**I. Interpretations**

**I Affirm**

**II. Framework**

#### **[Value]** As the topic prescribes, I value **Justice,** meaning a social system that respects each person’s membership in society. While citizens have different views on key issues, just governments must determine who is due what based on the core values that citizens *share*.

#### **[Daniels] Further,** since people are morally equal at birth, states must ensure them baseline social equality.

**Daniels:** Daniels, Norman. [Professor of Philosophy, Harvard University] “Democratic Equality: Rawls’s Complex Egalitarianism.” In Samuel Richard Freeman (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Rawls*. Cambridge University Press, 2003. CH

**Because of their interest in recognitional equality, when contractors choose principles they must assure all citizens that the terms of cooperation sustain their sense of self-respect. Self-respect is sustained when there is a basis for each to recognize and respond to others as equal citizens. The fundamental importance of protecting the capability of all to participate in democratic processes and public life, and of not simply assuming people formal rights that might be thought empty of real meaning or effect, derives from th**is concern to protect **the recognitional components of equality. Those** who are **best off must retain the awareness that the worst off are** still equal and **worthy participants** in the democratic regulation of society**. Those who are worst off must** continue to **see themselves as** worthy **equals-- in participation, in opportunity, and in the interest they have in pursuing their ends -- or they will not** be able to **sustain their self-respect and thus their participation.** A key reason for insisting that the term “democratic equality” refers to the all three principles of justice, and not just to fair equality of opportunity and the difference principle, derives from the importance of this egalitarian idea about the social bases of self-respect, with its echo of Rousseau.”

#### **[Standard] Thus,** my **criterion** is **Promoting Social Inclusion.** Promoting Social Inclusion means increasing all peoples’ ability to have a say in the conditions that govern them. As this criterion is about increasing access to political and social rights, arguments that only discuss *economic* benefits or harms from outer space aren’t relevant to the issue of *inclusion*.

Further, The Standard looks at structural inclusion, so it's not sufficient for the Neg to say particular instances can increase inclusion. Instead, The Neg must show that they increase overall inclusion within society. Weigh the round based on which debater provides more overall access to social goods.

**Contention 1: Harms**

**[Contention 1]** My first contention is the harms from appropriation and space endeavors outweigh any gain. Negating isn't worth the harms

**[Reimann]** Private companies are appropriating space for the wrong reasons, and are increasing economic disparity

**Reimann:** Reimann, Nicholas. Forbes Business Writer Leaving A Planet In Crisis: Here’s Why Many Say The Billionaire Space Race Is A Terrible Idea *Forbes* 2021

The driving force behind **space travel has shifted away from** its long history of massive **government projects to private industry** over the past few years. SpaceX’s May 2020 launch of two NASA astronauts from Kennedy Space Center in Florida marked the first manned launch from U.S. soil since 2011, with SpaceX becoming the first private company to send astronauts to the International Space Station during the same mission. Musk’s company has since been chosen as the sole company that will create spacecraft for NASA’s upcoming Artemis mission to send astronauts back to the Moon, beating out Blue Origin for the contract. **But the shift to privatization hasn’t just put billionaire’s companies at the forefront of scientific achievements—it’s accelerated the push for space tourism programs**, which for now come with price tags solely restricted to the ultrawealthy. **There’s also already been talk of luxury space hotels.** Orbital Assembly Corp. announced plans earlier this year for a 280-guest hotel called Voyager Station, **which** it said **will open in 2027.** The company hopes to work with SpaceX as a partner on the project. **$6 billion. That’s how much money it would take to save 41 million people set to die of hunger this year worldwide**, according to UN World Food Program **Executive Director David Beasley**. Beasley **sent a tweet** late last month **urging Musk, Branson and Bezos to team up to fight hunger, saying, “We can solve this quickly!”**

**[King]** Appropriation of space will come at detrimental costs to companies with a profit motive

**King:** King, Lyon. Michigan Technological University. “Space Tech has Outpaced Space Law, and we’re at risk of killing Innovation” *Tech Crunch* 2018

