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## Capitalists in Space --- 1nc

### A --- Space projects are motivated by the desire to incorporate the cosmos into capitalism’s productive processes --- makes wars in outer space inevitable

### Dickens 10 (Peter, Professor of Sociology – University of Brighton and Cambridge, UK, “The Humanization of the Cosmos – To What End?”, Monthly Review, 62(6), November, 6-6, http://monthlyreview.org/archives/2010/volume-62-issue-06-november-2010)

Instead of indulging in **over-optimistic and fantastic** **visions**, we should take a longer, harder, and **more critical look** at what is happening and what is likely to happen**. We can then begin taking a more measured view of space humanization, and start developing more progressive alternatives**. At this point, we must return to the **deeper, underlying processes** which are at the heart of the capitalist economy and society, and which are generating this demand for expansion into outer space. Although the humanization of the cosmos is clearly a new and exotic development, the social relationships and mechanisms underlying space-humanization are very familiar. In the early twentieth century, Rosa Luxemburg argued that an “outside” to capitalism is important for two main reasons. First, it is needed as a means of creating massive numbers of new customers who would buy the goods made in the capitalist countries.7 As outlined earlier, space technology has extended and deepened this process, allowing an increasing number of people to become integral to the further expansion of global capitalism. Luxemburg’s second reason for imperial expansion is the **search for cheap supplies of labor and raw materials**. Clearly, space fiction fantasies about aliens aside, expansion into the cosmos offers no benefits to capital in the form of fresh sources of labor power. But expansion into the cosmos does offer prospects for exploiting new materials such as those in asteroids, the moon, and perhaps other cosmic entities such as Mars. Neil Smith’s characterization of capital’s relations to nature is useful at this point. The reproduction of material life is wholly dependent on the production and reproduction of surplus value. To this end, capital stalks the Earth in search of material resources; nature becomes a universal means of production in the sense that it not only provides the subjects, objects and instruments of production, but is also in its totality an appendage to the production process…no part of the Earth’s surface, the atmosphere, the oceans, the geological substratum or the biological superstratum are immune from transformation by capital. **Capital is now also “stalking” outer space in the search for new resources and raw materials**. **Nature on a cosmic scale now seems likely to be incorporated into production processes**, these being located mainly on earth. Since Luxemburg wrote, an increasing number of political economists have argued that the importance of a capitalist “outside” is not so much that of creating a new pool of customers or of finding new resources.10 Rather, an outside is needed as a zone into which surplus capital can be invested. Economic and social crisis stems less from the problem of finding new consumers, and more from that of finding, making, and exploiting zones of profitability for surplus capital. Developing “outsides” in this way is also a product of recurring crises, particularly those of declining economic profitability. These crises are followed by attempted “fixes” in distinct geographic regions. The word “fix” is used here both literally and figuratively. On the one hand, capital is being physically invested in new regions. On the other hand, the attempt is to fix capitalism’s crises. Regarding the latter, however, there are, of course, no absolute guarantees that such fixes will really correct an essentially unstable social and economic system. At best, they are short-term solutions. The kind of theory mentioned above also has clear implications for the humanization of the cosmos. Projects for the colonization of outer space should be seen as the attempt to make new types of “spatial fix,” again in response to economic, social, and environmental crises on earth. Outer space will be “globalized,” i.e., appended to Earth, with new parts of the cosmos being invested in by competing nations and companies. Some influential commentators argue that the current problem for capitalism is that there is now no “outside.”11 Capitalism is everywhere. Similarly, resistance to capitalism is either everywhere or nowhere. But, as suggested above, the humanization of the cosmos seriously questions these assertions. New “spatial fixes” are due to be opened up in the cosmos, capitalism’s emergent outside. At first, these will include artificial fixes such as satellites, space stations, and space hotels. But during the next twenty years or so, existing outsides, such as the moon and Mars, will begin attracting investments. The stage would then be set for wars in outer space between nations and companies attempting to make their own cosmic “fixes.”

## Capitalists in Space --- 1nc

### B --- Space imperialism makes great power war inevitable due to resource competition and trades-off with efforts to solve global inequality

Dickens 9 (Peter teaches at the Universities of Brighton and Cambridge, UK Volume 57, Issue Supplement s1, pages 66–82, May 2009 2009 The Editorial Board of the Sociological Review Universities of Brighton and Essex, UK http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01817.x/pdf)

The imminent conquest of outer space raises the question of ‘outside’ and ‘inside’ yet again. Capitalism now has the cosmos in its sights, an outside which can be privately or publicly owned, made into a commodity, an entity for which nations and private companies can compete. As such the cosmos is a possible site of armed hostilities. This means, contra Hardt and Negri, that there is an outside after all, one into which the competitive market can now expand indefinitely. A new kind of imperialism is therefore underway, albeit not one attempting to conquer and exploit people ‘outside’ since there are no consumers or labour power to exploit in other parts of the solar system. Ferrying wealthy tourists into the cosmos is a first and perhaps most spectacular part of this process of capital's cosmic expansion. Especially important in the longer term is making outer space into a source of resources and materials. These will in due course be incorporated into production-processes, most of which will be still firmly lodged on earth. Access to outer space is, potentially at least, access to an infinite outside array of resources. These apparently have the distinct advantage of not being owned or used by any pre-existing society and not requiring military force by an imperializing power gaining access to these resources. Bringing this outside zone into capitalism may at first seem beneficial to everyone. But this scenario is almost certainly not so trouble-free as may at first seem. On the one hand, the investment of capital into outer space would be a huge diversion from the investments needed to address many urgent inequalities and crises on Earth. On the other hand, this same access is in practice likely to be conducted by a range of **competing imperial powers**. Hardt and Negri (2000) tell us that the history of imperializing wars is over. This may or may not be the case as regards imperialism on earth. But old-style imperialist, more particularly inter-imperialist, wars seem more likely than ever, as growing and competing power-blocs (the USA and China are currently amongst the most likely protagonists) compete for resources on earth and outer space. Such, in rather general terms, is the prospect for a future, galactic, imperialism between competing powers. But what are the relations, processes and mechanisms underlying this new phenomenon? How should we understand the regional rivalries and ideologies involved and the likely implications of competing empires attempting to incorporate not only their share of resources on earth but on global society's ‘outside’? Explanatory primacy is given here to economic mechanisms driving this humanization of the universe. In the same way that they have driven imperializing societies in the past to expand their economic bases into their ‘outsides’, the social relations of capitalism and the processes of capital accumulation are driving the new kind of outer space imperialisms. Such is the starting-point of this paper (See also Dickens and Ormrod, 2007). It is a position based on the work of the contemporary Marxist geographer David Harvey (2003) and his notion of ‘spatial fixes’. Capitalism continually constructs what he calls ‘outer transformations.’ In the context of the over-accumulation of capital in the primary circuit of industrial capital, fresh geographic zones are constantly sought out which have not yet been fully invested in or, in the case of outer space, not yet been invested in at all.

## Capitalists in Space --- 1nc

### C --- The alternative is to vote negative to reject aff’s cosmic capitalism --- this is a crucial political intervention to subject free-market capitalism in space to critical evaluation and build more socially equitable economic models

Nature 7 (p970 “Space for capitalism”. Academic OneFile. Web. 14 July 2011. Document URL)

Although British prime minister Edward Heath turned a fresh phrase in castigating "the unacceptable face of capitalism" in the 1970s, he was hardly unearthing something new. Aspects of capitalism have always suffered from unpalatable appearances, sometimes coinciding with genuine flaws. But capitalists' knack for opening up markets and creating wealth has benefited society sufficiently to make some of its practitioners' faces more than acceptable. Few fit more squarely in that camp than those who have made their fortunes through computers and the Internet. "The largest single legal creation of wealth we've witnessed on the planet", as venture-capitalist John Doerr has termed it, was brought about by imaginatively finding ways to provide things that made lives and businesses more efficient, more effective, more fun, or some combination of all three. Now a few of these people are devoting some of their acquired fortunes to the as-yet-untested business of inexpensive space flight (see page 988). Jeff Bezos, the founder of Amazon.com, has gathered together the expertise he thinks is needed to build rockets that will fly passengers first to the edge of space, later to orbit. Elon Musk, one of the begetters of PayPal, is building a range of rockets, some tailored to traditional satellite markets, some to taking people to the International Space Station. SpaceShipOne, which three years ago won the Ansari X prize for flying to an altitude of 100 kilometres and back twice within a fortnight, did so with the financial backing of Paul Allen, one of the founders of Microsoft. SpaceShipTwo is being developed in partnership with the Virgin Group, chaired by Richard Branson, a popular capitalist from a different background. At the very least, this activity is likely to provide some thrills for wealthy customers -- and cheaper launch options for certain types of satellite. Today's established rocket companies are vast concerns deeply embedded in the military-industrial complexes of various nations; it is a fair assessment that entrepreneurial competition will shake them up a bit. At best, one or more of these companies might actually find ways to make the launch of private citizens into orbit cheap and routine. This wouldn't just allow a lot of people to fulfil their childhood fantasies; it would also make it cheaper for governments to put people into orbit -- a capability that a number of them currently maintain at very high cost for little clear benefit. And it would render the eventual exploration of other bodies in the Solar System more affordable than it is today. This somewhat distant prospect, however, should not obscure various grounded truths. One is that getting cheap, reusable vehicles into orbit and back again is not going to be easy, and may well prove beyond the reach of current technologies. There are also security concerns. Given that the technologies needed to circle round Earth are basically the same as those needed to lay waste to the ground below, their development cannot always be viewed as an unmitigated good. Some faces would be entirely unacceptable as owners of what amounts to a privatized, intercontinental ballistic missile. The issue of who decides what constitutes 'acceptable' in that context remains unresolved. Finally, it can be anticipated that some would-be space entrepreneurs will, given half a chance, seek subsidy from the public purse. Such calls should be treated with scepticism. Certain public-private partnerships may make sense, and the programmes so far offered by NASA to encourage the development of private-sector resupply craft for the space station seem to do so. But in general, those who believe in private spaceflight should pursue their dream at their own expense. Of course, we might simply extend our existing rules of property to govern space as well, assuming all nations involved endorse a free-market system. But in uncharted territory, such as with cyberspace, our options seem to be limited to first-come-first-served and to the highest bidder, which we have seen lead to the inefficient and disorderly Internet gold rush. And because how we formulate property rights sets the tone for whatever economic model is adopted – e.g., a high-bid process would naturally foster capitalism – this has great implications on how markets and transactions would proceed in space.   If entering space marks our opportunity to start over again, then it seems that **unfettered capitalism should no longer be a sacred cow and should be subject to critical evaluation along with other competing economic models**. For instance, a purely free-market economy, while efficient at allocating scarce resources and inspiring innovation, is not so much concerned with need or merit, so a hybrid model may be desired.  At the risk of cynicism, if we were to truly apply Earth rules to space, then the ultimate, albeit morally problematic, litmus test for claiming property may be about one’s ability to physically defend the property. **Without a police force in space, it may first start with individuals or corporations defending their parcel against competitors in turf battles**, **despite** any prevailing **laws on Earth**. But while “right through might” may perfectly describe frontier justice, one would hope that we have evolved beyond that.   Even among enlightened people, there will inevitably be property-rights disputes in space, just as there is on terra firma between reasonable parties, so we will need a regulatory or administrative body that has jurisdiction over those lands, in addition to an enforcement agency. It won’t be enough that we govern from Earth – we will need a local organization to maintain law and order in real-time as well as to more efficiently administer public policy, urban planning and other matters. Again, **these concerns point to our new era in space exploration as a true opportunity to start over from scratch, bringing with it new responsibility to architect a blueprint for society in space.**

## Capitalists in Space --- 1nc

### D --- This demand can have transformative effects --- using the ballot to endorse a politics of space exploration and development that resists the corrupting effects of the military-industrial complex can generate social change

Parker 2009 (Martin, Professor of Culture and Organization at the University of Leicester School of Management, “Capitalists in Space,” The Sociological Review, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01818.x/full>)

If we go back to Weber's distinction between technique and value, we can see that it is rather an useful way of understanding these space libertarians. If one were to write ‘The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Space Exploration’, then value and the technique coincide in the ideology of the frontier. It is the very spirit of the American that is at stake here, and hence constructing the organizational and financial structures that might enable the calling to be met is a task of considerable seriousness. This is not merely about making money, but a reflection of the character of the pioneer, and the freedoms that they require. Such a position also allows NASA to be described as an organization within which such a fusion happened once, perhaps from 1962 to 1972, but that is now merely a zombie bureaucracy that has forgotten why it exists. Its task is to continue existing, a ‘mechanized petrification, embellished with a sort of convulsive self-importance’ populated by ‘Specialists without spirit, sensualists without heart’ (Weber, 1930: 182). The libertarians are suggesting NASA is all means and no ends, all red tape and no red touch paper. But does that mean that we have to concede that space is the new frontier for business, and the state had better get out of the way?

In response to the 1957 Sputnik furore and the idea that the Soviets were suddenly near to occupying the military and technological high ground, MIT President James R Killian was appointed to the position of Science Advisor to President Eisenhower. The Killian committee's report in March 1958 concerned arguments for a space programme, and it gave several reasons as to why the USA should invest in such a project. First was ‘the compelling urge of man to explore and discover, the thrust of curiosity that leads men to go where no one has gone before’. Second, ‘the defense objective’. Third, ‘national prestige’. Fourth, ‘scientific observation and experiment which will add to our knowledge and understanding of the earth, the solar system, and the universe’ (in Smith, 1983: 193–4). The subsequent formation of House and Senate committees, which listened to evidence from a variety of respondents with a vested interest in a state funded programme, did not prevent expansive declarations about frontiers, pioneers and exploration, yet discussion of commercial issues and inventions was vague (Smith, 1983: 196–7).

It seems to me that this was rather an important moment in defining the terms on which the commercialization of space could be imagined. It was primarily the state which was setting the agenda here, and primarily in ways that articulated either common human values – science, exploration – or specifically ‘traditional’ US values that were worth protecting.

In many respects the Apollo space capsule was also a time capsule, allowing the nation's Space van Winkle's to carry a vision of the fifties intact through My Lai and Watts, assassinations and campus riots, and the Tet offensive. For many commentators, both friend and foe, the social function of Apollo was to sustain a pre-Vietnam dream of conquest (Smith, 1983: 205).

While it is easy enough to question the content of these values, they are values which are not explicitly concerned with commercial interests. Indeed, as DeGroot argues, many members of the Eisenhower administration were well aware of the dangers of a co-optation by Big Aerospace, and attempted to minimize talk of the Sputnik threat precisely because:

in the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist (Eisenhower's farewell address, in 1961, quoted in DeGroot, 2007: 124).

That term, ‘military-industrial complex’, has rung down the intervening half century, and its condensation of state and capitalist power might lead us to assume that the state is inevitably co-opted in such ways. But perhaps **a different sort of diagnosis is possible, one that does not leave space as a battleground between free market libertarians and the Lockheed-NASA-Boeing space alliance.**

Leaving space for others

I began with Doritos advertising in 2008, and it seems appropriate that I should end with it, just as spaceflight was beginning. Imagine Neil Armstrong's parents, watching him go to the moon, in July 1969.

Because Neil's parents still had only a black-and white television, the TV networks gave them a large color set on which to watch the mission. On a daily basis, a local restaurant sent down half a dozen pies. A fruit company from nearby Lima delivered a large stock of bananas. A dairy from Delphos sent ice cream. Frito-Lay sent large cartons of corn chips. A local dairy, the Fisher Cheese Co., Wapakoneta's largest employer, proffered its special ‘Moon Cheeze’. Consolidated Bottling Company delivered crates of ‘Capped Moon Sauce’, a ‘secret-formula’ vanilla cream soda pop (Hansen, 2005: 7).

Uninvited or not, **business interests will continue to find their way into space**. A year before the Armstrongs were watching TV, Stanley Kubrick had placed a rotating Hilton hotel and a Pam Am shuttle plane in 2001: A Space Odyssey. The brands may change, and the future will not happen as quickly as we think, but unless we imagine massive state interventionism on a Soviet scale, capitalism will go into space.

Dickens and Ormrod claim that it already has, at least in terms of near earth orbit, and that the key issue is to engineer ‘a relationship with the universe that does not further empower the already powerful’ (2007: 190). In other words, a Marxist political economy of space would suggest that the military-industrial complex has already empowered the powerful, but would presumably be equally sceptical about the space libertarians' claims to be representing the ordinary citizen. Of course we might conclude from this that the answer is simply to turn away from space. The whole programme has not been without its critics, whether of capitalism, imperialism, patriarchy, techno-fetishism, bad science, bad policy making or even new world order conspiracy (Etzioni, 1964; DeGroot, 2007). Even at the height of space euphoria, in the summer of 1969, we find dissenting voices. ‘The moon is an escape from our earthy responsibilities, and like other escapes, it leaves a troubled conscience’ said Anthony Lewis in the New York Times. An Ebony opinion leader, asking what we will say to extra-terrestrials, suggested ‘We have millions of people starving to death back home so we thought we'd drop by to see how you're faring’. Kurt Vonnegut, in the New York Times Magazine, put it with characteristic élan.

Earth is such a pretty blue and pink and white pearl in the pictures NASA sent me. It looks so clean. You can't see all the hungry, angry earthlings down there – and the smoke and the sewage and the trash and sophisticated weaponry.' (all cited in Smith, 1983: 207)

In summary, the money could be better spent, and we would be better off tending our own gardens.

But even the best, and only, Marxist sociology of space has its authors making claims that go beyond the economic materialism they deploy. They claim that the desire to go into space is ‘cosmic narcissism’, a sort of projection of capitalist individualism onto the universe (Dickens and Ormrod, 2007; Dickens this volume). This is, in Weberian terms, a value, even if it is a value that Dickens and Ormrod dislike. Presumably they would prefer more communitarian or collectivist understandings of human values, in which we look more carefully at others, and not merely our own reflections. I might well agree with their politics, but I think that we should not dispose of a radical imagination so rapidly. In other words, there are ways in which we can think about the future that escape the clutches of Virgin Galactic, and that can still leave us misty-eyed about Armstrong.

Dickens and Ormrod are not keen on science fiction, seeing its utopianism as usually a distraction from hard thinking about the world. But a great deal of SF has been very engaged with the politics of its times, and persistently opened the possibility that the future (often, off earth and in the future) might be different. As a form of speculation suspended somewhere between utopias, fantasy and sociology, one definition of SF is that it involves systematically altering technological, social or biological conditions and then attempting to understand the possible consequences. Though much of SF has involved re-locating cowboy plots into spaceships, or constructing fantasies which re-tell ancient myths, much has also involved political thought experiments. It is hardly surprising that many radicals (whether counter-cultural or political) have found in SF a mirror for their own longings (see Jameson, 2005; Shukaitis, this volume). As Mannheim put it –

Wishful thinking has always figured in human affairs. When the imagination finds no satisfaction in existing reality, it seeks refuge in wishfully constructed places and periods. Myths, fairy tales, other-worldly promises of religion, humanistic fantasies, travel romances, have been continually changing expressions of that which was lacking in actual life (1960: 184).

But, for Mannheim, utopianism was also at the heart of political demands for change

A state of mind is utopian when it is incongruous with the state of reality in which it occurs (1960: 173).

As I suggested at the beginning, the idea that the world could be other than it is must be at the beginning for a demand that it can be different. Constance Penley suggests that the blended cultural text she calls ‘NASA/Trek’ is radical in just this way (1997). The dreams of Apollo, the nostalgia for a space age that never arrived (Benjamin, 2004; Parker, 2007, 2008), the sheer enormity of seeing the earth from space, are all examples of a science fiction that actually happened. To assume that we know, in advance, that the future must be either Big Business, or Big State, is to close down the possibilities that make the future worth spending time thinking about.

For me, there is something nauseating (or saddening) about imagining that the inhabitants of 47 Ursae Majoris would want Doritos, but I don't think that this means that space must be left for the capitalists. I don't share Kemp's craven enthusiasm for ‘Gaia capitalism’ (2007: 249), but I do find the pictures of Armstrong on the moon to be inspiring in ways that make me want the future, rather than being frightened of it. Mailer suggested that Apollo 11's paradox was that:

American capitalism finally put together a cooperative effort against all the glut, waste, scandal, corruption, inefficiency, dishonesty, woe, dread, oversecurity and simple sense of boredom which hounded the lives of its corporate workers (Mailer, 1971: 175).

Apollo promised something else. Not a solution, or a blueprint, though it generated enough of those, but literally ‘something else’. Perhaps even something sublime (Nye, 1994: 237 passim). The idea that our world might be different, both larger and smaller than we normally imagine, and that human beings can do extraordinary things. An idea that makes me nostalgic for the future.

# \*\*\*LINKS\*\*\*

## **Link --- Exploration/Development**

### Space expansion, commercialism, and tourism fuel the global capitalistic society but causes problems. Solutions to these problems are also capitalist.

### Dickens ’10 (Peter, “Space, the Final Bourgeois Frontier,” UNTNE, 11/20/10, http://www.utne.com/Science-Technology/Capitalist-Expansion-Into-Space.aspx) Andrew Muo

The workers of the world, despite their terrestrial solidarity, won’t unite to colonize other planets. Humanity’s expansion into space will be a strictly bourgeois-driven affair, argues Monthly Review’s Peter Dickens. The commodification of space, he writes, has already begun: It has now been made an integral part of the way global capitalist society is organized and extended. Satellites, for example, are extremely important elements of contemporary communications systems. These have enabled an increasing number of people to become part of the labor market. Teleworking is the best known example. Space tourism and electricity production will likely be the next big businesses conducted in space, but at what cost? Dickens takes issue with the grandiose rhetoric of the Space Renaissance Initiative, an advocacy group that promotes the growth of society past the Earth’s atmosphere, which argues that the Earth is on the brink of social, environmental, and population crises and the best way to avoid a global collapse is to stretch our collective legs. Dickens argues the Space Renaissance Initiative’s proposed solution is capitalist exploitation dressed up in a space suit. “The ‘solution,’” Dickens writes, seems to be simultaneously exacerbating social problems while jetting away from them. Consumer-led industrial capitalism necessarily creates huge social divisions and increasing degradation of the environment. Why should a galactic capitalism do otherwise? Space may not even be the final frontier for capitalism. Dickens turns to a nuanced Marxist critique of the commodification of space, which draws on the scholarly work of Polish philosopher and economist Rosa Luxemburg. Luxemburg maintained that capitalist societies require an “outside,” a sort of unconquered, underdeveloped periphery at which to aim growth and consumption. It serves a dual purpose: First, the outside is a potential source of new resources and second, the fervor to develop the outside fuels the economy on the “inside.” If space is the new outside, then it will ultimately be conquered, developed, and commodified—in which case, the solar capitalist economy will require a new outside.

