I affirm the resolution resolved: the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust

I offer the following definition

Appropriate is defined by the Merriam-Webster Dictionary as to

to set apart for or **assign to a particular purpose or use**

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/appropriate>

The value is **Justice**,defined as

**the quality of being** just; righteousness, equitableness, or **moral[ly] right**ness:

https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/justice

And therefore, the value criterion is **Reducing Pleonexia**

Pleonexia is defined by William Barclay as

**Pursuing one’s own interests with the complete disregard or consideration for the rights of others** or common humanity. An **accursed love of having**

Prefer this value criterion for two reasons

**First, Pleonexia is the root of all evil**

According to Professor of Philosophy, Daniel Wallace,

For **every possible kind of evil is motivated by Pleonexia.** Meaning, greed can lead to any number of different kind of evils **from the murderer who satisfies his desire to kill[,] to the oligarch who refuses to give to the poor, all evil is rooted in sickly greed**

**Second, Pleonexia destroys society**

Professor of Philosophy William Burghart explains,

The inevitable result of such conflict was the **Pleonexic power loses more than it** had **had before.** The Greeks, thus, had a theory that **acting on Pleonexia leads to a reduction in power and societal complexity. Excess and ever more excess is the force creating addiction and hence leading to self-destruction**

I offer the following two observations:

Firstly, as the affirmative debater, I only need to argue that the appropriation of outerspace by private entities is unjust. That means it is NOT by burden to argue that the public sector would be more just, or to offer an alternative.

Secondly, just because something may be necessary, does not mean it is just. For example, it may be necessary for the United States to keep nuclear arsenals in order to prevent a foreign nuclear attack, however it is still unjust because it is motivated by the US greed for power. My job in this debate is to argue that private appropriation is unjust because it is motivated by pleonexia, regardless of the necessity of space exploration.

**Contention 1) Private Pleonexia**

The appropriation of outer space by private entities is inherently pleonexic, as it is motivated

According to Borret 2020

**The** galactic-themed collection is inspired by the **age of private space travel**, which Townley says **is motivated by "greed, self-publicity, [and] a desire to do things that other people cannot do.**"

<https://www.businessinsider.in/tech/news/a-new-art-exhibition-exploring-the-greed-of-private-space-travel-is-inspired-by-elon-musk-and-jeff-bezos/articleshow/76908304.cms>

Therefore, because the pursuit of outerspace appropriation is done for purely greedy reasons, it is pleonexic and thus unjust.

However, the appropriation of outerspace is also pleonexic in three other ways.

**Subpoint a) Detracting from Earth Issues**

According to Heilweil 21

For many, [**the rise of commercial space** tourism](https://www.vox.com/recode/22583997/billionaires-blue-origin-elon-musk-jeff-bezos-rockets-planes-commercial-space-tourism)**is a**[**vulgar display of wealth and power**](https://nymag.com/intelligencer/2021/07/jeff-bezoss-space-trip-is-one-giant-leap-for-inequality.html)**.** **Amid several global crises, including climate change and a pandemic, billionaires are spending their cash on launching themselves into space for fun.** When Amazon founder Jeff Bezos told reporters after his first space tourism trip on Tuesday that Amazon customers and [employees](https://www.vox.com/recode/2020/6/29/21303643/amazon-coronavirus-warehouse-workers-protest-jeff-bezos-chris-smalls-boycott-pandemic) had “paid” for his flight, that only intensified that criticism.

