The aff brings western ontological conceptions of property into space. Enforceable norms regarding property acquisition exist within a legal framework. Regulating property at all requires law. **Baca:**

**“**It is fundamental in property law that **property rights are defined**, **not against the thing** that is the subject of the property law, **but against the rest of the** world. The use of traditional Hohfeldian relationships illustrates the sense of this proposition. A right supposes a correlative duty. Thus the establishment by legislatures or courts of rights against a thing would be pointless since it is useless to establish the correlative duty in the thing to the one who possesses the right. No degree of exertion by the state is likely to result in a submission by the thing to any laws other than those of physics. The state can, however, enforce the duties it imposes on **citizens. The law of property** is **regulat[es]**ionof **the behavior of persons relative to one another with respect to the** various **things** that **persons may possess.** Indeed, if property is recognized as the rights of a person vis-a-vis other persons rather than things, it is easy to see that **[Thus] property cannot exist without law.”**

Baca, Kurt Anderson. “Property rights in outer space.” *Journal of Air Law and Commerce.* Vol. 58, no. 4, 1993.

That means that to affirm requires the assertion of sovereign state authority over the commons of space. This replicates the logic of colonialism: establish a regulatory regime with respect to property acquisition, and then use the authority of the state to dispossess Indigenous persons of the “property” they have lived with by tradition.

Formal property “rights,” allow “citizens” to leverage the violence of the state to exclude people from material resources that exist in the natural commons. By declaring appropriation of space resources “unjust,” the aff imposes regimes of “justice” — rights, ethical desert, and contract enforcement, among others — on the relationship between people and the galactic commons.

The normative authority of the state, backed by violence, is necessary both to permit and prohibit the acquisition of property. In a stateless commons, actors simply *are;* in the world of regulatory state authority, people only “are” insofar as they conform to the normative expectations of the state.

This recreates the colonialist project of imposing jurisdiction and enacting property rules in a commons. **Shiri Pasternak** describes:

**“**Among other strategies of perfecting settler sovereignty, **the imposition of Western property rights onto Indigenous forms of landholding has been pivotal to colonization** and has produced a rich field of scholarly attention. When I first began writing about colonialism in Canada, property rights seemed to offer the most cogent explanatory power for how the social relations of land were transformed in the ‘New World’ by settlers. Certainly, there is compelling evidence to support this framework. But through my work with teh Algonquins of Barriere Lake - a small Anishnabe community located in the northern region of the Ottawa River watershed in Quebec - I found that **the imposition of property rights onto indigenous lands** already **presumes the state’s authority to govern**, whereas **it is *the apparatus of jurisdiction* that determines which laws will apply in a given context.** In other words, **the problem that colonization introduces** is not just the leasehold, the fee simple estate, or the government’s regulatory land management system that institute new social relations on the land. The problem **is the  machinery of jurisdiction that authorizes** **these proprietary** **regimes.** The utter confusion in the literature around how to define Indigenous peoples’ basis of ownership in contrast to Western property rights partly stems from this conflation between property and jurisdiction. Because **the issue in property literature** has moored on whether property did or did not exist in Indigenous societies prior to contact, **what tends to follow is a narrow debate about whether colonialism could actually *dispossess.***Even where the debate comes down on the side that Indigenous conceptions of property pre-existed contact, this approach still fences the debate into a rigid understanding of territorial belonging. Moreover, **it elides the fact that** in either case **Indigenous forms of *jurisdiction* govern the social relations of land on the territory,** **not a set of property** rights or **rules.** *Just as* on the other side of the ledger, claims to settler jurisdiction authorize Western property regimes**.”**

Pasternak, Shiri. "Property as a technique of jurisdiction: Traplines and tenure." *Contested Property Claims*. Routledge, 2017. 166-184.

This ontology of commodification reproduces all of the harms associated with neoliberalism: the oppression of Indigenous peoples; the overconsumption of resources leading to suffering; and the use of violence to compartmentalize resources and exclude alien Others from their use.

Thus, The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best performatively and methodologically rejects an ontology of consumption in favor of an ontology of care.

