**I. Interpretations**

**[Resolution]** I affirm, the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust

**[Appropriation] Oxford Languages defines appropriation as the action of taking something for one's own use, typically without the owner's permission.**

**[Private Entities] Private entities as defined by Law Insider is** Private entities means **individuals or organizations other than federal, state, or local personnel or agencies.**

**II. Framework**

**[Value]** Since the resolution is a question of justice surrounding inessential actions, **I value Societal Stability**

**[Criterion]** Since stability means preserving balance in society, **my criterion is maintaining a system of checks.** Maintaining a system of checks entails ensuring no private entity abuses their higher power to disrupt societal well being.

**Contention 1: The Harms Outweigh the Good**

**[Contention 1]** My first contention is the harms of space travel outweigh the benefits, and with space travel not being a necessity, It's unjust and pointless

**[Mallick]** Outer space is too hard to regulate, and the harms to the economy are too strong

**Mallick:** Mallick, Senjuti. ILS Law school “If space is a province to mankind who owns it’s resources” *Observer Research Foundation* 2016

Half a century after the first United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of **Outer Space,** the current debates are focused on new sets of challenges such as space mining, which **used to belong only to the realm of science** fiction. This paper analyses the rationale for extraterrestrial mining, as well as the efforts and responses of **various countries**—i.e, USA, Luxembourg, Russia, China and India. In examining the legal and governance basis for States and commercial players, this paper appreciates the economic benefits of space mining but **argue**s **against** the national legislations **legalising** extraterrestrial **appropriation** of resources **due to inconsistency with** international treaties and customary **international law.** It further argues that **the** concept of “**common heritage of mankind**” **is defeated** in the light of such legal frameworks. The paper ponders the global governance challenges brought about **by space mining activities and** suggests legal, policy and global frameworks for realising the benefits of commercial mining without **creating disparity between nations and disrupting dynamics of the world economy.**

**[Tabit]** Space travel kills the environment, and the more we normalize it, the worse the planet will get

**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.**

**[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!”**

**[Impact]** The impact is that appropriating space allocates money the wrong way. We need to look to our own planet first, people are suffering, and the appropriation of outer space by rich corporation owners can't be just when we see how much money is wasted in space instead of helping our own people. Appropriation of space creates an unhealthy dynamic that sharpens economic disparity, and disincentivizes a fair society. Space is not our number one priority right now, so to have money wasted already when we can't solve our own problems is unjust.

**[Lichtenstein]** Space exploration as a whole is impossible to justify, because there are too many potential harms

**Lichtenstein:** Lichtenstein, Drew. Harvard. Senior advisor of HarvardX “Bad things About Space Exploration” *Sciencing* 2018

Tied in **with the question of cost and risk of human life is the question of justification. Space exploration** appeals to the human desire to learn about the universe; however, it **does not have any straightforward, pragmatic application.** While there may be some practical use in the distant future, **such as possibly colonizing other planets**, it **is difficult to justify** continued space exploration **to people who are worried about immediate concerns, such as crime or the economy.**

**[Impact]** The impact is that space travel is a relatively new revelation, and we don't know the ins and outs of space yet as a whole. Space appropriation can't be just when we rely on private entities, because with all of these potential fears in mind, private entities will use space for their own benefit, and leave the rest of the world to bask in the potential harms to the economy or human rights. We can't have colonization, and we don't know what people like Bezos are capable of.

**[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.**

**[Impact]** The impact is that accidents in space can lead to detrimental and irreversible consequences. Many major world governments like America, Russia, and China have caused accidents in space that have led to debris being spread everywhere at dangerously high speeds. If even well funded world superpowers are making mistakes in space, leading to danger, It would be impractical to assume that private entities with restricted access to money and resources wouldn't cause these same accidents. If we allow for appropriation of outer space by private entities, space will be filled up at a higher rate. leading to more accidents, and private entities however rich they are don't have the correct experience to be going into space and potentially harming world order with more accidents.

