**I affirm**

**Value: Justice. Acting morally**

**Space: the physical universe beyond the earth's atmosphere. (Oxford Languages)**

**Appropriate: to take to or for oneself; to take possession of.(Dictionary.com)**

**Defending the neg world means defending capitalism. private entities exclusively exist within capitalistic societies, thus to argue for appropriation of space by private entities means to defend capitalism. If I prove that either A) that appropriation of space is unjust in some capacity B) That capitalism is unjust, meaning that the resolution cannot be argued on moral grounds; I win.**

**Value Criterion:**Deontology

Deontology states that we shouldn’t place the morality of any one person over another. This means that any action that prioritizes our own wellbeing and happiness over the wellbeing and happiness of others is immoral. This also includes the wellbeing of future generations, as we can reasonably project. Winter et al:

**“**Finally, **to recognize** the operation of **structural violence forces us to ask** questions about how and **why we tolerate it,** questions **which** often have **[can be] painful** answers **for** **the privileged** elite **who unconsciously support it.** A final question of this section is how and why we allow ourselves to be so oblivious to structural violence. Susan Opotow offers an intriguing set of answers, in her article Social Injustice. She argues that **our normal** perceptual/**cognitive processes divide people into in-groups** **and out-groups**. Those outside our group **[which] lie outside our scope of justice.** Injustice that would be instantaneously confronted if it occurred to someone we love or know is barely noticed if it occurs to strangers or those who are invisible or irrelevant. We do not seem to be able to open our minds and our hearts to everyone, so we draw conceptual lines between those who are in and out of our moral circle. **Those who fall outside are morally excluded, and become** either **invisible**, or demeaned in some wayso that we do not have to acknowledge the[ir] injusticethey suffer. **Moral exclusion** is a human failing, but Opotow argues convincingly that it **is an outcome of** everyday **social cognition. To reduce it**s nefarious effects, **we must** be vigilant in **notic[e]**ing **and listen**ing **to [the]** **oppressed**, invisible, outsiders. **Inclusionary thinking can be fostered by** relationships, **communication**, and appreciation of diversity**.”**

Winter, Deborah, & Leighton, Dana. “Structural violence.” In D. J. Christie, R. V. Wagner, & D. D. Winter (Eds.), Peace, conflict, and violence: Peace psychology in the 21st century. New York: Prentice-Hall, 2001.

This means that deontology is best at preventing structural oppression, while other criterions like consequentialism fail, generating ‘in’ and ‘out’ groups.

In reference to the resolution, we require a way to ethically appropriate property. Regarding this venture, Lock’s theories of property and the Lockean Proviso should be followed

According to Smith there are

**This essay (and the next) discusses two qualifications in Locke’s theory of private property. The first is what Robert Nozick called the *Lockean proviso*, according to which labor establishes an exclusive right to unowned resources, “at least where there is enough, and as good left in common with others.” The second qualification, commonly called the “spoilage limitation,” states that a person may not claim ownership of so many natural resources that some of them spoil before he is able to use them.**

Smith, George H. “Smith Explains How Locke Dealt with Some Problems in the Traditional Christian Theory of Private Property.” *Libertarianism.Org*, 6 Nov. 2015, www.libertarianism.org/columns/john-locke-some-qualifications-lockes-theory-property.

Locke’s theory of private property states we appropriate property when we combine our labor with the land. An exception to Locke’s theory is the Lockean proviso