### All space projects are inherently going to be is being pursued by the private sector. NASA is embracing capitalism and turning over their programs to the commercial industries.

Diamond ’10 (Peter, International leader in commercial space arena, “NASA Embraces American Capitalism and Entrepreneurship,” About the Moon, <http://www.odysseymoon.com/news/item/84-nasa-embraces-american-capitalism-and-entrepreneurship.html>) Andrew Muo

After 30 years of doing business the same way, NASA is finally entering the 21st century by embracing competition, capitalism and entrepreneurship. In NASA's new budget, President Obama and NASA Administrator Charles Bolden have proposed spending billions of dollars to purchase commercial human launch services and invest in game changing technologies. Many of the traditional players have translated this to mean that NASA's "Moon Mission" has been canceled, that NASA is out of the exploration business and is making a risky move turning over the 'right stuff' from Government hands to entrepreneurs and commercial industry. In reality, NASA is making a brilliant move. During the past 30 years the cost of getting humans into space has gone up, while reliability has gone down. Rather than have two or three commercial suppliers of human spaceflight, we have been solely dependent on the Space Shuttle. When the Shuttle stands down from service in a year's time, NASA will need to send American Astronauts to Kazakhstan to launch aboard the Russian Soyuz at a price of over $50 million per person... Until, at least, new commercial U.S. vehicles are made operational. The U.S. Government doesn't build your computers, nor do you fly aboard a U.S. Government owned and operated airline. Private industry routinely takes technologies pioneered by the government and turns them into cheap, reliable and robust industries. This has happened in aviation, air mail, computers, and the Internet. It's about time that it happen in space. The President's plan for commercial competition will ultimately take us much farther and much faster, not only to the Moon, but to Mars, the asteroids and beyond. Private companies will drive a very high level of safety because they will cease to exist if they do not. America's capitalist engine drives reliability in our aircraft, our cars, our computers and will do so in space, as well. Private companies will also inject innovation and breakthrough technology into our space program because that is their ethos.

## Link --- Exploration/Development

### Frontierism masks the plague of the imperial capital. The utilitarian actions of the bourgeois justifies viewing humans as products to be converted into capital.

Marshall 95 (Alan Marshall is in the Institute of Development Studies at Massey University, February 1995, “Space Policy”, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?\_ob=MImg&\_imagekey=B6V52-3XWRMXY-11-1&\_cdi=5774&\_user=1458830&\_pii=026596469593233B&\_origin=&\_coverDate=02%2F28%2F1995&\_sk=999889998&view=c&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkzV&md5=3654427bdc6e87641fbbb117001107b9&ie=/sdarticle.pdf)

Frontierism, however, is not so much a social or psychological concept as an economic philosophy. It emerges from the individualism so entrenched in American political and economic thought (which serves to secure the operation of *‘l&w* faire-ism’ as sacrosanct). Frontierism involves a belief in the individual to surmount the challenges of a new situation, a new territory or a new environment and carve out an existence. Once the individual has done this they deservedly call that territory or environment their own. By this process the frontier grows larger and carves out an extended base for economic and demographic expansion, so contributing to the wealth of the nation (or more accurately to the wealth of the bourgeoisie) by turning unproductive land into an economic resource. In US history, as in the history of some of the other New World nations, frontierism was an economic policy designed to tame the wilderness and present it in economic terms as soon as possible. In reality frontierism is a more accepted and socially-sensitive word for capitalist imperialism, since (just as in capitalist imperialism) it involves the appropriation of economic resources that are considered previously unowned. Like capitalist imperialism, frontierism perceives nothing of value in the frontier lands except what can be scraped from it economically and converted into capital. In nineteenth-century USA, the value of native peoples and the value of the landscape was arrogantly ignored as the West was made to succumb to the utilitarianism of the imperialistic capitalists. Such is also the outlook of those who advocate pioneering the ‘Final Frontier’. Frontierists views that the planets and moons of the solar system are valueless hunks of rock until acted upon by humans to produce economic value and contribute to capital accumulation. Space frontierists such as Wernher von Braun, Arthur C Clark, Kraft Ehrick, William Hartmann and Gerard O’Neill feel that imperialism can be excised from their frontierism by appealing to the innate curiosity in our personal consciousness. To them, frontierism in space will amply channel the human propensity to explore and expand in a constructive and benevolent way. These rationales for space expansion must, however, stand up for themselves, since they are ultimately separate from the frontierism experienced in history. The fact that there is confusion between these socio-psychological elements and the actual economic nature of fronterism in modern day calls for space development gives credit to the nineteenth century idealogues who so convincingly tied bourgeois economic policy with populist ideology that it continues to fool so many into believing fronterism is a worthy nationalist (even universalist) ideal.

### Space development is for the point of exploiting spaces resources

Bhagwat 2011 (Vishnu, former [Chief of the Naval Staff](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chief_of_Naval_Staff_of_the_Indian_Navy) of [India](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/India), Thee Weaponization of Space: Corporate Driven Military Unleashes Pre-emptive Wars, July 13, 2011, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=21432>)

The small financial elite , which is the oligarchy of political societies referred to ironically as democracies; the bankers, financial companies, big oil companies, giant GM Agribusinesses, drug and food companies and seed monopolies seeking to control the world’s food and energy , to dominate nations and people across the globe in all continents , have effectively privatized public assets and commons and , therefore , diminished and emasculated democracy with the ulterior intent of depopulating the world . It is the policies of this oligarchy which determine priorities of national budgetary allocations on weapon systems and their expansion into Space  to target the planet earth , and for use in the oceans , the seabed , and as earlier stated into Space . However all these areas of our small and vulnerable planet ,  the earth , the oceans , the atmosphere and space are intertwined and interconnected. As we see the world order today , the material conditions of the people from one continent to the other  , the direct consequences of colonialism  , breeding predatory wars for resources and markets , and conflicts within nations and interse between nations  , to further consolidate an extremely exploitative , parasitical and colonial regime to crush the ‘untermenschens’ or  sub-humans, which is the expression for the ordinary people of the this planet, to condemn millions with a predetermined policy to malnutrition , hunger, disease and death , as never before at any time in world history . In India , Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru had described these conditions as the “terror of hunger and unemployment”, thinking they were inherent characteristics of those times in colonial India and would be eradicated when freedom was won ! To encapsulate, the very character of accumulation of surplus under a system of Capitalism , its extreme parasitical characteristic of sucking the blood and fruits of toil of the worker and whole colonies, nurtures policies that  create satanic weapon systems to establish hegemony and dominance . Human progress in science and technology , instead of being  harnessed for the benefit of civilization is being used to innovate and invent , no matter what the cost to national budgets , weapon systems robotic in their capacity to kill and maim large numbers of people , increasingly the civilian population . This is being witnessed , to give one example with the drone technology  with its remote control ,  in advance  of   later versions  to be deployed in Space.  This process is accelerating   even as people are losing control over military budgets even as they  have no control over their political systems . The nature of this weaponization  is intended to destroy the human habitat and environment and has dangerous implications for the genetic future of mankind, in the nature of  GM and terminator seeds of the Agribusiness companies.

## Link --- Exploration

### Space exploration will inevitably result in its material expoitation

Dickens 10 (Peter, Professor of Sociology – University of Brighton and Cambridge, UK, “The Humanization of the Cosmos – To What End?”, Monthly Review, 62(6), November, 6-6, http://monthlyreview.org/archives/2010/volume-62-issue-06-november-2010)

At this point, we must return to the deeper, underlying processes which are at the heart of the capitalist economy and society, and which are generating this demand for expansion into outer space. Although the humanization of the cosmos is clearly a new and exotic development, the social relationships and mechanisms underlying space-humanization are very familiar. In the early twentieth century, Rosa Luxemburg argued that an “outside” to capitalism is important for two main reasons. First, it is needed as a means of creating massive numbers of new customers who would buy the goods made in the capitalist countries.[7](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en79) As outlined earlier, space technology has extended and deepened this process, allowing an increasing number of people to become integral to the further expansion of global capitalism. Luxemburg’s second reason for imperial expansion is the search for cheap supplies of labor and raw materials. Clearly, space fiction fantasies about aliens aside, expansion into the cosmos offers no benefits to capital in the form of fresh sources of labor power.[8](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en78) But expansion into the cosmos does offer prospects for exploiting new materials such as those in asteroids, the moon, and perhaps other cosmic entities such as Mars. Neil Smith’s characterization of capital’s relations to nature is useful at this point. The reproduction of material life is wholly dependent on the production and reproduction of surplus value. To this end, capital stalks the Earth in search of material resources; nature becomes a universal means of production in the sense that it not only provides the subjects, objects and instruments of production, but is also in its totality an appendage to the production process…no part of the Earth’s surface, the atmosphere, the oceans, the geological substratum or the biological superstratum are immune from transformation by capital.[9](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end#en77)Capital is now also “stalking” outer space in the search for new resources and raw materials. Nature on a cosmic scale now seems likely to be incorporated into production processes, these being located mainly on earth.

### The human need to explore space is based off a capitalist mindset

Dickens 10 (Peter, Professor of Sociology – University of Brighton and Cambridge, UK, “The Humanization of the Cosmos – To What End?”, Monthly Review, 62(6), November, 6-6, http://monthlyreview.org/archives/2010/volume-62-issue-06-november-2010)

At this point, we must return to the deeper, underlying processes which are at the heart of the capitalist economy and society, and which are generating this demand for expansion into outer space. Although the humanization of the cosmos is clearly a new and exotic development, the social relationships and mechanisms underlying space-humanization are very familiar.

## Link --- Exploration/Development

### Capitalism continuously fails and must be fixed- the aff is only a temporary solution so it’s try or die for the neg

Parker 2009 (Martin, Professor of Culture and Organization at the University of Leicester School of Management, “Capitalists in Space,” The Sociological Review, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01818.x/full>)

The rhetoric of the pioneer, and of the frontier, suggests that ordinary honest citizens will be able to stake their claims. However, as Dickens and Ormrod argue, these self-described space pioneers are not ordinary people, but members of a kind of ‘cosmic elite’ (2007: 4). Reading Kemp's description of the sort of people who are investing in these companies, it is easy to see what they mean (2007: 5). Added to Richard Branson are the founders of Amazon.com, Microsoft, Pay Pal, Compusearch and a smattering of games designers and hotel magnates. The entry level costs are huge, and the risks are gigantic. Even the people who might be travelling as space tourists will have to be very wealthy indeed. Virgin Galactic are currently asking $200,000 per flight, which is an expensive five minutes. Dickens and Ormrod's materialist analysis of the space industries concludes that off-earth capitalism is pretty much like capitalism on earth, in the sense that it runs into periodic crises that need to be fixed by the development and exploitation of new markets. These ‘fixes’ are necessarily temporary, but the promise of the ‘outer spatial fix’ is that it (potentially) opens a variety of ways in which capitalism might be extended beyond the boundaries of the earth. Adopting some ideas from the geographer David Harvey, they argue that the commodification of space allows for various circuits of capital to be re-imagined and a hegemonic model of neo-liberalism to spread skywards.

The relation between the military industrial complex and the war state is crucial in this regard, with space technologies including surveillance satellites, missile guidance, and the ‘weaponization’ of space being obvious gains. This much is clear from NASA onwards. However, the link between (for example) military satellites and communications and monitoring devices is clearly a very close one. Hence, access to the military high ground also means access to surveillance and media power over the entire planet, and this goes for both states and ‘defence’ companies. A further circuit is that of space tourism, clearly a domain only accessible to the hyper-rich, but further markets include the exploitation of materials from the moon, asteroids or planets; solar energy; off-earth manufacturing; colonies and terraforming projects. All of these would come with their attendant spin-off industries, such as clearing up space junk, provisioning off-planet habitats, accounting and legal services, security and so on.

### Space weaponization and development is focused on military domination, Western culture and economic competition

Dickens 7 Peter teaches at the Universities of Brighton and Cambridge, UK. His most recent book, co-written with James Ormrod, is Cosmic Society: Towards a Sociology of the Universe (2009). soc.sagepub.com/content/41/4/609.full.pdf

While pro-space activists and others are daydreaming about fantastical and yet seemingly benign things to do in outer space, socially and militarily dominant institutions are actively rationalizing, humanizing and commodifying outer space for real, material, ends. The cosmos is being used as a way of extending economic empires on Earth and monitoring those individuals who are excluded from this mission. On a day-to-day level, communications satellites are being used to promote predominantly ‘ Western’ cultures and ways of life. They also enable the vast capital flows so crucial to the global capitalist economy. Since the 1950s, outer space has been envisaged as ‘ the new high ground’ for the worldwide exercise of military power. The ‘ weaponization of space’ has been proceeding rapidly as part of the so-called ‘ War on Terror’ (Langley, 2004). The American military, heavily lobbied by corporations such as Lockheed Martin, Raytheon and Boeing, is now making new ‘ Star Wars’ sys- tems. These have been under development for over 30 years but are now being adapted to root out and destroy ‘ terrorists’ , if necessary with the aid of ‘ smart’ nuclear weapons. American government spending on the Missile Defence Program jumped by 22 percent in 2004, reaching the huge sum of $8.3 billion (Langley, 2004). The unreal and almost certainly unobtainable objective is to create a new kind of ‘ pure war’ in which terrorists are surgically pinpointed and killed while local civilians remain uninjured (Virilio, 1998; Virilio and Lotringer, 1998). Meanwhile, and paralleling the weaponization of space, surveillance satellites have also been much enhanced. Although originally devel- oped for military purposes, they are now increasingly deployed to monitor non- military populations, creating a global, orbital panopticon. Workers in British warehouses are even being tagged and monitored by satellite to ensure maxi- mum productivity (Hencke, 2005). For those elites in positions of power over the universe, as for pro-space activists, the universe is experienced as an object to be placed in the service of human wants and desires. However, for those with less privileged access to the heavens, the universe is far from being such an object – their relationship with it is more fearful and alienated than ever before. There are two mechanisms through which the majority of the world’ s popula- tion are kept in a state of reverence towards the cosmos. Both go towards con- structing it as a subject, a powerful agent in its own right, and one dominating Earthly affairs. This is a scenario with a long history stretching back to early Greece and into Parsons’ ‘ cosmological societies’ (Parsons, 1966; see also Assmann, 2002), and witnessed in E.B. Tylor’ s animistic tribal religions. The first is a sense of fear related to the kinds of military and surveillance applica- tions mentioned above. The second is a feeling of inadequacy in the face of con- temporary cosmological theory. There is a direct parallel between Bentham’ s panopticon and this new orbital or ‘ planetary’ panopticon (Whitaker, 2000). Both involve a watchstation up on high that watches deviant populations, and in neither case do the monitored have any knowledge of whether or not they are being watched. Foucault (1977) argued that this results in the watched regulating their own behaviour and conforming to the required social order. There are signs that the orbital panopticon is having a similar effect on people’ s subjectivity and relationship with the universe. The ‘ eye in the sky’ reinforces the idea that the heavens are distinct from Earthly affairs as far as monitored populations are concerned; a remystification of, and alienation from, the universe, which reduces people to passive conformists. Those able to utilize satellite technology have symbolically replaced God in the Heavens: the American military, for example, gaining a ‘ God’ s eye view’ over the planet (Weiner, 2004). Public knowledge that wars from space can be conducted instan- taneously, without the possibility of forewarning or resistance, furthers this fear that parallels pre-modern anxiety in the face of angry and punishing gods in the sky. US plans to construct ‘ rods from God’ , tungsten rods suspended from a satel- lite that can be dropped on targets on Earth with the impact of a nuclear explo- sion, play on this kind of sentiment. We introduce here some data from the Mass Observation (MO) project at Sussex University by way of illustration.

## Link --- Exploration

### Spaceflight maintains the current social order of unequal power and resources by isolating the elite

Billings 8(“Space Flight Culture and Ideology” history.nasa.gov/sp4801-chapter25.pdf Linda is a research professor at the George Washington University School of Media and Public Affairs in Washington, D.C. She does communication research for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration’s (NASA’s) astrobiology program in the Science Mission Directorate.)

This brief historical review has shown how the rhetoric of space advocacy has sustained an ideology of American exceptionalism and reinforced longstanding beliefs in progress, growth, and capitalist democracy. This rhetoric conveys an ideology of spaceflight that could be described, at its worst, as a sort of space fundamentalism: an exclusive belief system that rejects as unenlightened those who do not advocate the colonization, exploitation, and development of space. 56 the rhetorical strategy of space advocates has tended to rest on the assumption that the values of “believers” are (or should be) shared by others as well. Although the social, political, economic, and cultural context for space exploration has changed radically since the 1960s, the rhetoric of space advocacy has not. In the twenty-first century, advocates continue to promote spaceflight as a biological imperative and a means of extending U.S. free enterprise, with its private property claims, resource exploitation, and commercial development, into the solar system and beyond. This, among others, has addressed the problematic nature of these arguments: “the theses advanced to promote [solar system] settlement,” he noted, “are historical, culturally bound, and selectively anecdotal: that we need to pioneer to be what we are, that new colonies are a means of renewing civilization.”57 Spaceflight advocacy can be examined as a cultural ritual, performed by means of communication (rhetoric), for the purpose of maintaining the current social order, with its lopsided distribution of power and resources, and perpetuating the values of those in control of that order (materialism, consumerism, technological progress, private property rights, capitalist democracy). Communication research has shown how public discourses—those cultural narratives or national myths—“often function covertly to legitimate the power of elite social classes.”58 and this review has shown how the rhetoric of space advocacy reflects an assumption that these values are worth extending into the solar system.

## Link --- Exploration

### Space exploration is viewed as the final frontier – viewing resources as property leads to competition

Duvall and Havercroft 6(Taking Sovereignty Out of This World: Space Weapons and Empire of the Future\* Raymond Duvall Jonathan Havercroft University of Minnesota University of British Columbia October 2006 <http://www.ligi.ubc.ca/sites/liu/files/Publications/Havercroft_paper.pdf>)

The doctrine of space control has emerged in the U.S. military out of the belief that assets in space represent a potential target for enemies of the U.S.56 There are two kinds of vulnerable U.S. assets: private-commercial; and military. One concern is that rivals may attack commercial satellites, thereby disrupting the flow of information and potentially inflicting significant harm on global markets. Militarily, a second concern is that, through its increasing reliance on satellites for its Earth-based military operations, the U.S. has created an “asymmetrical vulnerability”. An adversary (including a non-state, “terrorist” organization) could effectively immobilize U.S. forces by disabling the military satellites that provide communication, command, and control capabilities. As noted above, U.S. military planners are already warning about a possible “Space Pearl Harbor”. Consequently, the doctrine of space control is designed to protect commercial and military satellites from potential attacks, and ultimately to prevent rivals from having access to space.57 As of the year 2000 there were over 500 satellites in orbit owned by 46 countries, worth in excess of $250 billion. With the rise of the information economy, satellites are playing an increasing role in international trade and finance. As such, U.S. military planners are concerned about commercial satellites. One rationalization for the weaponization of space is that these commercial assets represent a vulnerability to economic sabotage and terrorism. As Lambeth has argued, The most compelling reason for moving forward for dispatch toward acquiring at least the serious elements of space control capability is that the United States is now unprecedentedly invested and dependent upon on-orbit capabilities, both military and commercial. Since these equities can only be 10expected to grow in sunk cost, it is fair to presume that they will eventually be challenged by potential opponents.58 Notice how this description of space control discusses space in terms of a set of capital assets that should be protected from external threats. While scholars have for a long time debated whether one, if not the, primary objective of U.S. military endeavors is to protect the interests of business, when it comes to questions of space control it is one of only two things in space to protect. There are no human populations in space—with the exception of the two or three occupants on the International Space Station—that could be killed by conflict in space, so the thing that is being secured through the project of space control is technology—either commercial satellites or military assets. In Volume One of *Capital*, Marx chided classical political economists for their inability to explain how workers became separated from the means of production. Whereas political economists such as Adam Smith argued that a previous accumulation of capital was necessary for a division of labor, Marx argued that this doctrine was an absurd doctrine. Division of labor existed in pre-capitalist societies where workers were not alienated from their labor. Instead, Marx argued that the actual historical process of primitive accumulation of capital was carried out through brute force. The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the indigenous population of that continent, the beginnings of the conquest and plunder of India, and the conversion of Africa into a preserve for the commercial hunting of blackskins, are all things which characterize the dawn of the era of capitalist production. These idyllic proceedings are the chief moments of primitive accumulation.59 While not a perfect analogy, because of the lack of labour occurring in orbital space, the doctrine of space control is part and parcel of an ongoing process of such primitive accumulation. One of the purposes of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty was to keep outer space a commons where all states, regardless of technical ability or economic or military power, could participate in the potential benefits space has to offer. In the years since this treaty was signed, the primary economic use of space has been for commercial communications satellites. This industry has expanded dramatically in the last two decades. Total revenues for commercial space-related industries in 1980 were 2.1 billion dollars; by 2003 this figure had expanded to $91 billion and it was expected to increase at least as rapidly into the foreseeable future.60 On the economic front, space control is about determining who has access to this new economy. Positions in orbit for satellites are a new form of “real estate,” and by controlling access to outer space the U.S. would be forcibly appropriating the orbits around Earth, thereby placing the U.S. in a position to determine which governments and corporations could use space. In effect, orbital slots around earth would be turned into private property. This process of primitive accumulation is of importance to our concerns in two ways. First, the doctrine of space control represents the extension of U.S. sovereignty into outer space. In addition to being a clear violation of international law, it reinforces the constitutive effect identified in the previous section on missile defense, namely to re-inscribe the “hard shell” borders of the U.S., which are now extended to include the “territory” of outer space. This simultaneously constitutes the exclusive sovereignty of the U.S., while displacing the sovereignty of other states. 11 Second, space control bears significantly on the production of political subjectivities. The original Star Trek series would begin with the voice of Captain Kirk describing space as the “final frontier”. While presenting the exploration of space as a largely peaceful enterprise, the TV show was also drawing upon its viewers’ “memories” of the “western frontier” of 19th century U.S. expansion. At least since the writings of Frederick Turner, there has been the notion that the frontier represents the well-spring of U.S. ingenuity, freedom, and creativity. According to Turner, because as they expanded westward settlers in the U.S. had to continually adapt to a new environment, they became increasingly “American”. The theme of the frontier as essential for American identity has had a significant discursive role in U.S. imperialist expansion.61 Although Turner concluded that the American frontier had closed by the late 1890s, he argued that the U.S. could extend it frontier into new countries, such as Latin America. Theodore Roosevelt, influenced by the Turner thesis, concluded that in order to maintain the exceptional American identity new frontiers had to be opened overseas. The notion of frontiers, then, has been integral to the U.S. imperialist project since its outset. The doctrine of space control, seen in this light, is simply an extension of the imperial logic. By expanding into and taking control of the “final frontier” the U.S. is continuing to renew an exceptional—an exclusive—identity by adapting itself to the harsh realities of a new environment. So, the doctrine of space control can be read as extending U.S. sovereignty into orbit. While a clear violation of international law, this de facto expansion of U.S. sovereignty will have two effects. First, it enables a process of primitive accumulation, whereby orbital spaces around earth are removed from the commons initially established by the Outer Space Treaty, and places them under the control of the U.S. for use and perhaps even ownership by businesses sympathetic to U.S. interests. The U.S. becomes even more than it is now the state for global capitalism, the global capitalist state. Second, this doctrine of space control is part of the ongoing re-production of American subjects as “Americans”. Embedded within space control is the notion that space is a new frontier. Following the Turner thesis and Roosevelt’s doctrine of imperialist expansion, there has long been a drive for Americans to seek out new frontiers as a way of renewing the American identity and promoting American values of individuality, innovation, and exceptionalism.