Prefer additionally

1. The ontology of consumption means that people aren’t treated as equals which is a pre-requisite to any utilitarian based theory because you assume they are accounted for
2. Extinction impacts are impossible to calculate, we should focus on impacts we know are happening such as colonial perpetrated violence which is a continuous harmful structure

Prohibiting appropriation in the name of rejeting capitalism is self-defeating because it maps the ontology of capitalist commodification onto the act of ownership and use. Both consumption and preservation echo that land is a standing reserve, and is distinct from Indigenous ontologies of comportment which treat the relationship between persons and resources as one of mutual care. **Pasternak:**

**“**One approach to understanding the differences between Indigenous and Canadian expressions of jurisdiction is through Bradley Bryan’s work, which offers insightful reflection on property as ontology. Bryan’s work stands out in the property literature on colonization because he comes closest to describing the respective social relations of jurisdiction I witnessed at Barriere Lake. He theorizes that **English ontologies of property are based on a conception of the world as “standing reserve.”**14 As Bryan explains: “Technology . . . makes a demand of nature, and that demand is one of supply.”15 **This** Heideggerian **concept** that describes **[of] a world of instrumental modern comportment can be contrasted to an Indigenous comportment that I** have been **call**ing **an ontology of care.** To specify for this context, I mean for **“standing reserve”** to **pertain[s] to two** interrelated **proprietary systems: the** provincial **leasehold system that permits resource extraction** on Barriere Lake lands **and the conservation regime that legislates restrictions on extraction** and exploitation. **Both** the leasehold property right and the conservation regime **express a technique of** provincial **jurisdiction whereby** Barriere Lake **lands are managed as supply.** Jurisdiction at Barriere Lake is exercised by the provincial state and the band towards these different respective ends of comportment: supply and care. Jurisdiction inaugurates property, and through its actualization as care at Barriere Lake, expressed in a proprietary form through land tenure, we can see how jurisdiction embeds the community in particular relations of mutual reciprocity on the land. In contrast to Indigenous jurisdiction, the commodity form of land in **liberal capitalist society aims to erase value other than that which can be expressed in market terms.** As David Harvey notes, **“The exchange process** is . . . perpetually **abstract[s]**ing **from the specifics of location through price formation.** This paves the way for **[Value is conceptualized]** conceptualizing values **in place-free terms.”**17 Of course, despite the premise of abstraction, value can never actually be disembedded from land. That is what led Karl Polanyi to label land as a fictitious commodity at the heart of capitalist crisis: the market seeks to treat it as supply, despite its unpredictable and finite nature. Polanyi recognizes the value of land, irrespective of its fictitious properties. Brett Christophers underscores this point, arguing that perhaps it is time to reevaluate the meaning of ‘fictitious’ in the context of contemporary capitalism, where land is more valuable than ever to the political economy of nations, for example, concerning resource extraction. Land is *real* as a commodity and it literally *supplies* the geographic context for the political economy of the settler state. Even as a principle of conservation, *supply* is a key goal of maintaining wildlife populations, for the purposes of human consumption, survival of the species, and recreational hunting**.”**

Pasternak, Shiri. "Property as a technique of jurisdiction: Traplines and tenure." *Contested Property Claims*. Routledge, 2017. 166-184.

The alternative is an ontology of care

To undercut neoliberalism as we embark upon extraterrestrial expansion requires a *reimagining* of what appropriation means with respect to the relationship between the space-farer and their environment. The ontology of care provides an alternative way of relating to resources that rejects the affirmative’s project of imposing western regulatory norms onto property acquisition and instead understands the process of appropriation as one of accepting responsibility. **Pasternak 2:**

**“What is the ontological basis of life that property expresses [for]** at Barriere Lake? I spent a summer learning **Anishnabemowin** in the bush at Barriere Lake. Curious about the language of property and jurisdiction in Algonquin society, I asked Toby Decoursay one day if there was a word for ownership in [Algonquin] their language. *Kadthaben-duck* or *debendan,* he answered. What about a word for belonging or “to belong”? I asked. “Same thing almost,” he said. “*Debendaygayzik* or *debendan.*” **[In Algonquin] “To own and to belong are almost the same**?” Toby answered affirmatively: “Yep, ours is the *tibenindiziwin*, or *debdendan* or *benjigaywaynan. Nin-diki-bendan. Debendeegayzik.*” **The land is *ni(n)daki* - it means** my **responsibility/autonomy/belonging while referring to everything** there: **the moose, the sun, the stars, the trees, the eagle, the beaver, moon, the earth, and even the planet.** Literally, *aki* is “ground” while *nin* would mean “my.”**”**

Pasternak, Shiri. "Property as a technique of jurisdiction: Traplines and tenure." *Contested Property Claims*. Routledge, 2017. 166-184.

