

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

Definitions:

Definitions:

Space Appropriation as defined by the United Nations office for outer space affairs is:

Outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, is ^{not} subject to ^{national appropriation by} claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by other means.”[5]

Private entities:

In general Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term “private entity” means **any person or private group, organization, proprietorship, partnership, trust, cooperative, corporation, or other commercial or nonprofit entity**, including an officer, employee, or agent thereof.

Unjust:

Cambridge dictionary

not fair

Value: Justice

As stated by the resolution and Cornell 20,

<https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/justice>

[Justice is] The ethical, philosophical idea that people are to be treated impartially, fairly, properly, and reasonably by the law and by arbiters of the law, that laws are to ensure that no harm befalls another, and that, where harm is alleged, both the accuser and the accused receive a morally right consequence merited by their actions

Reducing Oppression

Recognizing structural violence is key to mitigating its oppressive effects

Winter and Leighton 99 [Deborah DuNann Winter and Dana C. Leighton. Winter: Psychologist that specializes in Social Psych, Counseling Psych, Historical and Contemporary Issues, Peace Psychology. Leighton: PhD graduate student in the Psychology Department at the University of Arkansas. Knowledgeable in the fields of social psychology, peace psychology, and justice and intergroup responses to transgressions of justice] (Peace, conflict, and violence: Peace psychology in the 21st century. Pg 4-5)]

Finally, to recognize the operation of structural violence forces us to ask questions about how and why we tolerate it, questions which often have painful answers for the privileged elite who unconsciously support it. A final question of this section is how and why we allow ourselves to be so oblivious to structural violence. Susan Opatow offers an intriguing set of answers, in her

article Social Injustice. She argues that our normal perceptual/cognitive processes divide people into in-groups and out-groups. Those outside our group lie outside our scope of justice. Injustice that would be instantaneously confronted if it occurred to someone we love or know is barely noticed if it occurs to strangers or those who are invisible or irrelevant. **We do not seem to be able to open our minds and our hearts to everyone, so we draw conceptual lines between those who are in and out of our moral circle. Those who fall outside are morally excluded,** and become either invisible, or demeaned in some way **so that we do not have to acknowledge the injustice they suffer.** Moral exclusion is a human failing, but Opatow argues convincingly that it is an outcome of everyday social cognition. To reduce its nefarious effects, **we must be vigilant in noticing and listening to oppressed, invisible, outsiders. Inclusionary thinking can be fostered** by relationships, communication, and appreciation of diversity. Like Opatow, all the authors in this section point out that **structural violence is not inevitable if we become aware of its operation, and build systematic ways to mitigate its effects.** Learning about structural violence may be discouraging, overwhelming, or maddening, but these papers encourage us to step beyond guilt and anger, and begin to think about how to reduce structural violence. All the authors in this section note that the same structures (such as global communication and normal social cognition) which feed structural violence, can also be used to empower citizens to reduce

Contention: The Priority of Humankind

Subpoint A: The General Populous Doesn't Benefit From The Appropriation of Space

Shammas, Victor and Holen, Tomas, 2019, One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space, Palgrave Commun, <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-019-0218-9>

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.

But how are we to understand NewSpace? In some ways, NewSpace signals the emergence of capitalism in space. The production of carrier rockets, placement of satellites into orbit around Earth, and **the exploration, exploitation, or colonization of outer space** (including planets, asteroids, and other celestial objects), **will not be the work of humankind as such, a pure species-being** (Gattungswesen), but **of particular capitalist entrepreneurs who stand in for and represent humanity. Crucially, they will do so in ways modulated by the exigencies of capital accumulation.** These enterprising capitalists are forging a new political-economic regime in space, a post-Fordism in space **aimed at profit maximization and the apparent minimization of government interference.** A new breed of charismatic, starry-eyed entrepreneurs, including Musk's SpaceX, Richard Branson's Virgin Galactic, and Amazon billionaire Jeff Bezos's Blue Origin, to name but a selection, aim at becoming 'capitalists in space' (Parker, 2009) or space capitalists. Neil Armstrong's famous statement will have to be reformulated: space will not be the site of 'one giant leap for mankind', but rather one giant leap for capitalistkind.^{Footnote5} **With the ascendancy of NewSpace, humanity's future in space will not be 'ours', benefiting humanity tout court, but will rather be the result of particular capitalists,** or capitalistkind.^{Footnote6} toiling to recuperate space and bring its vast domain into the fold of capital accumulation: NewSpace sees outer space as the domain of private enterprise, set to become the 'first-trillion dollar industry', according to some estimates, and likely to produce the world's first trillionaires (see, e.g., Honan, 2018)—as opposed to Old Space, a derisive moniker coined by enthusiastic proponents of capitalism-in-space, widely seen to have been the sole preserve of the state and a handful of giant aerospace corporations, including Boeing and Lockheed Martin, in Cold War-era Space Age.

