**Brackets for clarity or language <3**

**I affirm.**

**I value justice**

**First, all people are fundamentally morally equal. No natural distinction justifies giving one arbitrary power over others. This “ideal” definition of universal value precedes identity because:**

**(A) Universal moral worth is the basis of identity concerns. Were it not the case that all are morally equal we’d have no reason to critique structures that subordinate people arbitrarily.**

**(B) Material oppression is rooted in violations of universal value.**

**All resources derive ultimately from the commons, and all agents have an innate, equal, original claim to a fair share of an undiminished commons. This right holds regardless of arbitrary characteristics of birth, such as location or recency. Roark:**

**“**The notion that **moral agents have an initially equal moral claim** in respect **to natural resources** is highly plausible because **an agent cannot appeal to anything that she has done or a**ny sort of **hereditary right** that she has **to establish a greater initial claim over natural resources** than any other agent can legitimately claim. All agents stand in the same initial moral relationship to natural resources. ***No* agent is morally, or**for that matter **causally, responsible for creating** or establishing in any way whatsoever **land,** fresh **water,** the oceans, **the atmosphere,** crude oil, wild berries **or any other natural resources**. Natural resources are simply established or given by Nature or God. **Appealing to an agent’s industriousness**, labor, or other aspects of her agency **cannot demonstrate** that she possesses **any greater initial claim to** natural **resources** than any other agent **because natural resources are not brought about as a result of labor** or any aspect of agency**.”**

Roark, Eric. Removing the Commons. Lexington Books, August 28, 2013. P. 3.

**Recency of birth is arbitrary so the right to equitable access to the commons persists across generations. Weiss:**

**“**The second fundamental relationship is that between different generations of the human species. All generations are inherently linked to other generations, past and future, in using the common patrimony of earth. To define intergenerational equity, it is useful to view the human community  as a partnership among all generations. In describing a state as a partnership, Edmund Burke observed that ‘as the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership not only between those who are living but between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born.’ The purpose of human society must be to realize and protect the welfare and well-being of every generation. This requires sustaining the life-support systems of the planet, the ecological processes, and the environmental conditions necessary for a healthy and decent human environment. In this partnership, **no generation knows** beforehand **when it will be** the **living** generation, how many members it will have, **or** even **how many generations there will** ultimately **be**. It is useful, then, to  take the perspective of a generation that is placed somewhere along the spectrum of time, but does not know in advance where it will be located. Such a **[Each] generation would want to inherit the earth in at least as good condition as it had been in for any previous generation** and to have as good access to it as previous generations. **This requires each generation to pass the planet on in no worse condition than it received it in and to provide equitable access to its resources** and benefits**. Each generation is thus** both **a trustee for the planet** with obligations to care for it and a beneficiary with rights to use it**.”**

Weiss, Edith. “Our rights and obligations to future generations for the environment.” The American Journal of International Law, vol. 84, No. 1, January 1990, pp. 198-207.

**This means the Lockean Proviso is true. A taking from the commons violates the equity rights of others if it fails to leave “enough and as good” in terms of access.**

All economies are bound by these moral requirements regardless of their degree of advancement. When all common resources have been parceled out or developed, the right of each person born to equitable access to an undiminished commons is not reduced.

**The Standard is consistency with Lockean Libertarianism. van der Vossen explains:**

Plausible versions of libertarian theory must therefore attempt to strike some balance between the maximally restrictive and maximally permissive views. Consider ***Lockean libertarianism***, which **allows unilateral** use and **appropriation but insists on restrictions at** both **the stage of appropriation—in the form of the Lockean proviso** that “enough and as good” be left for others**—and subsequent possessions—because no one can exclude the needy from** one's **property. Lockean libertarianism views natural resources as initially unprotected by any property rule** (no consent is needed for use or appropriation) **but as protected by an ongoing compensation liability rule. Those who use natural resources**, or claim rights over them, **owe compensation to others for any wrongful costs imposed.**

van der Vossen, Bas, "Libertarianism", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2019 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2019/entries/libertarianism/>.

Prefer additionally –

a. Performativity: individuals have certain natural rights that must be met in order to access the space **Hoppe**:

**“Argumentation does not consist of free-floating propositions but** is a form of action **requiring the employment of scarce means;** and that the means which a person demonstrates as preferring by engaging in propositional exchanges are those of private property. For one thing, **[N]o one could** possibly **propose anything**, and no one could become convinced of any proposition by argumentative means, **if a person’s right to make exclusive use of [their] physical body were not** already **presupposed. [This]** It is this recognition of each other’s mutually exclusive control over one’s own body which explains the distinctive character of propositional exchanges that, while one may disagree about what has been said, it is still possible to agree at least on the fact that there is disagreement. It is also obvious that such a property right to one’s own body **must be** said to be **justified *a priori*, for** anyone who tried to justify **any norm** whatsoever would already have to **presuppose[s]** the exclusive right of control over his body as a valid norm **[it].**  simply in order o say, ‘I propose such and such.’ **Anyone disputing [this]** such a **right would [commit]** become caught up in **a practical contradiction** since arguing so would already imply acceptance of the very norm which he was disputing.**”**

Hoppe, Hans-Hermann. *The Economics and Ethics of Private Property,* p. 334.