**Miller Says**

**“**At the same time, because **the advent of trade** and money **has induced** a condition of **scarcity,** the Lockean Proviso, which had been dormant in the first stage, now becomes operative. **People can remove property from the commons** through labor; **but they cannot take so much that there is not ‘enough** and as good **left for others.’** Thus, this second historical epoch is the one to which the Lockean Proviso particularly applies. The problem for interpreting the Lockean Proviso therefore resolves itself into a matter of determining how, under conditions of scarcity and trade, the Proviso can limit the enclosure of resources from the commons without undermining the basic purposes of private property. Professor Sanders stresses the element of the Proviso that requires there to be ‘enough’ left for others, which he interprets as meaning that others must have resources sufficient to satisfy the ‘conveniences of life.’ I doubt, however, that the word will bear this construction. **‘Enough’ connotes**, not having as much as one wants, but rather having **a sufficiency to satisfy basic needs.** Locke himself does not seem to believe that the reference to ‘enough’ is a highly significant element, for he often leaves it out in referring to the Proviso. The essence of the Proviso is the requirement that what is left be ‘as good’ as what was taken. Indeed, the ‘as good’ element will almost always subsume the ‘enough’ element: Because people who appropriate property through labor will usually take enough to satisfy basic needs, the requirement that ‘as good’ be left for others implies that ‘enough’ will be left for them as well. Thus the principal interpretive problem is what Locke means by ‘as good.’ The key to the resolution of this problem, I believe, is the circumstance that in the second stage of property a money economy has developed. **In a money economy,** different **resources can be valued and exchanged** through the medium of money. This means thatthe criterion of **what is ‘as good,’ under the Lockean Proviso, can be a measure of exchange: Resource A can be as good as a different** type of **resource, B, if the** market **value of A is at least as high** as the market value of B. In the institution of money, says Locke, **humankind has ‘agreed to** disproportionate and **unequal possession of the Earth**, they **having by** a tacit and voluntary **consent found** out **a way**, how **a** man **[person] may fairly possess more land than [they]** he himself **can use** the product of, **by receiving in exchange for the overplus, Gold and Silver**, which may be hoarded up without injury to any one.’ **Thus the Lockean proviso is not violated if someone takes** land **out of the commons in excess of his or her** pro rata **share, so long as the benefits to others** resulting from the excess land being placed in productive use **exceed the value** of the excess land which is **taken.”**

Miller, Geoffrey. “Economic efficiency and the Lockean Proviso.” *Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy,* vol. 401, 1987. ***[Bracketing for gender equity]***

Falk:

**“**First, **if justice is determined by the equal rights of individuals to global resources** or inheritances, **then rich countries acquire income justly only when they acquire it justly from individuals** (e.g., by international trade and democratically legislated taxation). Only just countries have rights over the autonomous disposition of national income. An unjust rich state has no right to dispose or hold income. **A** just **rich country**, conversely, **has the right to dispose autonomously of national income, provided that** national income **represents its just share of global income. Any surplus is owed to individuals who are poor or to** (just) **poor states** that have acquired a right to dispose of income or resources by the consent of their citizens. Neither unjust poor states nor unjust rich states should (by the argument of equal rights of individuals) have rights over global income. If there were justice among ‘thieves,’ it might call for distribution withiout condition from unjust rich states to unjust poor states. It is difficult to see, however, why that scheme should apply to the surplus of just rich states beyond what they distribute to just poor states**.”**

Falk, Richard. *Principled World Politics: The Challenge of Normative International Relations.* Rowman & Littlefield, 2000.

The failure to observe this proviso denies the moral agency of those who suffer scarcity. **Vallentyne:**

**“**A plausible conception of **the ownership of natural resources must** be compatible with reasonably secure (not easily lost) self-ownership. At a minimum it should **allow unappropriated resources to be used by agents** without the permission of others [,] an**d without any loss of the rights of self-ownership**. **and** More specifically, a plausible conception **should be common-use-based** in the 9 sense **that (roughly)** justice permits agents to use unappropriated natural resources as long as they violate no one’s self-ownership(nor, perhaps, certain constraints of fair use).10 On the most permissive conception of common use, **the only constraint** **on** **use is the self-ownership of other agents. Agents are permitted** by justice to breathe air, walk on unoccupied land, eat apples in no one's possession, and even to chop down trees, and burn down shelters others have built—**as long as no one’s self-ownership is violated** (e.g., by being assaulted or killed). A less permissive version of common use would also impose some constraints of fair use that rule out some kinds of use (e.g., continued possession of the sole source of water). Under common use, no one owns the resource (in the sense of having the right to exclude others from use), and the only constraint on use is self-ownership, and perhaps some constraint of fair use. **Without** somesuch **condition of** permissible use of **natural resources, self-ownership has no real force, since it could be lost through the unavoidable use of natural resources.”**

Vallentyne, Peter. *Left-libertarianism: A primer*. Palgrave-Macmillan, 2000.

