WATERLOO ECONOMICS SOCIETY
UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH COMPETITION, 2026

Oligarchic Capital and the Exploitation of the Retail Investor in the SpaceX IPO

Rita Bhowmik

May 31, 2026

© 2026 Waterloo Economics Society. For competition use only.

ABSTRACT

Space Exploration Technologies Corp. (SpaceX) filed its S-1 registration statement with the Securities and Exchange Commission on May 20, 2026, targeting a valuation of up to 2 trillion under the ticker SPCX. This would mean the largest initial public offering (IPO) in recorded history. This paper applies tools from information economics to argue that the SpaceX IPO represents the use of a **hyper-politicised private company**, whose **valuation is dependent** on continued government patronage as a mechanism to **transfer insider-accumulated risk to retail investors**. We decompose the S-1 financials into three business segments (Space, Connectivity/Starlink, and AI/xAI), demonstrating that the headline revenue and EBITDA figures presented to prospective shareholders obscure a USD 41.3 billion accumulated deficit and a Q1 2026 net loss of USD 4.28 billion driven by xAI losses of USD 2.5 billion. We analyse the unprecedented 30% retail allocation as an instrument of demand anchoring and sentiment engineering, rather than access, leveraging Musk's documented influence over retail investor behaviour on social media platforms. The paper explores these dynamics within a broader framework of American oligarchic consolidation, examining how relationships between Musk, the Trump administration, and federal procurement constitute a material risk factor that receives inadequate disclosure in the S-1.

© 2026 Waterloo Economics Society. For competition use only.

1. INTRODUCTION

On May 20, 2026, SpaceX filed its S-1 registration statement with the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, seeking to raise USD 75 billion at a target valuation of USD 1.75–2 trillion under the ticker SPCX on the NASDAQ. If consummated at its targeted price, the offering will surpass Saudi Aramco's 2019 listing, previously the largest IPO in history at USD 29.4 billion raised, by more than 2.5 times on proceeds alone. The valuation target, meanwhile, would make SpaceX the third most valuable publicly listed company in the United States, trailing only Apple and Nvidia, and overtaking Microsoft.

Yet this milestone obscures a set of structural tensions that have received insufficient attention in the financial press and almost none in the academic literature. The purpose of this paper is to provide a rigorous economic analysis of the SpaceX IPO that is commensurate with its systemic significance. Specifically, we identify three problems that, taken together, constitute a compelling case that the IPO as currently structured represents an asymmetric transfer of risk from informed insiders to uninformed retail participants.

First, **the financial case for the headline valuation is materially weaker than presented.** SpaceX is not a unified profitable enterprise. Its S-1 consolidates three business segments with radically different financial profiles: Starlink (cash-generative, margin-positive), the Space launch business (capital-intensive, operating at a loss), and xAI (generating terrible losses of USD 6.35 billion in 2025 and USD 2.5 billion in Q1 2026 alone). The net loss of USD 4.94 billion for full-year 2025 and USD 4.28 billion for Q1 2026 alone represent a sharply deteriorating trajectory that is obscured by adjusted EBITDA figures that exclude these losses.

Second, **the IPO pricing process reflects manufactured, rather than discovered (real), value.** Private secondary market transactions have established successively higher valuations: USD 350 billion in late 2024, USD 800 billion in December 2025, and USD 1.25 trillion post-xAI merger in February 2026. Each of these anchor points was set by insiders in a market with no public participation. The public IPO then asks retail investors to validate and pay a premium above, a valuation that was set without them in transactions they were legally excluded from observing.

© 2026 Waterloo Economics Society. For competition use only.

Third**, SpaceX's founder, Elon Musk, occupies an unprecedented position of political-economic entanglement** that creates material, unhedgeable risk for public shareholders while creating concentrated upside for insiders. Musk served as head of the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE), which cancelled over 10,000 federal contracts, none of which affected his own companies. While SpaceX continued to win new government contracts from the same agencies. Donald Trump Jr., the son of the sitting President, holds equity in SpaceX through his venture fund. The S-1 nominally discloses these relationships but frames them as risks rather than what they structurally are: conditions of concentrated market power that inflate intrinsic value so long as the political alignment holds, and constitute catastrophic downside risk if it does not.