<https://www.vox.com/recode/22589197/space-travel-tourism-bezos-branson-rockets-blue-origin-virgin-galactic-spacex>

Jackson 21 elaborates that space appropriation

But for all its glamour, the “final frontier” **is** at best an amusement and at worst **a fatal distraction from the urgent task of rebuilding a society ravaged by social injustice, climate change and a loss of faith in the future.** With most of us still reeling from what the World Health Organisation has called a [shadow pandemic](https://theconversation.com/domestic-abuse-and-mental-ill-health-twin-shadow-pandemics-stalk-the-second-wave-148412) in mental health, any kind of escape plan at all looks remarkably like paradise. And emigrating to Mars is one hell of an escape plan. Let’s dream of some “final frontier” by all means. But let’s **[We should] focus our minds** too **on** some quintessentially **earthly priorities. Affordable healthcare. Decent homes for the poorest** in society. A **solid education** for our kids. Reversing the decades-long precarity in the livelihoods of the frontline workers – the ones who saved our lives. **Regenerating** the devastating loss of **the natural world.** Replacing a frenetic consumerism with an economy of care and relationship and meaning.

https://theconversation.com/billionaire-space-race-the-ultimate-symbol-of-capitalisms-flawed-obsession-with-growth-164511

Thus, private companies appropriating space detract resources away from real issues on earth in a pleonexic grab for money, and thus is unjust.

**Subpoint b) Increasing Wealth Inequality**

Stockwell 2020 states that

In similar ways to the ‘scaling’ of unequal international relations that has constituted our relationship with outer space under the guise of the ‘global commons’ (Beery, 2016: 99), **private companies** – through their anthropogenic discourse – **are scaling existing Earth-bound wealth inequalities** and social relations into space **by siphoning off extra-terrestrial resources. By constructing their [narratives]** endeavours **in [a] way**s **that appeal to the common good, [private space entities]** NewSpace actors **are** therefore **concealing the reality of how [outer space]** commercial **resource extraction [only] serves the** exclusive **interests of [the rich]** their private shareholders **at the expense of the vast majority of the global population.**

Stiglitz 2018 of Columbia University furthers, stating that wealth inequality leads to the

Political scientists have documented the ways in which **money influences politics [because]** in certain political systems, converting higher economic inequality into greater political inequality. Political inequality, in its turn, gives rise to more economic inequality as the **rich** us[ing]e their political power to **shap[ing]**e **the rules of the game in ways that favor [themselves]** them—**for instance,** by **softening antitrust laws and weakening unions**. Using mathematical models, economists such as myself have shown that this two-way feedback loop between money and regulations **lead[ing]s to [decreased economic and political welfare of everyone not in the top 1%]** at least two stable points. If an economy starts out with lower inequality, the political system generates rules that sustain it, leading to one equilibrium situation. The American system is the other equilibrium—and will continue to be unless there is a democratic political awakening.  An account of how the rules have been shaped must begin with antitrust laws, first enacted 128 years ago in the U.S. to prevent the agglomeration of market power. Their enforcement has weakened—at a time when, if anything, the laws themselves should have been strengthened. Technological changes have concentrated market power in the hands of a few global players, in part because of so-called network effects: you are far more likely to join a particular social network or use a certain word processor if everyone you know is already using it.

https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-american-economy-is-rigged/

Therefore, because the appropriation of outerspace thickens the pockets of the rich at the expense of everyone else, and it allows the rich to take advantaged of the less privileged, it is inherently pleonexic

**Subpoint c) Space Debris (I don’t think this links to pleonexia that well, but I’m insistent to keep this. It’s terminal defense on colonization negs)**

Companies’ desire to create profit off of satellites at the expense of the safety of everyone else is pleonexic. Currently, companies are looking to massive increase the amount of satellites in earths orbit. Bowler 2022 states that private entities like

This last one is important. **Starlink** already exists, and many other projects like [**OneWeb**](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/OneWeb_satellite_constellation) **and Amazon's** [Project Kuiper](https://www.cnbc.com/2021/11/01/amazons-project-kuiper-launching-first-internet-satellites-in-q4-2022.html) **are [adding]** already in development. As well as pushing back against new developments, it's also important for astronomers to work out how to live with these satellites now. "It's not a question of satellites versus astronomy, but rather how to mediate the different needs and interests and values that coalesce in outer space, including those that are less powerful," Jessica West, a senior researcher on space security at Project Ploughshares, [told Gizmodo.](https://www.gizmodo.com.au/2022/02/astronomers-rally-to-stop-starlink-and-other-satellite-constellations-from-ruining-the-sky/) "This requires open dialogue and coordinated and collective action. The international astronomy community is showing us how to do this. And the world is listening. This is a critical moment for space governance." But with **at least 100,000 satellites in our near future**, Gorman suggests being wary of how this will not only affect astronomers, but all of us.

