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

First, an observation: the affirmative debater must prove that the appropriation of outer space by private entities is actively unjust. Simply proving that appropriation of outer space is not a good idea is not sufficient to vote aff since the word “unjust” in the resolution requires proving an active moral statement in regards to private entities appropriating outer space. Thus, my proving that appropriation of space by private entities is either actively good or even permissible is enough to vote negative, since the affirmative must prove the resolution as an active moral statement.

The ability to bring conditions upon oneself is a prerequisite to moral judgment. **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. Because outer space is defined as the space between celestial bodies, the resolution is not a question of the appropriation of entities such as stars, planets, or asteroids; it is a question of the appropriation of the relatively empty space between those entities.

#### **1]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.**Voting aff denies the virtue private entities have the right to appropriate space. Doing so results in denial of self ownership and as an extension, freedom.

UNDERVIEW:

You cannot literally appropriate “space” because space isn’t anything; space is defined as the absence of anything. Space is the nearly entirely empty area that exists between celestial objects such as planets and stars. **B.A. Powell** explains:

**“Space itself isn't made out of anything** as far as we know, however, **the geometry of spacetime is manifested as gravity. There is no energy \*of\* space** -- **if you remove all sources of energy density, then space becomes truly empty and has no dynamics** (you recover special relativity). **Dark energy would be energy that you put \*in\* space.”**

Powell, B.A. [PhD, Physics]. “Zero point energy, dark energy, and space.” *Physics Forums,* April 15, 2010.

This means the resolution can only be defended using metaphorical language. Metaphoric communication is a form of structural oppression that targets persons with various cognitive and language disabilities.

USE OF METAPHOR IS ABLEIST — EXCLUDES PEOPLE WITH LANGUAGE PROCESSING DISABILITIES — EXPLICIT LANGUAGE IS KEY. **Balsiger:**

**“Children with learning disabilities based** up**on** **language processing** deficits often **struggle** **with** the higher-level language forms encountered in literature or advanced academic texts. This is particularly true if there is a history of early speech-language delays. These texts contain more complex syntax, such as passive sentence structure (“The opinions of the populace were tabulated by the pollsters”), prepositional phrases (“the population in the rural areas of the state”), and relative clauses (“the machine that was used to filter the oil-based discharge had a malfunction in its internal circuitry”). **Figurative language** contained in literature (e.g. **[such as] metaphors, [and] similes,** and slang) can also be challenging for these students. **Some** children with language learning disabilities have no problems with complex syntax or figurative language, but instead **have difficulty integrating** language and **meaning across sentences**, and across paragraphs. **They may** have excellent recall of explicit details, but **fail to extract** main **ideas**, larger themes, **and inferences that are not explicitly stated.”**

Balsiger, Linda. “Learning disabilities - an inside look.” *Bend Language & Learning.* No date. http://www.bendlanguageandlearning.com/Learning%20Disabilities%20-%20An%20Inside%20Look.pdf

**----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

**UNDER VIEW AGAINST UTIL EXTINCTION:**

**Cross-Ex:**

You say extinction comes “first.” That means that we evaluate risks of extinction before *any* other concern, right?

Where in your case do you present a calculus that allows us to calculate and weigh probabilities of extinction?

Under your framing, could the state assassinate an innocent person if circumstances arose such that doing so was necessary to avoid 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 the answer is 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.

# AT Debris cards

## **No risk: Debris strikes occur regularly and NASA has a robust tracking system. Maneuvering procedures limit risk of miscalc.**

**Cain**, Fraser. “How Do Astronauts Avoid Debris?.” Universe Today. December 23, 2015. Web. December 13, 2021. <http://www.universetoday.com/121067/how-do-astronautsavoid-debris/>.

