# Stock Aff

### Part 1: Framework

#### [Pettypiece] “RACISM GOOD” IS THE NEW EDUCATIONAL AGENDA – while anti-Black police shootings happen multiple times a month, Trump threatened to cancel anti-racism education by Executive Order.

Pettypiece: Pettypiece, Shannon. [Senior White House Correspondent, NBC News] “Trump calls for ‘patriotic education,’ says anti-racism teachings are ‘child abuse.’” NBC News, September 17, 2020. CH

WASHINGTON — President Donald Trump accused schools of teaching students “hateful lies about this country” and said he would be taking steps to “restore patriotic education” as he continued his opposition to efforts to raise awareness about racial inequalities. Speaking at what the White House described as a “conference on American history,” Trump said that he plans to sign an executive order soon to create a “national commission to support patriotic education” called the 1776 Commission and that he is directing funding to create a patriotic curriculum for schools. “Our youth will be taught to love America with all of their heart and all of their souls,” Trump said. The White House declined to say when Trump would sign the executive order. Trump said the framing of history around race was “toxic propaganda” and “a form of child abuse in the truest sense of those words” — specifically calling out critical race theory, a concept that was started around the idea that the law and legal institutions are inherently racist. He accused Democrats of pushing education that makes students “ashamed” of America's history. He also took aim at the 1619 Project, a New York Times-backed initiative that focused on the “consequences of slavery and the contributions of black Americans at the very center of the story we tell ourselves about who we are as a country.” The project, which won the Pulitzer Prize for commentary, was released last year to coincide with the anniversary of slaves' being brought to the Virginia Colony 400 years ago. Trump has been increasingly opposing anti-racism education efforts while denying that the country has a problem with racial inequality. When asked about the country's history of racial discrimination at a town hall gathering this week, Trump said “I hope there's not a race problem” before going on to talk about his support in the polls from Black voters. The Office of Management and Budget issued a directive this month prohibiting departments from using federal funds to administer diversity training that incorporates teachings about critical race theory and white privilege. Trump also threatened to cut off funding for schools that teach the 1619 Project.

#### [ROJ] Since discussions about Kant and util can happen anywhere, but those about race are under fire, the Role of the Judge is to Promote Anti-Racist Education in the Debate Space, meaning that they must endorse discussions about racism.

#### [Torres] And anti-racist education is uniquely key now – it’s the only way to address the problem.

Torres: Torres, Christina. [8th grade English teacher in Honolulu, Hawaii] “All Students Need Anti-Racism Education.” Tolerance.org, July 30, 2020. CH

