## DA

#### [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).**

#### [Jones 2] This opens the gates to the world of disimagination: by setting limits on what can and can’t be done with outer space, it is deemed ONLY useful for profit incentives.

**Jones 2:** Jones, Henry Craig. [Writer at Society and Space] “Enclosing the Cosmos: Privatising Outer Space and Voices of Resistance” *Society and Space,* 2021. JP

**The process of disimagination selectively edits the historical narrative, removing certain voices, modes of resistance, and alternative accounts, distorting the ability to imagine futures outside of the EuroAmerican neoliberal present [6] (Didi-Huberman, 2008: Giroux, 2014).** It is through the processes of disimagination that the condition of capitalist realism is enabled – a state of affairs wherein it is easier to imagine the end of the world than the end of capitalism **(Fisher, 2009 [7]).** Consequently, the futures curated, maintained, and promoted by NSE actors are structured through a white-ethnocentric rendition of history. **The resultant imaginaries and narratives implicitly and explicitly draw upon familiar tropes of white settler colonialism, such as enclosure, working land to produce ‘value’, and the displacing of indigenous/non-Western onto-epistemological frameworks, if not the people themselves [8] (Bhabha and Comaroff, 2002: Hesse, 2002: Loomba et al., 2005: Parry, 2002: Wilkes and Hird, 2019: Wood, 2017: Young, 2001).** Through imbibing popular discourses of Outer Space futurity with this history, similar arguments to past enclosures are made. **Specifically, that ‘production’ and the ability to ‘work’ a resource operates as the basis through which ownership may be exerted [9]; extractive industries not taking anything away but adding something, and issues coming to centre upon not occupancy or fruitful use but relative value (Wood, 2017).**