Contention 1) Appropriation of limited resources is unjust, as it prevents future generations from using them.

This right of equal access is no respecter of generational distinctions. One does not have a greater right to use common resources solely because of the arbitrary characteristic of having been born earlier. **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 **[is] 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 environmentalconditions 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 **[So] 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 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**.”**

Roark:

**“**Further, **no one is born a moral king with some sort of greater initial moral claim over natural resources than any other** agent. John Locke soundly and decisively beat to death, more than three centuries ago, in his *First Treatise of Government,* the view advanced by Robert Filmer that a king owned the entirety of the earth and had absolute dominion over his subjects because he claimed to be a direct descendant of the Almighty’s first son, Adam. No agent, Locke persuasively argued, has any moral right or birth claim to a greater initial moral claim to the earth than any other agent. **If an agent’s actions or birth right are not suitable reasons to explain why she has a greater initial moral claim to natural resources than any other agent, then it is difficult to see what type of reason(s) could accomplish such a feat. Absent any** convincing **reasons**, and I am highly skeptical any such reasons exist, **that would differentiate the initial** moral **claim that agents have** in respect **to natural resources,** it stands to reason that ***all* agents possess the *same* initial moral claim** in respect to these resources. I shall often describe the claim that agents have an initial equal moral claim to natural resources with the language that, ‘natural resources initially belong to everyone**.”**

Roark, Eric. *Removing the Commons.* Lexington Books, August 28, 2013. P. 4.

To appropriate non excess space resources is to put our own morality above others, which is unjust. We currently do not have access to enough high quality resources to think of allowing private entities to appropriate resources

Contention 2) Appropriation of resources when denying the needs of others is immoral. Falk explains:

Differing from both the Lockeans, the neo-Kantians raise a more fundamental set of moral concerns that limit all politically indiscriminate distributional claims founded on liberal principles. **International rights,** they argue, **must be founded on moral freedom** and individual self-determiantion. **One cannot separate the economic from the political features of a just social order**, but **freedom**, overall, **is prior to wealth**, just as Rawls’s maximum equal liberty is prior to the difference principle. They do not want to sacrifice freedom and democratic self-determination for material well-being unless, Rawls and others have argued, **the community finds itself in a state of desperation,** such that the natural principle of justice should operate, **determining that the basic minimum subsistence of all is the first duty of public justice.** Thus, **in cases of extreme inequality** and political anarchy within a country, the welfare liberals find justifiable a developmental, **[Kantians suggest]redistributing dictatorship to equalize opportunity as a necessary foundation for an eventually just liberal society.”**

Falk, Richard. *Principled World Politics: The Challenge of Normative International Relations.* Rowman & Littlefield, 2000.

This means that giving already affluent private entities exclusive access to appropriate space resources undermines the equality and freedom of others. Since space resources are currently irreplaceable, there is NO moral justification for usage of those resources.

Contention 3)Appropriation of space by private entities leads to expansion of capitalism, which promotes violation of worker’s rights to their own property, which contradicts the Lockean proviso. **Zwolinski et al:**

**Capitalist exploitation thus consists in the forced appropriation by capitalists of the surplus value produced by workers. Workers under capitalism are compelled by their lack of ownership of the means of production to sell their labor power to capitalists for less than the full value of the goods they produce. Capitalists, in turn, need not produce anything themselves but are able to live instead off the productive energies of workers. And the surplus value that capitalists are thereby able to appropriate from workers becomes the source of capitalist profit, thereby “strengthening that very power whose slave it is”**

Zwolinski, Matt, and Alan Wertheimer. “Exploitation (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy).” *Plato.Stanford.Edu*, Stanford University, 16 Aug. 2016, plato.stanford.edu/entries/exploitation.

