ST. Mark’s TS – 2AC AT Procedurals (1/8/12)

## Shameless Plug

**This document was formatted with DigiDebate. Go to http://www.digidebate.com for more details.**

## 2AC T Beyond the Mesosphere

**Counterinterpretation—**

**The mesosphere ends at 85 kilometers – prefer our interp – NASA definition**

**NASA 3** (October 8, For Students: In the Spotlight, http://www.nasa.gov/audience/forstudents/9-12/features/912\_liftoff\_atm.html, mrs)

Mesosphere

The mesosphere starts just above the stratosphere and extends to 85 kilometers (53 miles) high. In this region, the temperatures again fall as low as -93 degrees Celsius as you increase in altitude. The chemicals are in an excited state, as they absorb energy from the Sun. The mesopause separates the mesophere from the thermosphere.

The regions of the stratosphere and the mesosphere, along with the stratopause and mesopause, are called the middle atmosphere by scientists. This area has been closely studied on the ATLAS Spacelab mission series.

Thermosphere

The thermosphere starts just above the mesosphere and extends to 600 kilometers (372 miles) high. The temperatures go up as you increase in altitude due to the Sun's energy. Temperatures in this region can go as high as 1,727 degrees Celsius. Chemical reactions occur much faster here than on the surface of the Earth. This layer is known as the upper atmosphere.

**We meet – beyond is inclusive**

**Dictionary.com** No Date (“beyond,” http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/beyond, mat)

beyond  [bee-ond, bih-yond] Show IPA preposition 1. on, at, or to the farther side of: Beyond those trees you'll find his house.

## 2AC T Human/Commercial

**Counter-interpretation—remote presence is exploration—human presence isn’t necessary**

**Lester 9** –Ph. D. Research Fellow at the University of works on the Stratospheric Observatory for Infrared Astronomy, providing science and management policy, and is representing the astronomical community on the Lunar Exploration Roadmap effort he serves on the congressionally chartered Astronomy and Astrophysics Advisory Committee (AAAC), which reviews and provides advisory oversight and coordination of both space and ground-based astronomical research at NASA, NSF and DOE (Daniel F., “Visions of exploration” Space Policy Volume 25, Issue 4, November 2009, Pages 236-243)

What to do? There are few easy answers. However, the history of US exploration offers insight about places we can start.

First, we should accept that “exploration” is a multivalent term, with many meanings, some of which are contradictory, and all of which have historical precedent. For too long we have looked at the history of exploration selectively, seeking to find the antecedents which justify our own vision of exploration: as science, as human adventure, as geopolitical statement. This is a definitional fight which cannot be won. Space policy must acknowledge the multiple visions for space exploration, developing a clear-eyed metric of value which avoids the vagaries of lofty “exploration-speak”. If the merits of human exploration of the Moon and Mars are primarily symbolic and geopolitical, what are these goals worth in terms of federal funding? What are costs and benefits of missions developed to express “soft power” vs. science? Finally, which goals or combination of goals offers the best chance of long-term buy-in by the taxpayer? While historical precedent defines exploration in terms of human explorers who travel to new destinations, that definition is woefully obsolete with regard to discovery in an era in which teleoperation offers virtual presence for explorers who remain on the surface of the Earth. As has been pointed out by many authors, “robots” have come to be less personal assistants who follow us dutifully, and more expendable extensions of our senses. In this respect, science can be viewed as arguably the most important frontier for humankind, and whether it is done by humans in situ or by humans remotely is no longer a particularly relevant distinction.

**We meet—Development is satellites**

**Yamanouchi 3**, President of the National Space Development Agency (NASDA) in Japan (Shuichiro Yamanouchi, “ [Business leaders] Space and the Global Environment” http://www.japanfs.org/en/pages/011507.html)

The objective of space development is not rockets, it's satellites. When you think about what satellites do, the first things that pop into your mind are probably weather satellites, BS or CS television broadcast satellites, and GPS (Global Positioning System) satellites.

Broadly speaking, the satellites that are the most in use today are broadcast and communications satellites. Broadcasting satellites (BS) and communications satellites (CS) have become full-blown businesses. Unfortunately, Japanese industry has practically no orders for these on the world market. This is because it can't compete with the number of satellites turned out by Europe and America, and also because following a trade dispute with America five or six years ago, under "Super Article 301," Japan's satellites must be procured internationally. The costs are quite different for a company that builds ten satellites a year compared to a company that builds only one or two. Mitsubishi Electric Corporation finally got an order to build two, but because wages are so high in Japan, the unfortunate reality is that it is not a good business.