As more and more teachers, administrators, schools and organizations are questioning their practices and looking at the racist history of their institutions, many are finally asking, “How we can listen to and support Black students, teachers and communities who have been systemically silenced for too long?” This question is essential, and examining anti-Blackness in our practice is something we all must be looking at. Looking at anti-Blackness or inequities brought about by systems rooted in white supremacy and racism is something all students should be doing. While more institutions, including primarily or historically white ones, are committing to this work, white teachers with primarily white students can feel hesitant to discuss these issues since they may not feel it affects them. This idea is a fundamental misunderstanding of what anti-racist work actually is. Anti-racist work means acknowledging that racist beliefs and structures are pervasive in all aspects of our lives—from education to housing to climate change—and then actively doing work to tear down those beliefs and structures. Those beliefs and structures don’t just exist in primarily white/and or privileged institutions—they thrive there. Schools that house mostly students and teachers who have benefited from white privilege can lack the perspective to push back on institutional malpractice or racist mindsets that may be present. In addition, it is difficult to convince those with power and privilege to give those privileges up without clear education and work to understand why doing so is a necessity for true justice in our society. Doing the work in spaces of privilege may look different, but educators cannot pretend that anti-racist work doesn’t exist simply because their student body isn’t directly harmed by racism. There are clear aims that primarily white and otherwise privileged institutions must work toward in the fight against racism. Teachers must re-evaluate their curriculum. When teaching standards and core curricula have been developed for your students, it’s easy to simply follow along. However, it’s important to remember that our education system has been founded on historically racist practices, including silencing those from disenfranchised communities. It’s not just BIPOC who need to see themselves in the literature or history they study. White students need to hear those perspectives as well, just as straight and cisgender students need to read LGBTQ+ stories. This is because students need not just mirrors but also windows into other cultures, as Dr. Rudine Sims Bishop notes in her essay “Mirrors, Windows and Sliding Glass Doors.” Students from communities with white privilege need to hear voices from other perspectives in order to grow their own thinking. Those perspectives need to be diverse and empowering as well—only showing Black suffering or slavery does not begin to break down problematic beliefs about Black people. Instead, students coming from positions of power need to see and understand the power and agency of those who have been historically disenfranchised, particularly since society frequently tells them otherwise. This will allow white students and teachers to have a more accurate and nuanced understanding of our history, while also ensuring they can center BIPOC voices and be allies and accomplices instead of “saviors.” Students need to understand privilege and rethink power. Students from privileged communities can struggle to understand privilege since they may feel that they have had to work hard or struggle at times in their lives. Teachers must help students understand how privilege works at a systemic level that may have given students an edge that, while it may be one they didn’t ask for, is still very real. The work does not stop there, though. It can be easy in teaching privilege to fall into the trap of “white guilt” or “privilege guilt” (or even “survivor guilt” for BIPOC who have moved up socioeconomically and have internalized the belief that their communities were something to be “survived”). While guilt can be an important emotion to notice and process, educators should help students move through it to a place of action. Beyond “feeling bad” about generations of oppression, how can they use this knowledge to advocate for change and begin breaking down their own racist beliefs? How can they also reframe their understandings of privilege so that they stop prioritizing hegemonic ideas of success and worth? Some of that will mean teaching students to analyze and reframe how they see values and stories from other cultures. Most of us were taught to praise white-dominant cultural ideas: financial success, rugged individualism, paternalism. Because of this, cultures with different priorities may not be seen as “successful” or “valuable” in our eyes and in the eyes of our students. We need to teach students with privilege not to be “saviors” for historically disenfranchised communities, but rather to listen to, value and stand in kinship with them so we can work together toward justice. Schools must interrogate their practices and how they gained institutional privilege to begin with.

#### [ROB] Thus, the Role of the Ballot is to Endorse the Best Anti-Racist Resistance Strategy. That means we weigh the round based on which debater’s advocacy better combats racism – NOT as a footnote to some big stick extinction scenario that directs the discussion somewhere else. Filter those out – we call for impacts about racism itself.

### NB 1: Colonization

#### [Haskins 1] The dream of space colonization is the same as the ideologies of racist cowboys in the 1400s.

**Haskins 1**: Haskins, Caroline. [Current Editorial Intern for the Future section at The Outline. Former Editorial Intern for Motherboard, Vice's science/tech site.] “THE RACIST LANGUAGE OF SPACE EXPLORATION”, *The Outline*, August 14, 2018. EM

“I don’t know who it will be, and I don’t know what they will discover, or what they will accomplish,” Cruz said. “But I think it is every bit as vast and promising a frontier as the New World was some centuries ago.” **“You could argue that the effort to colonize space is likely to involve new forms of inequality**: shifts in tax revenues and administrative priorities devoted to that,” said Michael Ralph, a professor of anthropology at NYU. “As opposed to [supporting] other social institutions that benefit people like health care, education, infrastructure.” Earning money in space is an exciting prospect for a far-right, pro-business, anti-regulation politician like Cruz, and he explicitly associated it with European countries having colonized the Americas. **Starting in the late 1400s, Great Britain, Spain, and Portugal funded missions to the Americas in order to gather natural resources that would power up their economies. By stealing the land that made this resource extraction possible, colonizers used genocide, enslavement, biological weaponry, and warfare and that resulted in the deaths of tens of millions of indigenous people living in the “New World.” The concept of race, and therefore racism, was invented as a way of justifying their violence and legitimizing a hierarchy of race-divided labor.** Based off of what we know right now, the Moon and Mars are devoid of life, so this colonizing language is not actually putting other beings at risk. **But, there is the risk that the same racist mythology used to justify violence and inequality on earth — such as the use of frontier, “cowboy” mythology to condone and promote the murder and displacement of indigenous people in the American West — will be used to justify missions to space.**

#### [Haskins 2] Billionaire’s rhetoric of colonization as “adventures” erases the violence they used on colonization in history.

