### **1st**

Interpretation: Affirmative debaters may not read both, “We affirm: The appropriation of lunar heritage sites by private entities is unjust” and “Plan - Private entities ought not appropriate lunar heritage sites.”

Violation: They read both at the top of the aff case

And Is and Ought aren’t the same

1. Interp: Is is a state of being not a prescription for action

**Collins Dictionary:**

**Is is the third person singular of the present tense of**[**be1**](https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/be) **B. Violation:** They defend an ought statement

[Merriam Webster] And, ought is used to indicate an obligation

Merriam Webster: Merriam Webster [Merriam-Webster, Inc., is an American company that publishes reference books and is especially known for its dictionaries. In 1831, George and Charles Merriam founded the company as G &amp; C Merriam Co. in Springfield, Massachusetts.] “Ought”, Merriam Webster, No Date AA

**—used to express obligation**

Standards:

1. Stable advocacy — you don’t spec which of these is your advocacy, so if I read T on one, you can just opt out of it and say that your advocacy is the other — kills clash and education, since you never actually have to defend either of these

2. Strat skew — I don’t know which advocacy to prep against, since you can go for either — this justifies debaters just saying, “We affirm the resolution” and then reading a non-T plan under it — kills education, since we won’t learn about either advocacy if you don’t have to defend one in the round

Voter – advocacy skills most important we get out debate prior question things like fairness or ed

The voter is advocacy skills, meaning teaching students the skills necessary to be advocates for issues inside and outside of debate rounds.

Its advocacy skills – that the reason schools fund debate and is a side constraint to things like

fairness and education because it determines engagement

[Implication] DROP THE DEBATER: they&#39;ve already skewed the round – dropping the arg

means kicking the aff – destroys debate with nothing to advocate for or against.

Comp interps

1. Reasonability makes no sense on this shell – you can’t “reasonably” miscut a card. Either u cut the article as written or you didn’t

2. Reasonability is arbitrary – things being “reasonable” is subjective and invites judge intervention – comes first bc jurisdiction is a prior question to having a rd

3. reasonability collapses to competing interps – we use an offense defense paradigm to determine which brightlines are good

#### [Implication] DROP THE DEBATER: they've already skewed the round – dropping the arg means kicking the aff – destroys debate with nothing to advocate for or against.

#### [No RVIs] NO RVIs:

**1.** CHILLING EFFECT: RVIs encourage debaters to be abusive and win on T, which destroys the purpose of it to check abuse.

**2.** RVIs make no sense on T. Just as you wouldn't win for reading a 6-minute aff, it's expected that you're T, so you can't win on it.

#### [Competing Interps] USE COMPETING INTERPS: T is a binary – you can't be "reasonably" T. Competing interps makes them justify the aff – drop them if they can't.

### **2nd**

#### [Slattery-Quintanilla] Perpetuating a race neutral ideal of the cosmos furthers colonialism – science is NOT objective and treating space acquisition as such is entrenched in colonialist logic.

**Slattery-Quintanilla**: Slattery-Quintanilla, Claire E. [University of Denver] “Advancing Sylvia Wynter's Reimagination of the Human and Counter-Poetics: A Critique of Contemporary Western Science Discourse in Cosmos—a Spacetime Odyssey, with Host Neil deGrasse Tyson” *Digital Commons@ DU,* 2017. JP