Evaluate this but not extinction first or death ow because KNOW were not dead right now, but we don’t know if our argumentation is being polarized, performativity flows aff.

**AND under Lockean Proviso we care about the structure of discourse and action, not its consequences. Therefore, intentions outweigh consequences.**

**1) Action theory: Actions are defined by their intents, so you can’t evaluate the action before the intent. For example if I drink I must raise the glass to my lips and swallow, having infinite constituent parts. The only way to judge the topical action is by looking to intent.**

**2) Normativity: Only intent-based ethics are normative because if you’re held responsible for things you don’t intend, then there’s no reason to be moral because you can’t help your actions being immoral, because you’re held responsible for unintended effects. This controls the link to ethics because otherwise there’s no reason to follow morality.**

**3) Consequentialism kinda fails extempt**

**Interpretation: the neg must concede the aff fwk provided that its consistency with Lockean Libertarianism. Strat skew – neg is reactive and can up-layer the aff on moral frameworks, procedurals, and discursive arguments – AFC levels the playing field by forcing the neg to commit to the aff on substance, which ensures the AC matters. Procedural fairness is a voter and outweighs: Sequencing- extempt**

NOW AFFIRM,

Private appropriation of outer space fails the Lockean proviso. This is because accessible space-based resources are neither renewable nor replaceable. Thus any taking of an outer space resource denies the access of others to “as much and as good” of that particular resource

**Steiner 12:**

Steiner, Hillel. “Left libertarianism and the ownership of natural resources.” *Bleeding Heart Libertarians,* April 24, 2012.

Gains and losses are most acceptably shifted when they’re primarily the results of circumstance, and least acceptably shifted when they’re principally the products of choices made by those who incur them. And **what counts as circumstance**, I suggest, **is** pretty adequately **captured by** what we would include under the heading of “**nature**.” “Nature” covers a lot: **there are places where it rains all the time and places where it never rains; places with oil deposits and places with serious geological faults**; crowded and less crowded cyberspace locations; and genes that code for Kentucky blue grass, poison ivy, viruses, koala bears, cystic fibro- sis, schizophrenia, Pavarotti-type vocal chords, some elements of human intelligence, and so forth.  **Rights to** natural **resources** - to nature, compendiously construed - **are rights to bits of** all these various, and **variously valued, things.** So if we follow Locke and a number of other thinkers in that tradition, if we hold that **anyone claiming ownership over some bits of nature must leave “enough and as good for others”**, **we’re led** by a series of plausible steps to the conclusion that, in a fully appropriated world, **each person is entitled to an equal portion of the value of these bits of nature.** That is, **all owners of natural resources must pool the value of what they own in a fund - ultimately a global fund - to an equal portion of which everyone everywhere has a moral right.**

**SUBPOINT b)**

**Private space exploration relies on a colonialist mindset and ignores earth’s *actual* inequalities and issues.**

**McCormick**, Ted. "The Billionaire Space Race Reflects a Colonial Mindset That Fails to Imagine a Different World." *The Conversation*, 15 Aug. 20**21**,theconversation.com/the-billionaire-space-race-reflects-a-colonial-mindset-that-fails-to-imagine-a-different-world-165235. Accessed 4 Jan. 2022.