<https://www.sciencealert.com/the-international-astronomical-union-launches-new-center-to-fight-back-against-starlink-and-other-mega-constellations>

According to Gray 17,

**SpaceX [alone] wants to triple the number of satellites in our skies**

<https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/01/spacex-asked-permission-to-launch-4-425-satellites-more-than-orbit-earth-today/>

Private entities launching satellites for profit is inherently pleonexic, because it places money and profit over the lives and wellbeing of everyone else.

Massively increasing the amount of space debris has 2 impacts.

The first is increasing the probability of a satellite’s collision. Stockwell of Kings College London 2020 explains, stating that

Despite most debris being centimetres or millimetres in size **satellites often travel at the speed of a bullet, meaning that a collision between the two could be catastrophic in terms of environmental, mechanical and financial damage** Since the development of the Kessler Syndrome thesis in 1978 – which predicted that **space debris may become so dense as to trigger a chain reaction of major collisions** – space debris is considered more of a threat to security operations in the near-term than military space activity

https://www.e-ir.info/pdf/86284

Thus, private satellites in space is pleonexic because it puts the profits of private companies over the wellbeing of everyone else in society.

The second is trapping humanity on earth, and preventing an outer space escape. Pettit 2020 states

If this were to continue unchecked, it could take down communication systems and render parts of space inaccessible. Some experts have even suggested a **further build up of [satellite space] debris could trap humanity on Earth because rocket launches would become too dangerous.** The solution? Send up giant nets that can snatch debris out of orbit, while ensuring future satellites have self-destruct systems. "We've basically been launching things since 1957, and in the early decades, there wasn't any sense that this might become a major environmental problem," Dr Alice Gorman, of Finders University in Australia, told The Sun.

<https://www.the-sun.com/lifestyle/tech-old/1802341/space-debris-trap-humanity-earth-destruction/>

This means that humanity won’t be able to escape from earth, or even access the resources in space, because the space debris will make it too dangerous to launch a rocket into space in the first place.

Overall, because private appropriation of outerspace is a blind grab for money at the expense of the vast majority of the population, it is inherently pleonexic, and thus is unjust.

**Contention 2) State Pleonexia (Star Wars)**

The private appropriation of outer space is unjust, because it enables the pleonexic desires of states as well.

Currently, nations are prohibited from putting military bases or weapons in earths orbit.

In addition, according to **the Outer Space Treaty [of]**, which was approved in the General Assembly and entered into force on October 10, **1967**, the States Parties to the treaty, including the US, recognized "the common interest of all mankind in the progress of the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes." The treaty **calls on all States Parties to "refrain from placing** in orbit around the earth **any objects carrying nuclear weapons" [out in space,] and forbids the "establishment of military bases, installations and fortifications."**

<https://www.globaltimes.cn/content/1177832.shtml>

However, since states, like the US, cannot launch weapons in space, they rely on private corporations to circumvent outer space treaties. This is pleonexic, because it places countries desire for power over the promises made in international treaties. Stockwell of Kings College explains in 2020,

By adopting the 1967 UN Outer Space Treaty (OST) as an analytical framework in relation to the rise of the so-called US ‘NewSpace’ actors, this essay argues that **there are significant legal ambiguities regarding the status of private** space **companies in** orbital **space.** Such **loopholes allow the US government to circumvent its own obligations to the [Outer Space Treaty]** OST, whilst simultaneously undermining the notion of space as a ‘global commons’ through a commodification process.

