### Case

#### The space race is no longer defined by nation states. Private enterprises are stepping in and redefining NewSpace. In contrast to the Cold War, NewSpace is characterized by scientific innovation freed from slow states. This marks a new era of human progress masked by the ideological overtaking of capitalism in space.

**Shammas & Holen 19** [Victor L. Shammas & Tomas B. Holen, (2019) “One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space”] //DD

“**On** 6 **Feb**ruary **2018**, the California-based Space Exploration Technologies Corp., also known as SpaceX, launched its first Falcon Heavy rocket, a powerful, partially reusable launch vehicle, into space from Cape Canaveral Launch Complex 39 in Florida. With its significant thrust and payload capacity, the Falcon Heavy had the ‘ability to lift into orbit nearly 64 metric tons...a mass greater than a 737 jetliner loaded with passengers, crew, luggage and fuel' (SpaceX, 2018). Multiple reusable parts, including first-stage boosters (and, in later versions, composite payload fairing)1 provided a lift capacity nearly twice that of the next-most powerful rocket in operation, the United Launch Alli- ance’s (ULA) Delta IV Heavy, and at nearly one-third the cost. With this first Falcon Heavy test flight, which produced wide- spread public enthusiasm and outpourings of support from both politicians and industry observers,2 SpaceX demonstrated that private corporations were busy redefining the domain of space exploration. SpaceX seemed to usher in an era differing markedly from that other period of astronautical excitement, the Cold War- era space race between the United States and the Soviet Union. Additionally, visions once restricted to the domain of science fiction now seemed increasingly attainable, freed from the (alleged) impediments of slow-moving nation-states: with the ascendancy of private corporations like SpaceX, satellite launches, space tourism, asteroid mining, and even the colonization of Mars seemed increasingly achievable (Cohen, 2017; Dickens and Ormrod, 2007a, 2007b; Klinger, 2017; Lewis, 1996). In this sense, SpaceX’s Falcon Heavy also carried a crucial ideological payload: the very idea of private enterprise and capitalist relations overtaking outer space. The Falcon Heavy conveyed this idea quite concretely. Onboard the rocket was an electric car, a Tesla Roadster (**said to be Elon** Musk**’s personal** vehicle), which functioned as the rocket’s ‘dummy load', playing David Bowie’s ‘Space Oddity' and ‘Life on Mars?' on repeaton the car’s stereo system. An enticing marketing stunt viewed by millions online through SpaceX’s YouTube live stream—with 2.3 million concurrent views, it was the second biggest live stream in YouTube history (Singleton, 2018)—the Falcon Heavy test flight embraced the logic of ‘cool capitalism' (Schleusener, 2014), with in-jokes referencing Douglas Adam’s Hitchhiker’s Guide to the Galaxy, while **heralding the arrival of** a commercialized space age, dubbed by industry insiders as the age of **‘NewSpace'.** But how are we to understand NewSpace? In some ways, **NewSpace signals the emergence of capitalism in space.** The production of carrier rockets, placement of satellites into orbit around Earth, and **the exploration, exploitation, or colonization of outer space** (including planets, asteroids, and other celestial objects), **will not be the work of humankind as such, a pure species-being** (Gattungswesen), **but of particular capitalist entrepreneurs who stand in for and represent humanity.** Crucially, they will do so in ways modulated by the exigencies of capital accumulation. These enterprising capitalists are forging a new political-economic regime in space, a post-Fordism in space aimed at profit maximization and the apparent minimization of government interference. A new breed of charismatic, starry-eyed entrepreneurs, including Musk’s **SpaceX**, Richard Branson’s **Virgin Galactic**, and Amazon billionaire Jeff Bezos’s **Blue Origin, to name but a selection**, aim at becoming ‘capitalists in space' (Parker, 2009) or space capitalists. Neil Armstrong’s famous statement will have to be reformulated: space will not be the site of ‘one giant leap for mankind', but rather **one giant leap for** 5 **capitalistkind.** With the ascendancy of NewSpace, **humanity’s future in space will not be ‘ours', benefiting humanity tout court, but will rather be the result of particular capitalists, or capita- listkind,**6 toiling to recuperate space and bring its vast domain into the fold of capital accumulation: NewSpace sees outer space as the domain of private enterprise, set to become the ‘first-trillion dollar industry', according to some estimates, and likely to produce the world’s first trillionaires (see, e.g., Honan, 2018)—**as opposed to Old Space**, a derisive moniker coined by enthusiastic proponents of capitalism-in-space, **widely seen to have been the sole preserve of the state** and a handful of giant aerospace cor- porations, including Boeing and Lockheed Martin, in Cold War- era Space Age.”