No perms: (A) the resolution describes a normative or rule-based ontology of appropriation; this is incommensurate with the K alt and thus can’t be incorporated without triggering the K; (B) a perm would require severance from resolutional text which (1) means the aff is not topical and (2) kills neg strat formation and (3) kills clash as the severing aff can simply shift out of neg arguments instead of engaging with them.

CASE ENDS HERE

“In this article, I look at the effects of contemporary articulations of dispossession and struggles against dispossession in planning theory and practice. This entails a view of space as relational and continually produced (Lefebvre, 1991) by forces, processes, power relations and interventions of different kinds. In this sense, planning is a social field active in the production of space (Porter, 2010), according to tendencies that dissociate, hierarchise and fragment the social under the conditions of neoliberal political economy and most importantly under a framework of liberally conceived rights. In investigating the conditions under which restitution for dispossession is taking place in planning, I will take two particular modes of dispossession and read them as symptomatic of these tendencies: dispossession of Indigenous lands under conditions of coloni- alism, and the displacement of urban residents under conditions of urban renewal and gentrification.”

Porter, Libby. “Possessory politics and the conceit of procedure: exposing the cost of rights under conditions of dispossession.” *Planning Theory,* vol. 13, no. 4, 2014.

NASA DA

**NASA is preserving resources through leveraging private entities**

Miriam **Kramer 21**, author of Space, “NASA's plans for the future hinge on the success of private companies,” Axios, 12-7-2021, https://www.axios.com/nasa-private-spaceflight-plans-5a5710e6-5223-4da3-8c5d-5a712e1d862e.html

The private space players who will drive NASA's plans for the coming decade are declaring themselves and defining the stakes. Why it matters: NASA plans to focus on getting people to Mars and the Moon, and its deep space exploration **ambitions hinge on the agency** **being able to successfully hand over major operations in low-Earth orbit to private companies.** The space agency hopes companies will build private space stations that its astronauts can use and to continue to buy space on private rockets for launching its satellites and other payloads to orbit and beyond. NASA's "big experiment" right now is to test where these commercial partnerships work, the Planetary Society's Casey Dreier told Axios. What's happening: Last week, NASA announced it would award multimillion-dollar contracts to three teams of commercial space companies to start designing and building privately operated space stations.

**The aff forces trade-offs that crush effective Earth science which will lead to increased intensity of climate change**

**Haymet 7** (Tony, Director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography – University of California, San Diego, Mark Abbott, Dean of the College of Oceanic and Atmospheric Science – Oregon State University, and Jim Luyten, Acting Director – Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, “The Planet NASA Needs to Explore”, Washington Post, 5-10, [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/05/09/AR2007050902451.html](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve))

Decades ago, a shift in NASA priorities sidelined progress in human space exploration. As momentum gathers to reinvigorate human space missions to the moon and Mars, we risk hurting ourselves, and Earth, in the long run. Our planet -- not the moon or Mars -- is under significant threat from the consequences of rapid climate change. Yet the **changing NASA priorities will threaten exploration** here **at home**.

NASA not only launches shuttles and builds space stations, it also builds and operates our nation's satellites that observe and monitor the Earth. These satellites collect crucial global data on winds, ice and oceans. They help us forecast hurricanes, track the loss of Arctic sea ice and the rise of sea levels, and understand and prepare for climate changes.

NASA's budget for science missions has declined 30 percent in the past six years, and that trend is expected to continue. As more dollars are **reallocated** to prepare for missions back to the moon and Mars, sophisticated new satellites to observe the Earth will be **delayed, harming Earth sciences.**

The National Academy of Sciences has noted that the Landsat satellite system, which takes important measurements of global vegetation, is in its fourth decade of operation and could fail without a clear plan for continuation. The same is true for the QuikSCAT satellite, which provides critical wind data used in forecasting hurricanes and El Niño effects.