DO NOT let my opponent argue that the Lockean Proviso is non unique to the aff argument, my opponent argues for capitalism, which depends on a philosophical ideal that disobeys the Proviso

Contention 4) Capitalism leads to structural violence and exploitation of the working class. **Leech:**

**The fourth and final case study examines how capitalism is unsustainable from an ecological perspective, and argues that this constitutes a form of structural violence against future generations. The logic of capital requires constant growth in order to accumulate wealth, but that growth is dependent on the destruction of nature. Inevitably, the drive to maximize profits that lies at the root of the logic of capital requires that essential natural resources be exploited in an unsustainable manner—to disproportionately benefit a wealthy minority at the expense of the basic needs of the majority. This process not only constitutes structural violence perpetrated by the haves against the have-nots today, it also represents structural violence against future generations who will not be able to meet their basic needs.**

Leech, Garry. *Capitalism as Structural Genocide and the Socialist Alternative*. Amsterdam University Press, 2011.

As previously stated, negating means defending the expansion of capitalism. Capitalism is an oppressive system which promotes worker exploitation and defends structural violence.**Bonacich:**

**I shall return to the role of the middle class, both white and of color, shortly. Right now I want to dwell briefly on the relationship between capitalism and racism. It seems to me that capitalism and racism are closely connected. The emergence of capitalism in Western Europe coincided with the [supposed] "voyages of discovery," or colonial domination of most of the rest of the world. Capitalism evolved in Europe in part because of imperialism and the ability to extract wealth from the other nations and peoples of the globe. Ideas about racial inferiority and the superiority of Europe accompanied this conquest and expansion, providing a justification for an obviously unprovoked aggression. The Europeans managed to convince themselves that their reign of terror was really beneficent, bringing enlightenment, religion, and economic development to the savages. In fact, they often brought genocide and enslavement. The plunder they took helped build the economic and military might of Europe.**

Bonacich, Edna. “Racism in Advanced Capitalist Society: Comments on William J. Wilson’s The Truly Disadvantaged.” *Scholarworks.Edu*, Western Michigan University, Dec. 1989, scholarworks.wmich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1916&context=jssw.

Capitalism is a system built upon racist ideals, which cannot be dissolved absent a rejection of capitalism itself.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Neg Space Exploration

Instant prioritization of space exploration could lead to compromise of human rights. **Krichevsky et al:**

**Aspect of human rights is viewed by us as first and prioritized as it refers to all people on Earth, especially to those who developed, develops and will develop Moon personally and directly beyond Earth, in outer space, in lunar space and on Moon itself. Existing main human rights are written for Earth, they do not reflect peculiarities of relationships connected with space exploration, including Moon exploration. In such a setting space activity, space law and human rights were studied by one of the article authors in 1993-2012 (see: [Krichevsky, 2012: 222-230]). Problem of human rights in space is not solved yet, is actual and its complexity is growing.**

Krichevsky, Sergey, and Alexander Bagrov. “Moon Exploration:Legal Aspects.” *Web.Archive.Org*, 1 Nov. 2019, https://web.archive.org/web/20200521052820id\_/http://asljournal.org/journals/2019-4/ASL\_vol\_4\_KrichevskyBagrov.pdf.

Space expansion compromises a resolution of human rights issues, and justifies oppression. Additionally, prioritizing getting off the rock means my opponent relies on extinction first ideology.

**EXTINCTION UTIL UNDERVIEW:**

**Cross Ex:**

What are the impacts if we do not get off the rock?

So we should prioritize extinction over any other impacts?