2. REVIEW

The theoretical treatment of IPO pricing is the Rock (1986) model of the winner's curse, which establishes that uninformed investors systematically receive disproportionate allocations of overpriced offerings and are crowded out of underpriced ones. The equilibrium implication is that uninformed investors must be compensated through underpricing across the portfolio of offerings in which they participate. The SpaceX case inverts this logic in a particularly instructive way: the company has specifically engineered an allocation mechanism that maximises retail participation precisely in the situation where asymmetric information is most extreme.

Bebchuk and Kastiel (2017) provide the definitive theoretical treatment of the welfare costs of dual-class share structures in publicly traded firms. Their central argument is that while dual-class structures may be efficiency-enhancing when founded on genuine informational advantages of the controlling shareholder, they become welfare-reducing over time as those advantages erode. At SpaceX, Musk retains 85% of the voting power through Class B shares that carry ten votes per share, despite holding only 42% of the economic interest. The intersection of political connection and firm value has been extensively studied since Fisman (2001) demonstrated that stock prices of Indonesian firms closely connected to President Suharto fell sharply on negative news about his health. More recent work by Acemoglu et al. (2016) documents the 'Musk premium' in a more general framework: firms whose valuations depend on politically contingent rent flows face an unpriced tail risk that is categorically different from normal business risk.

The SpaceX case presents a version of this problem. Musk's companies have received an estimated USD 15.4 billion in government contracts over the past decade. NASA's Artemis human landing system contract with SpaceX is valued at USD 2.9 billion. The Space Force's Proliferated Low Earth Orbit program, where SpaceX holds 97% market share, constitutes an effective monopoly on national security launch services. These revenues are not independently negotiated in competitive markets; they are awarded through procurement processes over which Musk, during his tenure at DOGE, exercised direct influence.

The literature on retail investor behaviour has been substantially revised following the GameStop episode of January 2021. Barber et al. (2022) document that retail investors exhibit strong attention-driven trading, crowd into high-visibility stocks, and suffer systematic underperformance

relative to the broader market. Critically, Elon Musk's documented influence over retail investor sentiment through social media. His comments on Dogecoin, Tesla, and other assets have been shown to generate statistically significant price responses in event studies. The company's CFO has explicitly framed the 30% retail allocation as a strategy to attract 'Musk loyalists' who are less likely to sell.

3. SPACEX FINANCIAL ARCHITECTURE: ANALYSIS

The consolidation of three businesses with fundamentally different economics into a single set of headline metrics is not fraudulent, but it is systematically misleading. This section performs that disaggregation.

SpaceX's S-1 financials consolidate three entities: (1) the Space launch business (Falcon 9, Falcon Heavy, and Starship development); (2) the Connectivity segment, driven by Starlink satellite internet; and (3) the AI segment, comprising xAI and the X social media platform, acquired in a merger completed in February 2026. Because the xAI merger involved entities under common control (both controlled by Musk), accounting standards require the financial statements to be retroactively recast as if the merger had always existed. This means that every headline metric for 2024 and 2025 includes xAI's losses as if they were always SpaceX's.

The result is that standalone SpaceX generated approximately USD 16 billion in 2025 revenue; the reported USD 18.7 billion figure incorporates USD 2.7 -- 3 billion in xAI and X revenues alongside their far larger losses. This is not disclosed prominently in the S-1 narrative, and media coverage of the IPO has, without exception, cited the consolidated figure as the operative revenue number.