The Heritage Foundation 2021 concludes that

**The Space Force[, the United State’s Military Outer Space Program]** manages the National Security Space Launch (NSSL) program, which is a Major Defense Acquisition Program that **acquires launch services from private companies to deliver** national security **satellites [and weapons] into orbit.**

<https://www.heritage.org/military-strength/assessment-us-military-power/us-space-force>

SpaceX has already signed a contract in 2021 with the US government promising to give it launch services for space weapons.

https://futurism.com/the-byte/spacex-building-military-rocket-to-ship-weapons-anywhere-world

Private companies enable governments pleonexic behavior by allowing states the ability to exploit loopholes meant to keep peace

Further, weapons in space make countries nuclear trigger fingers itchier, due to its ability to disable missile detection systems. Graham of the Arms Control Association tells us what this means, stating that

Both the United States and Russia rely on space-based systems to provide early warning of a nuclear attack. If deployed, however, **U.S. space-based missile defense interceptors could eliminate the Russian early warning satellites quickly and without warning.** So, just **[As a result] the existence of U.S. space weapons** could **make[s] Russia’s strategic trigger fingers itchy [and vice versa].**

https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2005-12/features/space-weapons-risk-accidental-nuclear-war

This is really bad, because it weakens deterrence. Russia recognizes that the US could disable adversary missile defense systems, allowing them to launch nukes without the threat of mutually assured destruction, rendering conventional nuclear deterrence useless.

The impact is an international space war, as Hartung 18 tells us that

THE REAL DANGER: WEAPONS IN SPACE Donald Trump’s enthusiasm for the Space Force and **the militarization of space** has already given new life to spectacularly bad ideas shelved years ago. A case in point: the claim of Pentagon Undersecretary for Research and Engineering Michael Griffin that it **would** be “relatively easy” and affordable (at least by Pentagon standards) to construct space-based interceptors that could shoot down nuclear-armed ballistic missiles in their “boost phase,” that is, shortly after launching. But a 2012 study by the American Physical Society estimated that it could cost $300 billion to build the system of hundreds of space-based interceptors needed to counter even a handful of North Korean missiles in boost phase. And yet Congress did indeed pass an amendment to the 2019 defense bill calling for the Pentagon “to develop a space-based intercept layer.” Putting such weaponry in space could, of course, **lead other powers** (think Russia and China) **to assume that their satellite systems were at risk and** so **spark a new** Cold War–style **arms race in space** that would not only cost a fortune, but increase the odds of hair-trigger systems prone to mistakes launching a war there. Military and communications satellites, like those crucial to US military operations across the planet and those the global economy couldn’t do without, would be uniquely vulnerable in such a situation. John Tierney and Philip Coyle of the Center for Arms Control and Nonproliferation have summed up the potential consequences of putting missile interceptors in space this way: “**Space-based missile defenses would motivate US adversaries to increase their nuclear arsenals and expand their anti-satellite capabilities** to neutralize the new space infrastructure.” In other words, the president is now urging Congress and the military to embark on a project that could cost countless hundreds of billions of dollars and, in return, make America—and the world—less safe. And if that isn’t a Trumpian bargain of the first order, what is? SPACE FORCE: TRAGEDY OR FARCE? Pushing the idea of a Space Force to please his own ego and his supporters, as President Trump seems intent on doing while currying favor with one slice of the military-industrial complex, is likely to prove an extremely costly error. Worse yet, **the further militarization of space** risks the future of the planet itself. Whether done within or outside the Air Force, as a Space Corps or a Space Force, putting missile interceptors or satellite weapons in space **will** undermine what remains of Cold War–era arms-control programs and so **make both conventional and nuclear war more likely.**

https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/trumps-space-force-is-putting-us-all-in-danger/

Overall, because private entities act on pleonexia, which exasperates inequality on earth, and also enables the pleonexic behavior of states, it is ultimately unjust.

And thus, I affirm and stand ready for cross examination