#### However, this libertarianism-in-space is undermined by capitalisms dependency on the state. NewSpace is not about dissolving the state – instead, it’s about reprogramming the state for accumulation and private interests. SpaceX becomes analogous to the British East India Company extending the economic and colonial Empire of the neoliberal state.

**Shammas & Holen 2** [Victor L. Shammas & Tomas B. Holen, (2019) “One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space”] // DD

“What role, then, for the state? The frontiersmen of NewSpace tend to think of themselves as libertarians, pioneers **beyond the** domain of **state** bureaucracy (see Nelson and Block, 2018). ‘The government should leave the design work and ownership of the product to the private sector', the author of a 2017 report, Capitalism in Space, advocates. ‘The **private companies** know best how to build their own products to **maximize performance while lowering cost'** (Zimmerman, 2017, p. 27). One ethnographer notes that ‘politically, right-libertarianism prevails' amongst NewSpace entrepreneurs (Valentine, 2016, p. 1047–1048). Just as Donald Rumsfeld dismissed the opponents to the Iraq War as ‘Old Europe', so too are state entities’ interests in space exploration shrugged off as symptoms of ‘Old Space'. Elon Musk, we are told in a recent biography, unlike the sluggish Big State actors of yore, ‘would apply some of the start-up techniques he’d learned in Silicon Valley to run SpaceX lean and fast...As a private company, SpaceX would also avoid the waste and cost overruns associated with government contractors' (Vance, 2015, p. 114). **This libertarianism-in-space** has found a willing chorus of academic supporters. The legal scholar Virgiliu Pop introduces the notion of the frontier paradigm (combining laissez-faire economics, market competition, and an individualist ethic) into the domain of space law, claiming that this paradigm has ‘proven its worth on our planet' and will ‘most likely...do so in the extraterrestrial realms' as well (Pop, 2009, p. vi). This frontier paradigm is not entirely new: a ‘Columbus mythology', centering on the ‘noble explorer', was continuously evoked in the United States during the Cold War space race (Dickens and Ormrod, 2016, pp. 79, 162–164). But the entrepreneurial libertarianism of capitalistkind **is undermined by the reliance of the entire NewSpace complex on** extensive support from **the state, ‘a public-private financing model underpinning long-shot start-ups'** that in the case of Musk’s three main companies (SpaceX, SolarCity Corp., and Tesla) has been underpinned by $4.9 billion dollars in government subsidies (Hirsch, 2015). In the nascent field of space tourism, Cohen (2017) argues that **what began as an almost entirely private venture quickly ground to a halt in the face of insurmountable technical and financial obstacles, only solved by piggybacking on large state-run projects**, such as selling trips to the International Space Station, against the objections of NASA scientists. The business model of **NewSpace depends on the taxpayer’s dollar while making pretensions to individual self-reliance.** The vast majority of present-day clients of private aerospace corporations are government clients, usually military in origin. Furthermore, **the bulk of rocket launches in the U**nited **S**tates **take place on government property**, usually operated by the US Air Force or NASA. **This inward tension between state dependency and capitalist autonomy is** itself **a product of neoliberalism’s contradictory demand for a** minimal, **“slim” state, while simultaneously** (and in fact) **relying on a state reengineered** and retooled **for** the purposes of **capital accumulation** (Wacquant, 2012). As Lazzarato writes, ‘To be able to be “laissez-faire”, it is necessary to intervene a great deal' (2017, p. 7). Space libertarianism is libertarian in name only: **behind every NewSpace venture looms a thick web of government spending programs, regulatory agencies, public infrastructure, and universities bolstered by research grants from the state.