In this chapter I argue that Tyson and Cosmos perpetuate the myth-lie of science neutrality and objectivity by refusing to mention race at three levels: the relationship between European colonial racial subjugation and the emergence of contemporary Western science, the racialized logic that is part and parcel of this tool, and Tyson does not mention his experience as a black man in the sciences. **This refusal to mention race as it relates to Western science at the personal, socio-historical, and epistemic level upholds the symbolic overrepresentation of Man and Western colonial conceptualizations of time and space, supporting the naturalized, privileged position Western science holds over our ways of being and doing in our neoliberal capitalist, white supremacist global order**. Wynter explains that Western science is a “master discipline” of our contemporary episteme that reifies the biologically absolute, (neo)Liberal descriptive statement of the human overrepresented as Man2 homo oeconomicus, in which other “genres or kinds of being human, cannot be imagined to exist” (“How We Mistook” 116). In the article, “No Humans Involved an Open Letter to my Colleagues,” **Wynter argues that Western intellectuals, of which I would argue Tyson is one, cling to the notion that we can create a more just world through increased opportunity and representation for the wretched. However, this fails to question the “the validity of our present order of knowledge itself,” and how this order is upholding a notion of the human that normalizes the dehumanization and violent oppression of black people (57).** Wynter elaborates on this theory in her article “How We Mistook the Map for the Territory, and Reimprisoned Ourselves in Our Unbearable Wrongness of Being of Desêtre: Black Studies Toward the Human Project.” Wynter writes: 51 ... because the negative connotations placed upon the black population group are a function of the devalorization of the human, the systemic revalorization of Black peoples can only be fundamentally effected by means of the no less systemic revalorization of human being itself, outside the necessarily devalorizing terms of the biocentric descriptive statement of Man, over-represented as if it were by that of the human. This, therefore, as the territory of which the negative connotations imposed upon all black peoples and which serve to induce our self- alienation, as well as our related institutionalized powerlessness as a population group is a function, and as such, a map. (116) I argue Tyson is operating within an order of knowledge that naturalizes a biologically absolute notion of the human, which belies the recognition of his humanness. Tyson’s representation in the elite, white field of astrophysics does not fundamentally challenge our biocentric mode of being human and its concomitant (neo)Liberal, neocolonial, Westernized order of knowledge**. In fact, Tyson’s race-neutral articulation of Western science reinforces the myth-lie of science objectivity and neutrality that upholds the God- like status of this master discipline**. Wynter explains that secularist, scientific thought is an aporia that has created an order of knowledge with ridge, naturalized ways of being and doing, and relies on the notion of the “bioevolutionarily determined differential” of race. This aporia, Wynter explains, has led to: ...the negation of our co-humanity as a species via the “Color Line,” as well as to the ‘general wrong’ of Gerald Barney’s (and Aurelio Peccei’s) ‘global problematique’ and its intractable ‘problem’ of the looming possibility of our and other species’ extinction as a result of the related threats of global warming, climate change and general ecological cum environmental degradation. For all these ‘wrongs’ collectively function as the underside costs of the aporia of the secular West, as an aporia generated by our performative-enactment and behavioral-praxis of the planetarily extended, secular Western, now neo-Liberal- monohumanist genre of being hybridly human Man(2), itself over-represented in homo oeconomicus cum neo-Darwinian terms as homo sapiens sapiens as if this self-definition were isomorphic with the being of being human as Homo Narrans itself. (“Toward the Sociogenic” 222) 52 **Additionally, Denise Ferreira da Silva argues that racism is baked into the logic of Western science from the inception—the core of the scientific method is already based in racialized thinking**. Tyson rarely provides commentary on race. His memoir, The Sky is Not the Limit, is one of the few places he discusses his own experience as a black man or his own opinions about “race relations” in the U.S. In the few instances he has discussed this publicly, he takes the stance that is something like: “race is not a problem, unless I make it problem.” In an interview on the podcast “Waking up with Sam Harris,” Tyson states: My sense of it is: The loudest statement I can make is to not ever mention it [race] again. And it’s not a cop out. It may sound like that. As long as I make it an issue, then if you have people commenting about me will make it an issue, but if it’s not an issue there’s no fodder there for you to load your cannon with...What I do know is that as recently as ten years ago, there were taxis that would not pick me up going North of Manhattan...this is a numerically measurably thing. It used to be two out of five wouldn’t pick me up, now it’s one out of ten. (00:04:37- 00:05:55)

#### [Jones] The aff believes that “passing a policy” is key to solving their impacts – they use legislation to determine what can and can’t be done with property.