Furthermore,

The Selfishness of NewSpace Actors

Stockwell, Samuel, July 2020, Legal 'Black Holes' in Outer Space: The Regulation of Private Space Companies, E-International Relations, <https://www.e-ir.info/2020/07/20/legal-black-holes-in-outer-space-the-regulation-of-private-space-companies/>

The US government's support for private space companies is also likely to lead to the reinforcement of Earth-bound wealth inequalities in space.

Many NewSpace actors frame their long-term ambitions in space with strong anthropogenic undertones, by offering the salvation of the human race from impending extinction through off-world colonial developments (Kearnes & Dooren: 2017: 182). Yet, **this type of discourse disguises the highly exclusive nature of these missions**. Whilst they seem to suggest that there is a stake for ordinary citizens in the vast space frontier, **the reality is that these self-described space pioneers are a member of a narrow 'cosmic elite' – "founders of Amazon.com, Microsoft, PayPal... and a smattering of games designers and hotel magnates"** (Parker, 2009: 91).

Indeed, **private space enterprises have themselves suggested that they have no obligation to share mineral resources extracted in space with the global community** (Klinger, 2017: 208). This is reflected in the speeches of individuals such as Nathan Ingraham, a senior editor at the tech site Engadget, who claimed that asteroid mining was "how [America is] going to move into space and develop the next Vegas Strip" (Shaer, 2016: 50). Such comments highlight a form of what Beery (2016) defines as 'scalar politics'. 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 endeavours in ways that appeal to the common good, NewSpace actors are therefore concealing the reality of how commercial resource extraction serves the exclusive interests of their private shareholders at the expense of the vast majority of the global population.**

Subpoint B: Exploitation Must Be Wholly Beneficial

Meyer, Zach, Winter 2010, Private Commercialization of Space in an International Regime: A Proposal for a Space District, Northwestern Journal of International Law & Business, <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1705&context=njilb>

As a general observation, **the Outer Space Treaty is steeped in the rhetoric of a "common interest of all mankind,"** especially expressing the concern that one part of "all mankind"-the less-developed States-will be left out of the exploration and use of outer space while the other part of "all mankind"-the developed States-will reap all the rewards of exploiting outer space.⁵⁵

Specifically, it declares that the exploration and use of outer space is to be conducted "for the benefit and in the interests of all countries ... and shall be the province of all mankind." ⁵⁶ To that end, outer space is to "be free for exploration and use by all States without discrimination of any kind, on a basis of equality and in accordance with international law, and there shall be free access to all areas of celestial bodies."⁵⁷

The Moon Treaty generally echoes the Outer Space Treaty,⁶¹ but is also more extreme. While the Moon Treaty recognizes "the benefits which may be derived from the exploitation of the natural resources of the Moon and other celestial bodies," it protects those natural resources with rhetoric more potent than a common "interest." To wit, **the Moon Treaty declares that those natural resources "are the common heritage of mankind."** ⁶³ Is a "heritage" exploitable? If so, who can exploit it-"mankind?" How does an ideal like "mankind" exploit resources? **It would appear from the text of the Moon Treaty that a "heritage" is exploitable only by "mankind"** and that "mankind" is roughly translated into "an international consensus." That is, the Moon Treaty establishes a default rule generally prohibiting any exploitation of the natural resources of any celestial bodies in the solar system other than Earth, and then provides for two exceptions⁶⁵ based on international consensus. First, celestial bodies in the solar system other than Earth and the Moon are no longer subject to the restrictions of the Moon Treaty if contrary "specific legal norms enter into force with respect to any of these celestial bodies."⁶⁶ Second, if an appropriate international regime is created, then exploitation of the natural resources of celestial bodies may proceed.