Financial Summary

Segment	2025 Revenue (USD bn)	2025 Op. Income (USD bn)	Q1 2026 Revenue (USD bn)	Q1 2026 Op. Income (USD bn)
Connectivity (Starlink)	11.4	+1.19	3.26	+1.19
Space (Launch)	4.1	−0.66	0.62	−0.66
AI (xAI / X)	~3.2	−6.35	0.82	−2.47
Consolidated Total	18.7	−2.59	4.69	−1.94

Table 1. Segment-level financial summary derived from SpaceX S-1 filing, May 20, 2026. Sources: Fortune (2026), Yahoo Finance (2026), BitMEX Research (2026).

© 2026 Waterloo Economics Society. For competition use only.

The segmented picture is stark. Starlink is the only consistently profitable segment, generating USD 1.19 billion in operating income in both 2025 full-year and Q1 2026. The Space segment — the core identity of the company and the basis for most retail investor enthusiasm — operates at a structural loss. The AI segment is destroying capital at a rate of approximately USD 2.5 billion per quarter, a pace that would exhaust SpaceX's USD 16 billion cash reserves within approximately six quarters absent new capital raises or a dramatic reversal in AI unit economics.

The S-1 discloses an accumulated deficit of USD 41.3 billion as of March 31, 2026. This figure represents the running total of all net losses since SpaceX's founding in 2002. While it is not uncommon for high-growth companies to carry large accumulated deficits, the rate of accumulation is accelerating, not decelerating. The company posted a GAAP net loss of USD 528 million in Q1 2025 and USD 4.28 billion in Q1 2026.

Quarter	Net Loss (USD bn)	Primary Driver
Q1 2025	0.53	Starship development capex
Q2–Q4 2025 (avg)	~1.1 / qtr	xAI integration, Starship
Q1 2026	4.28	xAI losses (USD 2.47bn op. loss)
Accumulated Deficit (to Q1 2026)	41.3	Since founding, 2002

Table 2. Net loss trajectory, SpaceX S-1. Sources: Morningstar (2026), Motley Fool (2026).

Starlink's cash generation is subsidising two loss-making entities: the Starship development programme (a long-duration bet on the interplanetary transportation market) and xAI (a speculative AI venture competing against well-capitalised incumbents). A retail investor purchasing SpaceX at a USD 1.75 trillion valuation is implicitly: (a) paying approximately 87 times sales for a business whose profitable core is valued at an implied USD 1+ trillion while carrying the losses of two other businesses, and (b) accepting a governance structure in which the founder controlling 85% of the votes has an explicit contractual right to compete with SpaceX using that same AI technology.

© 2026 Waterloo Economics Society. For competition use only.

4. VALUATION

The IPO price discovery process is a mechanism for aggregating dispersed private information into a publicly observable signal. The SpaceX IPO process fails this standard in several independently significant ways.

The valuation trajectory that ultimately produced the USD 1.75–2 trillion IPO target was constructed entirely in private transactions inaccessible to public investors:

Date	Valuation (USD bn)	Transaction Type	Accessible to Retail?
Late 2024	350	Secondary tender offer (employees)	No
Dec 2025	800	Employee tender at $421/share	No
Feb 2026	1,250	xAI merger (common control)	No
Mar–May 2026	1,750	Roadshow target	No
Jun 2026 (est.)	1,750–2,000	Public IPO	Yes — first access

Table 3. SpaceX private-to-public valuation progression. Sources: New Market Pitch (2026), Bloomberg (2026), BitMEX Research (2026).

Markets are pricing SpaceX as though it will achieve revenue growth comparable to the most extraordinary technology companies in history, while simultaneously absorbing the ongoing losses of an AI segment that has not demonstrated competitive parity with ChatGPT, Gemini, or other incumbents. To justify the valuation on a discounted cash flow basis, assuming a 10% discount rate and a 5% terminal growth rate, SpaceX would need to generate approximately USD 80 billion in free cash flow annually within the foreseeable investment horizon.

© 2026 Waterloo Economics Society. For competition use only.

5. EXPLOITING THE COMMON INVESTOR

The SpaceX IPO's 30% retail allocation is often reported as a populist gesture, depicting Musk 'giving everyday Americans a chance to own a piece of the future.' This deserves careful scrutiny. In this section, we argue that the retail allocation serves specific economic functions that are primarily beneficial to insiders and underwriters rather than to retail investors themselves.