**Haskins 2**: Haskins, Caroline. [Current Editorial Intern for the Future section at The Outline. Former Editorial Intern for Motherboard, Vice's science/tech site.] “THE RACIST LANGUAGE OF SPACE EXPLORATION”, *The Outline*, August 14, 2018. EM

In the Destination Mars subcommittee meeting, Cruz said, “At the end of the day, the commercial sector is going to be able to invest billions more in dollars in getting this job [of getting to Mars] done.” **In his Thursday remarks regarding the Space Force, Pence also implied that celestial territories would be treated as private property (even though owning private property in space is explicitly illegal per the Outer Space Treaty, which the U.S. and dozens of other nations signed in 1967).** “While other nations increasingly possess the capability to operate in space, not all of them share our commitment to freedom, to private property, and the rule of law,” Pence said. “So as we continue to carry American leadership in space, so also will we carry America’s commitment to freedom into this new frontier.” **This approach to public-private partnerships directly mirrors colonist practices. For instance, the British East India Company violently colonized parts of India on behalf of the company, but over time, ownership of the stolen land shifted to Great Britain. While these risks feel a part of a far away future, in the present, idealizing colonization as a positive, replicable aspect of American history speaks to an unsettling indifference from leaders about the violent history of colonization. And by referencing historical events that victimized people of color, leaders paint a vision of the future in which people of color continue to be excluded, Walkowicz said that the social and economic legacy of colonization is ignored. By using narratives of adventurism and heroics, white Americans were able to convince other white Americans that they were not only entitled to steal and conquest land and persons, but that it was their destiny. Ralph said to The Outline that this mythology remains central to the way Americans conceptualize their history and culture. “Colonization is portrayed as a heroic conquest,” Ralph said.** “These practices are framed as central to American identity, essential to governance, politics, and all major social institution. But not depicted as a colonizing that is one caused by violence, displacement, dispossession.” **Even when people aren’t explicitly referring to settlements in space as “colonies,” they still use the rhetoric of colonizing the New World and the American frontier, which erases the stories of and violence against the people of color who lived and ranched in the region. But how did this language start being used in the first place? Presidents have also used frontierism and colonialism to get white citizens behind their agenda. When President John F. Kennedy announced his intention to bring Americans to the Moon in 1962, he paraphrased one of the earliest colonists on the North American continent.** “William Bradford, speaking in 1630 of the founding of the Plymouth Bay Colony, said that all great and honorable actions are accompanied with great difficulties, and both must be enterprised and overcome with answerable courage,” Kennedy said. Bradford was the governor of the Plymouth Bay Colony at the time of the Pequot War. In an overnight attack, British colonizers massacred four hundred soldiers, non-soldiers, and children. Bradford later described the act of genocide as a Christian victory. “...victory seemed a sweet sacrifice, and they gave the prays therof to God,” Bradford wrote, “who had wrought so wonderfully for them, thus to inclose their enemies in their hands, and give them so speedy a victory over so proud and insulting an enemy.” Although Kennedy did not characterize his vision for the Moon as creating a “colony” specifically, the association he wanted to create is clear: **The Moon is the next version of the New World, the next frontier for American conquest.** In his speech, Kennedy continues that men like Bradford teach us that “man, in his quest for knowledge and progress, is determined and cannot be deterred.” However, if “man” is a stand-in for “white colonizers,” “knowledge and progress” unabashedly brushes over the lives of indigenous persons and people of color that were lost in their quest to “explore.” It’s a profusely sanitized version of reality. “It’s fascinating that a term like ‘colonizing’ can be seen in neutral terms when it can’t exist without violence and dispossession,” Ralph said. It can’t exist without violence to establish a political hierarchy. Every colonial project is about managing populations, subjugating people, extracting resources.” But Kennedy was not the first person to use of colonizing language in the context of space. John Wilkins, one of the first people who ever theorized about humanity’s future in space, wrote “A Discourse Concerning a New World and Another Planet” back in 1638, where he argued that the Moon will be a place for human habitation in the future. Although it was a piece of science fiction theorization at the time, Wilkins justified his argument by saying that God created the Earth and stars for people to use in his honor. Colonizers are adventurers, Wilkins argues, whose ideals are worth replicating on other planets. “The invention of some other means for our convenience to the Moon cannot seem more incredible to us, than this did at first to them, to be discouraged in our hopes of the like success,” Wilkins wrote, admitting that any mission to the moon would be far in the future. “We have not now any [Sir Francis] Drake, or Columbus, to undertake this voyage, or any Daedalus to invent a convenience through the air.” Sir Francis Drake was a slave-trader, and of course, Christopher Columbus is responsible for the genocide of almost 3 million people on the island of Hispaniola (now the Dominican Republic and Haiti). As space travel has become more technologically feasible, science-fiction writers have speculated about how a space society would actually function. Arthur C. Clarke envisioned that “colonial” would be a dirty word in space in his 1954 book Earthflight: “And to do [enter Solar politics], one had to go to Earth; as in the days of the Caesars, there was no alternative. Those who believed otherwise or pretended to — risked being tagged with the dreaded word colonial.’” For Clarke, **colonialism was equated with privilege in a space society,** not because of racism and violence on Earth**.** Later in the novel, Clarke doesn’t hesitate to compare travelling between planets, and the nobility of doing so, with British colonizers travelling between continents in earlier centuries. Adilifu Nama, a professor of African American Studies at Loyola Marymount University who has written about the representation of race in science fiction, said that science fiction movies and books during the 1950s and 1960s often included narratives of invasion from alien lifeforms directly alongside conceptualizations of existing in other worlds. These anxious science fiction narratives became popular during the Civil Rights Movement. “We had [an] invasion emerging [during the Civil Rights Movement] of black folks invading these once pristine white spaces: with public transportation, public schools, and eventually particular neighbourhoods and black folks having access to better, more upscale neighbourhoods,” Nama said. “So there is also this invasion society around racial purity, and the tensions of science fiction can be read not only as Cold War anxieties, but racial anxieties about the other.”