[If yes]

So could the state kill a terrorist to prevent extinction

Under your framing, could the state kill an innocent if they felt doing so would prevent extinction?

[If the answer is No]

—> OK, so assassinating innocent people is a limit on the state’s power to prevent extinction. That means extinction isn’t first — it’s at best “second.” So what other kinds of things can’t the state do to avoid extinction? (Follow this general line: Clearly there’s something about harming innocents that is more important than avoiding extinction; where in your case do you identify and quantify what those alternative concerns are?)

[If yes]

Is there a limit to how many innocent people can be assassinated to avoid extinction? [If yes: limit on state question]

[If no]

If we can assassinate innocents to avoid extinction, can we do other things to them? Could we torture innocent people to avoid extinction? Enslave them?

**“Extinction first” is an independent voter**

“Extinction first” logic models genocidal thinking in the real world.

Extinction is treated as an ethical “trump cards” that would justify murder, rape, genocide, torture. No matter how bad it is, it’s not as bad as extinction.

The threat calculations are purely subjective evaluations of probabilities — just as in debate, both sides generate extinction scenarios — so any policymaker can use “extinction first” ideology to justify any policy at any time.

The threat evaluations are couched in elevated professional terms by self-identified experts and presented as authoritative judgments of the state.

The threats themselves (nuclear war, environmental devastation) are generated by the same policymakers who use those threats to justify further atrocities.

The magnitude of the imagined threat is used to beat back any counter-concerns. Prospective “future generations” are held hostage to the genocidal mindset of the state. **Neocleous 18:**