“Disruption” is a term (over)used in the technology world to describe some development or product that is inherently good. The formal definition of the term, however, is at odds with its casual use: a disruption is a “disturbance or problem that interrupts an event, activity, or process.” **Right now, space tech is currently experiencing** both flavors of **disruption. Reliable estimates indicate that within the next 5-7 years, the inhabitants of the Earth will launch more satellites into space than have been launched in the history of our planet up until now.** This is a disruption in the best sense; however, **there’s a serious problem: we’re at a very real risk of crushing our own** excitement and stalling our **progress** toward the stars. **Space policy** hasn’t been high on our government’s to-do list, and this unfortunate regulatory neglect **means that today’s most innovative companies’** plans **are being disrupted by** stuffy, antiquated **rules and regulations.------------------Faced with the prospect of this**, there’s no doubt that **ambitious** and **bold startups will** be tempted to **push the boundaries and see** just **how severe the penalties will be** for operating sans permit (and in fact, that seems to be the path taken by the Swarm team). At this point, nobody really knows what **the** real **consequences** are. **In the worst case**, they **will destroy the entire business of the startup that dares, but then bankruptcy might have been pretty much guaranteed anyway,** based on the undetermined time of the FCC appeal process.

**[Manning]** Space activities are uncharted and oftentimes reckless

**Manning:** Manning, Robert. Former Advisor to the Secretary of State. “The Dangers of Anarchy In Space” *The Hill* 2021.

I can’t think of a more dramatic illustration of how **reckless actions in space put all at grave risk** than **Russia’s** recentanti-**satellite** (ASAT) **test blowing up one of its own** defunct **satellites** and **creating** a cloud of **more than 1,500 pieces of space debris.** Even **small pieces of debris, when traveling at** some **17,000 miles per hour, can cause horrific damage** to satellites, **disrupting the space infrastructure that is the nervous system of modern life. Moscow’s test forced astronauts** (including its own cosmonauts) **on board the International Space Station** (ISS) **to take emergency safety measures for fear of collision.** Moscow’s test followed **a similarly dangerous Chinese** ASAT test in 2007, **and a U.S.** ASAT **test** (though designed to minimize debris) in 2008. All this **reflects a troubling anarchy in the cosmos**, a militarization of space, one ill-conceived aspect of unrestrained arms racing, the pathology of this era of great power competition. **Space junk is inadvertent, but** satellites that can kill or disable satellites and cyber jamming **highlight the military risks.** The anti-**space antics also reveal** the mutual **vulnerabilities that should spark a rethink of current policies in the interest of self-preservation.**

**[Tabit]** Space Appropriation increases the use of harmful rockets. Private sector appropriation will increase rocket usage, and harm the environment badly

**Tabit:** Tabit, Jesse. West Virginia University “Space Travel Is Great, but According to This, You Won’t Have a Planet to Come Home To” *Fedor’s Travel 2019*

While these plans may sound awesome in theory, their side effects…are less so. At least, **according to a recent analysis** from travel site [Champion Traveler](https://championtraveler.com/news/one-spacex-rocket-launch-produces-the-equivalent-of-395-transatlantic-flights-worth-of-co2-emissions/) which concluded that **one trip aboard SpaceX’s Falcon emits a carbon footprint** so large that it’s the **equivalent of flying across the Atlantic 395 times.** More of a road tripper than a frequent flyer? Here’s another way to look at it: **according to Champion Traveler, a single space flight reportedly emits as much CO2 as 73 cars do in one year.** And while Champion Traveler claims that these emissions represent a tiny fraction of the human race’s yearly CO2 output, one can’t help but wonder: **is it really worth compromising the health of our planet?** Even though it’s a small number, **who knows how things will spiral out of control as space travel becomes more popular and accessible.**

**[Wilkins]** Negating is wishful thinking, appropriating space reaps no benefits, simply because it won't happen

**Wilkins:** Wilkins, Michael. Writer for *ILLUMINATION,* Professor of Language and Communications in Kobe Japan. “Sorry, We aren’t going to space” *Medium* 2021 JG