#### [McKinson] The desire of white rich men to colonize space is for unjust domination.

**McKinson**: McKinson, Kimberley D. [Kimberley D. McKinson is a cultural anthropologist who conducts ethnographic research in Jamaica. She received her Ph.D. from the University of California, Irvine, and is currently an assistant professor of anthropology at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, The City University of New York (CUNY). McKinson’s research is situated at the intersections of urban security/insecurity, material culture, Caribbean postcoloniality, and critical Black historiography. Her work has been supported by the National Science Foundation, the University of California Center for New Racial Studies, the University of California Collaboratory for Ethnographic Design, and CUNY. McKinson is presently at work on her first book, Palimpsestic Securityscapes: Making Home and Excavating Memory in Postcolonial Jamaica.] “Do Black Lives Matter in Outer Space?”, *Sapiens Anthropology Magazine*, September 30, 2020. EM

**As the history of the space race shows, the dream of colonizing space has always been tied to narratives about domination and greatness. In the U.S., the historic NASA workforce has largely been White and male.** As writer Mark Dery noted in a groundbreaking essay about Afrofuturism, such men seem to believe they possess the power to design, own, and control “the unreal estate of the future.” **These narratives are not unlike the ones of Euro-American colonization and imperialism on Earth, which are stories of the exploitation, exclusion, and dehumanization of Black people, other people of color, and Indigenous people in the name of exploration, adventure, and expansion by White people. Today the scions of space colonization are the billionaire entrepreneurs who have founded commercial spaceflight companies—Musk (SpaceX), Jeff Bezos (Blue Origin), and Sir Richard Branson (Virgin Galactic). In other words, they are no longer political leaders from ideologically opposed nation-states, as they were during the Cold War. They are still, however, privileged and wealthy White men. (The combined net worth of Musk, Bezos, and Branson is over US$273 billion.) Their endeavors to colonize Mars and their fantasies for the future of humankind must be understood in the context of the racialized histories of colonization on Earth.**

