#### First Things First, the “Giant Leap for Mankind” Mentality falsely groups a collective humanity into the experiences of only wealthy capitalists in order to justify the deregulation of commercial space activity

Holen, Thomas B, and Shammas, Victor L. One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space.Palgrave Communications.1/29/19. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9> .DA=1/25/22.-SVJK)

We have already noted that it is not humanity, conceived as species-being, a Gattungswesen, that makes its way into space. The term Gattungswesen, of course, has a long intellectual pedigree, harking back to Hegel, Feuerbach, Marx, and others. The term can ‘be naturally applied both to the individual human being and to the common nature or essence which resides in every individual man and woman', Allan Wood (2004, p. 17) writes, as well as ‘to the entire human race, referring to humanity as a single collective entity or else to the essential property which characterizes this entity and makes it a single distinctive thing in its own right'. Significantly, the adherents of NewSpace often resort to the idea of humanity in its broad universality (e.g., Musk, 2017), but this denies and distorts the modulation of humanity by its imbrication with the project of global (and post-global, i.e., space-bound) capitalism. It is precisely the sort of false universality implied in the humanism of the supporters of NewSpace that Marx subjected to a scathing critique in the sixth of his Theses on Feuerbach. Here Marx noted that the human essence is not made up of some ‘abstraction inherent in each single individual' (1998, p. 570). Instead, humans are defined by the ‘ensemble of social relations' in which they are enmeshed. Under NewSpace, it is not humanity, plain and simple, that ventures forth, but a specific set of capitalist entrepreneurs, carrying a particular ideological payload, alongside their satellites, instruments, and supplies, a point noted by other sociologists of outer space, or ‘astrosociologists' (Dickens and Ormrod, 2007a, 2007b).

#### The deregulation of commercial space policy entrenches neoliberal reactions and destroy the possibility of a future global commons

Sutch, Peter and Roberts, Peri 2019. Outer space and neo-colonial injustice: Distributive justice and the continuous scramble for dominium. International Journal of Social Economics 46 (11) , pp. 1291-1304. 10.1108/IJSE-03-2019-0152 file

Recent developments in the rhetoric and policy of the United States of America towards outer space have the potential to both challenge central values of important global commons regimes and to pose an unjust threat to those states whose economic and societal development has been impeded by colonialism. The move by the USA toward the commercialization and militarization of outer space means that we are at the very early stages of a politics that could see the human species determine the fate of the natural and political environment beyond our planet and, in the process, determine the nature of the relationship between all human beings (including future generations). The glimmer of hope, held out by global commons regimes, that we might do so in an ordered, environmentally sustainable, and just manner is dimming as neo-liberal economics and realist foreign policy reassert their dominant place in public policy discussions. Greater inequality, more environmental degradation and the prospect of real space wars underlie the significance of the argument we make below. This paper takes these challenges seriously and argues that good reasons persist for restating the importance of commons values and for developing institutions that advance them, both with regards to outer space and elsewhere.

#### Private sector space innovation fuels government military dominance in space

Werner, Debra. Military turns to private sector for rapid space innovation.10/9/19.Space News. <https://spacenews.com/warfare-satellite-innovation-2019/> .DA=2/3/22

“When we put a man on the moon, there were probably 10,000 NASA contracts to invent everything from aluminum foil to Tang, the breakfast drink,” Peterman said. “If NASA wanted to put a man or woman on Mars today, the fastest, most effective way to do that, might be to write a one or two-page statement of objectives and let Elon Musk, [Jeff] Bezos, Richard Branson and some others bid on that.” If government agencies don’t embrace commercial innovation, the consequences could be grave, according to a panel of experts discussing the implications of space as a warfare domain. “The U.S. government’s ability to maintain dominance in space will be heavily dependent on their ability to work quickly to take advantage of all the commercial innovation we’re talking about here,” said Chris DeMay, HawkEye 360 chief technology officer and co-founder. “We see enemy nations investing in their own companies with parallel capabilities that will exceed ours if the U.S. government can’t continue to invest at a faster rate.”