Subpoint C: Impact

Sharma, Maanas, September 2021, The privatized frontier: the ethical implications and role of private companies in space exploration, The Space Review, (Maanas Sharma is the Editor-in-Chief of the Journal of Interdisciplinary Public Policy), <https://www.thespacereview.com/article/4238/1>

Another 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 profitable 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]

Furthermore,

United Nations, January 2020, Rising inequality affecting more than two-thirds of the globe, but it's not inevitable: new UN report, UN News, <https://news.un.org/en/story/2020/01/1055681>

The study shows that **the richest one per cent of the population are the big winners in the changing global economy, increasing their share of income between 1990 and 2015, while at the other end of the scale, the bottom 40 per cent earned less than a quarter of income in all countries surveyed. One of the consequences of inequality within societies, notes the report, is slower economic growth.** In unequal societies, with **wide disparities in areas such as health care and education, [meaning] people are more likely to remain trapped in poverty, across several generations.**

Contention 2: Space War

Antony **Funnel** Aug 23, **2018** <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2018-08-24/conflict-in-space-is-inevitable-expert-warns/10146314>

A leading Australian space law expert has warned **conflict over space assets is "inevitable"**, and more needs to be done now to avert the potential for hostility. **Professor Melissa de Zwart, the Dean of Law at the University of Adelaide, says growing commercial interest in the mining of precious minerals on asteroids and planets has heightened the danger.** "I think you have to be a realist about that," she said. "Where you have resources, where you have competition for those resources, where you have investment of money in the extraction of those resources ... there will be an expectation of security around that investment."

Private Entities have made Space Militarization possible

Patrick A. **Salin** February **2001** <https://sci-hub.se/https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0265964600000503>

We may consider that outer space should no longer be considered as a sanctuary safe from military operations as of 19 June 1999. On that day, a US Theater HighAltitude Area Defense (THAAD) rocket hit a target missile outside the Earth's atmosphere. Outer space is now undergoing a militarization process that is developing within a totally new framework, that of the privatization of space ventures and projects. The bipolar Cold War stage has been removed and gone is the threatening vision of nuclear warfare via all sorts of Earth-based and spaceborne weapons. Yet the big industrial concerns that manufactured the weapons of the Cold War have simply converted themselves and regrouped into mammoth civilian manufacturers, deploying constellations of civilian assets in outer space.² Instead of procuring the much-criticized US Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), they now produce dual-use goods that can be used in an undifferentiated manner for both civilian and military objectives [3,4]³. **The borderlines between civilian and military high technology goods that**

prevailed only a few years ago have become meaningless and technical parameters that qualified equipment as being military, less than "five years ago, are now useless, commercial entities being able to sell these, once forbidden tools, as plain commercial gadgets. The confusion between the US Department of Commerce and the US Department of State over determining what is (or should be) subject to authorization and what is not is illustrative of this situation. Yet, thanks to the loopholes and inconsistencies of the international treaties on outer space, we may soon end up with exactly the same result as during the Cold War * Hollywood's Star Wars, live! **We are slowly discovering that the militarization process of outer space** seems to be a given, **thanks to increasing competition within the space business environment.** And, **as privatization has accelerated during the last decade, we can clearly see an acceleration of the militarization process of outer space. This has become apparent through two main observations: (1) private space corporations are,** more than ever, **vanguards of national interests; and (2) commercial competition is another way for nations to impose their influence in space (and world) affairs.** In the end, what is at stake here is the fragile equilibrium between world peace and tensions, now transported into outer space

Commercial satellites have sparked nuclear interests and militarization of space

Nathan **Strout** July 20, **2019** (staff editor at C4ISRNET where he covers the intelligence community, "Can commercial satellites revolutionize nuclear command and control?" C4ISRNET, 4/12/21, c4isrnet.com/battlefield-tech/c2-comms/2019/07/12/can-commercial-satellites-revolutionize-nuclear-command-and-control/)

The rapid growth of commercial space makes the use of non-government satellites for nuclear command and control increasingly tempting, according to one official.