“Witness, for example, the phenomenon that has been described as neoliberalism. Much can and has been made of the ways in which neoliberalism involves a transformation of the individual: ‘economics are the method; the object is to change the heart and soul’, as Margaret Thatcher (Sunday Times, 1981) once put it. Taking such a claim seriously means reading neoliberalism not simply in terms of its destructive power, for example in destroying certain kinds of rights and institutions, but also in terms of its productive power: in its ability to create new kinds of social relations, new ways of living and new political subjects. The literature on the new neoliberal subject recognizes more than anything that what is being produced is an entrepreneurial self and a productive subject: a monetized, atomized and calculating subject that is required and expected to endlessly perform as a neoliberal subject in the social realm as well as in the marketplace (Dardot and Laval, 2013). This production of new subjectivities, however, is also very much an orientation of the subject around security: new political subjects forged through security, operating for security and organized around security. In other words, security- conscious neoliberal subjects. The connection between security and capital is thus integral to the neoliberal revolution and part of neoliberalism’s productive power and disciplinary core. (As with so many aspects of neoliberalism, what is of most interest is its disciplinary moment, and at the heart of this disciplinary moment lies the logic of security.) The explosion and expansion of security in the last two decades, while conventionally connected to the problem of terrorism (the ‘war on terror’), might just as properly be connected to the attempt to engrain neoliberalism into the hearts and minds of political subjects. Moreover, because the neoliberal subject is expected to be an active subject, this activity is also expected to respond to the demands of security as well as the demands of capital. As is well known, under neoliberalism it is no longer enough for us to simply work, earn our money, go home and spend it. Now we must believe in the work we are doing and actively show that we believe in it, identifying with the organization and signing up to the company’s mission, vision and values. The neoliberal workplace has become a ‘community of desire’, as Frédéric Lordon puts it, and yet this poses a problem for capital, which constantly questions the worker’s desire. In Lordon’s example: the employee- subject swears that they have no other passion than the manufacture of yoghurt, our company’s business, but can we really believe them? (Lordon, 2015, p. 84). The answer has to be no, and so the expected desire must be constantly expressed, measured and assessed, since it is always in danger of fading. A similar point might be made about the neoliberal polity, and likewise about the neoliberal security state: the citizen- subject swears that they have no other interest than the security of the social order, but can we really believe them? The answer must again be no,2 and so the expected desire must also be constantly expressed, measured and assessed, since it is always in danger of fading. Herein lies the basis for all the actions we are now being trained to undertake as security- conscious neoliberal subjects, such as being trained in ‘resilience’, being taught to be constantly ‘prepared for emergency’, and being encouraged to report any friends, family, lovers, neighbours and colleagues who we suspect might be doing something ‘suspicious’ (Neocleous, 2013, 2016, 2017). Part of the novelty of neoliberalism lies precisely in the idea that this active subject is not expected to remain content with the simple exchange of security for obedience, but, rather, is to be actively mobilized around the logic of security. **Security has become a neoliberal mobilization regime:** the people mobilized in the name of security as well as capital. Such **mobilization is** yet **a**nother **way** of incorporating the people into security and another way in which **security expresses its desire to exist without reply**, just like capital and the state. Part of **the illusion of security is that we are expected to bow down before it without** even **asking what it is or how it came to be** granted such a status**.** To exist without reply, **security seeks to nullify all dissent** and suppress any rebellion **even before such dissent [has]** and rebellion have **begun. Any objections** or resistance **to** any of **the policies** – not least the economic policies – being carried out by the powers **which claim to exercise security** on our behalf **are met either with [coercive]** security **measures** of the most coercive kind **or with the expectation that reason must abase itself before it –** all **our critical faculties set aside as security** and its leading **defenders tell us to shut up, listen and obey.** Those arguing against austerity, for example, are treated first and foremost as a threat to national security. Thus, far from security being emancipation, as some people working in the academic sector of the security industry like to claim and which is the very belief that security wants us to hold, the articulation of security as an overarching principle of politics – the idea, in other words, that security is the absolute foundation of all politics, or that security has to be the starting point for any political thought, or that security is the grounds on which we must accept the protection of the state, or that what all of us would most like for Christmas is security – is nothing less than the articulation of a demand for obedience. Security is in this sense central to the containment of social change, nothing less than the principle and process of pacification, if by ‘pacification’ we understand not simply the military crushing of resistance but, rather, the fabrication of social order (Neocleous, 2011, 2017; Neocleous, Rigakos and Wall, 2013). What does this obedience in the name of security produce? The answer is not difficult: obedience itself. Obedience produces obedience, as Foucault once commented (2014, p. 270) about what he called ‘pastoral power’. It reproduces itself as a system of obedience. That is, one accepts the principle of security in order to become obedient and one reproduces this state of obedience in a striving for the mythical state of security. Hence one is expected to manage oneself in the way that a security operative would have us be managed. This is the very point to which Hobbes alludes in the final paragraph of Leviathan; it is the very same point understood by all contemporary politicians when they speak the language of security; and it is the point implicit in much of the discourse and policies surrounding terrorism, which is why so much anti- terror legislation concerns itself with the obedience of the population. Obedience thereby becomes a permanent way of being, and we are encouraged and expected to believe that obedience is essential to the security of the subject. Obedience becomes fundamental to the principle of raison d’état, demanded by the state for security reasons, and our training in obedience a training of and for political order. And, given the security–commodity nexus, what we are being made obedient for is nothing other than the domination of our lives by capital. Security, then, demands that we bow down to security. It demands that we feel secure in our insecurity as bourgeois subjects but also insecure in our security as bourgeois subjects. It demands that we commit ourselves not to making history but, rather, to the eternal recurrence of the same: to securing capital and the state rather than anything against it or opposed to them. Like capital, security wants us to believe that it is our fate. Opening his book Politics and Fate, Andrew Gamble asks: ‘If politics were at an end, if this was our fate, what would this mean for us?’ (2000, p. 1). One answer: it would mean nothing less than being stuck in an endless security experience. ‘How was your security experience today?’, the questionnaire at Heathrow airport demands, after making us undergo a series of security rituals. An endless security experience, then, but one in which we are constantly asked to assess, measure and confirm our happiness in being able to participate in the rituals and thus in the process to confirm the extent to which security dominates our lives. A second answer to Gamble’s question: it would mean being subjected to one security innovation after another, including those innovations sold to us as being somehow ‘socially responsible’.**”**

Neocleous, Mark. “The bleak rituals of progress; or, if somebody offers you a socially responsible innovation in security, just say no,” in J. Peter Burgess, *Socially Responsible Innovation in Security,* pp. 133-6, 2018.