#### Capitalist economies generate fabricated value systems in tension with the devaluing effects of excess. Capitalism then necessitates infinite geographic expansion, without which it will inevitably collapse

Holen, Thomas B, and Shammas, Victor L. One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space.Palgrave Communications.1/29/19. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9> .DA=1/25/22.-SVJK)

A ‘spatial fix' involves the geographic modulation of capital accumulation, consisting in the outward expansion of capital onto new geographic terrains, or into new spaces, with the aim of filling a gap in the home terrains of capital. Jessop (2006, p. 149) notes that spatial fixes may involve a number of strategies, including the creation of new markets within the capitalist world, engaging in trade with non-capitalist economies, and exporting surplus capital to undeveloped or underdeveloped regions. The first two address the problem of insufficient demand and the latter option creates a productive (or valorizing) outlet for excess capital. Capitalism must regularly discover, develop, and appropriate such new spaces because of its inherent tendency to generate surplus capital, i.e., capital bereft of profitable purpose. In Harvey’s (2006, p. xviii) terms, a spatial fix revolves around ‘geographical expansions and restructuring…as a temporary solution to crises understood…in terms of the overaccumulation of capital'. It is a temporary solution because these newly appropriated spaces will in turn become exhausted of profitable potential and are likely to produce their own stocks of surplus capital; while ‘capital surpluses that otherwise stood to be devalued, could be absorbed through geographical expansions and spatio-temporal displacements' (Harvey, 2006, p. xviii), this outwards drive of capitalism is inherently limitless: there is no end point or final destination for capitalism. Instead, capitalism must continuously propel itself onwards in search of pristine sites of renewed capital accumulation. In this way, Harvey writes, society constantly ‘creates fresh productive powers elsewhere to absorb its overaccumulated capital' (Harvey, 1981, p. 8)

#### The ending impact of private appropriation of outer space is the immortalizing of settler colonial capitalist economies, ending history with the propulsion of humanity into an eternity of value labor.

Holen, Thomas B, and Shammas, Victor L. One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space.Palgrave Communications.1/29/19. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9> .DA=1/25/22.-SVJK)

Outer space serves at least two purposes in this regard. In the short-to medium-term, it allows for the export of surplus capital into emerging industries, such as satellite imaging and communication. These are significant sites of capital accumulation: global revenues in the worldwide satellite market in 2016 amounted to $260 billion (SIA, 2017, p. 4). Clearly, much of this activity is taking place ‘on the ground'; it is occurring in the ‘terrestrial economy'. But all that capital would have to find some other meaningful or productive outlet were it not for the expansion of capital into space. Second, outer space serves as an arena of technological innovation, which feeds back into the terrestrial economy, helping to avert crisis by pushing capital out of technological stagnation and innovation shortfalls. In short, outer space serves as a spatial fix. It swallows up surplus capital, promising to deliver valuable resources, technological innovations, and communication services to capitalists back on Earth. This places outer space on the same level as traditional colonization, analyzed in Hegel’s Philosophy of Right, which Hegel thought of as a product of the ‘inner dialectic of civil society', which drives the market to ‘push beyond its own limits and seek markets, and so its necessary means of subsistence, in other lands which are either deficient in the goods it has overproduced, or else generally backward in creative industry, etc.' (Hegel, 2008, p. 222). In this regard, SpaceX and related ventures are not so very different from maritime colonialists and the trader-exploiters of the British East India Company. But there is something new at stake. As the Silicon Valley entrepreneur Peter Diamandis has gleefully noted: ‘There are twenty-trillion-dollar checks up there, waiting to be cashed!' (Seaney and Glendenning, 2016). Capitalistkind consists in the naturalization of capitalist consciousness and practice, the (false) universalization of a particular mode of political economy as inherent to the human condition, followed by the projection of this naturalized universality into space—capitalist humanity as a Fukuyamite ‘end of history', the end-point of (earthly) historical unfolding, but the starting point of humanity’s first serious advances in space.