## Link --- Exploration --- 2nc Weaponization Bad IL

### Expansion into space is a mask for weaponization that would be used to protect capitalist interests.

**Marshall 95** (Alan Marshall is in the Institute of Development Studies at Massey University, February 1995, “Space Policy”, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?\_ob=MImg&\_imagekey=B6V52-3XWRMXY-11-1&\_cdi=5774&\_user=1458830&\_pii=026596469593233B&\_origin=&\_coverDate=02%2F28%2F1995&\_sk=999889998&view=c&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkzV&md5=3654427bdc6e87641fbbb117001107b9&ie=/sdarticle.pdf)

The imperialist expansion into space for strategic and/or military reasons is a demonstrated phenomenon of Cold War history. The initiation of the US space rocket programme under Eisenhower had much to do with the USSR’s newly developed ICBM capability as brazenly demonstrated by Sputnik 1. (Unlike Kennedy in the early 1960s, Eisenhower was more impressed by space travel’s potential as a military tool than a political one’ Since the early Space Age the strategic potential of space in military matters has been proven with respect to the field of global espionage. While the strategic use of Earth orbital space is accepted, any model predicting expansionist development into the rest of the Solar System on the basis of strategic concerns presupposes that there is something to defend. Again, this model can only serve to explain space development in the far future, when commercial or colonial ventures are set up and trading routes are established. Apart from a few calls to utilize the bodies of the Solar System as nuclear test sites the strategic or military impetus to expand in space seems weak.

## Link --- Development

### Even access to imperialistic development is class-based. The bourgeois, space capable nations restrict access to space from the proletariat, space incapable nations.

**Marshall 95** (Alan Marshall is in the Institute of Development Studies at Massey University, February 1995, “Space Policy”, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?\_ob=MImg&\_imagekey=B6V52-3XWRMXY-11-1&\_cdi=5774&\_user=1458830&\_pii=026596469593233B&\_origin=&\_coverDate=02%2F28%2F1995&\_sk=999889998&view=c&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkzV&md5=3654427bdc6e87641fbbb117001107b9&ie=/sdarticle.pdf)

If development does occur in space it will be of an imperialistic nature. It will be undertaken by a few technologically elite space-capable nations who will appropriate the commonly-owned resources of the Solar System for themselves, without any committed provision for the sharing of the benefits to other, non-space capable, nations. Unfortunately such imperialistic tendencies are not just a prospect for the future, they are evident in current space activities. Not throughout the Solar System maybe, but certainly within the confines of the near space of Earth orbit. Imperialistic tendencies in this realm have provoked a growing sense of resentment amongst those nations being subjected to it. For instance, with the continued development of the geostationary orbit, concern is being expressed that the space a satellite occupies in this type of orbit is becoming a scarce resource, and one which is becoming increasingly unavailable to non-space nations. Some of these nations have banded together under the 1986 Bogota Declaration to express their right to benefits accumulating to users of geostationary orbits above their territories. Included in this group of nations are the Third World states of Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Kenya, Uganda, Zaire and Indonesia. None of these states receives rent for the occupation of their geostationary space, just as no satellite launching nation or company pays rent to the rest of the global community for occupying a common space that belongs to all the world. Those nations and firms that launch and operate satellites generally feel that the benefits accrued from satellite activities are offered throughout the world through the normal market procedures. However, unlike the free-riding satellite operators, user nations have to pay to receive satellite services. Additional to this is the ability of the space-capable nations to obtain information about resources in the territories of non-space-capable nations, which is either made unavailable to the latter or is sold to them at a profit

## Link --- Government Support for Space Development /AT: Aff = Socialist

### Government space programs focus on furthering capitalism --- Constellation proves

Werb ’10 (Bob, Space Frontier Foundation Chairman, “Real Socialism in America,” <http://spacefrontier.org/2010/07/06/real-socialism-in-america/>) Andrew Muo

The word “socialism” has been bandied about a lot during the last year and applied to many situations that are a long way from the traditional understanding of the word: vesting full control over the means of production in government. It has been used to describe proposed and enacted changes to laws about health care, cap and trade, corporate bailouts, financial regulation, education, and even middle class tax cuts. While it may well be rational to argue that any increase in the size, power, or impact of government advances us on “the road to socialism,” the same thing can be said about the Patriot Act, No Child Left Behind or the vast majority of other laws enacted by Congress during the last 221 years. Interestingly there is a change being proposed by the Obama administration that deals with a government program where full control of the means of production is already in government hands – and the Obama team wants to change that. That’s right. In at least one instance, Barack Obama wants to put America on the road to capitalism. The program in question is called Constellation, NASA’s failed plan for a government designed, owned and operated repeat of the Apollo program. Every detail of this plan originates from within a government bureaucracy. Private sector participation is limited to carrying out the terms of extremely detailed contracts. Every material used, the thread on every bolt, and the color of the paint is to be precisely specified. Once built, the various parts of the Constellation system are to be operated from government facilities and by government employees. (The solid rocket boosters that are strapped onto the Space Shuttle offer a vivid example of how we currently conduct human spaceflight; according to Space News “Kent Rominger, a former space shuttle astronaut now with Alliant Techsystems of Minneapolis, said the space shuttle solid-rocket boosters his employer builds for NASA must meet some 32,000 individual requirements spelled out in 110 separate documents totaling 17,000 pages.” Not only is the Obama Administration proposing ending this socialist boondoggle, they want to use a big chunk of the money saved to promote competition among private sector players who are to both own and control the means of production, with government’s role limited to buying needed services and maintaining a regulatory environment that is to encourage innovation while protecting public safety. This economic system is commonly called “capitalism.”

### The Obama administration is pursuing capitalism by promoting an entrepreneurial perspective.

Coopersmith ’10 (Jonathan, Professor at the University of Texas, “(Anti-) socialism in space,” the space review, September 27, 2010, <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1701/1#idc-container>) Andrew Muo

In one of the more bizarre aspects of an already confusing political season, many conservatives have assailed the Obama administration for allegedly dragging the United States into a radical “socialism.” These attackers have obviously not examined the president’s proposed space policy. The ideological contradictions are amusing. Some politicians who decry federal efforts to ensure the safety of workers in mines and other workplaces have been uncompromising in their belief that only the government and not private enterprise can guarantee worker—astronaut—safety in space. Realizing how internationally competitive space has become, the Obama Administration is trying to make NASA more flexible and innovative by proposing the most market-oriented space policy in decades. The plans to revamp the human space program have received the most media and political attention. Less reported but as significant are efforts to advance commercial development, to encourage aerospace exports by significantly streamlining the bureaucratic International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) process, and to revamp the NASA Advisory Council to promote a more entrepreneurial perspective.

**Capitalist ideology is inherent in the American space program.**

**Billings ‘07**Linda Billings is a research professor at the George Washington University [School of Media and Public Affairs](http://www.gwu.edu/~smpa/) in Washington, D.C. She does communication research for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration’s (NASA’s) [astrobiology program](http://astrobiology.nasa.gov/) in the Science Mission Directorate. She also advises NASA’s Senior Scientist for Mars Exploration and Planetary Protection Officer on communications.

The ideas of frontier pioneering, continual progress, manifest destiny, free enterprise, and rugged individualism have been prominent in the american national narrative, which has constructed and maintained an ideology of “americanism”—what it means to be american, and what america is meant to be and do. in exploring the history of u.S. spaceflight, it is useful to consider how u.S. space advocacy movements and initiatives have interpreted and deployed the values and beliefs sustained by this national narrative.the aim here is to illuminate the role and function of ideology and advocacy in the history of spaceflight by examining the rhetoric of spaceflight advocacy. Starting from the premise that spaceflight has played a role in the american national narrative and that this national narrative has played a role in the history of spaceflight, this paper examines the relationship between spaceflight and this narrative.

Examining the history of spaceflight advocacy reveals an ideology of spaceflight that draws deeply on a durable american cultural narrative—a national mythology—of frontier pioneering, continual progress, manifest destiny, free enterprise, rugged individualism, and a right to life without limits. this ideology rests on a number of assumptions, or beliefs, about the role of the united States in the global community, the american national character, and the “right” form of political economy.according to this ideology,the united States is and must remain “number one” in the world community, playing the role of political, economic, scientific, technological, and moral leader. that is, the united States is and must be exceptional. this ideology constructs americans as independent, pioneering, resourceful, inventive, and exceptional, and it establishes that liberal democracy and free-market capitalism (or capitalist democracy) constitute the only viable form of political economy.2 the rhetoric of space advocacy exalts those enduring american values of pioneering, progress, enterprise, freedom, and rugged individualism, and it advances the cause of capitalist democracy.

## Link --- Government Support for Space Development/AT: Aff = Socialist

### The government is beginning to allocate scarce resources to commercial ventures in space --- acting as venture capitalist

Greenberg 92(Joel S. American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, *Space Economics*, Vol. 144, google books, p.324-325)

As the government has become active in promoting the commercial development of space, it has begun to, in essence, play the role of a venture capitalist and/or investment banker providing its scarcest resources (the use of funds, infrastructure, and personnel) to help initiate commercial ventures that are in the public interest. As a result, government, and in particular NASA, must also act as a venture capitalist and/or investment banker by evaluating the potential impacts and benefits that will result from its “investments.” NASA must ensure that its resources are allocated efficiently; i.e., resulting benefits will be maximized and benefits exceed costs. This implies that NASA must evaluate private-sector business ventures by performing financial analyses, making market forecasts, and so forth, and estimating the likely consequences of its investment, including the likelihood of achieving benefits. (NASA’s Office of Commercial Programs released a Request for Proposal in December 1989 with the subsequent award of a contract for the provision of financial analysis services for evaluating private-sector commercial space ventures seeking government support.) It must evaluate the appropriateness of making new investments as well as terminating previously established investments. In order to understand the rold of public-sector programs in encouraging the commercial development of space, it is necessary to have insight into private-sector investment decisions, how government actions may affect these decisions, and how the public sector should evaluate its investment opportunities. These are the main subjects of this article: to describe the ways that government programs can influence private-sector investment decisions and to develop a structure for assessing the likely effects of government programs specifically undertaken to influence private-sector investment decision. To accomplish this, private-sector investment attitudes must be understood. Results of a survey of investment attitudes are described. The investment attitudes are summarized quantitatively in terms of the likelihood of investment which is a function of expected return on investment (ROI), risk as measured as the variability or standard deviation of ROI, expected magnitude of investment, and expected payback period. A concept is also developed for assessing the impact of government programs through the investment likelihood function. Finally, the effect of various government actions of private-sector decisions is discussed in terms of the likelihood functions.

### This is still true --- Obama’s beginning to promote private sector competition for space --- Constellation proves

**Werb 10** (“Real Socialism in America” Bob is The Space Frontier Foundation Chairman http://spacefrontier.org/2010/07/06/real-socialism-in-america/)

The word “socialism” has been bandied about a lot during the last year and applied to many situations that are a long way from the traditional understanding of the word: vesting full control over the means of production in government. It has been used to describe proposed and enacted changes to laws about health care, cap and trade, corporate bailouts, financial regulation, education, and even middle class tax cuts. While it may well be rational to argue that any increase in the size, power, or impact of government advances us on “the road to socialism,” the same thing can be said about the Patriot Act, No Child Left Behind or the vast majority of other laws enacted by Congress during the last 221 years. Interestingly there is a change being proposed by the Obama administration that deals with a government program where full control of the means of production is already in government hands – and the Obama team wants to change that. That’s right. In at least one instance, Barack Obama wants to put America on the road to capitalism. The program in question is called Constellation, NASA’s failed plan for a government designed, owned and operated repeat of the Apollo program. Every detail of this plan originates from within a government bureaucracy. Private sector participation is limited to carrying out the terms of extremely detailed contracts. Every material used, the thread on every bolt, and the color of the paint is to be precisely specified. Once built, the various parts of the Constellation system are to be operated from government facilities and by government employees. (The solid rocket boosters that are strapped onto the Space Shuttle offer a vivid example of how we currently conduct human spaceflight; according to Space News “Kent Rominger, a former space shuttle astronaut now with Alliant Techsystems of Minneapolis, said the space shuttle solid-rocket boosters his employer builds for NASA must meet some 32,000 individual requirements spelled out in 110 separate documents totaling 17,000 pages.” Not only is the Obama Administration proposing ending this socialist boondoggle, they want to use a big chunk of the money saved to promote competition among private sector players who are to both own and control the means of production, with government’s role limited to buying needed services and maintaining a regulatory environment that is to encourage innovation while protecting public safety. This economic system is commonly called “capitalism.”

## Link --- Colonization

**Capitalism and colonization depend on each other – capital growth feeds off of colonization**

**Bhagwat** Oct 17 20**10** (Admiral Vishnu is a former Chief of the Naval Staff of India “The Weaponization of Space: Corporate Driven Military Unleashes Preemptive Wars” http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=21432)

As we see the world order today , the material conditions of the people from one continent to the other , the direct consequences of colonialism , breeding predatory wars for resources and markets , and conflicts within nations and interse between nations , to further consolidate an extremely exploitative , parasitical and colonial regime to crush the ‘untermenschens’ or sub-humans, which is the expression for the ordinary people of the this planet, to condemn millions with a predetermined policy to malnutrition , hunger, disease and death , as never before at any time in world history . In India , Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru had described these conditions as the “terror of hunger and unemployment”, thinking they were inherent characteristics of those times in colonial India and would be eradicated when freedom was won ! To encapsulate, the very character of accumulation of surplus under a system of Capitalism , its extreme parasitical characteristic of sucking the blood and fruits of toil of the worker and whole colonies, nurtures policies that create satanic weapon systems to establish hegemony and dominance . Human progress in science and technology , instead of being harnessed for the benefit of civilization is being used to innovate and invent , no matter what the cost to national budgets , weapon systems robotic in their capacity to kill and maim large numbers of people , increasingly the civilian population . This is being witnessed , to give one example with the drone technology with its remote control , in advance of later versions to be deployed in Space. This process is accelerating even as people are losing control over military budgets even as they have no control over their political systems . The nature of this weaponization is intended to destroy the human habitat and environment and has dangerous implications for the genetic future of mankind, in the nature of GM and terminator seeds of the Agribusiness companies. “Colonialism is a constant , necessary condition for capitalist growth . Without colonies , Capital accumulation would grind to a halt ,” said Rosa Luxemburg , a member of the Social Democratic Party in pre-Nazi Germany. We are now living in the era of Neo-colonialism disguised as Globalisation minus the foreign flag and armies, with the MNCs weaving the web of the Transnational Capitalist Class across our polity and economy. We must understand the reality of our present lawless world, where corporate driven military might unleashes pre-emptive wars, invasions and occupations and the UN system stands paralyzed , its Charter disregarded , the Treaties and conventions signed and ratified , flouted at every step . It is necessary for us to focus on the stark truth that those treaties and conventions do not protect humanity from the forces that want to dominate and exploit the resources of the world using every weapon system and all mediums --be they land , sea , the seabed or space and if the world system does not create a balance very soon than even from military bases that may be established on the earth’s planetary system.Vladimir Putin, then President and now the Prime Minister of Russia, speaking at the European Security Conference in Munich on 10th February 2007, said: “The unipolar world refers to a world in which there is one master, one center of authority, one center of force, one centre of decision making. At the end of the day this is pernicious not only for those within the system , but also for the Sovereign himself from within ; what is more important is that the model itself is flawed because as its basis there is and can be no moral foundation for modern civilization ( and even less for democracy ). We are seeing a greater and greater disdain for the basic principles of international law. We are witnessing an almost uncontained hyper use of force in international relations , force that is plunging the world into an abyss of permament conflicts . I am convinced that we have reached that decisive moment when we must seriously think about the architecture of global security.”

## Link --- Lunar Base

**A permanent moon base is not possible without private sector support and the assets are being handed to those with only financial motivation**

**Sinclair 8** (“Leading Global Capitalism to the Moon” Space Generation Advisory Council Amalie is organiser space for progressVenture Capital & Private Equity industry http://oldweb.spacegeneration.org/node/2060 )

So far, so good, obviously given current levels of funding, Nasa cannot move into the settlement of a permanent moon base without private sector outreach and support. However although much talk at the conference was given over to discussion of modes of transportation, habitats and even possibilities for exploiting the moons possible resources, finding water and fuel, growing food and mining ores … the nagging questions about social responsibility remain unanswered. Some certain benefits from the further space outreaches are expected in the nearer term. These prospects include critical research areas within our modern technological forums. In particular for the fields of nano-technology, genetic engineering and laser based communications, larger and more stable zero gravity laboratories would provide particular and optimal conditions to unlock and engineer new types of medicines and enhanced computational achievements. Policy making behind the current drive into an "industrial " or even a remunerative space capacity leaves much to be desired. G.L Kulcinsky, director of the Fusion Research Institute, currently sitting on the Nasa advisory committee estimates that the rare isotope Helium three, found in great abundance on the moon could provide a 10,000-year clean energy source for our future world through fusion reaction. Although such a fabulous prospect has not been overlooked or called out by the scientists, research within Tokomak facilities being an ongoing process, it might well have been already discretely overlooked within the obvious profile of the current space policy exposure. The silence at our Lunar conference was a coherent and pervasive one, despite expansive talk about "industrialization of the solar system and mention of Columbus, Jefferson, the creation of wealth " and such. Why the low profile, I wondered? Surely Helium three would be the most genuine reason and the most probable prospect for productive lunar settlement. In fact the conclusion I came to was that the potential for Helium 3/ fusion energy was probably the prime motivating and political force behind the entire current moon settlement initiative, but an unstated and a discrete one. Not egomania I am sure, after all we have taken a trip this way before with the late Ronald Regan's Star Wars, now we have a parting shot from the incumbent George Bush for " industrialization " of the solar system. The lack of overt discussion sets a dangerous precedent, as does the lack of proper international law, in particular concerning the generation of durable patent rights for private investors seeking space applications equity. It is inconceivable that an entire generation of valuable technological assets should be held by the handful of mega-rich who control the commercial arms of the current Nasa programs; equally inconceivable is the prospect of the Helium three energy resources being held by the multi-national energy consortiums without proper intra-governmental oversights. Our ensuing Moon and Space assets certainly belong to the people of this, our particular, destitute and sensitive human world. Certainly not to the financially motivated generations of casual space faring entrepreneurs who must not be permitted even by default to siphon the wealth of consensual international communities into a fabulous joy ride to Mars and beyond. Early this morning, the day after the Lunar conference ended, Yahoo web sites hosted a press release for a book on robotic moon exploration: Inconstant Moon by Louis Varrichio 2006, within curiously enough the "Yahoo Finance" pages, an obvious placement for a very obvious purpose, but perhaps a not an altogether ethical usage of a public press utility that claims no interest in the discrete but insidious processes of public propaganda. Barack Obama's policy speech, fortunately not at the " Brandenburg Gate " may well prelude the invitations to a newer but not less dangerous world. US initiative and outreach for technological innovation and technologically empowered international collaboration is badly needed, but such opening up must be preceded by close examination of many outstanding legal, treaty, ethical , environmental, and developmental responsibilities, if we are not to fall once again again into the well baited globalization traps from which we so hesitantly seek to emerge. This world not only needs an innovative , inclusive and highly advanced industrial paradigm, it seeks security on all levels and an equitability and availability of interests. The UN resolutions on the Peaceful Usage of Outer Space must be reexamined and reworked by the incoming US administration. A deeper appreciation of the tremendous value of space based assets and the undertaking of a very inclusive international space agenda will be the key to achieving global consensus at this critical juncture. Such a focused agenda must include and support cooperative near space capacities for communications, space security and earth observation as well as the upcoming outreach to the moon and even beyond …

## Link --- Hegemony

### The affirmative’s appeal to nationalism and leadership is merely a ploy to get public support for imperialism.

**Marshall 95** (Alan Marshall is in the Institute of Development Studies at Massey University, February 1995, “Space Policy”, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?\_ob=MImg&\_imagekey=B6V52-3XWRMXY-11-1&\_cdi=5774&\_user=1458830&\_pii=026596469593233B&\_origin=&\_coverDate=02%2F28%2F1995&\_sk=999889998&view=c&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkzV&md5=3654427bdc6e87641fbbb117001107b9&ie=/sdarticle.pdf)

Nationalism has been the background against which the US space programme has gained much of its popular support. The Kennedy and Johnson Administrations were able to tap into the political mileage to be gained from space travel. In the face of an attack on American national prestige by the Soviet Union’s space exploits nationalist sentiments were easily excited to gain support for a space programme that would reaffirm the USA’s technological prowess. Technological achievements are tangible examples of the superiority of a society, or so many a political leader has sought to convince its subjects. The Kruschev regime, too, held that the technological success of the Sputnik and Vostok projects clearly demonstrated the superiority of the Soviet communist system. Throughout many periods of imperialist history, nationalism has been an essential driving force. As Mommsen l1 declares ‘Sometimes states- men were far less inclined to engage in costly overseas ventures than were those sections of the population, including the masses, who were tempted by vague future greatness and economic advantage’. This situation may well apply to modern day USA, in which the repeated public calls for a massive reassertment of America’s space programme are repeatedly ignored by the US senate, who show a bias towards ‘prudent’ management of the federal budget rather than the future imperial glory of the USA in space. It might be claimed that the lack of receptivity of the US Senate to vast popular sentiments shows the inadequacy of America’s political structures in matters of representation. This may indeed be the case, but it seems likely that the main reason populism is not successfully spurring on Solar System space development is because space development is not popular enough. In the recent past, nationalist and populist calls for an increase in the US space effort were often imbued with ideological stances aimed at the activities of the USSR in space.

