**A is the interpretation:** The affirmative debater may only generate offense from affirming that the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust

**B is the violation:** B: Violation - their advocacy text doesn't just prohibit as unjust the appropriation of outer space; it goes *beyond* the topic to create a new extra-governmental agency to identify and allocate all orbital pathways. 1) This is extra-topical because the creation of the agency is not a necessary part of any ban or prohibition on appropriation and

2) It is also extra-topical because the creation of this agency wouldn't *require and DOESN”t* banning appropriation; in other words the aff advocacy is so far outside the topic wording you could do the aff advocacy while still allowing appropriation (ie, you could have an allocating agency and then each company could become the private owner of the orbital path allocated to them)

C: Standards

1) Limits

If the aff can advocate extra-topically then there is no limit to what they can read; there are infinitely many planks they could add. This would kill fairness because there would be no way for any neg to prepare. Multiple Impactsto neg ground: a) they choose extra-topical planks that destroy neg disads, e.g. getting to defend the UN divvying up orbits only in lower earth means I don’t, for example, get access to good innovation DAs b) they choose extra-T planks that could garner them unique advantages, e.g. UN diplomacy good and c ) prep-skew, they get to shift away the debate from generics and I don’t have the time to prepare for every single unique extra-T aff.

2) Utopian fiat

If the aff can advocate extra-topically, they can advocate so specifically as to solve any problem, killing all disad and counterplan ground for the neg. **This aff explicitly does this - by advocating for a global orbital allocation agency, they kill any disad with an innovation link because they are simultaneously not even prohibiting private appropriation, just regulating it *and* advocating specifically for a system of allocation.**

1. TVA solves all abuse; they can just read [they could just advocate not allowing appropriation ]

**D are the Voters**

**DTD-to deter future abuse**

Don’t give the them an RVI

1. You shouldn’t win if you are being fair,
2. Chilling effect

1)competing interps -reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention

2)Norming-Also, theory should create norms, but we can’t do that if we only discuss reasonability.

I negate the resolution: the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

The ability to bring conditions upon oneself is a prerequisite to moral judgement. **Wallace:**

To hold someone morally responsible is to view the person as the potential target of a special kind of moral appraisal. **People who are morally responsible** are not seen merely as acting in ways that happen to be good or bad; they **are not just causally responsible for certain** welcome or unwelcome **happenings,** the way a clogged drain [is] might be said to be responsible for the unfortunate overflowing of a basin. Rather, the **actions** of morally responsible people **are thought to reflect** specially **on them as agents**, opening them to a kind of moral appraisal that does more than record a causal connection between them and the consequences of their actions. As Susan Wolf has suggested**, assessing people as morally responsible has a quality of "depth," going beyond mere description of the moral character of what they do, or of their causal role in bringing their actions about.** An account of what it is to hold people responsible should start by characterizing this quality of depth, so as to locate more precisely the distinctive aspect of the phenomenon that is to be explained. [1] Wallace, R. Jay (Professor of Philosophy, University of California, Berkeley). Responsibility and the Moral Sentiments. (1994).

The right to self-ownership is the basis of all ethics. It is epistemically foundational since any attempt to update belief in response to evidence requires that one possess ownership over one’s mental states, i.e. that one is free to adopt and discard beliefs. This means that self-ownership includes a right to control one's mind and identity as well as the body, as well as making the decision to engage in the principles of a moral theory. Epistemology comes prior since it governs our acceptance of all other philosophical claims. And this comes before other epistemological arguments since a right to revise one’s beliefs is a conceptual prerequisite to any particular theory of justification.

My framework is means-based--“Maximizing self-ownership” is contradictory since it empowers the state to impose trade-offs, violating one person’s self-ownership to protect others, but once the state has this authority there’s no longer a right of self-ownership since we can’t forbid its infringements. Rather, consistency requires that the state protects against infringements of self-ownership without violating the self-ownership of other natural persons.