** SpaceX would not exist were it not for state-sponsored contracts of satellite launches. Similarly, in 2018, the US Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA)—the famed origin of the World Wide Web—announced that it would launch a ‘responsive launch competition', meaning essentially the reuse of launch vehicles, representing an attempt by the state to ‘harness growing commercial capabilities' and place them in the service of the state’s interest in ensuring ‘national security' (Foust, 2018b). This libertarianism has been steadily growing in the nexus between Silicon Valley, Stanford University, Wall Street, and the Washington political establishment, which tend to place a high value on Randian ‘objectivism' and participate in a long American intellectual heritage of individualistic ‘bootstrapping' and (alleg- edly) gritty self-reliance. But as Nelson and Block (2018, p. 189–197) recognize, one of **the central symbolic operations of capitalistkind resides in concealing its reliance on the state by mobilizing the charm of its entrepreneurial constituents and the spectacle of space.** There is a case to be made for the idea that **SpaceX** and its ilk **resemble semi-private corporations like the British East India Company.** The latter, **“incorporated by royal charter** from Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth I **in 1600 to trade in silk and spices**, and other profitable Indian commodities,” recruited soldiers and built a ‘commercial business [that] quickly became a business of conquest' (Tharoor, 2017). **SpaceX, too, is increasingly imbricated with a**n attempt on the part of a **particular state, the U**nited **S**tates, **to colonize and appropriate resources derived from** a particular area, that of **outer space**; it, too, depends on the infrastructure, contracts, and regulatory environment that thus far only a state seems able to provide. **Its private character, like that of the East India Company, is troubled by being deeply embedded in the state.** As one commentator has observed of SpaceX, ‘If there’s a consistent charge against **Elon Musk** and his high-flying **companies**...it’s that they’re **not really examples of independent, innovative market capitalism. Rather, they’re government contractors**, **dependent on taxpayer money to stay afloat'** (cit. Nelson and Block, 2018, p. 189). Perhaps this should not come as a surprise. As Bourdieu (2005, p. 12) observed, **‘The economic field is, more than any other, inhabited by the state, which contributes at every moment to its existence and persistence**, and also to the structure of the relations of force that characterize it'. The state lays out the preconditions for market exchanges. **Under neoliberalism, the state is the pre-eminent facilitator of markets. The neoliberal state is not so much a** Minimalstaat, night watchman state, or **slim state as it is the prima causa of market society** (see, e.g., Wacquant, 2012). Simi- larly, in the political theory of Deleuze and Guattari, **any economic development presupposes the political differentiation caused by the state** (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004a, p. 237–238). **Even in the global environment of contemporary capitalism, the market cannot operate without the state becoming integrated with capitalism itself, as ‘it is the modern state that gives capit- alism its models of realization'** (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004b, p. 480). **For capitalism to survive in outer space, the state must** create a regulatory environment, subsidize infrastructure, and hand down contracts – in short, **assemble outer space as a domain made accessible in legal, technical, and economic ways.**”

#### It's not a question of private enterprises versus the state. While capitalism relies on the state, the state also folds itself to the global circuits of capitalism. This creates a new hybridized state-market form and marks the era of the Capitalocene in space. Outer space is no longer about what we can do for humanity, but about how we can sustain capitalism in space.