## Link --- Resource Mining

### Resource mining collects private capital through exploiting resources

Hickman 99 (John, Associate Prof. of Government in Dept. of International Relations at Berry College, “The Political Economy of Very Large Space Objects,” Journal of Evolution and Technology <http://www.jetpress.org/volume4/space.pdf>)

Mining also serves as the primary economic rationale in Donald Cox and James Chestik’s (1996: 138−146, 211−272) proposal to colonize the asteroids. Planetary defense against asteroids and comets which might strike the Earth, transportation facilities intermediate between Earth and Mars, research facilities, and tourism and retirement homes all provide additional reasons for making asteroids the first focus for human expansion into space**. Although Cox and Chestik offer little detail about financing their proposal, this may be excused because the probable incremental nature of exploiting the asteroids is likely to mean that attracting capital should be comparatively less difficult than for other very large space development projects. Each asteroid mining venture might be financed separately and the total capital necessary for mining the asteroids could be raised over time and in smaller amounts. Robotic mining of asteroids passing near the Earth might be within the technological and economic reach of private firms and government space agencies in the next century**. Subsequent robotic mining ventures of bodies farther from the Earth might build on that initial experience. **Yet rather than open a new frontier for human settlement, such incremental economic development via robotic mining might foreclose it. Private investors and government space agencies might be content to limit space development to those ventures which yield economic returns in the short term.** Given better returns on investments on Earth and demands for government spending for public services, the occasional robotic mining ventures on near Earth asteroids might be the most ambitious space development project ever undertaken. It is difficult to see why such investments would generate other economic activity in space. Part of the problem is that robots might be too cost−effective.

## Link --- Resources

### The expansion in the solar system and the collection of resources are infused with the logic of capitalism

**Marshall 95** (Alan Marshall is in the Institute of Development Studies at Massey University, February 1995, “Space Policy”, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?\_ob=MImg&\_imagekey=B6V52-3XWRMXY-11-1&\_cdi=5774&\_user=1458830&\_pii=026596469593233B&\_origin=&\_coverDate=02%2F28%2F1995&\_sk=999889998&view=c&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkzV&md5=3654427bdc6e87641fbbb117001107b9&ie=/sdarticle.pdf)

Those that advocate the development of the solar system in the search for raw materials often appeal to the neo-Malthusianism with regards to the need to find ever more resources to satiate the expanding population of planet Earth. Although the grand plan to develop outer space so as to remedy an over-populated and resource deficient world reeks of dubious economic principles, and transparent self-interest, Malthusian sentiments are still widely held by those within the astronautics industry (especially by those charged with promoting the virtues of the industry). Even if resource depletion was directly linked to the population of the planet, the development of even more resources is not likely to provide for the necessities of most of the world’s people. New resources contribute to the consumptive wants of the wealthy, not to the needs of the populous poor

## Link --- Resources

**Space’s resources provide big advantages for the capitalist market.**

**Marshall 95** (Alan Marshall is in the Institute of Development Studies at Massey University, February 1995, “Space Policy”, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?_ob=MImg&_imagekey=B6V52-3XWRMXY-11-1&_cdi=5774&_user=1458830&_pii=026596469593233B&_origin=&_coverDate=02%2F28%2F1995&_sk=999889998&view=c&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkzV&md5=3654427bdc6e87641fbbb117001107b9&ie=/sdarticle.pdf>)

Why should expansionist development occur in outer space? What is there to motivate governments and private firms to develop space? Throughout the Space Age many officials in the US public sector, as well as many entrepreneurially minded space writers, have set their minds on the utilization of extraterrestrial resources.’ Some industries on Earth owe their existence (or a substantial amount of their revenue) to the utilization of space resources (for instance; the telecommunications, weather forecasting and living marine resource industries). Other private firms owe their success not to the utilization of space resources but to the vague pursuit of space resource utilization. Such companies succeed by campaigning their respective governments into giving them multi-million dollar contracts based on the precept that at some time in the future they will be able to utilize extraterrestrial resources commercially.\* Perhaps the most frequently elaborated rationale from human space expansion is the pursuit of new raw materials - raw materials which on Earth are unavailable or have become enormously rare. From this perspective, development in space is based upon the search for resources. Historical precedents for such a model can be cited to support this idea. For instance, British colonialism in South East Asia secured a ready supply of tin for England’s industrial revolution. American economic imperialism in Latin America supplied the USA’s burgeoning automobile industry with cheap rubber during the early twentieth century.

**Lack of resources poses opportunity for capitalists to exploit crisis and gain profits from space**

Dickens 9 (Peter teaches at the Universities of Brighton and Cambridge, UK Volume 57, Issue Supplement s1, pages 66–82, May 2009 2009 The Editorial Board of the Sociological Review Universities of Brighton and Essex, UK http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01817.x/pdf)

With a much longer-term perspective, private companies are now working on research for lunar and asteroidal mines, these being actively supported by a number of pro-space organizations (Prado, 2008). The Moon might seem a more obvious target but asteroids are currently seen as a better bet due to their metallic density. Metals found on the Moon are, after all, just the dispersed debris of asteroids. Compared with an equal mass taken from the Moon, asteroids have about three hundred times as much free metal. In the 1990s the market value of metals in the small known asteroid, known as 3,554 Amun, was $20 trillion. This includes $8 trillion worth of iron and nickel, $6 trillion worth of cobalt and about $6 trillion in platinum-group metals (Lewis, 1996). The Moon, however, remains attractive from a different viewpoint. Millions of tons of Helium-3 could be obtained from there, one metric ton being currently worth about $3 million. Caution is needed, however, regarding the prospects of all these materials as direct inputs into Earthly production-processes. The costs of returning materials to Earth would add so much to the cost of extracting them that it seems likely they will be unavailable for Earthly use in the foreseeable future. Advocates realizing this emphasize the use of space resources in space rather than bringing them down to Earth (Prado, 2008). But all these fixes are some way from being realized, although they are under certainly active development. Their investors are those seeing space resources as an opportunity to realize profits out of crises stemming from increasingly scarce natural resources on earth. The ideology most frequently adopted is that of refuting the Club of Rome's famous ‘Limits to Growth’ thesis. This predicted that population growth would soon be limited by lack of resources. (Meadows et al., 1972, 2005). The existence of space resources has also been used to criticize Marx's political economy (Thomas-Pellicer, 2004). James O'Connor (1994), coming from a Marxist perspective, argues that capitalism will eventually fall foul of its ‘second contradiction’– that between the forces and relations of production on the one hand and the conditions of production (inputs like labour, natural resources and infrastructure) on the other. This would cause a crisis in supply rather than demand and potentially result in state ownership and control over the means of production. Yet O'Connor's second contradiction thesis, can according to advocates of space development and settlement, be easily refuted. **Outer space represents resources for capitalism to continue ad infinitum**, especially if unfettered by state intervention.

## Link --- Resources

**Their claims of colonization are synonymous with the commercial, profit-seeking methods of capitalism.**

**Marshall 95** (Alan Marshall is in the Institute of Development Studies at Massey University, February 1995, “Space Policy”, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?\_ob=MImg&\_imagekey=B6V52-3XWRMXY-11-1&\_cdi=5774&\_user=1458830&\_pii=026596469593233B&\_origin=&\_coverDate=02%2F28%2F1995&\_sk=999889998&view=c&wchp=dGLzVlz-zSkzV&md5=3654427bdc6e87641fbbb117001107b9&ie=/sdarticle.pdf)

However, there may be the possibility that the rationales for development presented above will act in a cooperative and synergistic manner to make extraterrestrial space expansion not only possible, but probable. For instance, one scenario might go like this: because of a desire not to dislodge thousands of skilled workers previously employed in military technology, it is decided by the US government to make a sustained attempt to permanently occupy an orbiting space station or lunar base. Perhaps the government is convinced that cooperation with other nations in these activities will cut their costs quite considerably. Such a space programme could attract enough public support through nationalist or sociopsychological motives. Once a base on the Moon is established, its expansion could be made justifiable on the grounds that it is to some extent self-sustaining, through the use of local resources in construction. Throughout all these developments the venture never becomes truly commercial, but as it is an outlet for surplus capital and contributes to economic growth as measured in the national accounts, it might claim to be economically valuable for the country as a whole.

## Link --- Satellites/Internet

### Satellites and internet signaled the beginning of the neoliberal age and now are used to keep the power in the hands of elitists.

Dickens and Ormrod 8 (Peter Dickens, affiliated lecturer in the department of sociology at University of Cambridge, former visiting professor of sociology at the University of Essex, visiting professor of sociology at the University of Brighton, James Ormrod, lecturer in sociology in the School of Applied Science and the University of Brighton, February 2008, “Who Really Won the Space Race?,” The Monthly Review, <http://monthlyreview.org/2008/02/01/who-really-won-the-space-race>)

Some of these capital-investments in space at first seem relatively beneficial and benign. Communications satellites are, for example, a key way in which trade is conducted, a means by which information and capital flow on a global scale. Whether this is viewed as beneficial or benign depends on your view of global capitalism. But note that the development of the Internet, which partly depends on satellites, roughly coincided with the rise of neoliberalism. This involved widescale deregulation and privatization—what David Harvey calls “accumulation by dispossession.” The neoliberal experiment was an attempt to recreate a profitable capitalism after the social and economic crises of the 1960s and 70s. But it has not substantially delivered on its promises. The record is, to use Harvey’s diagnosis, “nothing short of dismal.” Large proportions of the population have fallen into poverty, especially in Russia and the old East European societies that fully adopted the neoliberal creed. Global indicators of health levels, life expectancy, and infant mortality have worsened almost universally since the 1960s. Significant exceptions to this trend are those societies such as Sweden and Poland that have managed to resist or at least tame the neoliberal experiment. Neoliberalization has therefore consolidated class power in the economic, political, and cultural spheres. But the human and environmental costs have been very high. Furthermore, neoliberalization has largely failed to generate economic expansion. Aggregate growth rates have fallen from 3.5 percent in the 1960s to 1.1 percent at the present time. Only East and South-East Asia, plus most recently India, have seen substantial economic growth. Satellites have been used as a way of exerting economic and political authority and creating the neoliberal experiment. The United States has not really won the space race. To the extent that some of the most powerful corporations using networks based on satellites are located in the United States, that country has indeed “won.” But this leaves millions of people “losing,” many of whom live in the United States. Once more it is the powerful, whether they are located in the United States or elsewhere, who have gained the most from the space race.

### Satellites are commercially exploited by capitalism and commercial investment will fail.

Deudney 85 (Daniel Deudney, Associate Professor of Political Science at John Hopkins University, PhD in Political Science, Spring 1985, “Forging Missiles into Spaceships,” <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/40208985.pdf?acceptTC=true>)

More recently, many space activists and enthusiasts have come to believe that business investment is about to boom in space, and that the engine of capitalist ingenuity and productivity can drive the expansion into space more rapidly and effectively than the existing public sector programs. These visions are, however, a mixture of ideological fantasy and promotional hype. It is true that the commercial exploitation of communication satellites is likely to continue to increase, and perhaps be joined by ventures to research and manufacture high-value pharmaceuticals, optics, and alloys in the almost weightless conditions of near space. Yet in thinking about the prospects for a self-supporting commercial space effort, it is worth recalling the often forgotten facts of space shuttle economics. By 1988, the federal government will have invested nearly $50 billion of public funds in research and development, procurement, and launch facilities for a fleet of four space shuttles. Besides the fact that this public investment is simply being written off as unrecoverable from potential customers, there is now considerable doubt that the space shuttle will ever be able to recover from customers even the added costs of fuel and personnel that each flight will entail

## Link --- Tourism

### Space tourism is proof of capitalism through rapid deregulation of space

**Parker 2009** (Martin, Professor of Culture and Organization at the University of Leicester School of Management, “Capitalists in Space,” The Sociological Review, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01818.x/full>)

At the time of writing, in mid 2008, a host of companies are lining up to offer space tourist experiences to those with money to spend ([Spencer with Rugg, 2004](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01818.x/full#b26); [Kemp, 2007](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01818.x/full#b12)). Most are small, despite their website hyperbole. The largest, and probably the first to succeed, is Virgin Galactic, which is intending to begin sending passengers up for four to five minutes of weightlessness for $200,000 by 2009. They have Richard Branson's money behind them, as well as the only current private sector re-useable vehicle. Thanks in part to Philippe Starck and celebrity endorsements, their marketing and corporate image is slick, even to the extent of claiming to be ‘greener’ than NASA. Their business plan suggests that they will be taking 3,000 people into space per year by their fifth year of operation ([Kemp, 2007](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01818.x/full#b12): 58). Their language articulates space as the exciting new destination of choice for affluent tourists, and not the old place where nationalism and bureaucracy culminated in repressed white men collecting rocks.

Space has become interesting again. And so much more fun. The Cold War rivalry of NASA and the Soviet cosmonauts was highly political and intensely serious. What is happening now is a space renaissance – and any renaissance is characterized by more colour and flair and a flowing of fresh thinking and activities ([Kemp, 2007](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01818.x/full#b12): 5).

Kemp's book, perhaps better described as a book length advert, has a foreword by Richard Branson and is published by Virgin. Virgin's competitors include companies with exciting names like Project Enterprise, EADS Astrium, SpaceX, Constellation Services International, Space Adventures Ltd and so on. Collectively they propose a future in which ‘ordinary people’ will be able to go into space, and break the stranglehold that the state has on this area of human endeavour.

Sharing this vision of deregulation are a series of companies who wish to take capitalism further into space. There are now commercial proposals for flying capsules with ash or mementoes to the moon or out into space, orbital rides around the moon, moon tourism, space hotels (including a proposal from Hilton International), new methods of collecting solar energy, and even mining on the moon**. Companies such as Bigelow Aerospace, Excalibur Almaz, Rocketplane, SpaceDev and Venturer Aerospace are involved in various speculative projects, most of them proposed or ‘under development’. At least eleven places are also vying to become ‘spaceports’, seven of them in the USA. It seems that, forty years after the first man on the moon, the state-industrial monopoly that put him there can no longer protect its territory.** In 2007, a congressman on the Space and Aeronautics subcommittee even introduced a bill proposing that the agency could, like racing cars, sell advertising space on its vehicles, equipment and suits ([Associated Content, 2007](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01818.x/full#b1)). Imagine Armstrong with a Doritos sticker on his helmet, intoning a script written by a PepsiCo marketing executive.

## Link – Weaponization

### Weaponization causes desire for ownership of outer space – social relations become capitalist

Duvall and Havercroft 6(Taking Sovereignty Out of This World: Space Weapons and Empire of the Future\* Raymond Duvall Jonathan Havercroft University of Minnesota University of British Columbia October 2006 <http://www.ligi.ubc.ca/sites/liu/files/Publications/Havercroft_paper.pdf>)

Each of the three forms of space weaponization has important constitutive effects on modern sovereignty, and, in turn, productive effects on political subjectivities. Exclusive missile defense constitutes a “hard shell” of sovereignty for one state, while erasing the sovereign political subject status of other states. Space control reinforces that exclusive constitution of sovereignty and its potentiality for fostering unilateral decision. It also constitutes the ‘space-controlling’ state, the U.S., as sovereign for a particular global social order, a global capitalism, and as a state populated by an exceptional people, “Americans.” Space weaponization in the form of capacities for direct force application obliterate the meaning of territorial boundaries for defense and for distinguishing an inside from an outside with respect to the scope of policing and law enforcement—that is authorized locus for deciding the exception. States, other than the exceptional “American” state, are reduced to empty shells of sovereignty, sustained, if at all, by convenient fiction—for example, as useful administrative apparatuses for the governing of locals. And their “citizens” are produced as “bare life” subject to the willingness of the global sovereign to let them live. Together, these three sets of effects constitute what we believe can appropriately be identified as late-modern empire, the political subjects of which are a global sovereign, an exceptional “nation” linked to that sovereign, a global social order normalized in terms of capitalist social relations, and “bare life” for individuals and groups globally to participate in that social order. If our argument is even half correct, the claim with which this paper began—that modes of political killing have important effects—would be an understatement! If the logic of space weaponization is to constitute a new, historically unprecedented form of empire, there are significant theoretical and practical implications. By way of conclusion, we take up some of the most important of those implications briefly in this section. Broadly speaking, recent theorizing on imperialism has posited two competing pictures of empire. On the one hand, scholars have put forward a global hegemonic view of empire in which a great power – presumably the United States – through a combination of hard and soft power dominates the international system to such an extant that it becomes the de facto sovereign of a global order.75 On the other hand, theorists such as Hardt and Negri have posited a de-centered version of Empire in which a network of loosely integrated institutions govern the various facets of the lives of subjects to such an extent that all political subjects on the planet are governed under a single, dispersed regime that they have labeled Empire. Our paper rejects both these images of Empire, and uses the site of space weaponization to posit a third version of Empire that is neither the de-centered late modern vision of Hardt and Negri, nor the centralized hegemonic vision of both advocates and opponents of American Imperialism.

# \*\*\*IMPACTS\*\*\*

## Impact --- Impact Calculus --- Magnitude/Probability

### Space development will end in all out war in space and on earth

Dickens 10 (Peter, Professor of Sociology – University of Brighton and Cambridge, UK, “The Humanization of the Cosmos – To What End?”, Monthly Review, 62(6), November, 6-6, http://monthlyreview.org/archives/2010/volume-62-issue-06-november-2010)

But even manufactured risks may be minimal in scope, compared with another risk stemming from cosmic colonization. This is outright war. Armed conflict has long been a common feature of past colonialisms; between colonizing nations as well as between the colonizers and aboriginal peoples. Satellites are already a means by which territories and investments on Earth are monitored and protected by governments operating on behalf of their economic interests. But the prospect of galactic colonialisms raises the distinct possibility of hostilities in space. Galactic wars may therefore be the product of galactic colonialism. Such a scenario was prefigured by the Star Trek science fiction television series in which the main role of “The Federation” is the protection of capitalist mining colonies.

### Space war for supremacy has already begun

Dickens 10 (Peter, Professor of Sociology – University of Brighton and Cambridge, UK, “The Humanization of the Cosmos – To What End?”, Monthly Review, 62(6), November, 6-6, http://monthlyreview.org/archives/2010/volume-62-issue-06-november-2010)

It is a discomforting fact that both China and the United States are now actively developing their own versions of “full spectrum dominance.” China demonstrated its capabilities in January 2007 by shooting down one of its own defunct satellites. In February 2008, the U.S. Navy demonstrated a similar capability, destroying a faulty U.S. satellite with a sea-based missile. An arms race in outer space has already started.