Why won't it go much farther than that for a long, long time. **Distance and cost. The moon, Mars, and the other planets in our solar system are borderline reachable, but they are uninhabitable rocks. To find a truly habitable planet where human civilization can thrive, we need to go to other solar systems.** Unfortunately, **they are** realistically **out of our reach. Alpha Centauri is the closest but, that is an impossible 4.3 light years away, over 40 trillion kilometers. Even without problems in transit, using current ion engines it would take over 80000 years.** Even with the fastest engines we can realistically conceive of making, nuclear, the journey would take 1000 years. **Read some discussion of the topic here. Not. Going. To. Happen. Not in our lifetime. Not in our children’s lifetime. Not in our grandchildren’s.** Maybe sometime in the very distant future, we’ll discover wormholes or warp engines. But **we need to face the fact they are pipe dreams past the horizon of time. They might even be impossible. The Earth is in trouble NOW! Climate change and pollution are serious problems. The population is ever-increasing and straining the capacity of the planet. Wealth inequality and conflict are rampant. Most** governments and **large private organizations are not responsive to the needs of the common people or the wider community of humanity**. And worse of all, several nations have the capability of destroying the planet with WMDs and that club is growing.

**Contention 2: Negating is Unjust**

**[Contention 2]** My Second contention is Negating means perpetuating injustices, Appropriation means the rich get richer, oftentimes due to the exploitation of less fortunate individuals.

**[Ingram]** Privatization harms people for a plethora of reasons.

**Ingram:** Ingram, David. Manager at Five I Enterprises. “What Are the Three Pitfalls Associated With the Private Sector Market System?” *Chron.* 2019 JG

Inequality of Income **The inevitable inequality of income is a major argument against pure private-sector** economies. In these economies, entrepreneurs have an unprecedented ability to generate wealth, but **generational cycles of wealth can introduce generational cycles of poverty** as well. As generations pass, **people born into poverty can find it increasingly difficult to take advantage of opportunities to rise out of poverty**, and those opportunities can be hard to find. Without public education and financial assistance for higher education, for example, people born into poverty can find it impossible to learn and develop skills valued by the market economy. **A pure private-sector economy also allows businesses to set any wages they choose for employees, even wages that are less than employees need to survive.** Profit and Ethics Without government intervention, **the profit motive can easily override ethical considerations in business. Without regulation, environmental pollution, wage discrimination and the sale of addictive and harmful substances can continue unchecked.** Without firm guidelines and controls, the profit motive can lead businesses to do great harm to society by selling unsafe products, contributing to health epidemics and reducing the quality of life for poor people. A mixed market system can create justifiable opportunities for private businesses to stay within ethical boundaries, while a pure private-sector economy leaves little, if any, incentive to do so. Public Welfare With no government intervention, **private businesses have no motivation or justification for providing goods and services to promote public welfare**, especially when those activities fail to generate a profit. A pure private-sector economy leaves governments with little room to provide for public education, health care, food assistance and financial assistance during economic recessions. **Governments exist for the benefit of people. Thus, public welfare should be their primary concern. The less control governments have over their countries' economies, the less influence they have to promote social justice and public welfare**. Command and Mixed Economies Pure "command" economies present a radical alternative to pure private-sector economies. In command economies, all decisions related to the production and distribution of goods and services rest in the hands of a centralized government. This kind of system addresses each of the pitfalls of the private sector, while introducing its own set of disadvantages. Mixed economies combine elements of private-sector and command economies to mitigate the pitfalls of each and highlight their advantages. In the United States, for example, industries that present dangers to public health and welfare are highly regulated by federal authorities. In a mixed economy, private businesses and government can work together toward a more balanced, equitable economic structure.

**[Tarnoff]** Neg supported Public Private Collaborations deteriorate Democracy, considering democracy is the closest we can get to a just government, It deteriorates justice itself.

**Tarnoff:** Tarnoff, Brett. Founding Editor of Logic. “How Privatization Could Spell The end Of Democracy” *The Guardian* 2017