**Jones:** Jones, Henry Craig. [Writer at Society and Space] “Enclosing the Cosmos: Privatising Outer Space and Voices of Resistance” *Society and Space,* 2021. JP

“**Along with increasing interest from private actors, discussions surrounding the enclosure of Outer Space – and asteroid mining more specifically – has seen growing coverage in recent years, several countries having passed legislation to begin legalising and encouraging extraterrestrial extractivism** [5]. Manoeuvres to enclose the extraterrestrial common and begin mining operations necessitate the establishment of a rights regime to ensure any disputes over access and ownership can be resolved. This opens a regulatory ‘frontier’ through which issues of land tenure and ownership can be thrashed out, taking on significance through its ability to greatly influence influxes of capital into these operations and mineralogical deposits (Bridge, 2004). Through the regulatory enclosure of Outer Space, a regime of exclusion can be implemented whereby (il)legitimate forms of use and abuse can be differentiated and associated boundaries inscribed through physical and discursive means (Li, 2014: Steinberg, 2018).” Private NSE actors have sought to influence these legislative processes through lobbying, advertising materials, press conferences, business forums, and public and private talks. **This has culminated in a process of enclosure wherein similar justifications to past enclosures are mobilised and reanimated. Once more, ‘production’ and the ability to ‘work’ a resource are becoming the modus operandi through which ownership over the common is being exerted (Wood, 2017), finding explicit articulation in the US SPACE Act 2015.** The mobilisation and perpetuation of this discourse is coupled with the perversion of the common heritage principle. **To refrain from extracting minerals throughout Outer Space is to (supposedly) ‘waste’ their potential and deprive future generations of the benefits this industry purports to provide (Steinberg, 2018).**

They empower states to take control over lunar historical entities

#### [Weheliye 1] Attempts to engage in this form of humanism furthers erasure – it restricts liminality and strengthens the state’s colonialist intentions.

**Weheliye 1**: Weheliye, Alexander. [Associate Professor of African American Studies at Northwestern University] ““Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human” 2014. BP

Suffering, especially when caused by political violence, has long functioned as the hallmark of both humane sentience and of inhuman brutality. **Frequently, suffering becomes the defining feature of those subjects excluded from the law, the national community, humanity, and so on due to the political violence inflicted upon them even as it, paradoxically, grants them access to inclusion and equality.** In western human rights discourse, for instance, the physical and psychic residues of political violence enable victims to be recognized as belonging to the “brotherhood of Man.” **Too often, this tendency not only leaves intact hegemonic ideas of humanity as indistinguishable from western Man but demands comparing different forms of subjugation in order to adjudicate who warrants recognition and belonging.** As W. E. B. Du Bois asked in 1944, if the Universal Declaration of Human Rights did not offer provisions for ending world colonialism or legal segregation in the United States, “Why then call it the Declaration of Human Rights?”2 Wendy Brown maintains, “politicized identity” operates “only by entrenching, restating, dramatizing, and inscribing its pain in politics; it can hold out no future...that triumphs over this pain.”3 Brown suggests replacing the identitarian declaration “I am,” which merely confirms and solidifies what already exists, with the desiring proclamation “I want,” which offers a Nietzschean politics of overcoming pain instead of clinging to suffering as an immutable feature of identity politics. While I recognize Brown's effort to formulate a form of minority politics not beholden to the aura of wounded attachments and fixated almost fetishistically on the state as the site of change, we do well to recall that many of the political agendas based on identity (the suffragette movement, the movement for the equality of same-sex marriages, or the various movements for the full civil rights of racialized minority subjects, for instance) are less concerned with claiming their suffering per se (I am) than they are with using wounding as a stepping stone in the quest (I want) for rights equal to those of full citizens. Liberal governing bodies, whether in the form of nation-states or supranational entities such as the United Nations or the International Criminal Court make particular forms of wounding the precondition for entry into the hallowed halls of full personhood, only acknowledging certain types of physical violence. For instance, while the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees passed a resolution in 2008 that includes rape and other forms of sexual violence in the category of war crimes, there are many forms of sexual violence that do not fall into this purview, and thus bar victims from claiming legal injury and/or personhood.4 Even more generally, the acknowledgment and granting of full personhood of those excluded from its precincts requires the overcoming of physical violence, while epistemic and economic brutalities remain outside the scope of the law. **Congruently, much of the politics constructed around the effects of political violence, especially within the context of international human rights but also with regard to minority politics in the United States, is constructed from the shaky foundation of surmounting or desiring to leave behind physical suffering so as to take on the ghostly semblance of possessing one's personhood. Then and only then will previously minoritized subjects be granted their humanity as a legal status.** Hence, the glitch Brown diagnoses in identity politics is less a product of the minority subject's desire to desperately cling to his or her pain but a consequence of the state's dogged insistence on suffering as the only price of entry to proper personhood, what Samera Esmeir has referred to as a “juridical humanity” that bestows and rescinds humanity as an individualized legal status in the vein of property. **Apportioning personhood in this way maintains the world of Man and its attendant racializing assemblages, which means in essence that the entry fee for legal recognition is the acceptance of categories based on white supremacy and colonialism, as well as normative genders and sexualities.**