## Impact --- Nuclear War

### Capitalism leads to nuclear war because of the focus on maximizing profit

Webb 4 (“War, capitalism, and George W. Bush” SAM is the NATIONAL CHAIRMAN, COMMUNIST PARTY USA http:// www.peoplesworld.org/war-capitalism-and-george-w-bush)

We are living in a fragile and unstable world. But perhaps that has always been the lot of humankind – certainly, it is a state of affairs as old as capitalism.  Capitalism was never a warm, cuddly, stable social system. It came into the world dripping with blood from every pore, as Marx described it, laying waste to old forms of production and ways of life in favor of new, more efficient manufacturing. Since then it has combined nearly uninterrupted transformation of the instruments of production with immense wealth for a few and unrelieved exploitation, insecurity, misery, and racial and gender inequality for the many, along with periodic wars, and a vast zone of countries imprisoned in a seemingly inescapable web of abject poverty.  Yet as bad as that record is, its most destructive effects on our world could still be ahead.  Why do I say that? Because capitalism, with its imperatives of capital accumulation, profit maximization and competition, is the cause of new global problems that threaten the prospects and lives of billions of people worldwide, and, more importantly, it is also a formidable barrier to humankind’s ability to solve these problems.  Foremost among these, in addition to ecological degradation, economic crises, population pressures, and endemic diseases, is the threat of nuclear mass annihilation.  With the end of the Cold War, most of us thought that the threat of nuclear war would fade and with it the stockpiles of nuclear weapons.  But those hopes were dashed. Rather than easing, the nuclear threat is more palpable in some ways and caches of nuclear weapons are growing. And our own government possesses the biggest stockpiles by far. Much like previous administrations, the Bush administration has continued to develop more powerful nuclear weapons, but with a twist: it insists on its singular right to employ nuclear weapons preemptively in a range of military situations. This is a major departure from earlier U.S. policy – the stated policy of all previous administrations was that nuclear weapons are weapons of last resort to be used only in circumstances in which our nation is under severe attack.  Meanwhile, today’s White House bullies demonize, impose sanctions, and make or threaten war on states that are considering developing a nuclear weapons capability. Bush tells us that this policy of arming ourselves while disarming others should cause no anxiety because, he says, his administration desires only peace and has no imperial ambitions. Not surprisingly, people greet his rhetorical assurances skeptically, especially as it becomes more and more obvious that his administration’s political objective is not world peace, but world domination, cunningly couched in the language of “fighting terrorism.”  It is well that millions of peace-minded people distrust Bush’s rhetoric. The hyper-aggressive gang in the Oval Office and Pentagon and the absolutely lethal nature of modern weapons of mass destruction make for a highly unstable and explosive situation that could cascade out of control. War has a logic of its own.  But skepticism alone is not enough. It has to be combined with a sustained mobilization of the world community – the other superpower in this unipolar world – if the hand of the warmakers in the White House and Pentagon is to be stayed.  A heavy responsibility rests on the American people. For we have the opportunity to defeat Bush and his counterparts in Congress in the November elections. Such a defeat will be a body blow to the policies of preemption, regime change, and saber rattling, and a people’s mandate for peace, disarmament, cooperation, and mutual security. The world will become a safer place.  In the longer run, however, it is necessary to replace the system of capitalism. With its expansionary logic to accumulate capital globally and its competitive rivalries, capitalism has an undeniable structural tendency to militarism and war.  This doesn’t mean that nuclear war is inevitable. But it does suggest **that nuclear war is a latent, ever-present possibility in a world in which global capital is king.** Whether that occurs depends in large measure on the outcome of political struggle within and between classes and social movements at the national and international level.

## Impact --- Nuclear War

### Even as the aff tries to solve impacts through a capitalist mindset, it’s the same mindset that creates threats to human survival including nuclear war

Marko 3 (“Anarchism and Human Survival: Russell's Problem,” UK Indymedia http://www.indymedia.org.uk/en/2003/05/68173.html)

Bertrand Russell throughout his long career as a public intellectual and political activist had reason to reflect on the follies of humanity and the real threats to human survival, threats which are self induced. Much speculation and movie making is devoted toward such survival threatening events as asteroid strikes and mantle head plumes. What is totally ignored is the threat to human survival posed by our own institutions. We can notch another one for the propaganda model; it is to be expected that our pathological institutions would not dwell on their inherent pathology. We can expect nothing less of the corporate media. I shall argue that we face what I refer to as "Russell's problem": “are Homo sapiens an intelligent maladaptive organism doomed to self extinction”? There exists good reason to suppose that a maladaptive, intelligent, organism would indeed cause its own extinction simply because of the destructive potential of intelligence. This is one of the farces of many science fiction stories, such as Star Trek, which posit the existence of hideous innately war like but highly intelligent species. This is not a productive mix; surely any advanced species, in order to reach such heights as inter-galactic travel, would need to be a species that places a premium on cooperation and solidarity. An avaricious intelligent species would only over time succeed in destroying itself and much of the ecological basis for the support of life long before it would be able to traverse wormholes. There exist three threats to survival namely nuclear war, ecological change and north-south conflict. All three I would argue can be traced to a single source that being the pathological nature of state capitalism. What is frightening is that eventual self induced extinction is a rational consequence of our system of world order much like the destruction of the system of world order prior to 1914 was a rational consequence of its internal nature. I shall focus in this essay on nuclear war, the most immediate threat. In doing so we will come to appreciate the nexus between this threat, globalisation and north-south conflict. Currently we are witnessing a major expansion in the US global military system. One facet of this expansion is the globalisation of US nuclear war planning known as "adaptive planning". The idea here is that the US would be able to execute a nuclear strike against any target on Earth at very short notice. For strategic planners the world's population is what they refer to as a "target rich environment". The Clinton era commander of US nuclear forces, Admiral Mies, stated that nuclear ballistic missile submarines would be able to "move undetected to any launch point" threatening "any spot on Earth". What lies at the heart of such a policy is the desire to maintain global strategic superiority what is known as "full spectrum dominance" previously referred to as "escalation dominance". Full spectrum dominance means that the US would be able to wage and win any type of war ranging from a small scale contingency to general nuclear war. Strategic nuclear superiority is to be used to threaten other states so that they toe the party line. The Bush administration's Nuclear Posture Review stipulated that nuclear weapons are needed in case of "surprising military developments" not necessarily limited to chemical or biological weapons. The Clinton administration was more explicit stating in its 2001 Pentagon report to Congress that US nuclear forces are to "hedge against defeat of conventional forces in defense of vital interests". The passage makes clear that this statement is not limited to chemical or biological weapons.

## Impact --- Makes War Inevitable

### Globalization will cause endless war and will make any other country not part of it, “rogue”

**Chowdhury 6** (Kanishka, Professor on American Culture at St. Thomas University, “Interrogating ‘Newness’”, Culture Critique, 2006, <http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/journals/cultural_critique/v062/62.1chowdhury.html#FOOT4>) Usha

In a sense, globalization is now used as a cover for endless war. Countries are designated as "rogue" regimes to the extent that they fail to assimilate into global capitalism. Globalization, then, has been presented as the natural economic order and one connected inextricably to the forces of democracy and civilization. Globalization as described by its advocates thus suggests a natural, neutral process, one in which a larger, benign global family looks out for each member's interests, and where the powerful nations teach, at a cost, those who are economically "backward" the ways of the world. This is a process in which the "Third World" elite are, of course, willing participants. Consider, for instance, the text of the May 6, 2003, full-page advertisement in the *New York Times* celebrating the new Nigeria: "In Nigeria, a new generation is looking to attract increased foreign investment. . . . New legislation has made foreign involvement easier. . . . Several state-owned enterprises are being prepared for privatization. . . . Foreign investors with unique and innovative projects are granted 'pioneer status.' . . . We have very generous tax-waivers—five years for pioneer status companies. . . . We are doing everything possible to cooperate with the United States" (C11). One doesn't have to look very hard at this advertisement to understand that the forces of multinational capital have produced this text many times over. After all, such "promotions," paid for in more ways than one by Third World citizens, are created in the West, for the Western consumer, and by Western advertising firms. Despite such glossy claims, we are clearly not considering **[End Page 128]** a harmonious, mutually beneficial process of global cooperation here; rather, we are witnessing the legitimized and systematic looting and subjugation of a sovereign nation, assisted by its national bourgeoisie; in short, we are observing another step in the process of endless war. Let us then begin our analysis of globalization by reattaching the designation "capitalist" to globalization, so we can focus on the unvarnished economic logic of this violent process of endless war. Globalization, of course, is not merely an economic process but one that has multiple cultural articulations. Although advocates celebrate the growth of cultural exchange, the greater accessibility to a range of cultural products, and the potential democratization of authoritarian societies through so-called liberatory cultural imports, these cultural transactions are characterized by and depend upon existing economic inequalities between metropolitan centers and the peripheries. Certainly the speed and volume of production and distribution of culture have made cultural goods like film and music more widely available, but the profits from these transactions are controlled by and distributed among an elite minority. Increased access to cultural material, moreover, has not translated into increased access to economic opportunity. Finally, those who have economic power establish the terms and rules for cultural exchange. Consequently, even though much is made of the occasional cultural product from the developing world that makes it way to the West, the financial and cultural traffic largely flows one way.[6](http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/journals/cultural_critique/v062/62.1chowdhury.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22FOOT6)

## Impact --- Space Weaponization/Nuclear War

### Capitalistic space weaponzation from, in, and through space will cause an accidental nuclear war because of miscalculation.

Marko ‘3 (“Anarchism and Human Survival: Russell's Problem,” IMC India, May 14, 2003, <http://india.indymedia.org/en/2003/05/4910.shtml>) Andrew Muo

It is also understood that the development of these nuclear weapons may require the resumption of nuclear testing, a key reason for the Administration's lack of readiness to abide by the CTBT treaty, which is meant to ban nuclear testing. The CTBT is a key feature of contemporary global nuclear non proliferation regimes for the US signed the CTBT in order to extend the nuclear non proliferation treaty (NPT) indefinitely. Abandoning the CTBT treaty, in order to develop a new generation of more "useable" nuclear weapons that will lower the threshold of nuclear war, will place the NPT regime under further strain and greatly increase the chances of further nuclear proliferation. There exists a "deadly connection" between global weapons of mass destruction proliferation and US foreign policy. One may well ask what has all this to do with state capitalism? Consider the thinking behind the militarisation of space, outlined for us by Space Command; “historically military forces have evolved to protect national interests and investments – both military and economic. During the rise of sea commerce, nations built navies to protect and enhance their commercial interests. During the westward expansion of the continental United States, military outposts and the cavalry emerged to protect our wagon trains, settlements and roads”. The document goes on, “the emergence of space power follows both of these models”. Moreover, “the globalization of the world economy will continue, with a widening between ‘haves’ and ‘have nots’. The demands of unilateral strategic superiority, long standing US policy known as "escalation" or "full spectrum" dominance, compel Washington to pursue “space control". This means that, according to a report written under the chairmanship of Donald Rumsfeld, "in the coming period the US will conduct operations to, from, in and through space" which includes "power projection in, from and through space". Toward this end, Washington has resisted efforts in the UN to create an arms control regime for space. As a result there will inevitably arise an arms race in space. The importance of this simply cannot be over-emphasised. Throughout the nuclear age there have been a number of close calls, due to both human and technical error, that almost lead to a full scale nuclear exchange between Washington and Moscow. These glitches in command and control systems were ultimately benign because both sides had early warning satellites placed in specialised orbits which could be relied upon to provide real time imagery of nuclear missile launch sites. However the militarisation of space now means that these satellites will become open game; the benign environment in space will disappear if the militarisation of space continues. Thus if the US were to "conduct operations to, from in and through space" it will do see remotely. Technical failure may result in the system attacking Russian early warning satellites. Without question this would be perceived by the Russian's as the first shot in a US nuclear first strike. Consider for instance a curious event that occurred in 1995. A NASA research rocket, part of a study of the northern lights, was fired over Norway. The rocket was perceived by the Russian early warning system as the spear of a US first strike. The Russian system then began a countdown to full scale nuclear response; it takes only a single rocket to achieve this effect because it was no doubt perceived by Russian planners that this single rocket was meant to disable their command and control system as a result of electromagnetic pulse effects. To prevent the loss of all nuclear forces in a subsequent follow on strike the Russian's would need to launch a full scale response as soon as possible. Because the US itself has a hair trigger launch on warning posture a Russian attack would be followed by a full scale US attack; the US has a number of "reserve options" in its war plans, thus such an accidental launch could trigger a global chain of nuclear release around the globe. Calamity was averted in 1995 because Russia's early warning satellites would have demonstrated that there was no launch of US nuclear forces. If these satellites were to be taken out then this ultimate guarantee disappears; the Russian ground based radar system has a number of key holes that prevent it from warning of an attack through two key corridors, one from the Atlantic the other from the Pacific. In the future if an event such as 1995 were to occur in space the Russians no longer would have the level of comfort provided by its space based assets. The militarisation of space greatly increases the chances of a full scale accidental nuclear war. The militarisation of space is intimately linked with US strategic nuclear forces, for the previous command covering space, known as Space Command, has merged with the command responsible for nuclear forces, Strategic Command. Upon merger, the commander of Strategic Command stated, "United States Strategic Command provides a single war fighting combatant command with a global perspective, focused on exploiting the strong and growing synergy between the domain of space and strategic capabilities." The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff added, "this new command is going to have all the responsibilities of its predecessors, but an entirely new mission focus, greatly expanded forces and you might even say several infinite areas of responsibility."

## Impact --- War/Interventions

### Coporate-driven military might makes global war inevitable through endless interventions

### Bhagwat 11 (Vishnu, former [Chief of the Naval Staff](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chief_of_Naval_Staff_of_the_Indian_Navy) of [India](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/India), Thee Weaponization of Space: Corporate Driven Military Unleashes Pre-emptive Wars, July 13, 2011, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=21432>)

We must understand the reality of our present lawless world, where corporate driven military might unleashes pre-emptive wars, invasions and occupations and the UN system stands paralyzed , its Charter disregarded  , the Treaties and conventions signed and ratified , flouted at every step . It is necessary for us to focus on the stark truth that those treaties and conventions do not protect humanity from the forces that want to dominate and exploit the resources of the world using every weapon system and all mediums  --be they land , sea , the seabed or space and if the world system does not create a  balance very soon  than even from military bases that may be established on the earth’s planetary system. Vladimir Putin, then President and now the  Prime Minister of Russia, speaking at the European Security Conference in Munich on 10th February 2007, said: “The unipolar  world refers to a world in which there is one master, one center of authority, one center of force, one centre of decision making. At the end of the day this is pernicious not only for those  within the system , but also for the Sovereign himself from within ; what is more important is that the model itself is flawed because as its basis there is and can be no moral foundation for modern civilization ( and even less for democracy ). We are seeing a greater and greater disdain for the basic principles of international law. We are witnessing an almost uncontained hyper use of force in international relations , force that is plunging the world into an abyss of permament conflicts . I am convinced that we have reached that decisive moment when we must seriously  think about the architecture of global security.” We have to move heaven and earth , the might of humanity to dismantle that decision making ruling elite in the ‘joint corporate –military board rooms ,’ be they located underground in the Strategic Command in Nebraska  or at multi-locations in Wall Street , the City ( London ) or Tel a Viv . The unlimited quest for establishing monopoly over the planet  earth’s resources and markets , **has led the world to witness unending wars** , sometimes referred to as ‘long wars’ , if that phrase makes it seem less destructive , and the unending pursuit of weapon platforms , for attaining  ‘full spectrum dominance’ and the ‘Strategic Defense Initiative’ (SDI ) or the Star Wars initiated by the ‘free market’ of the Reagan administration and Thatcherism , accelerating the death and destruction that we have witnessed , all across the globe be it in Angola , Congo, Somalia, Afghanistan , Iraq , Palestine , Central and Latin America   , Yugoslavia , Lebanon , Gaza and earlier in Korea, Vietnam and Cambodia among other countries with the  UN Security Council in some cases acquiescing and even assisting .

## Impact --- Economy

### Capitalism will collapse the economy

Sweezy 97 (Paul M., was a [Marxist](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marxist) [economist](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economist), political activist, publisher, and founding [editor](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Editor) of the [Monthly Review](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monthly_Review)., The Guilt of Capitalism, Monthly Review, vol. 49, no. 2, June 1997, <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-guilt-of-capitalism>) Connor Smith

Among Marxian economists “monopoly capitalism” is the term widely used to denote the stage of capitalism which dates from approximately the last quarter of the nineteenth century and reaches full maturity in the period after the Second World War. Marx’s Capital, like classical political economy from Adam Smith to John Stuart Mill, was based on the assumption that all commodities are produced by industries consisting of many firms, or capitals in Marx’s terminology, each accounting for a negligible fraction of total output and all responding to the price and profit signals generated by impersonal market forces. Unlike the classical economists, however, Marx recognized that such an economy was inherently unstable and impermanent. The way to succeed in a competitive market is to cut costs and expand production, a process which requires incessant accumulation of capital in ever new technological and organizational forms. In Marx’s words: “The battle of competition is fought by cheapening of commodities. The cheapness of commodities depends, ceteris paribus, on the productiveness of labor, and this again on the scale of production. Therefore the larger capitals beat the smaller.” Further, the credit system which “begins as a modest helper of accumulation” soon “becomes a new and formidable weapon in the competition in the competitive struggle, and finally it transforms itself into an immense social mechanism for the centralization of capitals” (Marx, 1894, ch. 27).

**Capitalism will dominate the world if it is continued, leading to financial crisis**

**Chowdhury 2002** (Kanishka, Professor on American Culture at St. Thomas University, “Its All Within Your Reach”, clogic.eserver.org, 2002, <http://clogic.eserver.org/2002/chowdhury.html>) Usha

First, I want to comment on what Appadurai claims is the predominant face of globalization, its seeming randomness; to use Appadurai's words, "disjuncture." The "economists" on CNN constantly draw attention to such disjunctures in the global scape: there is a financial crisis in Indonesia, one in South Korea and Japan; the ruble falls dramatically in Russia; the Dow falls and rises; meanwhile, however, they forget to mention that the capitalist bosses continue to make record profits. If one follows the path of ex-Treasury Secretary, Robert Rubins', travels around the world, one will notice no randomness or "disjuncture" in his ideological agenda to promote multinational interests. On a 1998 five-nation Africa Trip, for instance, Rubin stopped in South Africa "to encourage policies that Washington and international lending agencies endorse: austere budgets, open markets, vigorous business competition and the sale of state owned companies" (McNeil C5). Clearly, the age of finance capital is a "new" phase in capital accumulation, but as Fredric Jameson reminds us, "Capitalism's movement must be seen as discontinuous but expansive. With each crisis, it mutates into a larger sphere of activity and a wider field of penetration, of control, of investment, of transformation" (248). Marx and Engels said something along these lines in the *Communist Manifesto*: Modern industry has established the world market, for which the discovery of America paved the way. . . . [The] need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere. . . . The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionising the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. . . . The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all the instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian nations into civilization. . . . In a word, it creates a world after its own image" (475-77). So, while it would be naive to assume that capitalism operates in the same way it did in the age of Marx, Appadurai does not offer us an economic basis for understanding why the disjunctures in the new transnational economy indicate an actual shift in the productive ends of capitalism. Alberto Moreiras, for instance, argues that "Neoliberalism, understood as either the moment of real subsumption of labour into capital or as the highest stage of capitalism under the form of capital, is an intensification, not a paradigmatic shift" (382).

## Impact --- Energy Crisis

### Capitalism caused our energy crisis

Sweezy 97 (Paul M., was a [Marxist](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marxist) [economist](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Economist), political activist, publisher, and founding [editor](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Editor) of the [Monthly Review](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monthly_Review)., The Guilt of Capitalism, Monthly Review, vol. 49, no. 2, June 1997, <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-guilt-of-capitalism>) Connor Smith

Why, then, are we not already living in the period of transition from a proven deadly to a proven safe form of energy production?The short answer is capitalism—and this is in two complementary senses. First, in capitalist society power is in the hands of capitalists and their acolytes. They cannot be assumed to be ignorant of the energy situation and the dangers it portends for the future. Yet they have never used that power to take remedial action. Second, when faced with the energy crises of the 1970s and the widespread popular reaction, they did their best to confuse the real issues and limited themselves to making soothing promises which they promptly forgot—and obviously never intended to honor—when things calmed down. (Again Berman and O’Connor provide a wealth of confirming evidence.) By the late 1980s what had seemed to be a snowballing popular movement for an energy new deal was effectively scotched and by now is hardly more than a fading memory.

## Impact --- Terrorism

### Capitalism leads to terrorism

Foster 5 (John B., n University Department of Sociology Professor, Monthly Review, <http://www.monthlyreview.org/0905jbf.htm>) Andrew Muo

The United States is seeking to exercise sovereign authority over the planet during a time of widening global crisis: economic stagnation, increasing polarization between the global rich and the global poor, weakening U.S. economic hegemony, growing nuclear threats, and deepening ecological decline. The result is a heightening of international instability. Other potential forces are emerging in the world, such as the European Community and China, that could eventually challenge U.S. power, regionally and even globally. Third world revolutions, far from ceasing, are beginning to gain momentum again, symbolized by Venezuela’s Bolivarian Revolution under Hugo Chávez. U.S. attempts to tighten its imperial grip on the Middle East and its oil have had to cope with a fierce, seemingly unstoppable, Iraqi resistance, generating conditions of imperial overstretch. With the United States brandishing its nuclear arsenal and refusing to support international agreements on the control of such weapons, nuclear proliferation is continuing. New nations, such as North Korea, are entering or can be expected soon to enter the “nuclear club.” Terrorist blowback from imperialist wars in the third world is now a well-recognized reality, generating rising fear of further terrorist attacks in New York, London, and elsewhere. Such vast and overlapping historical contradictions, rooted in the combined and uneven development of the global capitalist economy along with the U.S. drive for planetary domination, foreshadow what is potentially the most dangerous period in the history of imperialism. The course on which U.S and world capitalism is now headed points to global barbarism—or worse. Yet it is important to remember that nothing in the development of human history is inevitable. There still remains an alternative path—the global struggle for a humane, egalitarian, democratic, and sustainable society. The classic name for such a society is “socialism.” Such a renewed struggle for a world of substantive human equality must begin by addressing the system’s weakest link and at the same time the world’s most pressing needs—by organizing a global resistance movement against the new naked imperialism.