In a standard mega-cap IPO, retail investors receive between 5% and 10% of the initial float. The rationale for limiting retail allocation is not discriminatory but practical: institutional investors perform due diligence, submit informed bids during bookbuilding, and provide price stability in the secondary market. They also absorb lock-up risk and maintain positions through the post-IPO stabilisation period.

SpaceX's proposed 30% allocation serves three distinct insider interests. First, it broadens the demand base at a valuation where institutional investors, who model GAAP earnings, may be reluctant to absorb the full float. Retail investors are more likely to anchor to the company's brand and Musk's personal reputation than to DCF models. Second, it creates a network of small shareholders whose selling behaviour is less coordinated and less likely to produce large downward price pressure in the immediate post-IPO period. Third, it generates a public narrative of democratic participation that serves Musk's political brand, which is itself part of the value proposition of SpaceX's government contract franchise.

Musk's documented ability to move retail investor sentiment through social media platforms he controls X, the platform through which SpaceX's IPO will be primarily promoted constitutes a feedback loop with no parallel in prior IPO literature. Event studies of Musk's tweets about Tesla, Dogecoin, and other assets consistently show statistically significant price responses within minutes. The SpaceX IPO deploys this mechanism in the direction of primary issuance rather than secondary market trading, raising novel questions about the line between legitimate promotion and market manipulation.

© 2026 Waterloo Economics Society. For competition use only.

6. POLITICAL ECONOMY AND THE OLIGARCHIC PREMIUM

This section argues that the most significant analytical innovation required to understand the SpaceX IPO is the incorporation of a category of value that does not appear in standard financial models: what we term the oligarchic premium. This is the increment to intrinsic value attributable not to competitive advantage, innovation, or superior economics, but to a founder's ability to extract rents from the state through political access.

Musk served as head of the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) from January 2025 until his departure in May 2025. DOGE was a non-statutory body that, during its operation, unilaterally cancelled more than 10,000 federal contracts. Congressional investigation has established that none of these cancellations affected SpaceX, Tesla, X, or any Musk-affiliated entity — a pattern that, in the language of public procurement law, raises significant questions under the Federal Acquisition Regulation's conflict of interest provisions.

Simultaneously, SpaceX continued to win new federal contracts from the agencies DOGE was nominally auditing: NASA, the Department of Defense, and the Space Force. Among these: a USD 2.9 billion Artemis human landing system contract; additional Artemis awards for missions 3 and 4; 97% of Space Force PLEO program task orders; and ongoing Commercial Crew Program missions at USD 133 million per flight. The government revenue stream of approximately USD 3 billion annually is not subject to competitive pricing as long as SpaceX maintains its effective monopoly on US launch capability and its founder maintains political proximity to the executive branch.

Donald Trump Jr. holds SpaceX equity through 1789 Capital, a venture fund in which he became a partner following his father's electoral victory in November 2024. 1789 Capital has invested approximately USD 50 million in SpaceX and xAI and has backed at least four companies that subsequently received federal contracts during the current administration. The White House has denied any conflicts of interest between the presidency and Trump family business activities; however, from an economic risk-analysis perspective, the question is not whether these relationships are corrupt in a legal sense but whether they constitute a material contingent asset for SpaceX.

© 2026 Waterloo Economics Society. For competition use only.

7. CONCLUSION

This paper has argued that the SpaceX IPO, while remarkable as a feat of financial engineering and brand capitalisation, represents a structurally novel form of retail investor risk that existing academic frameworks only partially address. The three central findings are as follows.

The financial case for a USD 1.75–2 trillion valuation is substantially weaker than the headline S-1 metrics suggest. Disaggregating the three operating segments reveals that the only profitable business (Starlink) is being used to subsidise an AI venture (xAI) that generated USD 6.35 billion in losses in 2025 and USD 2.5 billion in the first quarter of 2026 alone. The accumulated deficit of USD 41.3 billion, and the sharply accelerating loss trajectory, are not consistent with a GAAP-profitability-based valuation anywhere near the target.