**A profit-driven system doesn’t mean we get more for our money** – **it means someone gets to make more money off of us.** The healthcare industry posts record profits and rewards its chief executives with the highest salaries in the country. **It takes a peculiar frame of** mind to see this arrangement as **anything** resembling **efficient**. **Attacking public services on the grounds of efficiency isn’t just** incorrect, however – it’s beside the point. **Decades of neoliberalism have corroded our capacity to think in non-economic terms. We’ve been taught** that all fields of human life should be organized as markets, and **that government should be run like a business. This ideology has found its** perverse **culmination in** the figure of **Donald Trump, a celebrity billionaire with no prior political experience who catapulted himself into the White House by invoking his expertise as an businessman**. The premise of Trump’s campaign was that America didn’t need a president – it needed a CEO. Nowhere is the neoliberal faith embodied by Trump more deeply felt than in Silicon Valley. **Tech entrepreneurs** work tirelessly to turn more of our lives into markets and devote enormous resources towards “**disrupt**ing” **government by privatizing its functions.** Perhaps this is why, despite Silicon Valley’s veneer of liberal cosmopolitanism, it has a certain affinity for the president. On Monday, Trump met with top executives from Apple, Amazon, Google and other major tech firms to explore how to “unleash the creativity of the private sector to provide citizen services”, in the words of Jared Kushner. Between Trump and tech, never before have so many powerful people been so intent on transforming government into a business. But government isn’t a business; it’s a different kind of machine. At its worst, it can be repressive and corrupt and autocratic. At its best, it can be an invaluable tool for developing and sustaining a democratic society. Among other things, this includes ensuring that everyone receives the resources they need to exercise the freedoms on which democracy depends. **When we privatize public services, we don’t just risk replacing them with less efficient alternatives – we risk damaging democracy itself**. If this seems like a stretch, that’s because pundits and politicians have spent decades defining the idea of democracy downwards. It has come to mean little more than holding elections every few years. But this is the absolute minimum of **democracy’s meaning.** Its Greek root translates to **“rule of the people”** – **not rule by certain people, such as the rich** (plutocracy) or the priests (theocracy), but by all people. **Democracy describes a way of organizing society in which the whole of the people determine how society should be organized.**

**[Shammas & Holen]** Negating, and appropriating space invite capitalism with open arms

**Shammas & Holen:** Shammas, Victor. Metropolitan University Oslo. Holen, Tomas. Independent Scholar Oslo “One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space”*Palgrave Commun* 2019

**Outer space is becoming a space for capitalism. We are entering a new era of the commercialization of space, geared towards generating profits from satellite launches, space tourism, asteroid mining, and related ventures. This era, driven by private corporations** such as Elon Musk’s SpaceX and Jeff Bezos’s Blue Origins, **has been labeled** by industry insiders **as ‘NewSpace'**—in contrast to ‘Old Space', a Cold War-era mode of space relations when (allegedly) slow-moving, sluggish states dominated outer space. **NewSpace marks the arrival of capitalism in space.** While challenging the libertarian rhetoric of its proponents—space enterprises remain enmeshed in the state, relying on funding, physical infrastructure, technology transfers, regulatory frameworks, and symbolic support—NewSpace nevertheless heralds a novel form of human activity in space. Despite its humanistic, universalizing pretensions, however, **NewSpace does not benefit humankind as such but rather a specific set of wealthy entrepreneurs**, many of them originating in Silicon Valley, who strategically deploy humanist tropes to engender enthusiasm for their activities. **We describe this** complex **as ‘capitalistkind'.** Moreover, the arrival of **capitalism in space is fueled by the expansionary logic of capital accumulation. Outer space serves as a spatial fix, allowing capital to transcend its inherent terrestrial limitations.** In this way, the ultimate spatial fix is perhaps (outer) space itself.

**[Sharma]** Capitalism in space leads to ethical concerns, and inequalities that mirror what we see on earth today

**Sharma:** Sharma, Maanas. The Space Review Writer. “The privatized frontier: the ethical implications and role of private companies in space exploration” *The Space Review* 2021

**A**nother **large ethical concern is the prominence capitalism may have in the future of private space exploration** and the impacts thereof. **The growth of private space companies in recent years has been closely intertwined with capitalism. Companies have largely focused on** the most **profit**able projects, such as space travel and the business of space.[7] Many companies are funded by individual billionaires, such as dearMoon, SpaceX’s upcoming mission to the Moon.[8] Congress has also passed multiple acts for the purpose of reducing regulations on private space companies and securing private access to space. **From this**, many immediately jump to the conclusion that **capitalism in space will recreate the same conditions in outer space that plague Earth today, especially with the increasing** push to create a “space-for-space” economy, such as space tourism and new technologies to mine the Moon and asteroids. Critics, such as Jordan Pearson of VICE, believe that **promises of** “**virtually unlimited resources**” **are only for the rich, and will perpetuate the growing wealth inequality that plagues the world today.**[9]