**Shammas & Holen 3** [Victor L. Shammas & Tomas B. Holen, (2019) “One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space”] // DD

“**As Earth’s empty spaces are filled**, as our planet comes to be shorn of blank places, **capitalistkind emerges to rescue capitalism from its terrestrial limitations**, launching space rockets, placing satellites into orbit, appropriating extraterrestrial resources, and, perhaps one day, building colonies on distant planets like Mars. **But why limit ourselves to Mars?** As of mid-2017, NASA’s Kepler observatory had discovered more than 5000 exoplanets—planets that seem like promising alternatives to Earth, located at an appropriate distance from their respective suns in the famed ‘Goldilocks zone'. These ‘planetary candidates', as they are known —that is, candidates for the replacement of Earth, capable of supporting human life with only minimal technological aug- mentation or cybernetic re-engineering—are above all viable candidates for selection by specific capitalists seeking to discover new profitable ventures beyond the limits of an Earth-bound capitalism. **Space reveals the impotence of the neoliberal**, post- Fordist **state, its incapacity and unwillingness to embark on gigantic infrastructural projects, to project itself outwards, and to fire the imagination of (actual) humankind.** Capitalistkind steps in to fill the vacuum left behind by a state that lacks what Mann (2012, p. 170) calls ‘infrastructural power'. The old question, **the question of Old Space, was** quite simply: **is this planet a viable site for humankind, a suitable homeland for the reproduction of human life away from Earth? But** the new question, **the question for NewSpace, will be: can this celestial body support capitalistkind?** Will it support the interests of capitalist entrepreneurs, answering to the capitalist desire for continued accumulation? While some elements of the astrosociological community, such as the Astrosociology Research Institute (ARI),14 insist on eluci- dating the “human dimension” in outer space, Dickens and Ormrod recognize that this **humanization-through-capitalism really involves the ‘commodification of the universe'** (2007b, p. 2). While Dickens and Ormrod develop similar arguments to those sketched here—from their concept of an ‘outer spatial fix' to their argument about outer space becoming woven into circuits of capital accumulation—they were writing at a time when their remarks necessarily remained speculative: the commercialization of space was still in its infancy. In an inversion of Hegel’s owl of Minerva, reality has since largely confirmed their ideas and caught up with theory. Above all, when considering the various ventures ongoing in space today, it is not so much the uni- versalizing human dimension as the specifically capitalist dimension that is striking. With the advent of NewSpace, outer space is becoming not the domain of a common humanity but of private capital. The arguments laid out above mirror **an ongoing turn** in critical scholarship away **from** the notion of **the Anthropocene towards** a more rigorously political-economic concept of **Capitalocene, premised on the ‘claim that capitalism is the pivot of today’s biospheric crisis'** (Moore, 2016, p. xi). Just as the expo- nents of the concept of Capitalocene emphasize that **it is capitalism, and not humanity as such, that is the driving force behind environmental transformation**, so too does the notion of **capita- listkind emphasize that it is not humankind** tout court **but rather a set of specific capitalist entrepreneurs who are acting as the central transformative agents** **in outer space**, with the ‘ever-increasing infiltration of capital' **into what was formerly the domain of the state** (Dickens and Ormrod, 2007a, p. 6). We can also think about these issues in terms of what Philippopoulos- Mihalopoulos (2015) terms ‘spatial justice'. This concept captures the fact that struggles over justice are often struggles to occupy space, as the term is more conventionally understood, as with urban battles over the ‘right to the city' (Harvey, 2008), to provide just one example. But the same also holds true for outer space: **there is an ongoing struggle over the right to take up space in outer space.** So far, **the capitalist side appears to be winning.** As the proto-communism of the Cold War-era Outer Space Treaty is abandoned—in tandem with the increased technological feasi- bility of exploiting resources and accumulating profits in outer space—spatial justice in outer space increasingly comes to mean the ‘justice' of capital, capitalistkind taking the place of human- kind. It is comparatively easy to declare that outer space is a commons, as the Outer Space Treaty did in the late 1960s, when that domain is, for all practical purposes, inaccessible to capital; with the heightened accessibility of outer space, however, it is unsurprising that central political agents, such as President Trump’s administration, should seek to dismantle this regulatory framework and ensure the smooth functioning of capital accumulation beyond the terrains of Earth. What kind of capitalism is being projected into space? The complexity of state-market relations is sufficient to force us to hedge against a simplified reading of space commercialization: **it is not a matter of states against markets, as if the two were mutually exclusive. Instead**, as Bratton (2015) suggests, **we are witnessing the emergence of a ‘stack', a complex intertwining of commercial, geopolitical, and technological concerns, which challenges previous notions of state sovereignty.** This can be seen as **a hybridized state-market form, with technology playing a central role in reciprocal processes of political and economic transformation.** On the one hand, outer space was in some sense always already the domain of marketization, albeit to a limited extent, even during the Cold War, from the first commercial satellite launch in the early 1960s to President Ronald Reagan’s implementation of the Commercial Space Launch Act of 1984, which aimed to encourage private enterprise to take an interest in an emerging launch market. As Hermann Bondi, the head of the European Space Organization, wrote in the early 1970s, ‘It is clear...that there must be three partners in space, universities and research institutions on the one hand, the government on the second and industry on the third' (Bondi, 1971, p. 9).”