#### Thus I affirm: the appropriation of outer space by private parties is unjust, and I present the legal framework of global commons as universally preferable. Note that the burden of the negative is not to show that the private appropriation of space is beneficial, but that their specific form of appropriation is not achievable under a global commons framework

Sutch, Peter and Roberts, Peri 2019. Outer space and neo-colonial injustice: Distributive justice and the continuous scramble for dominium. International Journal of Social Economics 46 (11) , pp. 1291-1304. 10.1108/IJSE-03-2019-0152 file

Property is a legal construct. There are a variety of ways in which property rights can be assigned but the developed global commons solution was distinctive. Christopher Joyner’s exploration of the legal implications of the common heritage regime that was to govern property rights in the global commons begins (as do many accounts) with the traditional roman law distinction between res nullius and res communis. These terms apply to property or to space that is not owned by anyone. If that space is res nullius then it is open to ‘appropriation and exploitation by anyone who is capable of carrying out those acts’ (Joyner 1986:194). Sovereignty is gained, and exclusive property rights established, by demonstrating control over that space by settling it or exercising jurisdiction over it. On the other hand, if the area is considered res communis it is land owned by no one, open for use by all but not available for appropriation and so not available to become the exclusive property of any one person or any one nation (Joyner 1986:194). Here agents have free access but never gain exclusive title to the resources in question. International or global spaces, such as the sea and the resources therein, were traditionally thought of in res communis terms as, for example, ‘free seas’. However, when advances in scientific knowledge made it clear that the assumptions of inexhaustibility, the thought that resources were renewable and sustainable enough to provide for all indefinitely, that partly underpins the concept of free seas are problematic this (in addition to several other concerns about the consequences of establishing a res communis regime in the high seas) invited a different approach to at least some questions of property (Schrijver and Prislan 2009). Under emerging and innovative global commons rules spaces designated as such could not be appropriated and access to the resources of that space had to be carefully managed to ensure sustainability of access for all, at present and in the future. The conception of unowned resources and property in a global commons regime is therefore distinct from res nullius regimes because it denies the right of appropriation and it is distinct from res communis regimes because it denies unfettered access, replacing it with some form of regulated access. The questions of what spaces or resource should be thought of in these terms, what the term implied (about distributive or intergenerational justice for example), how the space and resources at stake were to be managed and administered, and what obligations the administrators had to humankind as a whole all formed part of the elaborate and often painstaking negotiations regarding property rights and benefit sharing underpinning the international conventions that emerged, and they continue to be hotbeds of legal, political and normative contention.

#### A framework of ending Capitalism precludes ethical deliberation. Capital value systems reduce decision-making to economic calculation.

Morgareidge, Clayton, Prof of Philosophy at Lewis & Clark College, 1998, Why Capitalism is Evil 08/22 http://www.lclark.edu/~clayton/commentaries/evil.html

To show why this is the case, let me turn to capital's greatest critic, Karl Marx. Under capitalism, Marx writes, everythingin nature and everything that human beings are and can do **becomes an object: a resource for**, or an obstacle to, the expansion of production, the development of technology, the growth of markets, and the circulation of money. For those who manage and live from capital, nothing has value of its own. Mountain streams, clean air, human lives -- all mean nothing in themselves, but are valuable only if they can be used to turn a profit**.** If capital looks at (not into) the human face, it sees there only eyes through which brand names and advertising can enter and mouths that can demand and consume food, drink, and tobacco products. If human faces express needs, then either products can be manufactured to meet, or seem to meet, those needs, or else, if the needs are incompatible with the growth of capital, then the faces expressing them must be unrepresented or silenced. Obviously what capitalist enterprises do have consequences for the well being of human beings and the planet we live on. Capital profits from the production of food, shelter, and all the necessities of life. The production of all these things uses human lives in the shape of labor, as well as the resources of the earth. If we care about life, if we see our obligations in each others faces, then we have to want all the things capital does to be governed by that care, to be directed by the ethical concern for life. But feeding people is not the aim of the food industry, or shelter the purpose of the housing industry. In medicine, making profits is becoming a more important goal than caring for sick people. As capitalist enterprises these activities aim single-mindedly at the accumulation of capital, and such purposes as caring for the sick or feeding the hungry becomes a mere means to an end, an instrument of corporate growth. Therefore ethics, the overriding commitment to meeting human need, is left out of deliberations about what the heavyweight institutions of our society are going to do**.** Moral convictions are expressed in churches, in living rooms, in letters to the editor, sometimes even by politicians and widely read commentators, but almost always with an attitude of resignation to the inevitable. People no longer say, "You can't stop progress," but only because they have learned not to call economic growth progress. They still think they can't stop it. And they are right -- as long as the production of all our needs and the organization of our labor is carried out under private ownership. Only a minority ("idealists") can take seriously a way of thinking that counts for nothing in real world decision making. Only when the end of capitalism is on **the table will ethics have a seat at the table.**