**[Lenzen and Weidmann]** Underdeveloped nations are exploited and blamed for harms and dirty work of the rich

**Lenzen & Weidmann:** Lenzen, Manfred. University of Sydney. “Rich nations displace environmental damage to developing countries” *PhysicsWorld* 2018 Weidmann, Tommy. University of Sydney “Rich nations displace environmental damage to developing countries” *PhysicsWorld* 2018

**Around a third of environmental and social impacts from consumption in wealthy nations is displaced to developing countries**, according to the latest analysis. And that trend in **outsourcing responsibility is increasing**. “Many citizens of **rich countries require the work of up to five poor people to satisfy their consumption**,” said Manfred Lenzen of the University of Sydney, Australia. “**Rich consumers like us are implicated in pollution and inequality all over the world, and people in poor countries bear the brunt of our large environmental and social footprints**.” According to Tommy Wiedmann of UNSW Sydney, indirect effects facilitated by often complicated supply-chains are mostly hidden from consumers, who generally do not know where the raw ingredients of their purchases stem from.

**As An Underview:**

#### **[Marx] THE NC’S NON-UNIQUE –** space *exploration* isn’t the same as *appropriation*, so we **CAN** get their benefits on the aff.

**Marx:** Marx, Paris. [Host of the Tech Won't Save Us podcast; author of *Road to Nowhere: Silicon Valley and the Future of Mobility*] “Yes to Space Exploration. No to Space Capitalism.” *Jacobin*, June 8, 2020. https://jacobinmag.com/2020/06/spacex-elon-musk-jeff-bezos-capitalism CH

**Yes to Space Exploration. No to Space Capitalism.** BY PARIS MARX **Jeff Bezos and Elon Musk have a vision of space that serves the narrow interests of capitalists. But we don’t want to be indentured servants on a Martian colony — we want solar exploration that benefits humanity as a whole.** On May 30, SpaceX finally launched astronauts into space more than two years behind schedule. President Donald Trump was on hand for the launch. After pushing for the militarization of space with the formation of the US Space Force, Trump fused his own vision with that of SpaceX founder Elon Musk, declaring, “We’ll soon be landing on Mars and we’ll soon have the greatest weapons ever imagined in history.” Early in Trump’s presidency, Musk faced criticism for being part of the administration’s advisory council and refusing to step down even as Trump signed his signature Muslim ban. It was believed Musk was hoping to benefit from greater public subsidies, on top of the billions NASA gave to SpaceX, and he’s set to do so as part of Trump’s plan to get astronauts back on the moon by 2024. More recently, the two have found themselves of the same mind on the pandemic as they shared misleading health information and Musk echoed Trump’s calls to “open the economy” and give people their “freedom” back. The May 30 launch symbolized both Trump’s desire to project an image of revived American greatness and Musk’s need not only to bolster the myth that makes his wealth possible, but to set the foundations for a privatized space industry.

**He adds:**

Space has been used by past US presidents to bolster American power and influence, but it was largely accepted that capitalism ended at the edge of the atmosphere. **That’s no longer the case, and just as past capitalist expansions have come at the expense of poor and working people to enrich a small elite, so too will this one. Bezos and Trump may have a public feud, but that doesn’t mean that their mutual interest isn’t served by a renewed US push into space that funnels massive public funds into private pockets and seeks to open celestial bodies to capitalist resource extraction. This is not to say that we need to halt space exploration. The collective interest of humanity is served by learning more about the solar system and the universe beyond, but the goal of such missions must be driven by gaining scientific knowledge and enhancing global cooperation, not nationalism and profit-making. Yet that’s exactly what the space billionaires and American authoritarians have found common cause in, with Trump declaring that “a new age of American ambition has now begun” at a NASA press briefing just hours before cities across the country were placed under curfew last week. Before space can be explored in a way that benefits all of humankind, existing social relations must be transformed, not extended into the stars as part of a new colonial project.**