#### There is no endpoint to capitalism – capitalism requires a continuous expansion and appropriation to save itself from its own limitation. In this sense, outer space presents the ultimate fantasy of surplus accumulation and results in spatial fixation.

**Shammas & Holen 5** [Victor L. Shammas & Tomas B. Holen, (2019) “One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space”] // DD

“No longer terra nullius, **space is now the new terra firma of capitalistkind**: its naturalized terroir, its next necessary terrain. **The logic of capitalism dictates that capital should seek to expand outwards into the vastness of space**, a point recognized by a recent ethnography of NewSpace actors (Valentine, 2016, p. 1050). The operations of **capitalistkind serve to resolve a series of (potential) crises of capitalism, revolving around the slow, steady decline of spatial fixes** (see e.g., Harvey, 1985, p. 51–66) as they come crashing up against the quickly vanishing blank spaces remaining on earthly maps and declining (terrestrial) opportunities for profitable investment of surplus capital (Dickens and Ormrod, 2007a, p. 49–78). **A ‘spatial fix' involves the geographic modulation of capital accumulation**, consisting in the **outward expansion of capital onto new geographic terrains, or into new spaces**, with the aim of **filling a gap in the home terrains of capital.** Jessop (2006, p. 149) notes that spatial fixes may involve a number of strategies, including the creation of new markets within the capitalist world, engaging in trade with non-capitalist economies, and exporting surplus capital to undeveloped or underdeveloped regions. The first two address the problem of insufficient demand and the latter option creates a productive (or valorizing) outlet for excess capital. **Capitalism must regularly discover, develop, and appropriate such new spaces because of its inherent tendency to generate surplus capital**, i.e., capital bereft of profitable purpose. In Harvey’s (2006, p. xviii) terms, **a spatial fix revolves around ‘geographical expansions** and restructuring...**as a temporary solution to crises understood**...in terms of the overaccumulation of capital'. **It is a temporary solution because these newly appropriated spaces will in turn become exhausted of profitable potential and are likely to produce their own stocks of surplus capital;** while ‘capital surpluses that otherwise stood to be deva- lued, could be absorbed through geographical expansions and spatio-temporal displacements' (Harvey, 2006, p. xviii), **this outwards drive of capitalism is inherently limitless: there is no end point or final destination for capitalism.**

#### The impact is galactic extinction – as capitalism jumps from Earth throughout space, it’ll leave behind the traces of dead exoplanets in search for the next space to absorb and accumulate.

Haskins 17 [Caroline Haskins June 7, 2017 Capitalism Will Ruin Other Planets After It Ruins Earth] //ACCS JM + DD

