# **1AC - Space Cap**

## **Framework**

**I affirm the resolution, “Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.”**

**The value for the round is clearly justice as whether or not the appropriation of outer space by private entities is or is not just is the question posed by the resolution. So only a value of justice will answer the question of the resolution. Random House Unabridged Dictionary defines justice to mean, “just treatment of all members of society with regard to a specified public issue, including equitable distribution of resources and participation in decision-making.” We should look to the text of the resolution whenever possible as doing so empowers us to actually resolve the debate. So unless my opponent upholds justice you can already prefer my framework on topical relevance and focus.**

**A collectivized, rather than privatized, vision of space exploration will empower us to pursue all of our space initiatives.**

**Roberts ’21,** Spencer Roberts (a science writer, musician, ecologist, and rooftop solar engineer from Colorado), “We Need a Socialist Vision for Space Exploration,” Jacobin, September 8, 2021, https://jacobinmag.com/2021/09/socialist-space-exploration-

publicly-funded-nasa-education-futurism

Finally, a **socialist vision** for space exploration could enable us to reach our full potential to venture into the unknown. History enshrines the intrepid explorers, but the true heroes of the space age are the workers at ground control. Yuri Gagarin made it home safely because of his command crews stationed from Baikonur to Khabarovsk. Apollo 13 famously called on Houston when they had a problem. Today, many of our brightest astrophysicists and aerospace engineers are swept up by military departments and weapons manufacturers. We should **use their talents for science** and education instead. That doesn’t mean, however, colonizing Mars. The Red Planet is a cosmic wonder, but a dreadful place for Earthlings. It has very little carbon dioxide, and no amount of terraforming will reinstate the magnetic dynamo that once deflected the solar winds now stripping away its depleted atmosphere. In fact, everything we have learned from researching Mars has reinforced the importance of protecting the fragile atmosphere of our home planet. While piloted space flights may be useful in some situations, we should place far more emphasis on collaboratively building robots like the ones that have taught us about our planetary neighbors. In today’s space race, these initiatives compete for funding. By **prioritizing cooperation over colonization**, however, we could pursue them all. We could attempt to retrieve raw materials for green energy infrastructure from decommissioned satellites and uninhabited asteroids instead of mines in the Global South. We could search the solar system for extraterrestrial life by flying rotorcrafts into the hydrocarbon-rich atmosphere of Titan and boring submarines into the icy subsurface ocean of Europa. We could strive for the first landing on Pluto, Eris, or even beyond — not to plant a flag, but **seed a concept of what we can collectively achieve**.

**So the criterion is embracing a collectivized vision for space exploration. Prefer this as a collectivized vision for space exploration meets our definition of justice by**

**1) ensuring there is an equitable distribution of resources as they are discovered and utilized in our efforts in outer space and**

**2) ensuring participation in decision-making of all nations and peoples as space is explored and utilized in a cooperative manner.**

**So only a collectivized vision for space exploration achieves justice in the context of the resolution. If I prove that the appropriation of outer space by private entities is a rejection of this collectivized vision, we must affirm.**

### **My sole contention is that Appropriation of outer space by private entities is a rejection of the collectivized vision of space exploration**

**Subpoint A. The appropriation of outer space by private entities is an extension of colonial capitalism.**

**Levine ’15,** Nick Levine (an MPhil candidate in history of science at the University of Cambridge), “Democratize the Universe,” Jacobin, March 21, 2015, https://jacobinmag.com/2015/03/space-industry-extraction-levine

As an alternative to the laissez-faire approach advocated by many private interests, the “common heritage” principle also provided a legal framework for the democratic distribution of revenues derived from the international commons. In 1973, the Indian delegation to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space tried to put this idea into celestial practice, proposing an amendment to the Outer Space Treaty that called for equitable sharing of space benefits, particularly with developing countries. The Brazilian delegate to the committee summarized the group’s position: “It does not seem justifiable . . . that space activities . . . should evolve in a climate of total laissez- faire, which would conceal under the cloak of rationality new ways for an abusive exercise of power by those who exert control over technology.” Despite opposition from both the Soviet Union and the United States, the final draft of this new outer space agreement included a version of the “common heritage of mankind” doctrine. When the finalized treaty was brought to the US in 1979 for ratification, business groups balked. **The vision of egalitarian** galactic **democracy suggested by the document was** rightly seen as **contrary to narrow American interests.** The United Technologies Corporation, a designer and manufacturer of aircrafts and other heavy machinery (including the Black Hawk helicopter) took out a large advertisement in the Washington Post and a number of other newspapers, warning that the treaty would establish an “OPEC-like monopoly, require mandatory transfer of technology, and impose high international taxes on profits as a way of shifting wealth from the developed to the less developed countries.” The president of the corporation, Alexander Haig, also testified against the treaty in Congress in 1979, warning that “**the common heritage concept expressed in the treaty underlies Third World efforts directed at a fundamental redistribution of global wealth.**” Haig was hired as Ronald Reagan’s secretary of state in 1981, and political opposition to the bill forced NASA’s chief counsel to abandon defense of the treaty. In the end, the Moon Treaty, as the 1979 document came to be known, failed to gain more than a few signatories, leaving open the question of how the benefits of outer space were to be shared. In 1988, a different coalition of developing countries added the question of space benefits to the UN outer space committee’s agenda. But they failed to gain traction, and by 1993 they had to concede, as two long-time delegates to the outer space committee put it, that **“their attempt [at] a redistributive revolution in international space cooperation had failed.”**