**Counter-interpretation—Development means creating technology for the use of space**

**SDPA 5** – of the Republic of Korea (5/31, reprinted in the UN Committee on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, http://www.unoosa.org/pdf/limited/c2/AC105\_C2\_2009\_CRP14E.pdf)

The terms in this act are defined as follows:

1. "Space development" means any one of the following items:

(a) Research activities and technology development activities relevant to the design, manufacturing, launch, and/or operation of space objects and

(b) The use and exploration of outer space as well as activities that promote such activities

**Prefer our counter-interpretation—**

**Their interp is arbitrary, dated, and absurd**

**Lester and Robinson 9** –\*Ph. D. Research Fellow at the University of works on the Stratospheric Observatory for Infrared Astronomy, providing science and management policy, and is representing the astronomical community on the Lunar Exploration Roadmap effort he serves on the congressionally chartered Astronomy and Astrophysics Advisory Committee (AAAC), which reviews and provides advisory oversight and coordination of both space and ground-based astronomical research at NASA, NSF and DOE AND \*\* assistant professor of history at the University of Hartsford. His teaching and research fields include the history of exploration, history of American culture and science, and the history of globalization (Daniel F., “Visions of exploration” Space Policy Volume 25, Issue 4, November 2009, Pages 236-243, Science Direct)

The word ‘‘exploration’’ threads its way through every discussion of human space flight and often headlines national policy statements about the US space agency. Yet this concept, so rooted in our culture, remains remarkably ill-defined. In this paper, we examine various presumptions implicit in the term and its ramifications for federally supported space endeavors. We argue that historical examples of exploration, widely used by policy makers, often make poor models for contemporary space travel. In particular, historical precedents of exploration set up a land-biased view of discovery, a restriction which impedes full expression of the Vision for Space Exploration and its possible scientific returns. These same precedents also set up a view of discovery that is biased toward in situ human presence, a view that modern technology is rendering increasingly absurd.

## 2AC T Pre-existing

**Counter-interpretation—Increase doesn’t require pre-existence**

**Reinhardt 5** – U.S. Judge for the UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT (Stephen, JASON RAY REYNOLDS; MATTHEW RAUSCH, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. HARTFORD FINANCIAL SERVICES GROUP, INC.; HARTFORD FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY, Defendants-Appellees., lexis)

Specifically, we must decide whether charging a higher price for initial insurance than the insured would otherwise have been charged because of information in a consumer credit report constitutes an "increase in any charge" within the meaning of FCRA. First, we examine the definitions of "increase" and "charge." Hartford Fire contends that, limited to their ordinary definitions, these words apply only when a consumer has previously been charged for insurance and that charge has thereafter been increased by the insurer. The phrase, "has previously been charged," as used by Hartford, refers not only to a rate that the consumer has previously paid for insurance but also to a rate that the consumer has previously been quoted, even if that rate was increased [\*\*23] before the consumer made any payment. Reynolds disagrees, asserting that, under [\*1091] the ordinary definition of the term, an increase in a charge also occurs whenever an insurer charges a higher rate than it would otherwise have charged because of any factor--such as adverse credit information, age, or driving record 8 --regardless of whether the customer was previously charged some other rate. According to Reynolds, he was charged an increased rate because of his credit rating when he was compelled to pay a rate higher than the premium rate because he failed to obtain a high insurance score. Thus, he argues, the definitions of "increase" and "charge" encompass the insurance companies' practice. Reynolds is correct.

“Increase" means to make something greater. See, e.g., OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY (2d ed. 1989) ("The action, process, or fact of becoming or making greater; augmentation, growth, enlargement, extension."); WEBSTER'S NEW WORLD DICTIONARY OF AMERICAN ENGLISH (3d college ed. 1988) (defining "increase" as "growth, enlargement, etc[.]"). "Charge" means the price demanded for goods or services. See, e.g., OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY (2d ed. 1989) ("The price required or demanded for service rendered, or (less usually) for goods supplied."); WEBSTER'S NEW WORLD DICTIONARY OF AMERICAN ENGLISH (3d college ed. 1988) ("The cost or price of an article, service, etc."). Nothing in the definition of these words implies that the term "increase in any charge for" should be limited to cases in which a company raises the rate that an individual has previously been charged.