Today, **the moon and Mars are in projectors’ sights.** And **the promises billionaires Elon Musk and Jeff Bezos make for colonization are similar in ambition to those of four centuries ago.** As Bezos told an audience at the [International Space Development Conference](https://www.geekwire.com/2018/jeff-bezos-isdc-space-vision/) in 2018: “We will have to leave this planet, and we’re going to leave it, and it’s going to make this planet better.” **Bezos** traces his thinking to Princeton physicist Gerald O’Neill, whose 1974 article “[The Colonization of Space](https://space.nss.org/the-colonization-of-space-gerard-k-o-neill-physics-today-1974/)” (and 1977 book, *The High Frontier*) **presented orbiting settlements as solutions to nearly every major problem facing the Earth.** Bezos echoes O’Neill’s proposal to move heavy industry — and industrial labour — off the planet, rezoning Earth as a mostly residential, green space. A garden, as it were. Jeff Bezos talks about space exploration and leadership at the 2018 International Space Development Conference. **Musk’s plans for Mars are at once more cynical and more grandiose,** in timeline and technical requirements if not in ultimate extent. **They center on the dubious possibility of “**[**terraforming**](https://www.businessinsider.com/nasa-just-quashed-elon-musks-plans-to-make-mars-habitable-for-humans-2018-7)**” Mars using resources and technologies that don’t yet exist.** Musk planned to [send the first humans to Mars in 2024](https://www.businessinsider.com/elon-musk-spacex-mars-plan-timeline-2018-10), and by 2030, he envisioned breaking ground on a city, [launching as many as 100,000 voyages from Earth to Mars](https://www.businessinsider.com/elon-musk-says-we-could-put-a-million-people-on-mars-within-a-century-2015-6) within a century. As of 2020, the timeline had been pushed back slightly, in part because terraforming may require bombarding Mars with 10,000 nuclear missiles to start. But **the vision – a Mars of thriving crops, pizza joints and “entrepreneurial opportunities,” preserving life and paying dividends while Earth becomes increasingly uninhabitable — remains.** Like the colonial [company-states](https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066120928127) of the 17th and 18th centuries, [Musk’s SpaceX leans heavily on government backing but will make its own laws on its newly settled planet](http://bostonreview.net/science-nature/alina-utrata-lost-space). A failure of the imagination The techno-utopian visions of **Musk and Bezos** betray some of the same assumptions as their early modern forebears. They **offer colonialism as a panacea for complex social, political and economic ills, rather than attempting to work towards a better world within the constraints of our environment.** And **rather than facing the palpably devastating consequences of an ideology of limitless growth on our planet, they seek to export it, unaltered, into space. They imagine themselves capable of creating liveable environments where none exist. But for all their futuristic imagery, they have failed to imagine a different world.** And they have ignored the history of colonialism on this one. Empire never recreated Eden, but it did fuel centuries of growth based on expropriation, enslavement and environmental transformation in defiance of all limits. We are struggling with these consequences today.

**3. Private space exploration gives corporations too much power over individuals, and opens the door for monopolies.**

**Ward**, Peter. "The Unintended Consequences of Privatizing Outer Space." *Science Focus*, 6 Nov. 20**19**,www.sciencefocus.com/space/the-unintended-consequences-of-privatising-space/. Accessed 4 Jan. 2022.

But **space** isn’t the bastion of free-floating freedom some think it is, and it’s **[is] ripe for exploitation by monopolies. A space station operator,** for example, **could decide which fibre optics manufacturer could use its facility and which could not. The fibre optics produced in a zero-gravity environment are much cleaner and more valuable than that produced on Earth, meaning that one company would have a massive advantage,** and the space station would decide who had access to the best manufacturing conditions. That’s just one example of a potential monopoly, but if you go further into the future of space exploration, things only get more frightening. **Imagine a colony on** [**the Moon**](https://www.sciencefocus.com/tag/the-moon/) or [Mars](https://www.sciencefocus.com/space/mars-facts-figures-fun-questions-red-planet/) **run by a corporation. That one company would control everything the colonists need to survive, from the water to the oxygen to the food. That’s a dangerous amount of power for any company, but it’s a very real scenario.** So what stops a major corporation landing on the Moon and setting up a colony? One very old document. [The Outer Space Treaty](http://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/spacelaw/treaties/outerspacetreaty.html) was signed in 1967 by all of the major space-faring nations, and explicitly states nobody can go to another planet or the Moon and claim that territory for their own. It’s a very important document, but it’s flawed. For one thing, the private space sector wasn’t around when the treaty was written so it’s not clear how some of the rules would be applied to private companies. And secondly, given the ambitions of many countries and corporations, there’s no way it’s going to last much longer. Anyone with a plan to land on the Moon or Mars and stay there is going to run into the Outer Space Treaty, and the smart money is on the wealthy and powerful winning out against an old loophole-ridden document. Politicians such as Ted Cruz in the United States have [already called for changes](https://spacenews.com/cruz-interested-in-updating-outer-space-treaty-to-support-commercial-space-activities/) to be made to the treaty, and given the increasing amounts of money private space companies spend on lobbying in the United States, more such attempts will follow. **It’s imperative that the space community as a whole takes this issue on to ensure the needs of all, and not just the private sector, are taken into account should any alterations be made.** The further we look into the future of humans in space, the more reality resembles science fiction. That’s why it’s difficult to make people take the issues which could potentially arise seriously. But **now is the time to consider the problems that could arise from a commercially-led space race, and take the necessary small steps now to avoid potentially disastrous consequences** in the future.

The concept of appropriation constitutes a hoarding by private companies, which fail to leave enough and as good as for generations because capitalism sustains itself via private entities and their commodification

TURNS structural violence NC’s, helping those least well off requires that we don’t tolerate capitalist mindsets, so oppression frameworks logically affirm

**F - is for Friends who do stuff together**

**U - is for Underview**

**N - is for aNyone and aNywhere at all down here in the deep blue sea :music:**

*They change by the round, plz msg me for previous UVs I’ve read*