#### The role of the judge as an intellectual is to endorse movements seeking to produce truth contributing to the destruction of Neoliberalism.

Wood,David and Medina, Jose.l. Apr 15, 2008.Truth: Engagements Across Philosophical Traditions. https://books.google.com/books?id=fsRmQSnLT-kC&pg=PA334&lpg=PA334&dq=It+seems+to+me+that+%5BW%5Dhat+must+now+be+taken+into+account+in+the+%5BThe%5D+intellectual+is+not+the+%E2%80%98bearer+of+universal+values.%E2%80%99+Rather,+it%E2%80%99s+%5Bis%5D+the+person+%5Bwho%5D+occupying+a+specific+position+%E2%80%93++but+whose+specificity+is+linked,+in+a+society+like+ours,+to+the+general+functioning+of+an+apparatus+of+truth.+In+other+words,+the+intellectual+has+a+three-fold+specificity&source=bl&ots=07eiVieX6e&sig=1bCI2QExvtx64a2VLbz7Yn3myqs&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj0mO2K7eTNAhXHSyYKHSTaAGMQ6AEIIjAC#v=onepage&q=It%20seems%20to%20me%20that%20%5BW%5Dhat%20must%20now%20be%20taken%20into%20account%20in%20the%20%5BThe%5D%20intellectual%20is%20not%20the%20%E2%80%98bearer%20of%20universal%20values.%E2%80%99%20Rather%2C%20it%E2%80%99s%20%5Bis%5D%20the%20person%20%5Bwho%5D%20occupying%20a%20specific%20position%20%E2%80%93%20%20but%20whose%20specificity%20is%20linked%2C%20in%20a%20society%20like%20ours%2C%20to%20the%20general%20functioning%20of%20an%20apparatus%20of%20truth.%20In%20other%20words%2C%20the%20intellectual%20has%20a%20three-fold%20specificity&f=false.DA=7/8/16.-SVJK)

It seems to me that [W]hat must now be taken into account in the [The] intellectual is not the ‘bearer of universal values.’ Rather, it’s [is] the person [who] occupying a specific position – but whose specificity is linked, in a society like ours, to the general functioning of an apparatus of truth. In other words, the intellectual has a three-fold specificity: that of his class position (whether as petty-bourgeois in the service of capitalism or ‘organic’ intellectual of the proletariat); that of his conditions of life and work, linked to his condition as an intellectual (his field of research, his place in a laboratory, and political and economy demands to which he submits of against which he rebels, in the university, the hospital, etc.); lastly, the specificity of the politics of truths in our societies. And [I]t’s with this last factorthathis position can take on a general significance and that his local, specific struggle can have effects and implications which arenot simply professional or sectorial. The intellectual can [and] operate[s] and struggle at the general level of that regime of truth which is so essential to the structure and functioning of our society. There is a battle ‘for truth,’ or at least ‘around truth’ – it being understood [as] once again that by truth I do not mean ‘the ensemble of truths which are to be discovered and accepted,’ but rather ‘the ensemble of rules according to which the true and false are separated and specific effects of [from] power attached to the true’, it being understood also that it’s not a matter of a battle ‘on behalf’ of the truth, but of a battle about the status of truth and the economic and political role it plays. It is necessary to think of the political problems of intellectuals not in terms of ‘science’ and ‘ideology’, but in terms of ‘truth’ and ‘power’. And thus the question of the professionalization of intellectuals and the division between intellectual and manual labour can be envisaged in a new way. All this must seem very confused and uncertain. Uncertain indeed, and what I am saying here is above all to be taken as a hypothesis. In order for it to be a little less confused, however, I would like to put forward a few ‘propositions’ – not firm assertions, but simply suggestions to be further tested and explained. ‘Truth’ is to be understood as a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements. ‘Truth’ is linked in a circular relation with system of powers, which produces and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it. A regime of truth. This regime is not merely ideological or superstructural; it was a condition of the formation and development of capitalism. A[a]nd it’s this same regime, which, is subject to certain modifications, operates in the socialists countries (I leave open here the question of China, about which I know little). The essential political problem for the intellectual is not to criticize the ideological contents supposedly linked to science, or to ensure that his own scientific practice is accompanied by a correct ideology, but that of [to] ascertaining the possibility of constitution a new politics of truth. The problem is not changing people’s consciousness’s – or what’s in their heads – but the political, economic, institutional regime of the production of truth. It’s not a matter of emancipating truth from every system of power (which would be a chimera, for truth is already power) but of detaching the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social economic and cultural, within which it operates[.]