**This means the appropriation of outer space by private entities is a *prima facie* rejection of the collectivized principles and vision of the Outer Space Treaty which attempted to protect space for the benefit and cooperative use of all people.**

**Subpoint B. The appropriation of outer space by private entities will be done ignoring redistributive obligations creating the newest capitalist frontier.**

**Levine ’15,** Nick Levine (an MPhil candidate in history of science at the University of Cambridge), “Democratize the Universe,” Jacobin, March 21, 2015, https://jacobinmag.com/2015/03/space-industry-extraction-levine Recent US plans for outer space development, shaped overwhelmingly by Silicon Valley’s intuitions and capital, **stand in stark contrast to the futuristic democratic dreams** of the Group of 77.The most prominent of these entrepreneurial visions has been Elon Musk’s plan to colonize Mars. For now, international law seems to unequivocally forbid territorial claims on Mars and other celestial bodies. The legal status of resource extraction, on the other hand, remains an open question. A vocal group of entrepreneurs is hoping to set a precedent for the private appropriation of natural resources from asteroids, without internationally redistributive obligations. Planetary Resources, an asteroid-mining company whose backers include Larry Page, Eric Schmidt, and James Cameron, plans to launch satellites to prospect for valuable asteroids in the next two years. Another US firm, Deep Space Industries, will launch exploratory satellites as soon as next year. These entrepreneurs hope to extract the valuable platinum-group metals, essential for manufacturing electronics, that are rare on Earth. Sensationalist articles on space mining will tell you about an asteroid worth $20 trillion. Investors also believe that asteroids might provide water that could be broken down into oxygen and hydrogen in space, yielding air for astronauts and fuel for their ships.This could facilitate a dramatic acceleration in the economic development of outer space. The CEO of Deep Space Industries said he hopes asteroids near Earth will be “like the Iron Range of Minnesota was for the De troit car industry last century — a key resource located near where it was needed. In this case, metals and fuel from asteroids can expand the in-space industries of this century. That is our strategy.” Another entrepreneur **called the industrialization of outer space the “biggest wealth-creation opportunity in modern history.**” Before this value can be generated, however, the legal wrinkles have to be ironed out. And so in the summer of 2014, the ASTEROIDS Act was introduced in the House of Representatives to “promote the right of United States commercial entities to explore and utilize resources from asteroids in outer space, in accordance with the existing international obligations of the United States, free from harmful interference, and to transfer or sell such resources.” The legislation was intended to clarify US interpretations of international space law, explicitly granting American companiesthe right to extract asteroid resources and bring them to market. The conclusion of Congress’s last session means that the bill will have to be reintroduced for it to move forward, and it is uncertain exactly when and how this will happen.

**The appropriation of outer space by private entities is a rejection of the collectivized vision of outer space by making space a safe space only for a few, private individuals who plan to extend the reach of capitalism to outer space to entrench greater inequality on earth.**

**Subpoint C. Space capitalism causes mass exploitation for the sake of elite capitalistkind**

Victor L. **Shammas &** Tomas B. **Holen**, Shammas is a professor of Criminology and Sociology of Law at the University of Oslo and Holen is an Independent Scholar, **2019**, “One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space”, <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9> (accessed: 07/08/21)

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 capitalist kind**.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.