“**Some left-wing thinkers think that the galaxy will eventually be in danger of being destroyed by capitalism.** At last week's [Left Forum Conference](https://www.leftforum.org/) in Manhattan, **a NASA researcher suggested that the drive to explore exoplanets and mine asteroids has been bred primarily out of a need to feed the beast of capitalism. "[Exoplanet exploration] has been masked as a scientific interest, a human interest**, and human curiosity **to explore different worlds,"** Anastasia Romanou, a climate research scientist for Columbia University and NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies, said. **"Late era capitalism is feeling the pressure from resource scarcity, and therefore, it has to find its own way out.** It cannot think outside its own box of solutions, and **it will have to find another place, and another place, and another place to exploit."** Romanou fears that **exoplanets will suffer the same fate as the global south, which was first explored, then mined for minerals and drilled for oil. "Late capitalism" describes** the theoretical dying days of a capitalist economy. These final days [include](https://www.amazon.com/Capitalism-Verso-Classics-Ernest-Mandel/dp/185984202X) resource **shortages and weakened manufacturing practices—essentially, the bourgeoisie have been stretched too thin.** But the term has also been repurposed as a [meme](https://www.reddit.com/r/LateStageCapitalism/) that mocks the absurdity of modern capitalism.Kai Kaschinski, a representative of the Fair Oceans organization, said that **exoplanets and asteroids will one day face the same fate as the deep seas, which are in the process of being privatized and mined by resource extraction companies.”**

#### The desire to establish a multiplanatery species or to venture into outer space to prevent our extinction is not an act of humanism. Instead, it’s a symptom of capitalism ensuring its survival. It’s not humanity but capital that must outlive extinction as we jump throughout space.

**Shammas & Holen 6** [Victor L. Shammas & Tomas B. Holen, (2019) “One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space”] //DD

“Fredric Jameson’s (2003, p. 76) oft-quoted observation that it is easier to imagine the end of humankind than the end of capitalism, is realized in the ideals and operations of capitalistkind. Elon Musk has observed that the goal of SpaceX is to establish humankind as a ‘multiplanetary species with a self-sustaining civilization on another planet' whose purpose isto counteract the possibility of a ‘worst-case scenario happening and **extinguishing human consciousness'** (Vance, 2015, p. 5). But couldn’t we view this idealistic assertion on behalf of humanity in another way? It is not human consciousness, over and against what the writer Kim Stanley Robinson (2017, p. 2) calls ‘mineral unconsciousness' (i.e., the mute, geological reality of the natural universe), so much as a specifically capitalist consciousness that is at stake. While the actions of capitalistkind may primarily be aimed at ensuring the future survival of the human species, an additional result is to ensure that the very idea of capitalism itself will outlive a (dis- tantly) possible extinction event. Capitalism is a self-replicating system, pushing to expand ever outwards, using a territorializing strategy of survival. As David Harvey notes, ‘a steady rate of growth is essential for the health of a capitalist economic system, since **it is only through growth that profits can be assured and** the **accumulation** of capital be **sustained'** (1990, p. 180). In this respect, **outer space is ideal: it is boundless and infinite. As Earth comes to be blanketed by capital, it is only to be expected that capital should set its sights on the stars** above. The actions of capitalistkind serve to bolster the capitalist mode of production and accumulation: it is not only life but capital itself that must outlive Earth—even into the darkness of space.”

#### Thus, I defend the resolution Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust. To clarify, defend the resolution as a general principle – means no implementation.

#### The Outer Space Treaty of 1967 and the sea serve as models for communism in space that precludes the activities of capitalism.

**Shammas & Holen 7** [Victor L. Shammas & Tomas B. Holen, (2019) “One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space”] // DD