For starters, **NASA and the US Department of Defense are constantly tracking** as much of the **orbital debris** that they can. **They know the position of every piece of debris larger than a softball**. Which I think, as far as careers go, would be grossly underestimated for its coolness and complexity at a cocktail party. “What do you do for a living?” “Me, oh, I’m part of the program which tracks orbital debris to keep astronauts safe.” “So…you track our space garbage?” “Uh, actually, never mind, I’m an accountant.” Furthermore, **they’re tracking everything in low Earth orbit** – where the astronauts fly – **down to a size of 5 cm**. That’s 21,000 discrete objects. **NASA then compares the movements of all these objects and compares it to the position of the Space Station. If there’s any risk of a collision, NASA takes preventative measures and moves the Space Station to avoid the debris**. The ISS has thrusters of its own, but it can also use the assistance of spacecraft which are docked to it at the time, such as a Russian Soyuz capsule. **NASA is ready to make these maneuvers at a moment’s notice if necessary, but often they’ll have a few days notice, and give the astronauts time to prepare**. Plus, who doesn’t love a close call

THIS ONE IS GOOD IF THEY USE ANY NUKE WAR ARGS AS WELL

## **No risk, collisions happen regularly and don't result in conflict.**

**Gray**, Melissa. “Chinese Space Debris Hits Russian Satellite, Scientists Say.” CNN. March 09, 2013. Web. December 13, 2021. <http://www.cnn.com/2013/03/09/tech/satellite-hit/>.

**The problem of collisions involving space debris is not** a **new** one. “**Collisions happen all the time**, everywhere. Big collisions -- now those are the rare ones,” said space debris expert William Schonberg, chairman of the Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering Department at the Missouri University of Science and Technology. The last major space debris collision was in 2009 between Iridium 33, an operational U.S. communications satellite, and Cosmos 2251, a decommissioned Russian satellite, Kelso said. Scientists know of only a handful of such collisions, but that's only because they happened with objects that were being monitored. Kelso and Schonberg say **it's likely there are other “junk to junk” collisions involving unmonitored objects that no one knows about**. In the case of the Russian satellite in January, “it would have been very difficult to tell there had been a collision if it hadn't been for the fact that somebody was operating the satellite and noticed a collision,” said Kelso. **Experts and leading government agencies have been working on the space junk problem for decades**, but it's a tricky one to solve, Schonberg told CNN. Trying to catch or deflect debris runs the risk of making the problem worse, he said. The debris could shatter into more pieces or change orbit and be on a collision course with something else. Some soft-impact lasers can nudge objects into a calculated orbit toward Earth so they will be pulled down and burn up in the atmosphere, Schonberg said. But scientists must make sure that happens over an ocean to minimize danger to people. “Our technology has not caught up with our desire to clean up our mess” in space, Schonberg said. “If nothing else,” said Kelso, this collision “was a bit of a reminder that it will likely happen again, and maybe we should get back to work trying to figure out what to do about it.”

# AT Russia analytical

Uniqueness outweighs the link- if we are quote “on the brink” as your [Weir 21] card says, we would not have much power in changing that, the only way we would be able to is to launch the nukes, preventing any attacks by Russia, but that is obviously counterintuitive.

AT Tragedy of the Commons(Lockean Proviso-MUST MODIFY)

The aff advantages come from the idea that they prohibit private companies from launching satellites and therefore reduce or avoid space debris

They are 100% losing the round on this argument:

A) Prohibiting ownership is not the same as regulating use

The aff prohibits ownership, but does not regulate use. Unregulated common resources can be used by anyone; ie in the status quo, space is an unregulated commons where private ownership is already prohibited by the Outer Space Treaty and anyone can launch a satellite resulting in massive overcrowding. That means that the aff is just defending the s-quo and they do nothing to reduce the “use” of space and their link to their advantages doesn’t exist.

DO NOT let them say that their position “regulates use” because 1) Their case doesn’t talk about that; they can’t shift their advocacy; and 2) regulating use is a non-topical action so no topical aff can garner offense from regulating use

B) The neg world uniquely solves debris, so I get all the benefits of the aff

1) TURNS CASE: Leaving space as a commons leads to the “tragedy of the commons” where everyone has an incentive to put as many satellites into space as possible because they get the full benefit of each satellite and bear only a portion of the harm of over-use, and no one has an incentive to regulate consumption of space, leading to maximal destruction

2) TURNS CASE: Privatizing space solves this because if private entities own orbital paths or regions of space, they can exclude others from using them; this reduces the number of satellites and eliminates collisions;

and 3) TURNS CASE: Privatization uniquely removes existing debris, because per the tragedy of the commons, private entities have incentives to make sure their property is “clean” of debris while no one has an incentive to “clean” the commons because they bear the full cost of cleaning but get only a portion of the benefit