The impact of “extinction first” thinking exists in the real world: every war is based on the threat of mutual destruction, and when combatants use rape, torture, and genocide as tools of war they justify their acts with explicit references to preventing the destruction of the state or world.

Treat this as a pre-fiat voter:

A) They make the debate space unsafe. Extinction first says that racism, sexism, transphobia, slavery, and genocide are all, at best, secondary considerations. Either implicitly or explicitly extinction framing tells me that my body, my agency don’t matter and can be subordinated based on any fractional probability of extinction. Advocacies that conditionally justify genocidal ideation have to be rejected forcibly regardless of the flow.

B) They didn’t have to argue “extinction first.” They could have argued that threats of extinction are significant concerns to be weighed based on probability against other kinds of impacts. “Extinction first” and its implication that no other ethical concern matters was a conscious choice they made. They need to lose the debate because they chose to defend genocidal thinking in order to make impact calc easier.

LARP/Counter Plan Neg Analytical

LD differentiates itself from policy due to alternative strategies, such as non plan/counter plan cases. To require debaters to read a certain case breaks down walls between LD and policy, and presents no reason why the 2 are separate competitions. There was no restriction on my opponent to read a counter plan, and as they failed to respond to the case I presented, they should be stricken from the ballot.

Self Ownership Neg

Libertarianism places limits on self ownership of individuals, turns case. **Christmas:**

**The concentration of the ownership of capital that these barriers to entry maintain can plausibly be described as an essential feature of actually existing capitalism, even to this day. As Charles Johnson notes, however, there are now even more ways in which the state erect barriers to entry today (2011a; 2011b). The expanding scope of regulation and occupational licensure mean it is even harder to enter industries on an entrepreneurial basis. It has even meant that people are unable to make the surplus capacity of their own property productive. In order to use one’s own property in a “commercial” way one has to conform to all sorts of standards which are unattainable for nearly all except for market incumbents with political access. Regulation, especially when lobbied for by the regulated industry, can thus produce strong cartels through mandatory standardisation that keeps out competitors that might force the cartel to lower their prices (cf. Rothbard, 2009, 636-754; 1089-1143). The restriction of the movement of persons across national borders, the monopolisation of security (policing, military, etc.), communications, and infrastructure have also had severe effects (Johnson, 2011a).**

Christmas, William I. “SELF-OWNERSHIP AND ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION: AN ESSAY ON THE HISTORICAL ENTITLEMENT THEORY OF JUSTICE.” *Research.Manchester.Ac.Uk*, School of Social Sciences, 2017, www.research.manchester.ac.uk/portal/files/184633986/FULL.

In order to function, capitalism must place barriers on commercial enterprise, creating discrimination and limiting self ownership. Negating the resolution auto denies self ownership, thus my opponent concedes the debate.

Response(s) to Util

My opponent weighs impacts based on the amount of pleasure generated in comparison to the amount of pain created. This is a terrible system for the following reasons:

A)Util is a horrible criterion which justifies structural violence through generation of ‘in’ and ‘out’ groups. As stated in my Winter card. This phenomenon generates systemic moral exclusion and justifies things like racism, sexism and transphobia.

B)Util devalues human life by turning us into numbers. Ethical natures and achievements mean nothing under util. Actions intending, as well as attempted don’t matter under util if the result is considered a net negative.

C)It justifies slavery. Under util, if enslaving people can justify net positive econ impacts, it is considered morally ok.