During a speech June 26, **Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. David Goldfein said** that the service — which oversees both **the United States'** ground-based intercontinental ballistic missiles, as well as strategic bombers capable of delivering nuclear warheads — **was open to the idea of using private sector satellites.** "Whether it's Silicon Valley or commercial space, there's unlimited opportunities ahead right now for us in terms of how we think differently on things like nuclear command and control," said Goldfein. "I, for one, am pretty excited about it." **The military has increasingly turned to the commercial sector to expand its capabilities more cost efficiently.** For instance, **the National Reconnaissance Office** — the agency in charge of the nation's spy satellites — **announced that it was looking to expand the amount of satellite imagery it buys from commercial companies. The Air Force has also expressed interest in developing a hybrid architecture for satellite communications,** which would see war fighters able to switch between commercial and military satellites as they move through coverage areas. The National Reconnaissance Office is dipping its toe into the world of commercial data, awarding three study contracts that will put it on track to start purchasing commercial satellite imagery. **According to Goldfein, there's no reason that commercial capabilities could not similarly be applied to nuclear C2.**

Militarization of Space breeds distrust and war

Alexandra **Gilliard** June 10, **2019** (Senior Editor and interviewer of international relations experts for the International Affairs Forum. She holds an M.S. in Global Studies and International Relations from Northeastern University, and a B.A. in International Relations from Boston University, with expertise in conflict resolution, arms control, human rights issues, and the MENA region, "What Are The Consequences Of Militarizing Outer Space?" Global Security Review, 6/10/19 <https://globalsecurityreview.com/consequences-militarization-space/>)

Only so many states currently have access to space—which means **any militarization** be by the few, while other states would be left to fend for themselves. This **would establish a clear power imbalance that could breed distrust among nations, resulting in a more insecure world and a veritable power keg primed for war.** **Additionally, deterrence measures taken by states with access to space would escalate, attempting to build up weapons caches not dissimilar to the nuclear weapons stockpiling activities of the Cold War. In any**

arms race, it is inevitable that more advanced weaponry is created. Yet, this does not only pose a risk to assets in space. Should a terrestrial war break out, this weaponry may eventually be deployed on the ground, and **space-faring states would be able to capitalize on the power imbalance by using these new developments against states that have not yet broken into the space industry or developed equally-advanced weaponry. The militarization of space would inevitably increase the chances of war** and also threaten the industries that rely on space to carry out their daily operations. Without treaties and resolutions to regulate and limit armament in space, the international community risks facing extreme consequences. Furthermore, **with the history of U.S. disinterest in UN efforts to regulate space, the implementation of a meaningful, multilateral agreement for arms control in space is unlikely.**

Space war leads to nuclear war

Laura **Grego**, July 7, **2015**, former senior scientist in the Global Security Program at the Union of Concerned Scientists. She focuses her analysis and advocacy on the technology and security dimensions of ballistic missile defense and of outer space security, “Preventing Space War,” Union of Concerned Scientists, <https://allthingsnuclear.org/lgrego/preventing-space-war/>

The Pentagon has known that space could be a flash point at least **since the late 1990s** when it **began including satellites and space weapons in** earnest as part of **its wargames**. The early games revealed some surprises. For example, attacking an adversary’s ground-based anti-satellite weapons before they were used could be the “trip wire” that starts a war: in the one of the first war games, an attack on an enemy’s ground-based lasers was meant to defuse a potential conflict and protect space assets, but instead was interpreted as an act of war and initiated hostilities. **The games also revealed that disrupting space-based communication and information flow or “blinding” could rapidly escalate a war, eventually leading to nuclear weapon exchange.**

The war games have continued over the years with increased sophistication, but continue to find that conflicts can rapidly escalate and become global when space weapons are involved, and that even minor opponents can create big problems. The report back from the 2012 game, which included NATO partners, said these insights have become “virtually axiomatic.”