**[Manning 2]**

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

**Moreover, an already crowded Earth orbit is getting more so. The private sector has entered** the **space** business **with new** technologies enabling the miniaturization of **satellites**, called Cubesats, some no bigger than a shoebox. Google, Amazon and Elon Musk’s SpaceX plan to launch some 50,000 such satellites in this decade. **These are all at risk from 27,000 pieces of space debris,** tracked by the Department of Defense’s impressive Space Surveillance Network (SSN), **as well as by some half a million smaller pieces, the size of marbles. With both satellites and debris traveling at roughly 17,000 miles an hour, collisions could be catastrophic. Yet there is a paucity of rules governing behavior in space, which, like sea,** air and cyber, **are global commons. The** 1967 **Outer Space Treaty** (OST) **is the one accord signed by all major space-faring nations, 197 nations in all. They agreed to the principles** in the OST, which says: “**Exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means. and shall be the province of all mankind.”**

**Contention 2: Space Appropriation Is not necessary**

**[Contention 2]** My second contention is that space appropriation by private entities is not necessary in any society. We already have laws in place that prevent appropriation by nations, so to give the right of appropriation to private entities would be an unnecessary risk that undermines well respected laws already in existence, making it impossible to justify

**[United Nations Department of Outer Space Affairs]** The outer space treaty has already been created, and respected by major nations. These laws specifically prohibit appropriation, and are supported by UN members

**UN:** Excerptfromthe outer space Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies 1976.

**The Outer****Space****Treaty was** considered by **the** Legal Subcommittee in 1966 and **agreement** was reached in the General Assembly in the same year ( resolution 2222 (XXI)). The Treaty was largely based **on** the Declaration of **Legal Principles Governing** the Activities of States in **the Exploration and Use of Outer Space**, which had been adopted by the General Assembly in its resolution 1962 (XVIII) in 1963, but added a few new provisions. The Treaty was **opened for signature by** the three depository Governments (**the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States of America)** in January 1967, and it entered into force in October 1967. **The Outer Space Treaty provides the basic framework on** international **space law, including the following principles:** the exploration and use of outer space shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries and shall be the province of all mankind; outer space shall be free for exploration and use by all States; **outer space is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means**; States shall not place nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction in orbit or on celestial bodies or station them in outer space in any other manner; the Moon and other celestial bodies shall be used exclusively for peaceful purposes; astronauts shall be regarded as the envoys of mankind; States shall be responsible for national space activities whether carried out by governmental or non-governmental entities; States shall be liable for damage caused by their space objects; and States shall avoid harmful contamination of space and celestial bodies.

**[Impact]** The impact is that all members of the United Nations have abided by this treaty since 1967. It has been well respected, and has applied a reliable and stable framework on space law. 193 nations agree that appropriation in space should be avoided. If we give private entities the power to appropriate space, that violates the outer space treaty itself, and the agreement of 193 nations. It is unjustifiable to destroy the principles of law that protect the status quo so rich corporations get richer. Outer space was never meant to be subject to appropriation by anyone and this is reflected in the status quo.

**[Grush]** The outer space treaty is a fair and reliable check on all outer space affairs including appropriation

**Grush:** Grush, Loren. Senior Reporter for ABC, New York Times, and The Verge How an international treaty signed 50 years ago became the backbone for space law *The Verge* 2017

**The Outer Space Treaty was** never intended to be comprehensive, though. **Created** when space travel was in its infancy, the agreement was meant **to address issues that could arise as space technology advanced.** So it is somewhat flexible in its interpretation, as well as limited. But **the treaty has** still **acted as the foundation for every piece of space legislation that has been created** in the past half century. “**It’s** essentially **the most important** and most fundamental **source of international space law**,” Christopher Johnson, the space law adviser **for the Secure World Foundation**, tells *The Verge*. “All international space law follows from it and all national space activities fall under the treaty.” Here are some of the biggest impacts **the Outer Space Treaty has had in its 50-year history**: Right away, the Outer Space Treaty **establishes** that all nations should have free access to space, and that exploration of the cosmos should be **a peaceful** enterprise. Such exploration should also be done “for the **benefit** and in the interests **of all countries**,” quickly setting up the importance for international cooperation in the realm of space travel. But immediately after creating this “fair use” of space, **the treaty makes one important caveat: space and celestial bodies cannot be appropriated** by a nation. That means **a country can’t claim the Moon as its own**, for instance. The motivation was to prevent space land grabs, similar to the territorial claims that plagued the exploration of Antarctica in the first half of 1900s.

**[Impact]** The impact is that the outer space treaty was created to prepare for changes in space exploration. The United Nations were prepared for technology to advance, and created the treaty to protect the rights of people. The treaty still stands as an impactful set of laws that keeps people stable and safe, and checks any nation or group wanting to gain too much power. The treaty undoubtedly keeps the general public safe from harms of appropriation, and with that in mind makes appropriation not only unjustifiable, but definitely unjust. Following the treaty is the best course of action for stability through checks.

Because appropriation leads to economic harms and corporations getting too much power, as well as a disruption to world order beyond the realm of justice **I affirm and stand ready for cross ex.**