The price discovery process has been fundamentally compromised by the construction of a private-market anchor chain — from USD 350 billion in 2024 to USD 800 billion in December 2025 to USD 1.25 trillion post-merger — that retail investors were legally excluded from observing. The public IPO does not represent true price discovery; it represents the first opportunity for retail investors to buy into a price that was set for them, in transactions they were not permitted to participate in, by insiders with dramatically superior information.

These findings are situated within a broader political economy context in which SpaceX's valuation is meaningfully dependent on its founder's political access — access that is not quantifiable, not hedgeable, and not adequately disclosed. The company's effective monopoly on US launch capability and Space Force PLEO contracts, combined with the documented self-dealing of the DOGE episode, represents a category of risk — oligarchic premium — that traditional financial models are not designed to capture.

The policy reforms proposed in Section 9 are not radical interventions; they are calibrations to existing regulatory frameworks that would, if implemented, produce more information-efficient capital markets without materially impeding legitimate primary issuance. The SpaceX IPO is, in this sense, an opportunity: the largest offering in history, conducted at the frontier of political-economic entanglement, in a period of heightened concentration of wealth and power. What the capital markets do with that opportunity — and what policymakers choose to learn from it — will determine whether the next generation of oligarchic IPOs is conducted on more equitable terms.

© 2026 Waterloo Economics Society. For competition use only.

REFERENCES

Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., Kermani, A., Kwak, J., & Mitton, T. (2016). The value of connections in turbulent times: Evidence from the United States. Journal of Financial Economics, 121(2), 368–391.

Barber, B. M., Huang, X., Odean, T., & Schwarz, C. (2022). Attention-induced trading and returns: Evidence from Robinhood users. Journal of Finance, 77(6), 3141–3190.

Bebchuk, L. A., & Kastiel, K. (2017). The untenable case for perpetual dual-class stock. Virginia Law Review, 103, 585–631.

BitMEX Research. (2026, May 14). SpaceX IPO guide: S-1 breakdown, valuation and trading strategy. BitMEX Blog.

Bloomberg. (2026, May 20). How SpaceX's dream of a record-breaking IPO stacks up. Bloomberg Graphics.

Cremers, M., Lauterbach, B., & Pajuste, A. (2018). The life-cycle of dual-class share structures. European Corporate Governance Institute Finance Working Paper No. 550.

European News. (2026, March 27). SpaceX IPO: Musk plans to allocate up to 30% of shares for retail investors. Euronews Business.

Fisman, R. (2001). Estimating the value of political connections. American Economic Review, 91(4), 1095–1102.

Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. Journal of Financial Economics, 3(4), 305–360.

Loughran, T., & Ritter, J. R. (2002). Why don't issuers get upset about leaving money on the table in IPOs? Review of Financial Studies, 15(2), 413–444.

Loughran, T., & Ritter, J. R. (2004). Why has IPO underpricing changed over time? Financial Management, 33(3), 5–37.

Morningstar. (2026, May 23). 6 charts on SpaceX's pre-IPO financials. Morningstar Research.

Motley Fool. (2026, May 25). The SpaceX IPO is coming. These are the 3 most important numbers from its S-1 filing. The Motley Fool.

New Market Pitch. (2026, April 22). SpaceX IPO tracker 2026. New Market Pitch Blog.

Piketty, T. (2014). Capital in the Twenty-First Century. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Reuters. (2025, February). US lawmakers question Musk's dual role at SpaceX and government agency. Reuters.

Ritter, J. R. (2022). Initial public offerings: Updated statistics. University of Florida Working Paper.

Rock, K. (1986). Why new issues are underpriced. Journal of Financial Economics, 15(1–2), 187–212.

Space Exploration Technologies Corp. (2026, May 20). Form S-1: Registration Statement. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. Retrieved from https://www.sec.gov.

© 2026 Waterloo Economics Society. For competition use only.