Participants in the most recent Schriever war games found that when space weapons were introduced in a regional crisis, it escalated quickly and was difficult to stop from spreading.

The compressed timelines, the global as well as dual-use nature of space assets, the difficulty of attribution and seeing what is happening, and the inherent vulnerability of satellites all contribute to this problem.

War and Conflict affects people in poverty the most

Marks 16 (Chancellor’s Fellow at the University of Edinburgh, where she is Director of the University’s Global Development Academy and the School of Social and Political Science’s MSc in African Studies. Her research focuses on the internal dynamics of violence and civil war, gender relations, and post-conflict development. She is currently leading comparative research projects on peacebuilding and post-conflict trajectories in Democratic Republic of Congo, Liberia, Nigeria, and Sierra Leone, “Poverty and conflict,” GSDRC, 08/16, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5980670a40f0b61e4b00003e/Poverty-and-conflict_RP.pdf)

Poverty and conflict Zoe Marks October 2016 **Poverty and conflict are widely understood to be closely interconnected;** with poverty making countries more prone to civil war, and armed conflict weakening governance and economic performance, thus increasing the risk of conflict relapse (Goodhand 2001). The selected readings in this pack move beyond reductive and harmful assumptions about ‘pathologies’ of poverty to examine the latest research into the poverty-conflict nexus. Earlier studies identified macro-level factors that made countries more likely to experience armed conflict. For example, low per capita income and large populations correlate with civil war, whereas ethnic and religious diversity does not make countries more prone to conflict (Fearon & Laitin 2003). Newer research examines the processes and mechanisms that precipitate and shape violence on the ground. At the state level, **poverty can lower resilience to conflict by weakening government institutions, stripping capacity for public goods provision, and limiting the projection of power and authority, whether soft or coercive. Poverty also compounds vulnerability to insurgency at the individual and community level by lowering the opportunity cost of mobilising for violence.** High rates of unemployment and inequality, combined with low levels of education and development, are thought to soften the ground for recruitment and provide motives to fight (Humphreys & Weinstein 2008).¹ These individual correlates of poverty often follow systematic patterns that lead to ‘horizontal inequalities’. Horizontal inequalities occur when members of ethnic, religious, or other identity groups have unequal access to public goods, opportunities and resources. Group-level inequalities can generate social and economic polarisation that increases the risk of violent conflict (Østby 2008; Stewart 2009). Of course, these dynamics alone do not start wars. **Political grievances and conflict proneness are most likely**

to lead to violence—from terrorism to civil war—when poverty and inequality combine with repression, particularly in anocracies, regimes that are neither strongly democratic, nor wholly autocratic (Abadie 2004; Mousseau et al. 2003). Yet, governance can also mitigate the link between poverty and conflict. Resource governance plays a key role in shaping countries’ economic and structural vulnerability to conflict (Ross 2004; Thies 2010). While social welfare spending, particularly on education and healthcare, and stable aid flows reduce the risk of war, aid shocks and excessive military spending increase its likelihood (De Ree & Nillesen 2009; Nielsen et al. 2011; Savun & Tirone 2011; Taydas & Peksen 2012). Similarly, economic shocks, such as the 2008 spike in global food prices, can spark social unrest that escalates into armed conflict in vulnerable political settings (Blattman & Miguel 2010; Lagi et al. 2011). **Once conflict breaks out, it hits the poor the hardest: social welfare is depleted as goods and services are diverted to the war effort; rural infrastructure is destroyed in contested territory; and justice and security provision retracts into urban areas and elite enclaves. Conflict causes and compounds**

poverty. First depleting labour and human capital, then destroying productive assets and financial capital, and finally, eroding the social capital of trust and cooperation upon which strong political and economic systems depend

(Mercier et al. 2016). The war economies and institutions that are created in conflict are overwhelmingly extractive, and tend to warp local political economies through their reliance on smuggling and coercion (Keen 1997). These practices can become conflict drivers in their own right, and can perpetuate conflict-related violence and inequality even after war has officially ended (Justino 2013).