#### [Weheliye 3] The alternative is habeas viscus or becoming human. To clarify, this is an anti-humanist ethic where we change our view on humanity from legality (a body that is coherent) to focus on flesh (a *real, actualized, material* body) to in order prioritize affective encounters.

**Weheliye 3**: Weheliye, Alexander. [Associate Professor of African American Studies at Northwestern University] ““Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human” 2014. JP

The poetics and politics that I have been discussing under the heading of habeas viscus or the flesh are concerned not with inclusion in reigning precincts of the status quo but, in Cedric Robinson's apt phrasing, “the continuing development of a collective consciousness informed by the historical struggles for liberation and motivated by the shared sense of obligation to preserve [and I would add also to reimagine] the collective being, the ontological totality.”31 Though the laws of Man place the flesh outside the ferocious and ravenous perimeters of the legal body, habeas viscus defies domestication both on the basis of particularized personhood as a result of suffering, as in human rights discourse, and on the grounds of the universalized version of western Man. Rather, habeas viscus points to the terrain of humanity as a relational assemblage exterior to the jurisdiction of law given that the law can bequeath or rescind ownership of the body so that it becomes the property of proper persons but does not possess the authority to nullify the politics and poetics of the flesh found in the traditions of the oppressed. As a way of conceptualizing politics, then, habeas viscus diverges from the discourses and institutions that yoke the flesh to political violence in the modus of deviance. Instead, it translates the hieroglyphics of the flesh into a potentiality in any and all things, an originating leap in the imagining of future anterior freedoms and new genres of humanity. To envisage habeas viscus as a forceful assemblage of humanity entails leaving behind the world of Man and some of its attendant humanist pieties. As opposed to depositing the flesh outside politics, the normal, the human, and so on, we need a better understanding of its varied workings in order to disrobe the cloak of Man, which gives the human a long-overdue extreme makeover; or, in the words of Sylvia Wynter, “the struggle of our new millennium will be one between the ongoing imperative of securing the well-being of our present ethnoclass (i.e. western bourgeois) conception of the human, Man, which overrepresents itself as if it were the human itself, and that of securing the well-being, and therefore the full cognitive and behavioral autonomy of the human species itself/ourselves.”32 Claiming and dwelling in the monstrosity of the flesh present some of the weapons in the guerrilla warfare to “secure the full cognitive and behavioral autonomy of the human species,” since these liberate from captivity assemblages of life, thought, and politics from the tradition of the oppressed and, as a result, disfigure the centrality of Man as the sign for the human. As an assemblage of humanity, habeas viscus animates the elsewheres of Man and emancipates the true potentiality that rests in those subjects who live behind the veil of the permanent state of exception: freedom; assemblages of freedom that sway to the temporality of new syncopated beginnings for the human beyond the world and continent of Man.

#### [Wehelieye 3] Deviant bodies are compared against one another under the state as the color line sets the basis for how subjects should be – women, queer folk, and black people stray from the standard conception of the Western Man, and face oppression as a result. Thus, the Role of the Ballot is to deconstruct the western Man.