## Impact --- Environment

### Capitalism will keep exploiting the environment, and will use force to keep doing so

Wallis 10 (Victor, Professor of Liberal Arts at Berkeley, “Beyond “green capitalism”, February 2010, http://monthlyreview.org/2010/02/01/beyond-green-capitalism)

A disdain for the natural environment has characterized capitalism from the beginning. As Marx noted, capital abuses the soil as much as it exploits the worker.[1](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/02/01/beyond-green-capitalism#fn32) The makings of ecological breakdown are thus inherent in capitalism. No serious observer now denies the severity of the environmental crisis, but it is still not widely recognized as a capitalist crisis, that is, as a crisis arising from and perpetuated by the rule of capital, and hence incapable of resolution within the capitalist framework.

It is useful to remind ourselves that, although Marx situated capitalism’s crisis tendencies initially in the business cycle (specifically, in its downward phase), he recognized at the same time that those tendencies could manifest themselves under other forms—the first of these being the drive to global expansion.[2](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/02/01/beyond-green-capitalism#fn31) Such manifestations are not inherently cyclical; they are permanent trends. They can be sporadically offset, but for as long as capitalism prevails, they cannot be reversed. They encompass: (1) increased concentration of economic power; (2) increased polarization between rich and poor, both within and across national boundaries; (3) a permanent readiness for military engagement in support of these drives; and (4) of special concern to us here, the uninterrupted debasement or depletion of vital natural resources.

### Capitalism sees nature as a free gift to exploit --- makes extinction inevitable

Foster 09 (John Bellamy, Professor of Sociology at University of Oregon, “The Paradox of Wealth: Capitalism and Ecological Destruction”, November 09, <http://monthlyreview.org/2009/11/01/the-paradox-of-wealth-capitalism-and-ecological-destruction>) Connor Smith

Behind this tragedy-cum-farce is a distorted accounting deeply rooted in the workings of the system that sees wealth entirely in terms of value generated through exchange. In such a system, only commodities for sale on the market really count. External nature — water, air, living species — outside this system of exchange is viewed as a “free gift.” Once such blinders have been put on, it is possible to speak, as the leading U.S. climate economist William Nordhaus has, of the relatively unhindered growth of the economy a century or so from now, under conditions of business as usual — despite the fact that leading climate scientists see following the identical path over the same time span as absolutely catastrophic both for human civilization and life on the planet as a whole.[1](http://monthlyreview.org/2009/11/01/the-paradox-of-wealth-capitalism-and-ecological-destruction#fn1)

## Impact --- Environment

### Capitalism is destroying the environment

Foster 09 (John Bellamy, Professor of Sociology at University of Oregon, “The Paradox of Wealth: Capitalism and Ecological Destruction”, November 09, <http://monthlyreview.org/2009/11/01/the-paradox-of-wealth-capitalism-and-ecological-destruction>) Connor Smith

In the Oh shit era, the debate, McKibben says, is over. There is no longer any doubt that global warming represents a crisis of earth-shaking proportions. Yet, it is absolutely essential to understand that this is only one part of what we call the environmental crisis. The global ecological threat as a whole is made up of a large number of interrelated crises and problems that are confronting us simultaneously. In my 1994 book, [The Vulnerable Planet](http://monthlyreview.org/press/books/pb019x/), I started out with a brief litany of some of these, to which others might now be added:Overpopulation, destruction of the ozone layer, global warming, extinction of species, loss of genetic diversity, acid rain, nuclear contamination, tropical deforestation, the elimination of climax forests, wetland destruction, soil erosion, desertification, floods, famine, the despoliation of lakes, streams, and rivers, the drawing down and contamination of ground water, the pollution of coastal waters and estuaries, the destruction of coral reefs, oil spills, overfishing, expanding landfills, toxic wastes, the poisonous effects of insecticides and herbicides, exposure to hazards on the job, urban congestion, and the depletion of nonrenewable resources.11The point is that not just global warming but many of these other problems as well can each be seen as constituting a global ecological crisis. Today every major ecosystem on the earth is in decline. Issues of environmental justice are becoming more prominent and pressing everywhere we turn. Underlying this is the fact that the class/imperial war that defines capitalism as a world system, and that governs its system of accumulation, is a juggernaut that knows no limits. In this deadly conflict the natural world is seen as a mere instrument of world social domination. Hence, capital by its very logic imposes what is in effect a scorched earth strategy. The planetary ecological crisis is increasingly all-encompassing, a product of the destructive uncontrollability of a rapidly globalizing capitalist economy, which knows no law other than its own drive to exponential expansion.

### US Capitalism is the root of the ecological problems

Foster 09 (John Bellamy, Professor of Sociology at University of Oregon, “The Paradox of Wealth: Capitalism and Ecological Destruction”, November 09, <http://monthlyreview.org/2009/11/01/the-paradox-of-wealth-capitalism-and-ecological-destruction>) Connor Smith

In fact, a new historical period had emerged in the ten years since the Rio summit. Economically, the world had witnessed what Paul Sweezy in 1994 called “the triumph of financial capitalism” with the transformation of monopoly capital into what might be called global monopoly-finance capital.5By the end of the twentieth century capitalism had evolved into a system that was if anything more geared to rapacious accumulation than ever before, relatively independent from its local and national roots. Global financial expansion was occurring on top of a world economy that was stagnating at the level of production, creating a more unstable and more viciously inegalitarian order, dominated by neoliberal economics and financial bubbles. Declining U.S. hegemony in the world system, coupled with the demise of the Soviet Union, induced repeated and increasingly naked U.S. attempts to restore its economic and political power by military means. Meanwhile, global warming and other crucial environmental problems had crossed critical thresholds. The question was no longer whether ecological and social catastrophes awaited but how great these would be. For those (including myself) in Johannesburg in 2002, watching the U.S. president prepare for war in the petroleum-rich Persian Gulf while the planet was heating up from the burning of fossil fuels, the whole world seemed on fire.

## Impact --- Environment

### **The more the aff stretches the limits of capitalist production, the less efficient capitalism becomes and the environment collapses. Trying to solve using capitalist technology will fail.**

Liodakis 10 (George, Technical University of Crete, Dept. of Sciences, “Considering Economic and Ecological Crisis from a Communist Perspective,” International Initiative for Promoting Political Economy, http://www.iippe.org/wiki/images/1/18/CONF\_ENV\_Liodakis.pdf) (Karusala)

It becomes clear from our preceding discussion that capitalist production encounters both internal and external limits, and it is the over-passing of these limits that leads to a deepening economic and ecological crisis. The internal limits have more to do with the conditions of profitability and accumulation (capitalist valorization), as well as the balance of class struggle, while the external limits have to do more with the social and especially the natural conditions of production. But these natural conditions of production are not fixed, an external immutable nature and a finite amount of natural resources, as neo-Malthusians usually conceive natural limits. A production of a ‘second nature’ (see Castree 1995, O’Connor 1998, Spence 2000, Liodakis 2010: 103-104) and, moreover, the real subsumption of labour, nature and science under capital in contemporary conditions (see Liodakis 2010: 25) give a radically different, very dynamic and to a considerable extent social shaping to these ‘external limits’. These limits, whether social or natural, are largely manifested through the processes of valorization of labour and natural resources, and especially though the imperatives lyingbehind the OCC increase, as well as through the imperative of an increasing labour exploitation, which again meets certain social and biological (natural) limits. It is evident that the exploitation of both nature and labour power lies behind these limits, and there is ample historical evidence that capitalism is capable of temporarily overcoming these limits and ameliorating material shortages or the growing rift in the society – nature metabolism through a series of successive shifts in major technologies and/or the utilization of new resources (see Marx 1967, III: 110, 118-119, Burkett 1999: 116, Moore 2000, Clark and York 2008). It is also revealing that, it is not low but rather high productivity that lies behind the overaccumulation crisis of capitalism and this has also serious ecological implications. As stressed by R. Smith (2010), ‘when, as under capitalism, the whole point of using resources efficiently is just to use the saved resources to produce even more commodities, to accelerate the conversion of even more natural resources into products … capitalist efficiency turns into its opposite’. This point is clearly associated with the so-called Jevon’s paradox, which should be good lesson for those upholding a naïve belief that social (and ecological) problems can be successfully tackled by technological means, or that an essential decoupling of capitalist production from its ecological impact could ever be achieved (see also Foster 2000b, Castro 2004, Burkett 2006: 269-70, Liodakis 2010: 116-117). In a certain sense, of course, a more efficient use of resources by means of ‘eco-efficiency’ and ‘dematerialization’ may be important, even under capitalism, ‘because it can give us breathing space to carry out more fundamental changes. However, it cannot be a substitute for those changes’ (Næss and Høyer 2009: 95).

### Capitalist drive for profit neglects environmental concerns

**Magdoff and Magdoff 5** (Approaching Socialism [Fred](http://monthlyreview.org/author/harrymagdoff) is a professor emeritus of plant and soil science at the University of Vermont in Burlington and a director of the Monthly Review Foundation; Harry worked for the [United States Department of Commerce](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Department_of_Commerce) <http://monthlyreview.org/2005/07/01/approaching-socialism>)

Ecological degradation occurred in numerous precapitalist societies. But with capitalism there is a new dimension to the problem, even as we have better understood the ecological harm that human activity can create. The drive for profits and capital accumulation as the overriding objective of economic activity, the control that economic interests exert over political life, and the many technologies developed in capitalist societies that allow humans rapidly to change their environment—near and wide, intentionally or not—mean that adverse effects on the environment are inevitable. Pollution of water, air, and soil are natural byproducts of production systems organized for the single goal of making profits. Under the logic of capitalist production and exchange there is no inherent mechanism to encourage or force industry to find methods that have minimal impact on the environment. For example, new chemicals that are found useful to produce manufactured goods are routinely introduced into the environment—without the adequate assessment of whether or not they cause harm to humans or other species. The mercury given off into the air by coal-burning power plants pollutes lakes hundreds of miles away as well as the ocean. The routine misuse of antibiotics, added to feeds of animals that are being maintained in the overcrowded and unhealthy conditions of factory farms, has caused the development of antibiotic resistant strains of disease organisms. It is a technique that is inconsistent with any sound ecological approach to raising animals, but it is important to capital because profits are enhanced. In addition, the development of an automobile-centered society in the United States has had huge environmental consequences. Vast areas of suburbs, sometimes merging into a “megatropolis,” partially erase the boundaries between communities. The waste of fuel by commuting to work by car is only part of the story of suburbanization, as some people work in the city while others work in different suburbs. Shopping in malls reachable only by cars and taking children to school and play require transportation over significant distances. Climate change resulting from global warming, not completely predictable, but with mostly negative consequences, is another repercussion of unfettered capitalist exploitation of resources. As fossil fuels are burned in large quantities by factories, electrical generation plants, and automobiles and trucks, carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere have increased. There is some concern that the gradual warming could actually lead to a fairly rapid change, with such factors as the melting of polar ice, changes in precipitation and river flow, and a cessation of the thermohaline conveyor (of which the Gulf Stream is a part) that brings warm water to the north Atlantic and helps keep North America and Europe warm (see “[The Pentagon and Climate Change](http://monthlyreview.org/2004/05/01/the-pentagon-and-climate-change),” *Monthly Review*, May 2004).

## Impact --- Environment

### Capitalism creates environmental havoc and widens the cap between the rich and poor

Visser 10 (“From the Age of Greed to the Age of Responsibility” Wayne is Senior Associate at the University of Cambridge Programme for Sustainability Leadership www.waynevisser.com/chapter\_age\_responsibility.pdf)

So this begs the question: is capitalism itself fundamentally flawed? Will capitalism – with its short-term, costexternalisation, shareholder-valueCSR 2.0: From the Age of Greed to the Age of Responsibility 239 focus – always tend towards greed, at the expense of people and the planet? Will the scenario of ‘overshoot and collapse’ that was computer modelled in the 1972 Limits to Growth report (and confirmed in revisions 20 and 30 years later) still come to pass? Has Karl Marx been vindicated in his critique (if not his solution) that by design, capitalism causes wealth and power to accumulate in fewer and fewer hands? To answer these quintessential questions, we need to look at the facts. According to WWF, humanity’s Ecological Footprint, driven by the spread of capitalism globally, has more than tripled since 1961. Since the late 1980s, we have been in overshoot – meaning that the world’s Ecological Footprint has exceeded the Earth’s biocapacity. Between 1970 and 2003, WWF’s Living Planet Index, which tracks over 6,000 populations of 1,313 species, fell by 29%. By their estimates, we would need three planets if everyone on earth were to adopt the energy intensive, consumptive lifestyle of the capitalist Western world. The UN Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, issued in 2005, reaches similar conclusions: 60% of world ecosystem services have been degraded; of 24 evaluated ecosystems, 15 are being damaged; water withdrawals have doubled over the past 40 years; over a quarter of all fish stocks are overharvested; since 1980, about 35% of mangroves have been lost; about 20% of corals were lost in just 20 years and 20% more have been degraded; and species extinction rates are now 100–1,000 times above the background rate. So, by all accounts, capitalism is failing spectacularly to control the environmental impacts of the economic activities that it is so successful at stimulating. The social impacts of capitalism are more ambiguous. On the one hand, critics like Naomi Klein (author of No Logo and The Shock Doctrine) argue that ‘Gucci capitalism’ results in labour exploitation and a ‘race to the bottom’. In other words, capital flows to wherever the social or environmental standards are lowest. Not only this, but capitalism is designed to create the instability that we have seen in the markets and those that suffer the most from this volatility are always the most vulnerable, namely the poor of the world. On the other hand, largely thanks to its adoption of capitalism, China has enjoyed economic growth of more than 9% a year over the past 30 years and as a result, between 1981 and 2005, their poverty rate fell from 85% to 16%, or by over 600 million people. That represents real positive impacts on real people. But at what cost? Some estimate that environmental damage robs China of 5.8% of its GDP every year. What’s more, the gaps between rich and poor in China are growing. WAYNE VISSER Perhaps the trillion-dollar question is not whether capitalism per se acts like a cancer gene of greed in society, but whether there are different types of capitalism, some of which are more benign than others? To date, the world has by and large been following the American model of shareholder-driven capitalism, and perhaps this is the version that is morally bankrupt and systemically flawed? Management guru, Charles Handy, seems to agree. In an interview I conducted with him in 2008, he confessed: ‘I’ve always had my doubts about shareholder capitalism, because we keep talking about the shareholders as being owners of the business, but most of them haven’t a clue what business they’re in. They are basically punters with no particular interest in the horse that they’re backing, as long as it wins’.

## Impact --- Space Pollution

### Commercializing space places it in risk of destruction just like the Earth because of man-made pollution

Dickens and Ormrond 2007 (Peter and James S., University of Essex, “Outer Space and Internal Nature: Towards a Sociology of the Universe,” Sociology, [http://soc.sagepub.com/content/41/4/609.full.pdf+html](http://soc.sagepub.com/content/41/4/609.full.pdf%2Bhtml))

Two recent developments affecting our relationship with the cosmos make this project especially pertinent. The first concerns changes in the way in which we understand the universe, in particular what is sometimes called ‘metacosmology’ – abstract theories about the origin and nature of the universe not amenable to empirical testing, represented to a certain extent in Einstein, but amplified in the work of Stephen Hawking and others. Here we have a set of theories that are increasingly detached not only from everyday knowledge and understanding, but even from scientific observations of the heavens (Frankel, 2003; Lerner, 1991; Norris, 2000). Second, and more importantly for this article, the universe is becoming increasingly humanized, as in the last few decades we have interacted with the universe in a physical rather than purely imaginative manner. For many years now outer space has been used for social purposes. Communications networks, surveillance and military operations depend on space technology – satellites and ballistic missiles. At the same time, outer space is becoming increasingly commercialized. Outer-space tourism is now possible for wealthy individuals (Van Pelt, 2005). There is also simmering interest in the moon and, in the longer term, asteroids and other planets as a source of materials, possibly to overcome the ‘Limits to Growth’ thesis (Lewis, 1996; Osborn, 2006). The ongoing development of ‘space law’ is a good indication of a growing humanization of outer space (Pop, 2000; White, 2002). There has also for some time been active discussion of using solar power satellites to harness the sun’s energy in orbit, and of ‘terraforming’ the nearer planets; making them into Earth-like entities which can be populated by humanity (Haynes, 1989; McKie, 2004), as well as other forms of space colonization. All these developments are risky, especially the contamination generated by spacecraft reliant on radioactive materials and nuclear power. The creation of debris in near-Earth space is also a growing hazard for future space development. In the event of mining or terraforming other planets, a whole new set of risks would emerge. There is no better example of the kinds of escalating risks of late modernity identified by Beck (1992), as we seek space solutions for Earthly problems and in the process take risk beyond the global scale. These developments are generating new social movements contesting the use of the universe in such a way. The ‘pro-space movement’ is generally in favour of these kinds of developments (e.g. the National Space Society, Space Frontier Foundation, the Mars Society). Opposition comes from groups like the Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space, and the Institute for Cooperation in Space.

## Impact --- Poverty

**Capitalism creates rich take over leading to poverty**

**Magdoff and Foster 10** (What Every Environmentalist Needs to Know About Capitalism Fred Magdoff s professor emeritus of plant and soil science at the University of Vermont in Burlington and a director of the Monthly Review Foundation and John Bellamy Foster is editor of the independent [socialist](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Socialism) magazine [*Monthly Review*](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Monthly_Review) and professor of [sociology](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sociology) at the [University of Oregon](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/University_of_Oregon) in [Eugene](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eugene%2C_Oregon). Monthly Review, March 2010)

The characteristics of capitalism discussed above—the necessity to grow; the pushing of people to purchase more and more; expansion abroad; use of resources without concern for future generations; the crossing of planetary boundaries; and the predominant role often exercised by the economic system over the moral, legal, political, cultural forms of society—are probably the characteristics of capitalism that are most harmful for the environment. But there are other characteristics of the system that greatly impact the issue of social justice. It is important to look more closely at these social contradictions imbedded in the system. There is a logical connection between capitalism’s successes and its failures. The poverty and misery of a large mass of the world’s people is not an accident, some inadvertent byproduct of the system, one that can be eliminated with a little tinkering here or there. The fabulous accumulation of wealth—as a direct consequence of the way capitalism works nationally and internationally—has simultaneously produced persistent hunger, malnutrition, health problems, lack of water, lack of sanitation, and general misery for a large portion of the people of the world. The wealthy few resort to the mythology that the grand disparities are actually necessary. For example, as Brian Griffiths, the advisor to Goldman Sachs International, quoted above, put it: “We have to tolerate the inequality as a way to achieving greater prosperity and opportunity for all.”41 What’s good for the rich also—according to them—coincidentally happens to be what’s good for society as a whole, even though many remain mired in a perpetual state of poverty.Most people need to work in order to earn wages to purchase the necessities of life. But, due to the way the system functions, there is a large number of people precariously connected to jobs, existing on the bottom rungs of the ladder. They are hired during times of growth and fired as growth slows or as their labor is no longer needed for other reasons—Marx referred to this group as the “reserve army of labor.”42 Given a system with booms and busts, and one in which profits are the highest priority, it is not merely convenient to have a group of people in the reserve army; it is absolutely essential to the smooth workings of the system. It serves, above all, to hold down wages. The system, without significant intervention by government (through large inheritance taxes and substantial progressive income taxes), produces a huge inequality of both income and wealth that passes from generation to generation. The production of great wealth and, at the same time great poverty, within and between countries is not coincidental— **wealth and poverty are likely two sides of the same coin.**

**Uneven distribution of wealth creates deprivation of resources to 80% of the population**

**Magdoff and Magdoff 5** (Approaching Socialism [Fred](http://monthlyreview.org/author/harrymagdoff) is a professor emeritus of plant and soil science at the University of Vermont in Burlington and a director of the Monthly Review Foundation; Harry worked for the [United States Department of Commerce](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Department_of_Commerce) <http://monthlyreview.org/2005/07/01/approaching-socialism>)

Capitalism, with a number of political variations, has produced more goods, inventions, new ideas, and technological advances than in all of previous history. During the approximately two and a half centuries of industrial capitalism there has been—with the important exceptions of severe recessions, depressions, and wars—nearly continuous expansion of the leading capitalist countries. But what has this enormous progress and development of productive capacities created as far as the living conditions and relations of the people on this earth? On the one hand, there is a significant portion of the world’s population, perhaps 20 percent, that lives in comfort with many opportunities for education, housing, and purchasing a variety of goods almost at will. But within this generally well-off group there is a very uneven distribution of riches, with the wealthiest controlling huge amounts of wealth. The wealthiest 691 people on earth have a net worth of $2.2 trillion, equivalent to the combined annual GDP of 145 countries—more than all of Latin America and Africa combined! The richest 7.7 million people (about 0.1 percent of world’s population), with net financial worth of more than $1 million, control approximately $28.8 trillion—equivalent to 80 percent of the annual gross domestic product of all the countries of the world. This is more than the combined annual GDP of all countries of the world minus the United States. (It actually also encompasses about 40 percent of the U.S. GDP as well.) Despite the huge quantity of wealth produced and accumulated in a few hands, the details of how so much of humanity actually lives—the numbers and conditions of the wretched of the earth—are outrageous. Of the approximately 6.3 billion people in the world: About half of humanity (three billion people) are malnourished and are chronically short of calories, proteins, vitamins, and/or minerals.3 Many more are “food insecure,” not knowing where their next meal is coming from. The UN estimates that “only” 840 million (including ten million in the wealthy core industrialized countries) are undernourished, but this is greatly below most other estimates. One billion live in slums (about one-third of the approximately three billion people living in cities). About half of humanity lives on less than what two dollars a day can purchase in the United States. One billion have no access to clean water. Two billion have no electricity. Two and a half billion have no sanitary facilities. One billion children, half of the world’s total, suffer extreme deprivation because of poverty, war, and disease (including AIDS). Even in wealthy core capitalist countries, a significant portion of the population lives insecure lives. For example, in the United States twelve million families are considered food insecure and in four million families (with nine million people) someone regularly skips a meal so there will be enough food for other family members.[4](http://monthlyreview.org/2005/07/01/approaching-socialism#en4) Another part of the human condition over the past two and a half centuries of industrial capitalism has been the almost continuous warfare with hundreds of millions of people killed. Occupation, slavery, genocide, wars, and exploitation are part of the continuing history of capitalism. Wars have resulted from capitalist countries fighting among themselves for dominance and access to global markets, from attempts to subjugate colonies or neocolonies, and ethnic or religious differences among people—many of which have been exacerbated by colonial occupation and/or imperial interference. The basic driving force of capitalism, to accumulate capital, compels capitalist countries to penetrate foreign markets and expand their market share. However, it is impossible to separate the leading imperialist countries’ economic drive to invest and sell abroad from their political and military policies—all interests are intertwined in a very dangerous combination. Warfare is continuing in the post-Cold War era—with the United States eager to display its military power—and there is potential for even more misery. The estimate that 100,000 Iraqis have died as a result of the U.S. invasion gives some idea of the magnitude of the disaster that has fallen on that nation.