### NB 2: Exclusion

#### [Haskins 3] We cannot dream of a new planet until we fix the one we are on now.

**Haskins 3**: Haskins, Caroline. [Current Editorial Intern for the Future section at The Outline. Former Editorial Intern for Motherboard, Vice's science/tech site.] “THE RACIST LANGUAGE OF SPACE EXPLORATION”, *The Outline*, August 14, 2018. EM

**In a future where humans potentially do live on non-earth planets, that same racist mythology would carry through to who is allowed to exist on, and benefit from, extraterrestrial spaces. On Earth, and in the United States specifically, the ideal of a merit-based society has been used to justify race-blind hiring policies that fail to account for, say, the implicit bias against black or Asian-sounding names, or the legacy of segregation, which continues to make children of color more vulnerable to attending underfunded schools. Narratives of “law and order” have also been used to justify racial profiling and harsher prison sentences for people of color than for white people who commit the same crimes. Not nearly enough work has been done here on Earth to ensure that these structural inequalities wouldn’t carry through. “Those narratives do carry specific implications about how people living on other worlds might be structured,” Lucianne Walkowicz, the current Chair of Astrobiology at the Library of Congress, told The Outline.** Walkowicz organized the Decolonizing Mars Conference that took place on June 27 as well as a public follow-up event planned for September, to discuss how colonial language is shaping our potential future in space.

#### [Haskins 4] Black and poor people will be left out of non-earth civilizations.

**Haskins 4**: Haskins, Caroline. [Current Editorial Intern for the Future section at The Outline. Former Editorial Intern for Motherboard, Vice's science/tech site.] “THE RACIST LANGUAGE OF SPACE EXPLORATION”, *The Outline*, August 14, 2018. EM

“Space is not just built for nothing, it’s built for people.” **When we think about humanity’s potential to exist on other planets, it’s important to consider who won’t have access to space, in part due to a total lack of concern over these issues by people who are able to access it. Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos intends to make space a place for the rich to use for adventure leisure, and SpaceX/Tesla founder Elon Musk has proposed that a Martian “colony” can save a selection of humanity from the collapse of civilization in some World War III scenario.** Granted, right now, these are just words from billionaires who want to excite the public about their business ventures. **But they suggest that if the economically and socially vulnerable are priced out of a life-saving journey from Earth, it is a justifiable loss. “All of these things that are said off the cuff [by billionaires] have some implications that are concrete and count some people in, and some people out,” Walkowicz said.** Part of that concern is fueled by the fact that Cruz and Pence have presented the path to settling space as one that will be privately funded, but lead by the U.S. government.

#### [Haskins 5] The new Space Race shifts attention and resources away from actual issues.

**Haskins 5**: Haskins, Caroline. [Current Editorial Intern for the Future section at The Outline. Former Editorial Intern for Motherboard, Vice's science/tech site.] “THE RACIST LANGUAGE OF SPACE EXPLORATION”, *The Outline*, August 14, 2018. EM

Ralph said to The Outline that **the Space Race of the 1950s and 60s shouldn’t be seen as purely a nationalist competition between the U.S. and Soviet Union: it was also a distraction from the Civil Rights Movement.** “A lot of what we think of as the Space Race was the US and Russia competing as rivals for supremacy in space back in the 1950s, but also that movement was about civil rights and the struggle for justice for Americans,” Ralph said. **“In a way, you could argue that space exploration has historically been used to shift public attention away from the struggle of social justice.”** According to Walkowicz, that people dip into the violent, racist history of colonialism and gloss over their language using a sense of adventure provided by the American frontier is no coincidence. **“The people for whom the American frontier myth were constructed, who were primarily white men, also now have the narrative of space,“ Walkowicz said.** “And because tech is so incredibly non-diverse, and has been so slow to change even in those small ways in which it has, I think a lot of **those narratives go unquestioned.” The people with the power to make a future in space possible, such as Trump, Pence, and Cruz, or the money to actually get us there, like Elon Musk and Jeff Bezos, are the same people who have and will always benefit from systemic racism and the potential economic glory from new economic ventures. Ralph noted that prioritizing space travel undermines funding for sustainable forms of energy like wind and solar, and efficient ways to construct affordable houses and schools. It also has direct economic implications for the people who rely on any number of federally-funded social programs in the U.S.** “In Trump’s America, we have a lot of conservatives and even libertarians insisting there’s too much government spending on social programs, and yet Trump wants to use our federal funds to reinvigorate our space programs,” Ralph said. **“Just like in the 1950s and 60s, [Trump] is using space exploration to cultivate nationalist sentiment and arguably shift questions away from questions of social justice and questions of inequality.”**