**Weheliye 3**: Weheliye, Alexander. [Associate Professor of African American Studies at Northwestern University] ““Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human” 2014. JP

Consequently, **racialization figures as a master code within the genre of the human represented by western Man, because its law-like operations are yoked to species-sustaining physiological mechanisms in the form of a global color line—instituted by cultural laws so as to register in human neural networks—that clearly distinguishes the good/life/fully-human from the bad/death/not-quite-human**. This, in turn, authorizes the conflation of racialization with mere biological life, which, on the one hand, enables white subjects to “see” themselves as transcending racialization due to their full embodiment of this particular genre of the human while responding anti-pathetically to nonwhite subjects as bearers of ontological cum biological lack, and, on the other hand, in those subjects on the other side of the color line, it creates sociogenically instituted physiological reactions against their own existence and reality.40 Since the being of nonwhite subjects has been coded by the cultural laws in the world of Man as pure negativity, their subjectivity impresses punishment on the neurochemical reward system of all humans, or in the words of Frantz Fanon: “My body was returned to me spread-eagled, disjointed, redone, draped in mourning on this white winter's day. The Negro is an animal, the Negro is bad, the Negro is wicked, the Negro is ugly.” **Political violence plays a crucial part in the baroque techniques of modern humanity, since it simultaneously serves to create not-quite-humans in specific acts of violence and supplies the symbolic source material for racialization**. For Wynter, the promise of black studies—and the numerous other ruptures precipitated by the 1960s—lies in its liminality, which contains potential exit strategies from the world of Man. **However, we must first devise new objects of knowledge that facilitate “the calling in question of our present culture's purely biological definition of what it is to be, and therefore of what it is like to be, human.”** We must do so because we cannot fully understand the present incarnation of the human from within the “biocentric and bourgeois” epistemic order that authorizes the biological selectedness of Man and, conversely, the creation of “dysgenic humans” (those who are evolutionarily dysselected), “a category comprised in the US of blacks, Latinos, Indians as well as the transracial group of the poor, the jobless, the homeless, the incarcerated,” the disabled, and the transgendered.43 Within our current episteme, these groups are constituted as aberrations from the ethnoclass of Man by being subjected to racializing assemblages that establish “natural” differences between the selected and dysselected. In other words, black, Latino, poor, incarcerated, indigenous, and so forth populations become real objects via the conduit of evolutionarily justified discourses and institutions, which, as a consequence, authorizes Man to view himself as naturally ordained to inhabit the space of full humanity. **Thus, even though racializing assemblages commonly rely on phenotypical differences, their primary function is to create and maintain distinctions between different members of the Homo sapiens species that lend a suprahuman explanatory ground (religious or biological, for example) to these hierarchies**. As Wynter explains, “all our present struggles with respect to race, class, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, struggles over the environment, global warming, severe climate change, the sharply unequal distribution of the earth resources...—these are all differing facets of the central ethnoclass Man vs. Human struggle.”44 Wynter's oeuvre facilitates the analysis of the relay between different forms of subjugation, because in it the human operates as a relational ontological totality. Therefore, the Man versus Human battle does not dialectically sublate the specificity of the other struggles but articulates them in this open totality so as to abolish Man and liberate all of humanity rather than specific groups.

### 3rd - DA

#### asserting ownership over something does not, by itself, harm others, the process of appropriation can’t be considered unjust.

#### [Hayase & Ura] The mere process of owning something isn’t the same as using it, it doesn’t justify violating equal freedom.

Hayase & Ura: Hayase, Kohji [Graduate School of Integrated Arts and Sciences, Hiroshima University, Hiroshima, Japan] and Mitsuhiro Ura. [Faculty of Psychology, Otemon University, Osaka, Japan], “Ownership or Taking Action: Which Is More Important for Happiness?” May 2015. https://www.scirp.org/pdf/PSYCH\_2015051309482001.pdf AC

Forty years ago, John Lennon sang, “Imagine no possessions, I wonder if you can”. The concept of possession itself is interesting to consider, and investigate, and debate (Curchin, 2007). A recent report explained happiness and well-being as agential flourishing (Raibley, 2012). Possession (ownership) and taking action are concepts that contrast with each other, since the former represents stasis or little movement, and the latter is dynamic and movement itself. Thus, we have arrived at a significant question, psychologically and philosophically: Which is more important to achieve happiness, ownership (possession) or taking action? There is little research about the preference for ownership or taking action in relation to happiness. In this paper, we examine the happiness that people feel from possession or ownership in comparison to the happiness they achieve as a result of taking action. The purpose of this paper is to investigate Japanese people’s preference for ownership (possession) or taking action, to evaluate the correlations of this preference with gender, age, level of education, and annual income, and to discuss reasons for people’s preference.