**Increase can be from zero**

**WORDS AND PHRASES 7** (CUMULATIVE SUPPLEMENTARY PAMPHLET, 2007 Vol. 20A, 07, 76.

Increase: Salary change of from zero to $12,000 and $1,200 annually for mayor and councilmen respectively was an “increase” in salary and not merely the fixing of salary. King v. Herron, 243 S.E.2d36, 241 Ga. 5.

**Develop means to bring to a more advanced or effective state**

**Dictionary.com, 11** (http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/develop)

develop

verb (used with object)

1. to bring out the capabilities or possibilities of; bring to a more advanced or effective state: to develop natural resources; to develop one's musical talent.

2. to cause to grow or expand: to develop one's muscles.

3. to elaborate or expand in detail: to develop a theory.

## 2AC T Substantial

**We meet—substantial means significant**

**OED 8** Concise Oxford English Dictionary 2008, Twelfth Edition, Oxford Reference Online, http://www.oxfordreference.com.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/views/ENTRY.html?entry=t23.e56062&srn=1&ssid=464527616#FIRSTHIT

substantially

→ adv.

1. to a great or significant extent.

2. for the most part; essentially.

**Their interpretation is impossible—there is no baseline for a substantial increase on this topic—any interpretation is arbitrary—which turns their standards**

**Colon 97** Jeffrey M. Colon, Associate Professor of Law, Fordham University School of Law, Winter 1997, San Diego Law Review, 34 San Diego L. Rev. 1, Lexis Academic

n138. I.R.C. 877(e). Neither the statute nor the legislative history indicates how much of a reduction in taxes is necessary in order to constitute a "substantial" reduction. The meaning of "substantial" varies from one Code section to the other. Compare, e.g., I.R.C. 368(a)(1)(C) (West 1988 & Supp. 1996) (acquisition of "substantially all" of acquired company's assets for ruling purposes is 70% of gross assets and 90% of net assets (Rev. Proc. 77-37, 1977-2 C.B. 568)) with I.R.C. 1092 (West 1988 & Supp. 1996) ("substantial diminution" of risk of loss).

## 1AR Space Education Impact

**Aff is critical to space education – their mindset is counterproductive**

**Tomme, US Airforce Lieutenant Colonel, 5** (Ed, http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/cadre/ari\_2005-01.pdf, The Paradigm Shift to Effects-Based Space:

Near-Space as a Combat Space Effects Enabler”, ZBurdette)

This paper is an outgrowth of comments I heard and attitudes I experienced at the JFCOM Joint Space Concept Development and Experimentation Workshop in Norfolk at the end of March 2004. I presented a briefing on near-space at the conference along with colleagues from JFCOM, the Army Space and Missile Defense Battlelab, the Naval Research Laboratory, and the Navy Warfare Development Command. It discussed how many functions that are currently done with satellites could be performed for tactical and operational commanders using near-space assets much more cheaply and with much greater operational utility. The briefing was very well received with nothing but positive comments all around. However, once we broke into focus groups trying to develop exercise inputs for such subjects as operationally responsive space, the near-space concept was almost forgotten. It didn't fit into the normal mindset of what space meant, so it was difficult to convince other group members that it should be discussed in the same breath as, say, a TacSat-type program.

After much thought, it was my perception that the problem was one of mindset as to what the word “space” meant to the warfighter. After reading space doctrine (Army, Navy, Air Force, and Joint), I discovered that the mindset I sensed at the workshop had actually been codified to define space as a place where we operate satellites. That mindset is counterproductive.

The thesis of this paper is that space is currently a medium through which warfighters get effects—typically those effects are strongly related to Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C4ISR)— not just a place and not based on a specific platform type. Until recently, most C4ISR effects have been delivered from satellite platforms (apologies to our manned and unmanned air-breathing ISR assets). The reason for operating in such a manner was that, in general, no other way existed to obtain similar effects. The extreme costs of space were justified due to their monopoly on the ability to provide those needed effects. However, with the advent of near-space concepts, those same effects can be obtained in a different way, especially for operational and tactical users.