#### The viewing of this drive to hyper-possess material goods as the de-facto state of nature for humankind is the root cause of environmental degradation, and the dehumanization of persons.

Varma, Associate Professor and Regents Lecturer, School of Public Administration University of New Mexico, 2003 (Roli, Sage productions, “E.F. Schumacher: Changing the Paradigm of Bigger Is Better,” http://bst.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/23/2/114, accesed 7/10/08, page 116).

Materialismholds that the world is by its very nature material; the world consists of particles of matter; each of them has its own existence. These particles interact with each other and in their totality form the world. Matter is objective reality existing outside and independent of the mind; anything mental or spiritual is a product of material processes. Materialism is based on the scientific investigations of natural phenomena and thus seeks explanations in terms of factors that can be verified. It views each human being as a social atom withcertain inherent properties andattributes. In the industrial system of production, materialismhas beenreduced to the ideology of market.The market isseenbothas the natural condition of mankindand irresistible; it gives the people what they want. The production and consumption of material goods and the acquisition of money are the main goals of the market. It is believed that the generation of wealth will result insatisfaction with nonmaterial goods such as justice,harmony**,** happiness, beauty,and health. Against materialism, Schumacher believed in idealism, which views spiritual as prior to the material. For him, there was a higher, more real, and nonmaterial world beyond the material world. He believed that the problem of industrial production resulting in the environmental crisis stemmed from misplaced values. Unlike religious teachings, materialism shows noself control orrespect with the natural world. Schumacher(1977) made a distinction between “convergent” and “divergent” problems (p. 121). Convergent problems relate to the nonliving aspect of the world; in contrast, divergent problems relate to the human issues. Withconvergent problems, scientific investigations tend to find solutions; the answers tend to converge. However, with divergent problems, scientific investigations lead to opposite solutions; the answers tend to diverge. Schumacher believed that materialismtreats all problems as convergent and thus dehumanizes individuals**.** He therefore suggested a return to religious truth. In his words, “the modern experiment to live without religion has failed” (p. 139). Schumacher thought of the materialist philosophy ofoverproduction and overconsumptionas aroot of many problems facing the modern world. For instance, the practice of mechanized agriculture and factor farmingadds to the pollution of land and water. Similarly, increasing wealth of people depends on making continuous demands on limited world resources. Schumacher (1973) questioned measuring a man’s “standard of living” by assuming that a “man who consumes more is ‘better off’ than a man who consumes less” (p. 54). He believed that material prosperity could not lead to world peace because “it is attainable only by cultivating such drives of human nature as greed and envy**”** (p. 30). According to him, “man must never lose his sense of the marvellousness of the world around and inside him” (Schumacher, 1974, p. 31). He therefore promoted “reduction of needs” to promote “peace and permanence” (Schumacher, 1973, p. 31).