the U.S. Senate, while debating whether to ratify the OST, also understood this phrase to require an equitable division of space‐borne wealth among all nations.51 The validity of this interpretation of ”for the benefit...of all countries” is strengthened by language in U.N. Resolution 1962‐XVIII 2 Adopted unanimously by the General Assembly, Resolution 1962‐XVIII helped form the basis of the OST. The Resolution states that the ”use of outer space should be carried on for the betterment of mankind and for the benefit of States irrespective of their degree of economic or scientific development.53It is not unreasonable to understand this language,with its strong egalitarian flavor, as requiring that we read ”for the benefit...of all countries” as creating a legal mandate for wealth redistribution**.** Such a system would likely devastate the development of space. An international body ‐‐ a necessarily political body ‐‐ would determine what degree of wealth sharing is fair to ”all countries.54 The parties that take the initiative to create and improve technology, and take the financial and physical risks that are part and parcel of the pioneering development of space, would be required to defer to international political consensus.Must all development be held hostage while this cumbersome commission is designed, negotiated, and ratified? Might not such a system be more politics driven than profit‐driven, inevitably leading to inefficient pork‐barreling?Should private parties worry that profits earned at great personal risk, expense, and effort be stripped and spread, equitably or otherwise, ”for the benefit...of all countries?”It is no wonder that the Moon Treaty, which represents the apex of the philosophy of forced wealth sharing, was opposed by both the United States and the Soviet Union, and has been ratified by only nine relatively minor nations.5