#### **The appropriation of outer space by private entities will extend labor marginalization and exploitation into space.**

#### **Marx ’20, Paris Marx (a socialist writer and host of the Tech Won't Save Us podcast), “Yes to Space Exploration. No to Space Capitalism,” Jacobin, June 8, 2020, https://jacobinmag.com/2020/06/spacex-elon-musk-jeff-bezos-capitalism**

#### But these billionaires do not hide who would be served by their futures. Musk has given many figures for the cost of a ticket to Mars, but they’re never cheap. He told Vance the tickets would cost $500,000 to $1 million, a price at which he thinks “it’s highly likely that there will be a self- sustaining Martian colony.” However, the workers for such a colony clearly won’t be able to buy their own way. Rather, Musk tweeted a plan for **Martian indentured servitude** where workers would take on loans to pay for their tickets and pay them off later because “There will be a lot of jobs on Mars!” Bezos is even more open about how the workforce will have to expand to serve his vision, but has little to say about what they’ll be doing. His plan to maintain economic “growth and dynamism” requires the human population to grow to a trillion people. He claims this would create “a thousand Mozarts and a thousand Einsteins” who would live in space colonies that are supposed to house a million people each, with the surface of Earth being mainly for tourism. Meanwhile, industrial and mining work would move into orbit so as not to pollute the planet, and while he doesn’t explicitly acknowledge it, it’s likely that’s where you’ll find many of those **trillion workers toiling for their space overlord and his descendants.**

#### **Capitalism destroys all value to life –it turns workers into slaves, their very consciousness turned into a means for profit while money takes precedent over human life**

**Marsh 95**, Professor of Philosophy at Fordham University, PhD from Northwestern University

(James, Critique Action and Liberation, p 277)

Ideally, nature, workers' own bodies, and the world around them, should be the vehicle of their conscious self-expression. **In estranging human beings from object and process, capitalism estranges them from their own consciousness. It turns consciousness into** a means of individual life or **mere physical existence. Rather than living to work the worker works in order to live,** to keep body and soul together. That which should be a means becomes an end, and that which should be the end becomes a means. Rather than nature being the environment in which human beings freely, consciously express themselves and realize themselves, nature is turned against them. Consciousness ceases to be an end and **becomes a means to the realization of profit.** Use value, the capacity of products for fulfilling real human needs, in capitalism becomes subordinate to the product's exchange value, the abstract labor time as measured in money. The consciousness of everyone, even the capitalist, is alienated in the pursuit of profit. Money becomes an all-consuming god devouring everything in its path. In this institutionalized reification in which things become more important than consciousness, what Marx calls the fetishism of commodities arises. **Human beings forget that they are the source of value in their wealth** and think that it is the source of their value.

**Subpoint D. We must affirm now to fight for a more democratic political economy. Levine ’15, Nick Levine (an MPhil candidate in history of science at the University of Cambridge), “Democratize the Universe,” Jacobin, March 21, 2015, https://jacobinmag.com/2015/03/space-industry-extraction-levine**

The history of the Moon Treaty serves as a reminder that outer space is not just a screen onto which we project techno-utopian fantasies or existential anxieties about the infinite void. It has been, and will continue to be, a site of **concrete struggle over economic power.** The politics of the present are undoubtedly different from those of the 1970s. The egalitarian project of the Group of 77 has given way to BRICS-style market liberalism. Global capital has gained power where international labor efforts have stagnated. Domestic inequalities have skyrocketed. The rapid proliferation of information technologies has temporarily masked the reality that the future, to paraphrase William Gibson, is not being very evenly distributed. **Without international political organization** to challenge galactic market fundamentalism, **a twenty-first century space odyssey could mean the concentration of even more wealth and income in the hands of a few powerful corporations** and the most technologically advanced countries. At the same time, and for the same reasons, the prospect of preserving the final frontier as a celestial commons presents an opportunity to fight for a more democratic political economy.

**This means the only way to achieve a collectivized vision of space and expand democratic choice into the final frontier is to reject the appropriation of outer space by private entities as it is unjust and so we must affirm. Thank You.\**

**Underview**

**[1] If I win one layer vote aff**

[a] Time skew--neg has 7 minutes to uplayer and makes the round impossible to win

[b] It forces you to engage with the aff creating substantive discussion on something we both had time to prep for

**[2] The neg may only make one response to each argument in the aff and must answer them all**

[a] Makes sure we have an equal number of arguments for reciprocity

[b] Solves flooding the 1ar since you choose the best answers

**[3] Neg must only defend the converse of the res**

[a] Prep Skew--I disclosed the case but you didn’t disclose the counter advocacy text meaning you’ll always be more ready for the debate than me

[b] Strat Skew- the aff can only indict the squo, which means alternative advocacies moot all aff offense forcing a 1ar restart and creating a 13-7 skew