“**The Outer Space Treaty of** 19**67 established space as terra nullius.** One of the treaty’s premises is that **no celestial body can be claimed as the property of any particular state, so that ‘outer space...is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means'. While this does not prevent nations from extracting resources** from celestial bodies, **there is a clear requirement that these activities benefit all of Earth’s inhabitants** (Tronchetti, 2013, p. 14; Lyall and Larsen, 2009), **paving the way for kind of communism in space which precludes the proclivities of capitalistkind.** As noted, **however, the Outer Space Treaty’s assertion of space as a commons has come under pressure** in recent years, at first in the form of so many quasi-comical ventures, bordering on fraudulent shams, with a flourishing online trade in ‘lunar property'— ‘Everybody Is Saying It...Nothing Could Be Greater Than To Own Your Own Crater!'8—including the production of seemingly authentic land deeds that remain practically unen- forceable and contravened by treaty obligations anyway. More recently, its status as commons has been denied by President Trump and leading US Republicans. **Communism in space was a possibility only so long as space was materially inaccessible to capitalistkind: as space becomes a probable site of profitable ventures, the Outer Space Treaty’s proto-communism must falter and fade away.** Certain **parallels exist between** the exploration and colonization of **outer space and** similar maritime ventures back on Earth. To take but one limited aspect of the overlapping legal issues raised by these two areas, that of resource exploitation: the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of **the Sea** (UNCLOS) established that the ‘seabed and ocean floor' beyond a nation’s territorial waters (or ‘the Area') are the ‘common heritage of mankind, the exploration and exploitation of which shall be carried out for the benefit of mankind as a whole'. Like outer space, Earth’s seabed is part of the commons. Similarly, the International Seabed Authority, which was established to oversee the 1982 convention, is to ‘provide for the equitable sharing of financial and other economic benefits derived from activities in the Area' (UN, 1982, p. 71). In principle, then, any profits arising from, e.g., the mining of polymetallic nodules, are to be shared with all of humankind, including ‘developing States, particularly the least developed and the land-locked among them' (UN, 1982, p. 56). Whether this is likely is to happen is, according to a recent review, likely to be hampered by two factors. First, the commercial exploitation of seabed metals, which is first and foremost a technical issue, ‘seems as far away as ever' (Wood, 2008). Second, and perhaps more importantly, the political climate surrounding the creation and ratification (with the exception of the United States) of the 1982 convention has now appreciably shifted: ‘Much of the ideological passion that characterized the debates in the First Committee of the Third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea, and to some degree also in the Preparatory Commission, have now subsided' (Wood, 2008). As with **outer space, the ocean floor becomes a legal site of contestation the moment states and corporations are technically capable of exploiting it.**”

#### The 1AC is a starting point for a communist future and functions as a spaceship to navigate the chaos of capitalism – our understanding of outer space as a collective commons opens up a radical imaginary beyond this world that allows us to create spaces of possibility within the present through which alternative realities become possible.

**Shukaitis 09** [Stevphen Shukaitis (2009) Space is the (non)place: Martians, Marxists, and the outer space of the radical imagination Wiley-Blackwell Publishing] // DD

“Joe Hill, the famous labour activist and songwriter, in a letter he wrote the day before his execution, said that the following day he expected to take a trip to Mars during which, upon his arrival, he would begin to organize Martian canal workers into the Industrial Workers of World. Why did he do this? After all, it might seem a bit odd that Hill, famous in his songwriting and reworking for consistently mocking the promises and deceits of religious reformers offering ‘pie in the sky’ (and that’s a lie) to oppressed and exploited migrant workers more concerned about getting some bread in the belly (and maybe some roses, ie dignity, too). Hill continues to say that with the canal worker he’ll sing Wobbly songs ‘so loud the learned star gazers on Earth will for once and all get positive proof that the planet Mars is really inhabited’ (Smith, 1984: 164). So why the reference to some form of other worldly-ness, one in which, rather than promising salvation or escape from the trials and tribulations of this world, Hill rather imagines himself as extending and continu- ing the very same social antagonism that brought him to the day before his execution in the first place? Aside from the personal characteristics of Hill’s immense wit and humor (Rosemont, 2002), this chapter will argue that **there is something** more than that, something **about the particular role outer space and extraterrestrial voyage play within** the **radical imagination.** It will explore the idea of voyages out of the world **as an imaginal machine for thinking and organizing to get out of this world that we want to leave behind.** In other words, how **themes and imagery of space take part in the construction and animation of socially and historically embedded forms of collective imagination and creativity**; how **they operate as nodal points in ever-fluctuating networks of collective intelligence animated through the shaping of social reality. For if utopia has ‘no place’ in this world, no spatiality on our maps, the dream to leave this earth can hold quite a seductive sway for those who desire** to found a new earth upon **escape** from this one. Within the imaginal space created through the imagery of space travel **one can find an outer space of social movement**