## Impact --- Morality/Value to Life

### Capitalism is morally insolvent

Morgareidge 98 (Clayton, HE is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Lewis and Clark College, “Why Capitalism is Evil,” Radio Active Philosophy, http://legacy.lclark.edu/~clayton/commentaries/evil.html-Singh

In recent commentaries for the Old Mole I have been trying to make capitalism look bad -- as bad as it really is.  I have argued that capitalism is war, and that those of us who do not own capital suffer from it just as do civilian populations caught between opposing armies, or as foot soldiers conscripted into armies fighting for interests that are not our own.  I've tried to show that capitalism is the violent negation of democracy, for it is the interests of those who own capital that determine how we live: their jobs, products, services, manufactured culture, and propaganda shape our lives and our minds.   Today I'd like to point to the ways in which capital undermines the foundation of moral life. Well, what is the foundation of moral life?  What makes it possible for human beings to recognize that they have responsibilities to each other and to their communities?  For example: What could possibly make anyone willing to pay living wages to workers in Indonesia or Haiti if you can get them to work for less?  The 18th Century philosopher David Hume asks, What reason can anyone give me to not to prefer the annihilation of all mankind to a scratch on my finger?  Hume is one of many philosophers who argue that no such reason can be given.  This means that the foundation of ethics lies not in reason, but rather in our passions or our hearts. For Hume it is part of our nature that we feel sympathy for each other, and this sympathy counters our narrow self-interest.   Other philosophers have taken similar positions.  Josiah Royce an American philosopher of the last century argued that you do not really understand another person if you do not understand her aspirations, fears, and needs.  But to understand someone's feelings is, in part, to share them.  And you cannot share an aspiration or a need without wanting to see it fulfilled, nor can you share a fear without hoping that it will not come to pass.  So the mere recognition of what other human beings are involves us in wanting to see them live and prosper.  The French-Jewish philosopher Emmanual Levinás whose major work appeared in 1961 claims that ethics arises in the experience of the face of the other. The human face reveals its capacity for suffering, a suffering we are capable of either inflicting or opposing.  So to look into the face of another human being is to *see*the commandment, Thou shalt not kill.  Another American philosopher, Nel Noddings, in her 1984 book Caring, argues that the ethical commitment arises out of the caring response that most of us feel towards those who, like children, are in need.   Most parents encourage this caring response in their children, with the result that we grow up with an interest in cultivating our own capacity to care for others. Now none of these philosophers are naive: none of them thinks that sympathy, love, or caring determines all, or even most, human behavior.  The 20th century proves otherwise.  What they do offer, though, is the hope that human beings have the *capacity* to want the best for each other.   So now we must ask, What forces are at work in our world to block or cripple the ethical response?   This question, of course, brings me back to capitalism.  But before I go there, I want to acknowledge that capitalism is not the only thing that blocks our ability to care.  Exploitation and cruelty were around long before the economic system of capitalism came to be, and the temptation to use and abuse others will probably survive in any future society that might supersede capitalism.  Nevertheless, I want to claim, the putting the world at the disposal of those with capital has done more damage to the ethical life than anything else.  To put it in religious terms, capital is the devil. To show why this is the case, let me turn to capital's greatest critic, Karl Marx.    Under capitalism, Marx writes, everything in 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.[[1]](http://legacy.lclark.edu/~clayton/commentaries/evil.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22_ftn1%22%20%5Co%20%22)   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 other’s 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.

**Encouraging the capitalist attitude is basically refortifying the slavery and genocide of founding American ideas.**

**Lindsay 10**—(Peta, She is a Youth and Student “Columbus Day: US Capitalism Built on Slavery, Genocide”, Red Ant Liberation Army News, October 11, 2010, http://redantliberationarmy.wordpress.com/2010/10/11/columbus-day-u-s-capitalism-built-on-slavery-genocide) –Singh

The slave trade provided the European and U.S. ruling classes with centuries of free labor. In the 1600s, the Spanish began using African slaves in gold and silver mines. Most European colonies used the plantation system to produce sugar, cotton, tobacco, indigo, rice and other crops for export to the European market. This process provided Europe with enough material wealth to spur the rapid advances in technological development and production known as the Industrial Revolution. Even today some U.S. companies can trace their success to profits made from slavery. A 2002 lawsuit against AETNA insurance, CSX and Fleet Boston sought reparations for African Americans from these companies based on their participation in the slave system. AETNA made its money insuring slaves as the property of their masters. CSX is the present permutation of a company that used slave labor to lay railroad tracks. Fleet Boston is a bank that was founded by a slave trader. The lawsuit is important because it raises the African American community’s just demand for reparations and at tacks the greedy profiteers of slavery. It insists that African Americans be compensated for centuries of forced labor and discrimination. These historical conditions created the economic disparity faced by African Americans in the U.S. today. It is not only specific companies that owe reparations; the U.S. government must pay as well. Slave labor built the White House. The so-called “founding fathers” of America owned slaves. For nearly 100 years, the U.S. government and their capitalist partners reaped massive profits dripping with the blood of African slaves. Genocide and slavery in the name of capitalist accumulation was practiced in the Americas and the rest of the colonized world. Karl Marx wrote in “Capital”: “The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of black-skinned, signaled the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production.” Columbus and those like him are heroes to the capitalists. They understand that the cruelty and exploitation that marked the colonization of the Americas benefited them. The capitalists’ unyielding search for profits and superprofits leaves them neither conscience nor morality. Although legal chattel slavery no longer exists in the Americas, capitalist exploitation of poor and oppressed people continues to this day. This is the legacy of Christopher Columbus. For that reason, the masses of people who suffer exploitation have no reason to celebrate on Columbus Day.

## Impact --- Value To Life

### No value to life with capitalism- it takes away rights to education, democratic decision-making, and workers’ rights, and increases gender and racial inequality

### Hill 7 (David, Prof. of Education Policy at University of Northampton, UK, Chief Editor:Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies “Analysing and Resisting Capitalist Education: Six Theses,” Rouge Forum Conference, http://www-rohan.sdsu.edu/~rgibson/rouge\_forum/hill.htm) (Karusala)

What are the Results of Neo-Liberalism? Widening Inequalities

Neo-Liberalism and its Effects

Neo-liberal policies globally have resulted in

1: a loss of Equity, Economic and Social Justice for citizens and for workers at work

2: a loss of Democracy and Democratic Control and Democratic Accountability

3: a loss of Critical Thought and Space.

The Growth of National and Global Inequalities

Inequalities both between states and within states have increased dramatically during the era of global neo-liberalism. Global Capital, in its current neo-liberal form in particular, leads to human degradation and inhumanity and increased social class inequalities within states and globally. These effects are increasing (racialized and gendered) social class inequality within states, increasing (racialized and gendered) social class inequality between states. The degradation and Capitalisation of humanity, including the environmental degradation impact primarily in a social class related manner. Those who can afford to buy clean water don't die of thirst or diarrhoea. In many states across the globe, those who can afford school or university fees, where charges are made, end up without formal education or in grossly inferior provision.

Kagarlitsky has pointed out that `globalisation does not mean the impotence of the state, but the rejection by the state of its social functions, in favour of repressive ones, and the ending of democratic freedoms (2001, quoted in Pilger, 2002, p. 5).

In Britain the increasing inequalities, the impoverishment and creation of a substantial underclass has also been well-documented (2). Brenner has noted how in the USA Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) owned 2% of market capitalisation in 1992, yet by 2002 they owned 12%, `the greatest of the appropriations by the expropriators' (Brenner, 2002a. See also Brenner, 2002b, c.)

The current form of globalisation is tightening rather than loosening the international poverty trap. Living standards in the least developed countries are now lower than thirty years ago. 300 million people live on less than a dollar a day (Denny and Elliot, 2002). Inequalities within states have widened partly because of the generalised attack on workers’ rights and trade unions, with restrictive laws passed hamstringing trade union actions (Rosskam, 2006. See also Hill, 2005a, Hill et al, 2006; Hill et al 2007).

Weissman (2003) writes that There is something profoundly wrong with a world in which the 400 highest income earners in the United States make as much money in a year as the entire population of 20 African nations -more than 300 million people.

The Growth of education quasi-markets and markets and the growth of educational inequality

There is considerable data globally on how, within marketised or quasi-marketised education systems, poor schools have, by and large, got poorer (in terms of relative education results and in terms of total income) and how rich schools (in the same terms) have got richer. Whitty, Power and Halpin (1998) examined the effects of the introduction of quasi-markets into education systems in USA, Sweden, England and Wales, Australia and New Zealand. Their conclusion is that one of the results of marketizing education is that increasing `parental choice' of schools, and/ or setting up new types of schools, in effect increases school choice of parents and their children and thereby sets up or exacerbates racialized school hierarchies (3).

… the poor have less access to preschool, secondary, and tertiary education; they also attend schools of lower quality where they are socially segregated. Poor parents have fewer resources to support the education of their children, and they have less financial, cultural, and social capital to transmit. Only policies that explicitly address inequality, with a major redistributive purpose, therefore, could make education an equalizing force in social opportunity (Reimers, 2000, p. 55).

Hirtt (2004) comment on the apparently contradictory education policies of Capital, “to adapt education to the needs of business and at the same time reduce state expenditure on education”. He suggests that this contradiction is resolved by the polarization of the labour market. He suggests that, for neoliberal Capital, from an economic point of view it is not necessary to provide high level education and of general knowledge, to all future workers: “it is now possible and even highly recommendable to have a more polarized education system…. education should not try to transmit a broad common culture to the majority of future workers, but instead it should teach them some basic, general skills” (Hirrt, 2004 p. 446).

The Growth of Undemocratic (Un)accountability

Within education and other public services business values and interests are increasingly substituted for democratic accountability and the collective voice. This applies at the local level, where, in Britain, the USA, Pakistan and many other countries, for example, private companies- national or transnational- variously build, own, run and govern state schools and other sections of local government educational services. There is an important democratic question here. Is it right to allow private provides of educational services based outside India, or Brazil, or Britain, for example. Where is the local democratic accountability? In the event of abuse or corruption or simply pulling out and closing down operations, where and how would those guilty be held to account?

This anti-democratisation applies too at national levels. As Barry Coates, discussing the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) has pointed out, `GATS locks countries into a system of rules that means it is effectively impossible for governments to change policy, or for voters to elect a new government that has different policies’ (2001, P.28. See also Grieshaber-Otto and Sanger, 2002; Rikowski, 2001a, 2003; Hill et al, 2006).

Detheorised Education and the Loss of Critical Thought

The Increasing subordination and commodification of education, including university education have been well-documented (4). One aspect is that, other than at elite institutions, where the student intake is the wealthiest and most upper class, there is little scope for critical thought. In my own work I have examined how the British government has, in effect, expelled most potentially critical aspects of education, such as sociological and political examination of schooling and education, and questions of social class, `race' and gender, from the national curriculum for what is now, in England and Wales, termed `teacher training' (5). It was formerly called `teacher education'. The change in nomeclature is important both symbolically and in terms of actual accurate description of the new, `safe', sanitised and detheorised education and training of new teachers.

'How to' has replaced 'why to' in a technicist curriculum based on 'delivery' of a quietist and overwhelmingly conservative set of 'standards' for student teachers. This has, of course, had a major impact on the teaching force, and thereby on schooling. Teachers are now, by and large, trained in skills rather than educated to examine the `whys’ and the `why nots' and the contexts of curriculum, pedagogy, educational purposes and structures and the effects these have on reproducing Capitalist economy, society and politics.

2. Social Class Exploitation

The development of (`raced' and gendered) social class- based `labour-power' and the subsequent extraction of `surplus value'- is the fundamental characteristic of Capitalism. It is the primary explanation for economic, political, cultural and ideological change.

Social Class is the:

essential form of Capitalist exploitation and oppression

dominant form of Capitalist exploitation and oppression

## Impact --- Morality/Value to Life

### Capitalism is a system where a few people gain at the expense of others

Foster 10 (John Bellamy, Professor of sociology at University of Oregon, “Capitalism, the Absurd System: A View from the United States”, June 2010, <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/06/01/capitalism-the-absurd-system-a-view-from-the-united-states>) Connor Smith

The problem faced by Steinbeck’s hapless tenant farmer is that there seems to be no individual or group of individuals who are ultimately responsible and accountable for the economic decisions that are harming people all over the country. It is a system “made by men,” and some are obviously gaining at the expense of others. The relation between the haves and the have-nots is clear, but the opacity of the market and the impersonality of it all nonetheless seem to constrain the possibility of active rebellion.[4](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/06/01/capitalism-the-absurd-system-a-view-from-the-united-states#en62) This opacity of the capitalist system and of the relations of class and power that constitute it create the illusion of freedom, based on a seeming lack of direct coercion. Who really is the boss? Who is making the decisions? CEOs? Stockholders? Financial markets? We come to believe that, as individuals, we are unconstrained in our day-to-day activities, since we remain at liberty, except when the state intrudes on our lives. Everything around us seems to function via Adam Smith’s invisible hand. What we lose sight of is the reality of an alienated, commodified existence with its innumerable chains forged by class and property relations.

### Capitalism is unjust- exploits workers

### Conway 87 (David, British academic philosopher and Professor of Philosophy at Middlesex university, “A Farewell to Marx: An Outline and Appraisal of His Theories”, 1987, <http://hem.passagen.se/nicb/marx.htm>) Connor Smith

According to proponents of the justice interpretation, Marx believed that capitalism involves exploitation because he believed it was unjust that the capitalist appropriates the surplus value created by the worker without making a reciprocal return to the worker. On this view, Marx believed that a person was morally entitled to the full product of his labour, minus certain deductions that are necessary for replenishing and expanding means of production and for providing public goods and welfare for the disabled. Workers in socialism will receive such a product of their labour. In capitalism, workers receive less than this. Some surplus value that the worker produces which rightly ought to go to the worker goes to the capitalist. On this view, the deductions made from the product of the labour of the able-bodied for the provision of welfare for the disabled are not instances of exploitation because such deductions are not unjust. The disabled are morally entitled to them.

## Impact --- Turns Case --- Turns Warming

### Attempting to solve warming through a mindframe of capitalism allows the aff the ignore their contribution to warming.

Wallis 9 (Victor, Prof. of Liberal Arts at Berkley College, “Beyond ‘Green Capitalism’,” Monthly Review, <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/02/01/beyond-green-capitalism>)

A disdain for the natural environment has characterized capitalism from the beginning. As Marx noted, capital abuses the soil as much as it exploits the worker.[1](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/02/01/beyond-green-capitalism#fn32) The makings of ecological breakdown are thus inherent in capitalism. No serious observer now denies the severity of the environmental crisis, but it is still not widely recognized as a capitalist crisis, that is, as a crisis arising from and perpetuated by the rule of capital, and hence incapable of resolution within the capitalist framework. It is useful to remind ourselves that, although Marx situated capitalism’s crisis tendencies initially in the business cycle (specifically, in its downward phase), he recognized at the same time that those tendencies could manifest themselves under other forms—the first of these being the drive to global expansion.[2](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/02/01/beyond-green-capitalism#fn31) Such manifestations are not inherently cyclical; they are permanent trends. They can be sporadically offset, but for as long as capitalism prevails, they cannot be reversed. They encompass: (1) increased concentration of economic power; (2) increased polarization between rich and poor, both within and across national boundaries; (3) a permanent readiness for military engagement in support of these drives; and (4) of special concern to us here, the uninterrupted debasement or depletion of vital natural resources. The economic recession of 2008, widely recognized as the most severe since the post-1929 Depression, has been variously interpreted on the left in terms of whether or not capital can overcome it by, in effect, restoring the restraints—some of them socially progressive—that it had accepted (in the United States) in the 1930s. To the extent that such remediation is viewed as possible, the crisis is seen as undermining only the neoliberal agenda and not capitalism, as such.[3](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/02/01/beyond-green-capitalism#fn30) In that case, we would witness a perhaps cyclical return to a period of greater governmental regulation (including greater responsiveness to limited working-class demands). But what is not at all cyclical—and what most sharply distinguishes the present crisis from that of the 1930s—is the backdrop of aggravated environmental devastation. The reign of capital has now been thrown into disarray not only by financial chaos, but also by the shrinkage and disruption of the natural infrastructure which serves not only the survival needs of the human species but also the particular requirements of the capitalist ruling class. The immediate grounds for ruling-class concern arise along several major axes: (a) rising raw material and energy costs; (b) losses from catastrophic climate events; and (c) mass dislocation, popular disaffection, and eventual social upheaval. It is this set of preoccupations that drives the political agenda of “green capitalism.” While there are obvious points of convergence between different green agendas, it eventually becomes clear that any full merger between an agenda that is insistently capitalist and one that accentuates the green dimension is impossible. Nonetheless, immediate pro-ecology steps are urgently needed, irrespective of their sponsorship. The resulting dilemma is one that the left must face without delay, as an integral step in developing whatever more radical strategy might be possible for the longer term. At a conceptual level, it is clear that “green capitalism” seeks to bind together two antagonistic notions. To be green means to prioritize the health of the ecosphere, with all that this entails in terms of curbing greenhouse gases and preserving biodiversity. To promote capitalism, by contrast, is to foster growth and accumulation, treating both the workforce and the natural environment as mere inputs. Capital is no stranger to contradiction, however. Just as it seeks to balance market-expansion with wage-restraint, so it must seek to balance perpetual growth with preservation of the basic conditions for survival. Despite the ultimate incompatibility of these two goals, therefore, capital must to some extent pursue both at once. Although green capitalism is an oxymoron, it is therefore nonetheless a policy-objective. Its proponents thus find themselves in an ongoing two-front struggle against, on the one hand, capital’s more short-sighted advocates and, on the other, the demand for a far-reaching ecologically grounded conversion of production and consumption. The green capitalist vision is sometimes associated with small enterprises that can directly implement green criteria by, for example, using renewable energy sources, avoiding toxic chemicals, repairing or recycling used products, and minimizing reliance on long-distance shipment for either supplies or sales. But the scope of such practices is likely to be severely limited by market pressures. The aspect of local self-sufficiency is most widely seen in the food-services sector, especially in farmers’ markets, which have experienced a notable resurgence in recent years in industrialized countries. This corresponds more to what Marx called “simple commodity production,” however, than to capitalist enterprise. Agribusiness allows residual space for it, but at the same time undercuts it through economies of scale facilitated by technologies of food processing and storage; political clout, resulting in subsidies; and reliance on a typically migrant workforce that receives less than a living wage. Because of the resulting cost differences (as well as inconveniences of access), patronage of farmers’ markets is likely to remain primarily a political choice until much more is done to offset the artificial competitive edge enjoyed by the food-industrial complex.