In January, a partnership of university and NASA scientists demonstrated that climate change and higher ocean temperatures were reducing the growth of microscopic plants and animals at the heart of the marine food web.

Their analysis was based on nearly a decade of NASA satellite measurements of ocean color, which unfortunately are at risk of being interrupted for several years.

Sea levels are rising, and the Arctic Ocean may be ice-free in summer. The buildup of carbon dioxide in the oceans threatens to make them more acidic, which may in turn hinder the ability of some types of marine life, including corals, to build their shells and skeletons. **We must learn** as much as we can **to assess** these **threats and develop solutions.**

Satellites provide coverage of vast, remote regions of our planet that would otherwise remain unseen, especially the oceans, which play an important role in climate change. Without accurate data on such fundamentals as sea surface height, temperatures and biomass, as well as glacier heights and snowpack thickness, we will not be able to understand the likelihood of dangers such as more severe hurricanes along the Gulf Coast or more frequent forest fires in the Pacific Northwest.

Climate change is the **most critical problem** the Earth has ever faced.

Government agencies and the private sector, as well as individual citizens, need to better grasp the risks and potential paths of global climate change. Mitigating these risks and preparing for the effects of warming will require scientific understanding of how our complex planet operates, how it is changing, and how that change will affect the environment and human society.

John F. Kennedy's brilliant call to put a man on the moon by the end of the 1960s set an arbitrary deadline, but the deadline we face today is set by nature. NASA must continue to play a vital role in helping find ways to protect our planet for (and perhaps from) its intelligent life. Exploration of space is a noble quest. But we can't afford to be so starry-eyed that we overlook our own planet.

**Warming may inevitable but adjusting government policy can mitigate the worst effects – specifically, for sea level rise.**

**Economist 17**, "How government policy exacerbates hurricanes like Harvey," Economist, https://www.economist.com/news/leaders/21727898-if-global-warming-were-not-enough-threat-poor-planning-and-unwise-subsidies-make-floods