**They add:**

On the other hand, there is little research about the preference for ownership (possession) or taking action in relation to happiness. One reason could be the difficulty in differentiating the terms “taking action”, and “experience”. One possible difference between the terms action and experience might be that people valued taking action for its achievement value, in addition to its experiential value (Nozick, 1974) . According to Webster’s New World Dictionary, action is the doing of something and/or state of being in motion or of working, whereas experience is the act of living through an event or events; personal involvement in or observation of events as they occur. These meanings are similar in Japanese. Taking action might have broader meaning beyond its experiential value (i.e., experiencing an event or events), such as work or achievement of value, and/or volunteering and making charitable contributions. Moreover, happiness from taking action is to some extent different from happiness from experience or experiential purchase, in accordance with the distinction between episodic happiness and well-being (Raibley, 2012) , since experience or experiential purchase is related or connected to an episode, an event, or events. We investigated the preference for ownership (possession) or taking action, in relation to hap- piness, considering that the term taking action included the term experience. We think that ownership is not only related to purchasing behavior, but also related to the monopolization of materials, which is close to being selfish. Psychological study of monopolization materials (Why do some people like to monopolize materials instead of freely transferring them to others?) is a very important and useful topic for the psychology of happiness and/or peace. When we look deeply into the question of ownership, we can find very broad and meaningful aspects in ownership, as like as in taking action. We think that taking action and ownership are also comparable in their broad meanings. Then, we carried out the research about the preference for ownership (possession) or taking action in relation to happiness.

#### [Nelson & Block] And private property appropriation respects a system of equal freedom.

Nelson & Block write in the context of space appropriation: Nelson, Peter Lothian [Professional engineer], and Walter E. Block [American Austrian School economist]. *Space Capitalism: How Humans Will Colonize Planets, Moons, and Asteroids*. Switzerland: Palgrave MacMillan, 2018. CH

In sharp contrast, each and every transaction that occurs under laissezfaire capitalism can boast volunteerism. When A purchases a pen from B for $1, they both agreed to the transaction. It was unanimous. And the same goes for all other commercial interactions, whether buying or selling, trading or bartering, lending or borrowing, or saving and investing. Thus, if property remains in the private sector, there is no violation of any just law as there is with public property. How can property rights be established? From the libertarian perspective, this is accomplished through homesteading. How does this work? The general rule is simple.8 One mixes his labor with the land, by planting a field or harvesting trees; a man captures and domesticates an animal, or kills one for food. Then, he becomes the owner of the resource owners establishes just title. So, if one man grows corn, and another milks a cow, and then they barter, the farmer owns the milk, even though he did not produce it, as does the rancher the corn, ditto. But, both can trace titles to what they now own to initial homesteading and voluntary interaction. The problem with so-called government ownership is that no politician, no bureaucrat, ever homesteaded or freely traded anything.9 Instead, the king, or the congress, simply declared control over certain territories. But this is on a par with everything else done by this institution. There is no justification, merely the fraudulent claim: “Might makes right.” We therefore conclude that private property, the very basis of the free enterprise system, is justified. Commons What of unowned property not controlled by either government or private individuals? The ethical status of the commons depends upon exactly how and why this occurs. The short answer is, if property is unowned because it is sub-marginal, then all is well. If, on the other hand, this status arises because the state refuses to allow private parties to homestead virgin territory and take ownership over it, then this is contrary to the libertarian ethos. The unowned property itself, of course, is not to blame; it is inanimate. The fault lies with the institution that refuses to allow homesteading and settlement on it. Why is some land sub-marginal? This is because it does not pay to settle on it. The terrain is too rough, or too far away from civilization to be economical, or too dangerous, or for any other reason unsuitable for habitation by any but the heartiest and most adventurous persons and even then, only temporarily.