## Thus, I affirm:

#### [Gangawat] Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

**Gangawat:** Gangawat, Amanya. [Amity University Kolkata] “Re-exploring Terra Nullius and Property Rights in Space: Could a Lunar Settlement Claim the Lunar Estate?” *Advanced Space Law,* 2020. JP

**Since such an initiative requires a lot of funding, individuals must not be given the right to own a Moon plot**. However, they can visit the space with the help of such Corporations. **Since the principle followed in outer space is the concept of res communis, these private entities must be created and funded by individuals, but they must collaborate with the government.** Inthe past two decades, through a combination of technology, policy, and will, governments of more than a dozen countries have successfully transferred many space operations to the private sector, and it has yielded good results. Hence, there is a need to create a treaty that the Nation- State must consent to and be a party and make a collaborative effort to specialize such entities. It must be noted that the proposed regime does not favour private entities as a whole. Instead, it impresses upon the fact that Nations’ Collaborative efforts can open future prospects without providing much harm. However, a complete understanding of Nation-states is required for this 20 Advanced Space Law, Volume 6, 2020 Re-exploring Terra Nullius and Property Rights in Space: Could a Lunar Settlement Claim the Lunar Estate? by Amanya Shree Gangawat purpose. If each state start building their own Corporation, such a proposed regime would be a complete failure. **Hence, instead of claiming lands on the lunar estate, such objects in outer space must be utilized for the greater good and for the larger masses. Now, a question can be raised, that not everyone will be able to afford it, then the answer to this question is that, when Nations collaborate together, they must resort to the solution of using such technology which adheres to this question**. There must also be guidelines governing such entities to avoid any conflict and establish a Dispute Resolution Body in case of any dispute. **Moreover, there is a need for all Nations to come forward and make a ban on such individuals’ claims**. There must also be legislation banning all such individual’s claims on the plot of the Moon. The proposed regime requires a two-tire support system from: i) private entities and government and ii) cooperation among governments in order to be implemented effectively; iii) there should be no discrimination based on the capacity, power, or economy of the State. Each State must have equal rights in respect of this purpose. Once the requirement is fulfilled, the proposed regime can act to leverage the new frontier’s opening. Throughout the discussion, we find that the land on the Moon can benefit society as a whole. **It can also be concluded that the principle followed in outer space is that of res communis, which means it is the common heritage of mankind.** Hence, collaboration with private entities is essential for the purpose of capacity building and cost reduction. Most countries like Ukraine, India, the USA, Russia, UK have signed and ratified the “Outer Space Treaty,” which makes it impossible for any person to lay claim on a piece of land in space legally. According to this Treaty, outer space, which includes Moon and other celestial bodies, is common to all mankind, and therefore it cannot be owned by any nation. To maintain a balance between the development of the society and Natural resources, as well as to benefit all, one can take resort to the above-proposed regime. This can open a new frontier through private entities and the government’s initiatives at the National level and increase the cooperation among governments at the International level. With new affordable spaceflight technologies on the horizon, such activity in space will be a possibility in the near future. Therefore, to conclude, one can use the lunar estate, for the benefit of all, but one cannot sell a plot of Moon, of which he himself is not the owner, and any such person claiming such land on the basis of a document is unforce able. **Moreover, a settlement is a better option than just claiming a random land on the lunar surface.**

#### [Trapp] “Appropriation of outer space” by private entities refers to the exercise of exclusive control of space.

**Trapp:** Trapp, Timothy J. [JD Candidate at UIUC Law] “TAKING UP SPACE BY ANY OTHER MEANS: COMING TO TERMS WITH THE NONAPPROPRIATION ARTICLE OF THE OUTER SPACE TREATY” *UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LAW REVIEW* Vol. 2013 No. 4 Jun 30, 2013. EM