Thus, the standard is consistency with self-ownership, defined as a moral actor’s right to control one’s self under principles of mutual restraint.

I contend that the appropriation of outer space by private entities is consistent with their self interest and an act of exercising their self-ownership under principles of mutual restraint.

Private entities’ ventures into space are a reflection of their self interest, and under principles of self-ownership are not unjust insofar as they do not violate the self ownership of another. The aff denies people the right to put satellites etc. in orbit without the express permission of the U.N, this infringes on self ownership.

**2]  And Libertarianism/self ownership mandates a market-oriented approach to space—that negates**

**Broker 20 [(Tyler, work has been published in the Gonzaga Law Review, the Albany Law Review and the University of Memphis Law Review.) “Space Law Can Only Be Libertarian Minded,” Above the Law, 1-14-20,** [**https://abovethelaw.com/2020/01/space-law-can-only-be-libertarian-minded/**](https://abovethelaw.com/2020/01/space-law-can-only-be-libertarian-minded/)**] TDI**

**The impact on human daily life from a transition to the virtually unlimited resource reality of space cannot be overstated. However, when it comes to the law, a minimalist, dare I say libertarian, approach appears as the only applicable system. In the words of NASA, “2020 promises to be a big year for space exploration.” Yet, as Rand Simberg points out in Reason magazine, it is actually private American investment that is currently moving space exploration to “a pace unseen since the 1960s.” According to Simberg, due to this increase in private investment “We are now on the verge of getting affordable private access to orbit for large masses of payload and people.” The impact of that type of affordable travel into space might sound sensational to some, but in reality the benefits that space can offer are far greater than any benefit currently attributed to any major policy proposal being discussed at the national level. The sheer amount of resources available within our current reach/capabilities simply speaks for itself. However, although those new realities will, as Simberg says, “bring to the fore a lot of ideological issues that up to now were just theoretical,” I believe it will also eliminate many economic and legal distinctions we currently utilize today. For example, the sheer number of resources we can already obtain in space means that in the rapidly near future, the distinction between a nonpublic good or a public good will be rendered meaningless. In other words, because the resources available within our solar system exist in such quantities, all goods will become nonrivalrous in their consumption and nonexcludable in their distribution. This would mean government engagement in the public provision of a nonpublic good, even at the trivial level, or what Kevin Williamson defines as socialism, is rendered meaningless or impossible. In fact, in space, I fail to see how any government could even try to legally compel collectivism in the way Simberg fears. Similar to many economic distinctions, however, it appears that many laws, both the good and the bad, will also be rendered meaningless as soon as we begin to utilize the resources within our solar system. For example, if every human being is given access to the resources that allows them to replicate anything anyone else has, or replace anything “taken” from them instantly, what would be the point of theft laws? If you had virtually infinite space in which you can build what we would now call luxurious livable quarters, all without exploiting human labor or fragile Earth ecosystems when you do it, what sense would most property, employment, or commercial law make? Again, this is not a pipe dream, no matter how much our population grows for the next several millennia, the amount of resources within our solar system can sustain such an existence for every human being. Rather than panicking about the future, we should try embracing it, or at least meaningfully preparing for it. Currently, the Outer Space Treaty, or as some call it “the Magna Carta of Space,” is silent on the issue of whether private individuals or corporate entities can own territory in space. Regardless of whether governments allow it, however, private citizens are currently obtaining the ability to travel there, and if human history is any indicator, private homesteading will follow, flag or no flag. We Americans know this is how a Wild West starts, where most regulation becomes the impractical pipe dream.** But again, this would be a Wild West where the exploitation of human labor and fragile Earth ecosystem makes no economic sense, where every single human can be granted access to resources that even the wealthiest among us now would envy, and where innovation and imagination become the only things we would recognize as currency**. Only a libertarian-type system, that guarantees basic individual rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness could be valued and therefore human fidelity to a set of laws made possible, in such an existence.**