THE extent of the devastation will become clear only when the floodwater recedes, leaving ruined cars, filthy mud-choked houses and the bloated corpses of the drowned. But as we went to press, with the rain pounding South Texas for the sixth day, Hurricane Harvey had already set records as America’s **most severe deluge** (see Briefing). In Houston it drenched Harris County in over 4.5trn litres of water in just 100 hours—enough rainfall to cover an eight-year-old child. The fate of America’s fourth-largest city holds the world’s attention, but it is hardly alone. In India, Bangladesh and Nepal, at least 1,200 people have died and millions have been left homeless by this year’s monsoon floods. Last month torrential rains caused a mudslide in Sierra Leone that killed over 1,000—though the exact toll will never be known. Around the world, governments are grappling with the threat from floods. This will **ultimately** be about **dealing with climate change**. Just as important, is **correcting short-sighted government policy** and the perverse incentives that make flooding worse. Judgment day The overwhelming good news is that storms and flooding have caused far fewer deaths in recent decades, thanks to better **warning systems** and the construction of **levees, ditches and shelters**. The cyclone that struck Bangladesh in 1970 killed 300,000-500,000 people; the most recent severe one, in 2007, killed 4,234. The bad news is that storms and floods still account for almost three-quarters of weather-related disasters, and they are becoming more common. According to the Munich Re, a reinsurer, their number around the world has increased from about 200 in 1980 to over 600 last year. Harvey was the third “500-year” storm to strike Houston since 1979. At the same time, floods and storms are also becoming more **costly**. By one estimate, three times as many people were living in houses threatened by hurricanes in 2010 as in 1970, and the number is expected to grow as still more people move to coastal cities. The UN reckons that, in the 20 years to 2015, storms and floods caused $1.7trn of destruction; the World Health Organisation estimates that, in real terms, the global cost of hurricane damage is rising by 6% a year. Flood losses in Europe are predicted to increase fivefold by 2050. One cause is **global warming**. The frequency and severity of hurricanes vary naturally—America has seen unusually few in the past decade. Yet the **underlying global trend** is what you would expect from climate change. Warmer seas **evaporate faster** and warmer air can hold more **water vapour**, which releases energy when it condenses inside a weather system, feeding the **violence of storms** and the **intensity of deluges**. Rising **sea levels**, predicted to be especially marked in the Gulf of Mexico, **exacerbate storm surges**, adding to the **flooding**. **Harvey** was unusually devastating because it suddenly gained strength before it made landfall on Friday; it then **stayed put**, dumping its rain on Houston before returning to the Gulf. Again, that is consistent with models of a **warmer world**. **Poor planning** bears **even more blame**. Houston, which has almost no restrictions on **land-use**, is an extreme example of what can go wrong. Although a light touch has enabled developers to cater to the city’s rapid growth—1.8m extra inhabitants since 2000—it has also led to concrete being laid over vast areas of coastal prairie that used to absorb the rain. According to the Texas Tribune and ProPublica, a charity that finances investigative journalism, since 2010 Harris County has allowed more than 8,600 buildings to be put up inside 100-year floodplains, where floods have a 1% chance of occurring in any year. Developers are supposed to build ponds to hold run-off water that would have soaked into undeveloped land, but the rules are poorly enforced. Because the maps are not kept up to date, properties supposedly outside the 100-year floodplain are being **flooded repeatedly**. **Government failure adds to the harm**. Developing countries are underinsured against natural disasters. Swiss Re, a reinsurer, says that of the $50bn or so of losses to floods, cyclones and other disasters in Asia in 2014, only 8% were covered. The Bank of International Settlements calculates that the worst natural catastrophes typically permanently lower the afflicted country’s GDP by almost 2%. America has the opposite problem—the federal government subsidises the insurance premiums of vulnerable houses. The National Flood Insurance Programme (NFIP) has been forced to borrow because it fails to charge enough to cover its risk of losses. Underpricing encourages the building of new houses and discourages existing owners from renovating or moving out. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, houses that repeatedly flood account for 1% of NFIP’s properties but 25-30% of its claims. Five states, Texas among them, have more than 10,000 such households and, nationwide, their number has been going up by around 5,000 each year. Insurance is meant to provide a signal about risk; in this case, it stifles it. Mend the roof while the sun shines What to do? Flooding strengthens the case for **minimising climate change**, which threatens to make wet places wetter and storms stormier. Even those who doubt the science would do well to see action as an **insurance policy** that pays out if the case is proven. However, that **will not happen fast**, **even if all countries**, **including America**, **sign up to international agreements.** More immediately, therefore, politicians can **learn from Houston**. Cities need to protect **flood defences** and **catchment areas**, such as the **wetlands around Kolkata** and the **lakes in and around Pokhara in Nepal**, whose **value is becoming clear**. Flood maps need to be up to date. Civil engineers, often starved of funds and strangled by bureaucracy, should be **building and reinforcing levees and reservoirs now**, before it is too late. The NFIP should start to charge market premiums and developing countries should sell catastrophe bonds. All this is a **test of government**, of **foresight** and the ability to withstand the lobbying of homeowners and developers. But politicians and officials who **fail the test** need to realise that, sooner or later, they will **wake up to a Hurricane** Harvey **of their own**.

**The impact’s global war**

Eric **Holthaus 15**, editor at rollingstone magazine citing James Hansen, former NASA climatologist, "The Point of No Return: Climate Change Nightmares Are Here," Rolling Stone, accessed 10-23-2016, http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/the-point-of-no-return-climate-change-nightmares-are-already-here-20150805

On July 20th, James Hansen, the former NASA climatologist who brought climate change to the public's attention in the summer of 1988, issued a bombshell: He and a team of climate scientists had identified a newly important feedback mechanism off the coast of Antarctica that suggests mean sea levels could rise 10 times faster than previously predicted: 10 feet by 2065. The authors included this chilling warning: If emissions aren't cut, "We conclude that multi-meter **sea-level rise** would become **practically unavoidable**. **Social disruption** and **economic consequences** of such large sea-level rise could be **devastating**. It is not difficult to imagine that conflicts arising from **forced migrations** and **economic collapse** might make the planet **ungovernable**, **threatening the fabric of civilization."**