The issues presented in relation to the nonappropriation article of the Outer Space Treaty should be clear.214 The ITU has, quite blatantly, created something akin to “property interests in outer space.”215 It allows nations to exclude others from their orbital slots, even when the nation is not currently using that slot.216 This is directly in line with at least one definition of outer-space appropriation.217 [\*\*Start Footnote 217\*\*Id. at 236 **(“Appropriation of outer space, therefore, is ‘the exercise of exclusive control or exclusive use’ with a sense of permanence, which limits other nations’ access to it.”)** (quoting Milton L. Smith, The Role of the ITU in the Development of Space Law, 17 ANNALS AIR & SPACE L. 157, 165 (1992)). \*\*End Footnote 217\*\*]The ITU even allows nations with unused slots to devise them to other entities, creating a market for the property rights set up by this regulation.218 In some aspects, this seems to effect exactly what those signatory nations of the Bogotá Declaration were trying to accomplish, albeit through different means.219

## Solvency:

#### [McKinnis] The appropriation of space perpetuates the inequality on earth, but adopting this vision of justice changes the dynamic.

**McKinnis:** McKinnis, Sarah. [Writer at The Politic] “Who Owns the Moon?: Capitalism in Outer Space” *The Politic,* 2020. JP

**Even now, before any country or individual has legal claim to the Moon, there is money being made off of the desire to own the land.** Dennis Hope has made about $12 million by selling the Moon, as well as other planets in our solar system, which he lays claim to without any legal backing. He started in 1980, writing to the UN to inform them of his claim; he sees it as undisputed because the UN never responded. Hope believes he is justified by a loophole in the original Outer Space Treaty, but lawyers say he has no legal backing. **Despite this, a reported seven million people have given their money to this scam, including the aides of two former presidents; Carter and Reagan both “own” lunar land, and an unnamed customer bought land for George W. Bush. Hope’s website claims itself as “the only recognized world authority for the sale of lunar and other planetary real estate in the known solar system”; currently, acres of the Moon that are ten miles from the Apollo 11 landing site are selling for $49.99 per acre, with an extra $2.50 to add a name to the deed. Hope is also selling the entire planet of Pluto for $250,000, for which he has had no takers as of yet.** It’s a relatively harmless scam that demonstrates the ambiguity and extent to which the current space laws are overdue for reform. When it comes to talking seriously about property rights in space, the need for thoughtful, comprehensive reform is one that will become more and more urgent as capabilities increase. Even now, space powers are working to mine asteroids, which contain water and other materials that could benefit life on Earth, as well as the search to go beyond. In the summer of 2018, a Japanese spacecraft reached an asteroid and blasted small holes in the surface in an attempt to collect samples, and NASA has also been studying how to do this. In the long term, the structures for which the U.S. government is advocating will likely foment competition and rivalry once powers have established claims of sovereignty over areas of the Moon and other celestial bodies; this is in stark contrast to the cooperative environment that they initially hoped to foster when establishing NASA as a civilian agency. Indeed, the plaque left on the Moon, attached to the Apollo 11 Lunar Module reads, “We came in peace for all mankind.” However, the U.S. may be failing to pursue avenues that will allow these words of peace and unity to ring true in future missions. **The possibility of the exploitation of these resources is not, at its core, truly a problem with the space regulations but a continuation of the unequal systems we sustain on Earth. We have seen privilege and inequality invade this realm when it comes to space tourism, but, hopefully, there is still time to reimagine what the use of space resources could look like**. This requires moving past the idealistic treaties we have now and toward a set of guidelines that the major space powers are willing to sign and ratify. It remains to be seen whether a better agreement will be reached in this international political environment, especially when a new treaty is not even something that many space officials, lawyers, and analysts support. However, technology and space capabilities have advanced so much since the 1967 Outer Space Treaty and since the most recent UN agreement—the 1979 Moon Agreement. **This requires an advance in the way international governance institutions and individual countries think about outer space property rights. It also requires a shift away from the capitalist view of land and natural resources—instead choosing a perspective similar to the idea held in Indigenous communities and by others who believe that land is not something that at its core can be bought and sold, a perspective that encompasses much more respect and reverence for these natural resources.**