## Impact --- Turns Case --- Turns Art

**Anything and everything under capitalism is turned to profit therefore destroying art**

**Moore 2009** (Aaron, Assistant Professor in History at Arizona University, Para-Existential Forces of Invention, Positions: East Asia Cultures Critique Journal, 2009, <http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/journals/positions/v017/17.1.moore.html#back>) Usha

Nakai first develops his ideas on modern capitalism in a 1932 essay published in the journal *Risō* (*Ideals*). After criticizing philosophers such as Oswald Spengler who, "under the guise of an intellectual crisis, curse modernity" for its "mechanization and popularization of culture," Nakai instead focuses on the issue of "intellectual mechanization" under modern capitalism.[16](http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/journals/positions/v017/17.1.moore.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22f16) "What constitutes the largest aspect of intellectual mechanization is the specialization of intellectual culture and its professionalization," Nakai writes (*NMz*, 2:45). For example, philosophy has been professionalized, and philosophers take up the particular occupation of teacher to make a living — "thought is an occupation" (47). Within the specialization of philosophy, there are Leibniz specialists, Dilthey specialists, and so on (47). Based on this professionalization and specialization, philosophers find jobs in large educational institutions.Nakai then links specialization to the commodification of thought in modern capitalist society. He writes, "To the extent that literature is presented through institutions of profit such as publishing houses, bookstores, magazines and newspapers, it is a commodity. To the extent that it is a commodity, it is ordered according to the plans of the newspaper or magazine. Something that is regulated by demand is a product. There are cases too where literature is sold by means of the ghost-writer, or by using some famous person's name — i.e. by the advertised name (label)" (49). Writers must shape their skills and work according to the specific demands of huge,**[End Page 133]** profit-driven media corporations (such as Paramount or Nikkatsu in film), the "demand structure of patrons and brokers, and the editing of newspapers and magazines," and the specialized market of different commodities (53). For example, "Large corporations have already been established [in the film and music industries] which have boards of directors consisting of industrialists. Dividends are announced each year in the newspaper and their stocks rise and fall accordingly. Here a plan is executed according to the intentions of the board of directors and the estimate of the product's value is calculated in terms of money. And when there are strikes, there are also firings" (50). The very creative energy of art has been permeated by an instrumental logic of profit. Like everyone else, artists must sell their labor power to live — they are then repackaged, commodified, and sold as "stars" or "directors." "At present, all artistic geniuses are specialists, and because [their arts] are specializations, they are occupations for livelihood, and because they are occupations, they form their life structure beneath profit-driven collective organizations," Nakai adds (51). Artistic practice is not an individual endeavor divorced from society but rather is intertwined with it and takes the form of specialized occupations within large capitalist organizations necessary for life. Artists also form large associations that link artists and media corporations and set the collective standards and limits for creative activity in the market (53).In several essays published in 1936 and 1937, Nakai further elaborates on how modern capitalism restrains the critical potential of the people through specialization and commodification. In a 1936 *Gakusei Hyōron* (Student Critique) essay aimed at film students, Nakai describes what he calls the "masses as object of profit" or "the masses imagined by capital":[17](http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/journals/positions/v017/17.1.moore.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22f17)

# \*\*\*ALTERNATIVE\*\*\*

## Alternative --- Socialism --- Space

**The alternative is to reject the plan and alter to a communist society in which space is explored and developed for the good of mankind**

**ICC 9** (International Communist Current “Apollo 11 and the lunar landing: the adventure that wasn’t” http://en.internationalism.org/icco nline/2009/10/apollo-11-lunar-landing )

Nonetheless, it would be simplistic to see only the hypocrisy. The lunar expedition was also a colossal risk: a project of such cost, such complexity, and such novelty had never been undertaken before. The very fact that it was undertaken at all was also the expression of the American ruling class' remarkable confidence in its own abilities - a self-confidence which had been totally lost by the old powers, bled white after two world wars and losing ground economically and militarily. The United States, on the contrary, seemed to be at the height of their powers: they had suffered no bombardment of their home territory, and had emerged from the Second World War as the only undisputed victor, with an unequalled military power and apparently in the midst of an economic boom whose prosperity remained an object of admiration and envy for other countries. In the USA, the ruling ideology had, so to speak, lagged behind reality and it continued to express the self-confidence of a triumphant bourgeoisie which would have been more appropriate to the 19th century, before the bloodbath of 1914-18 demonstrated that the capitalist class was henceforth an obstacle to the future progress of the human species. In 1962, Kennedy proposed to send a man to the moon in ten years. In the end, it was only seven years later that Apollo 11 touched down on the moon. But far from marking the beginning of a new triumphant era of expansion into space, in the image of the expansion to the West in the 19th century, the lunar programme's success marked the moment when capitalism's decadence caught up with the American Dream. The country was bogged down in the Vietnam War, Kennedy had been assassinated, and the first signs of the economic crisis were beginning to appear - the USA would abandon the gold standard in 1971, bringing to an end the Bretton Woods system which had guaranteed the international financial system's stability since World War II. America's space programme suffered the same fate as its declining economy, military invincibility, and ideological self-confidence. The objective fixed by Reagan for the 1980s was no longer exploration but the "Star Wars" programme: the out and out militarisation of orbital space. The ambition to develop cheaper and more effective means to send men and equipment into space thanks to the space shuttle, came to nothing: today the shuttle is thirty years old and the USA is itself dependent on equally aging Russian rockets to supply the International Space Station (ISS). In 2004,George W. Bush announced a new "vision" for space exploration, with the completion of the ISS and the launch of a new moon mission in 2020 in order to prepare later missions to Mars. But as soon as one looks a little closer, it is obvious that this is nothing but a bluff. The cost of an expedition to Mars would be truly astronomical, and at a time when the US government is sinking billions in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, there is nothing to show where it will find the necessary funds for the NASA. And although Obama is presented as a new Kennedy - young, dynamic, and a bearer of hope - it is obvious that he has not, and cannot have, Kennedy's ambition. The United States are no longerthe triumphant power of forty years ago, but a giant with feet of clay, increasingly contested by second or even third-rate powers. Even the plans for manned lunar flights are more and more under attack within the Obama administration, let alone manned flights to Mars.[10] There will be no "new space era": the great powers are on the contrary engaged in a race to militarise near space with spy satellites, and no doubt soon with laser-armed anti-missile satellites; Low Earth Orbit is becoming an enormous scrap heap of obsolete satellites and abandoned rockets. World capitalism is a moribund society which has lost its ambition and its self-confidence, and the great powers think of space only in terms of protecting their own petty interests on Earth. Can we reach the stars? Of all the human species' exploits, the greatest is certainly that undertaken by our distant ancestors 100,000 years ago, when they left humanity's cradle in the Rift Valley to populate first the African continent, then the rest of the world. We will never know what qualities of courage and curiosity, of knowledge and openness towards the new, our predecessors called on as they set out to discover a new world. This great adventure was that of a primitive communist society (or rather a proliferation of such societies). We cannot say whether humanity will one day be capable of leaving Earth and travelling to other planets, or even other stars, but this much is certain: such an exploit will only be carried out by a communist society which no longer pours gigantic resources in war, which has repaired the damage done to the planet by capitalist anarchy, which has put an end to the terrible waste of its youth's physical and mental energy in poverty and unemployment, which undertakes exploration and scientific research for the good of mankind and the joy of learning, and which will be able to look to the future with confidence and enthusiasm.

## Alternative --- Socialism --- Space

**Space should be used for the benefit of all, not for exploitation for the rich**

### Dickens 10 (Peter, Professor of Sociology – University of Brighton and Cambridge, UK, “The Humanization of the Cosmos – To What End?”, Monthly Review, 62(6), November, 6-6, http://monthlyreview.org/archives/2010/volume-62-issue-06-november-2010)

So outer space technology can be used for tackling a number of immediate social and political issues. But these strategies do not add up to a philosophy toward outer space and the form humanization should take. Here again, the focus should be on the development of humanity as a whole, rather than sectional interests. First, outer space, its exploration and colonization, should be in the service of some general public good. Toward this end, the original intentions of the 1967 UN Outer Space Treaty should be restored. Outer space should not be owned or controlled by any economic, social, and political vested interest. The cosmos should not, in other words, be treated as an extension of the global environment, one to be owned and exploited. We have seen enough of this attitude and its outcomes to know what the result would be. Spreading private ownership to outer space would only reproduce social and environmental crises on a cosmic scale.

**It’s try or die --- reject capitalism to embrace the socialist path to survival**

Dickens 10 (Peter, Professor of Sociology – University of Brighton and Cambridge, UK, “The Humanization of the Cosmos – To What End?”, Monthly Review, 62(6), November, 6-6, http://monthlyreview.org/archives/2010/volume-62-issue-06-november-2010)

The course on which U.S and world capitalism is now headed points to global barbarism—or worse. Yet it is important to remember that nothing in the development of human history is inevitable. There still remains an alternative path—the global struggle for a humane, egalitarian, democratic, and sustainable society. The classic name for such a society is “socialism.” Such a renewed struggle for a world of substantive human equality must begin by addressing the system’s weakest link and at the same time the world’s most pressing needs—by organizing a global resistance movement against the new naked imperialism.

## Alternative --- Socialism

### We must change government and socio-politics to solve for ecological problems which will make a better society

Biro 2006 (Andrew, Canada Research Chair in Political Ecology and Environmental Political Theory, “Human needs and the crisis of the subject”, John Hopkins

The same form of argument can be applied against the idea that the appropriate response to capitalism's ecological destructiveness is the preservation of the "nature" which is being rendered increasingly scarce. Even leaving aside the ecological dictum that "everything connects," arguments for the preservation of nature run into the problem that the "nature" that is to be preserved is one that is already socialized.[44](http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v009/9.4biro.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn44%22%20%5Co%20%22) As nature is rendered "scarce" (and hence in need of preservation industry demonstrates. Thus, to paraphrase Zizek, we could say that the only way of breaking out of the constraints of a world in which nature is thoroughly commodified, is to invent a new culture. What might such a culture look like? At the very least, it must develop a more integrated understanding of what we currently largely take to be separate realms and processes – the natural and the social.), nature itself becomes a site for value production – and perhaps the less *apparently*socialized the better, as the dramatic recent rise of the eco-tourism Discourses of scarcity must be understood to describe not natural(ized) fact, but socio-ecological relations. This emphasis on the social is of course not to argue that, for example, global climate change or fossil fuel depletion are not measurably occurring, but rather that the trajectory of ecological changes may be influenced by a variety of social factors,[45](http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v009/9.4biro.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn45%22%20%5Co%20%22) and perhaps more importantly, that social institutions and relations necessarily refract ecological changes and determine their specific impacts: No elaborate argument should be necessary to establish the point that there are some limits to economic and population growth. But everything depends on whether we regard such limits as a bitter disappointment or as a welcome opportunity to turn from quantitative accumulation to qualitative improvement in the course of creating a conserver society.[46](http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v009/9.4biro.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22_edn46%22%20%5Co%20%22)

## Alternative --- Socialism --- Try or Die

**Our alternative is to reject the aff and establish an oppositional society against the oppressive system of capital.**

**Herod 4** (James Herod, Faculty at the University of Massachusetts, January 2004, Getting Free 4th edition, <http://www.jamesherod.info/Getting_Free.pdf>)

It is time to try to describe, at first abstractly and later concretely, a strategy for destroying capitalism. At its most basic, this strategy calls for pulling time, energy, and resources out of capitalist civilization and putting them into building a new civilization. The image, then, is one of emptying out capitalist structures, hollowing them out, by draining wealth, power, and meaning from them until there is nothing left but shells. This is definitely an aggressive strategy. It requires great militancy and constitutes an attack on the existing order. The strategy clearly recognizes that capitalism is the enemy and must be destroyed, but it is not a frontal attack aimed at overthrowing the system; it is an inside attack aimed at gutting it, while simultaneously replacing it with something better, something we want. Thus, capitalist structures (corporations, governments, banks, schools, etc.) are not seized so much as simply abandoned. Capitalist relations are not fought so much as they are simply rejected. We stop participating in activities that support (finance, condone) the capitalist world and start participating in activities that build a new world while simultaneously undermining the old. We create a new pattern of social relations alongside capitalist ones, and then continually build and strengthen our new pattern while doing everything we can to weaken capitalist relations. In this way our new democratic, nonhierarchical, noncommodified relations can eventually overwhelm the capitalist relations and force them out of existence. This is how it has to be done. This is a plausible, realistic strategy. To think that we could create a whole new world of decent social arrangements overnight, in the midst of a crisis, during a so-called revolution or the collapse of capitalism, is foolhardy. Our new social world must grow within the old, and in opposition to it, until it is strong enough to dismantle and abolish capitalist relations. Such a revolution will never happen automatically, blindly, determinably, because of the inexorable materialist laws of history. It will happen, and only happen, because we want it to, and because we know what we’re doing and how we want to live, what obstacles have to be over-come before we can live that way, and how to distinguish between our social patterns and theirs. But we must not think that the capitalist world can simply be ignored, in a live-and-let-live attitude, while we try to build new lives elsewhere. (As mentioned earlier, there is no elsewhere.) There is at least one thing, wage slavery, that we can’t simply stop participating in (but even here there are ways we can chip away at it). Capitalism must be explicitly refused and replaced by something else. This constitutes war, but it is not a war in the traditional sense of armies and tanks; it is a war fought on a daily basis, on the level of everyday life, by millions of people. It is a war nevertheless because the accumulators of capital will use coercion, brutality, and murder, as they have always done in the past, to try to block any rejection of the system. They have always had to force compliance; they will not hesitate to continue to do so. Still, there are many concrete ways that individuals, groups, and neighborhoods can gut capitalism, which I will enumerate shortly. We must always keep in mind how we became slaves; then we can see more clearly how we can cease being slaves. We were forced into wage slavery because the ruling class slowly, systematically, and brutally destroyed our ability to live autonomously. By driving us off the land, changing the property laws, dismantling community rights, destroying our tools, imposing taxes, gutting our local markets, and so forth, we were forced onto the labor market in order to survive, our only remaining option being to sell our ability to work for a wage. It’s quite clear, then, how we can overthrow slavery: we must re-verse this process. We must begin to reacquire the ability to live without working for a wage or buying the products made by wage slaves (that is, we must free ourselves from the labor market and the way of living based on it), and embed ourselves instead in cooperative labor and cooperatively produced goods. Another clarification is needed. This strategy does not call for re-forming capitalism, for changing capitalism into something else. It calls for totally replacing capitalism with a new civilization. This is an important distinction because capitalism has proved impervious to reforms as a system. We can sometimes, in some places, win certain concessions from it (usually only temporary ones) and some (usually short-lived) improvements in our lives as its victims, but we cannot reform it piecemeal. Hence, our strategy of gutting and eventually destroying capital-ism requires at a minimum a totalizing image, an awareness that we are attacking an entire way of life and replacing it with another, and not merely reforming one way of life into something else. Many people may not be accustomed to thinking about entire systems and social orders, but everyone knows what a lifestyle is, or a way of life, and that is the way we should approach it. The thing is this: in order for capitalism to be destroyed, millions and millions of people must be dissatisfied with their way of life. They must want something else and see certain existing things as obstacles to getting what they want. It is not useful to think of this as a new ideology. It is not merely a belief system that is needed, like a religion, or like marxism or anarchism. Rather it is a new prevailing vision, a dominant desire, an overriding need. What must exist is a pressing desire to live a certain way and not to live another way. If this pressing desire were a desire to live free, to be autonomous, to live in democratically controlled communities, to participate in the self-regulating activities of a mature people, then capitalism could be destroyed. Otherwise, we are doomed to perpetual slavery and possibly even to extinction.

## Alternative --- Socialism --- Einstein Votes Neg

### Our alternative is to reject the aff embrace socialism in both economy and education.

Einstein 49 (Albert Einstein, 1921 Nobel Physics Prize Winner, awarded the Max Planck medal for excellence in theoretical physics, awarded the Franklin Medal for work on the theory of relativity, Time Magazine’s Person of the Century, pretty much the smartest dude ever, May 1949, “Why Socialism?,” The Monthly Review, <http://monthlyreview.org/2009/05/01/why-socialism>)

I am convinced there is only one way to eliminate these grave evils, namely through the establishment of a socialist economy, accompanied by an educational system which would be oriented toward social goals. In such an economy, the means of production are owned by society itself and are utilized in a planned fashion. A planned economy, which adjusts production to the needs of the community, would distribute the work to be done among all those able to work and would guarantee a livelihood to every man, woman, and child. The education of the individual, in addition to promoting his own innate abilities, would attempt to develop in him a sense of responsibility for his fellow-men in place of the glorification of power and success in our present society

## Alternative --- Socialism --- Solves Space Exploration

### A socialist alternative furthers space exploration- it views science as a priority rather than a source of profit

Palacek 9 (Mike, “Capitalism Versus Science,” Fightback, http://ireland.marxist.com/marxist-theory/165-ireland/7630-capitalism-versus-science-)

The ultimate proof of capitalism’s hindrance of science and technology comes not from capitalism, but from the alternative. While the Soviet Union under Stalin was far from the ideal socialist society (something which we have explained extensively elsewhere), its history gives us valuable insight into the potential of a nationalized planned economy. In 1917 the Bolsheviks took control of a backwards, semi-feudal, third world country that had been ruined by the First World War. In a matter of decades, it was transformed into a leading super-power. The USSR would go on to be the first to put a satellite into orbit, the first to put a man in space, and the first to build a permanently manned outpost in space. Soviet scientists pushed the frontiers of knowledge, particularly in the areas of Mathematics, Astronomy, Nuclear Physics, Space Exploration and Chemistry. Many Soviet era scientists have been awarded Nobel prizes in various fields. These successes are particularly stunning, when one considers the state the country was in when capitalism was overthrown. How were such advancements possible? How did the Soviet Union go from having a population that was 90% illiterate, to having more scientists, doctors and engineers per capita than any other country on Earth in just a few decades? The superiority of the nationalized planned economy and the break from the madness of capitalism is the only explanation. The first step in this process was simply the recognition that science was a priority. Under capitalism, the ability of private companies to develop science and technology is limited by a narrow view of what is profitable. Companies do not plan to advance technology, they plan to build a marketable product and will only do what is necessary to bring that product to market. The Soviets immediately recognized the importance of the overall development of science and technology and linked it to the development of the country as a whole. This broad view allowed them to put substantial resources into all areas of study. Another vital component of their success was the massive expansion of education. By abolishing private schools and providing free education at all levels, individuals in the population were able to meet their potential. A citizen could continue their studies as long as they were capable. By contrast, even many advanced capitalist countries have been unable to eliminate illiteracy today, let alone open up university education to all who are able. Under capitalism, massive financial barriers are placed in front of students, which prevent large portions of the population from reaching their potential. When half of the world’s population is forced to live on less than two dollars a day, we can only conclude that massive reserves of human talent are being wasted. The soviet government immediately tore down all the barriers on science that strangle innovation within the capitalist system. Patents, trade secrets, and private industry were eliminated. This allowed for more collaborative research across fields and a free flow of information between institutions. Religious prejudices that had long held back rational study were pushed aside. One only has to look at the ban on stem-cell research under the Bush regime to see the negative effects religious bigotry can have on science.

## Alternative --- Citizen of the Cosmos

### The alt is to become a citizen of the cosmos and learn where we really are in the universe

Dickens 10 (Peter, Professor of Sociology – University of Brighton and Cambridge, UK, “The Humanization of the Cosmos – To What End?”, Monthly Review, 62(6), November, 6-6, http://monthlyreview.org/archives/2010/volume-62-issue-06-november-2010)

The Ancient Greek philosopher Diogenes (412-323 BCE) was once asked where he came from. “I am a citizen of the Cosmos,” he replied. All of us are, and should consider ourselves citizens of the cosmos. It belongs to all of us. But this does not necessarily mean our physical presence in the cosmos and travelling vast distances into the solar system, often creating formidable hazards. It means much more: creating an understanding of the cosmos and our place within it. The cosmos is important for human identity. Knowledge of the cosmos can provide humanity with at least provisional answers to some fundamental questions. How did we get here? What is humanity’s place in the cosmos? How is the structure of the universe developing? Is there life elsewhere? In what ways are humans, and other entities, part of the cosmos? What cosmic processes can we actually observe on an everyday basis?

### Doing so will bring humanity into the next stage of evolution

Dickens 10 (Peter, Professor of Sociology – University of Brighton and Cambridge, UK, “The Humanization of the Cosmos – To What End?”, Monthly Review, 62(6), November, 6-6, http://monthlyreview.org/archives/2010/volume-62-issue-06-november-2010)

There are some important lessons to be learned from debates in the past. Diogenes’ attitude to the cosmos, for example, was taken up in Russia just before the Revolution. This, of course, was another time of great social and economic turmoil. These upheavals helped to spur on attempts to regain a sense of what could be considered certain in an otherwise uncertain world. Before the Revolution, a loose-knit group of people known as Cosmists argued that a form of cosmic humanization was central to developing the next major stage of human evolution. New rocket technology combined with older forms of theosophic philosophy and occult thinking could be used, the Cosmists argued, both to perfect humanity and the cosmos itself. The cosmos would be humanized as a result of cosmic colonization, and at the same time humanity would develop a cosmic consciousness. This was even to apply to dead as well as living people. Penetrating the heavens was a means of finding the “corporeal particles” that had constituted the people who had died. These particles would enable people to be resurrected, using new medical technologies and remade into living beings. These resurrections meant that the massive number of human ancestors could be used to humanize the solar system and beyond. All these ideas then found widespread interest, partly because esoteric and occult philosophy was fashionable in Russia at the time, and partly because the idea of space travel was being made popular by the many journals and societies promoting amateur rocketry.

# \*\*\*ANSWERS TO\*\*\*

## AT: Perm --- Complete Rejection Key

### All instances of capitalism, including the plan, must be rejected- remaining capitalist instances can overtake reform

Hariman 96 (Robert “Rhetoric and Marxism” Pennsylvania State University http://www.jstor.org/stable/40237925?seq=2)

So it is that we turn to the next génération of Marxists to see how they attempted to overcome this deficit in the Marxist understanding of the means for collective action. Marcuse, who is presented as primarily a philosopher of communication, provided the explanation of how late capitalism co-opts résistance movements through a complex of technocratie, bureaucratie, and mass-mediated stratégies of control. Marcuse leaves us with both a compelling account of negative médiation and only one place to go: the autonomous work of art becomes the sole means for negating cultural domination. Aune identifies this move to the pure aesthetic as a reprise of thè original commitment in Marxism to a dialectic defined in rigid Opposition to all rhetorical practice. Despite Marcuse's attention to mass communication and to the role of aesthetic awareness in practical judgment, his work leads to a dead end. Aune contrasts this trajectory with the approach taken by Williams, who is set before us as an unsung hero. Williams appears as the ideal Marxist rhetorician: He avoided the errors in Marx's critique of ideology by identifying its unreflective dependence on misleading metaphors (such as base and superstructure); he held to the most important sense of cultural analysis, whether understood in respect to works of art or in respect to the lived expérience of a class or group, which is to discern the communal "structure of feeling" that is the essence and motive for all communication and any question of authenticity; heunderstood that politicai persuasion required skillful appropriation or redéfinition of the established idiolect of thè society; and he understood that thè cali for emancipatory change could become persuasive only when it spoke to ordinary people where they actually lived, that is, in a manner that respected their sense of place, their parochial sentiments, and their loyalty to organic institutions.

### Rejecting capitalism is necessary for allowing alternative social arrangements to emerge

**Herod 6** (James, social commentator, “ The Strategy Described Abstractly,” Getting free, 1/22/06, <http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman_g/Strate/GetFre/06.htm> Singh

It is time to try to describe, at first abstractly and later concretely, a strategy for destroying capitalism. This strategy, at its most basic, calls for pulling time, energy, and resources out of capitalist civilization and putting them into building a new civilization. The image then is one of emptying out capitalist structures, hollowing them out, by draining wealth, power, and meaning out of them until there is nothing left but shells.This is definitely an aggressive strategy. It requires great militancy, and constitutes an attack on the existing order. The strategy clearly recognizes that capitalism is the enemy and must be destroyed, but it is not a frontal attack aimed at overthrowing the system, but an inside attack aimed at gutting it, while simultaneously replacing it with something better, something we want.   Thus capitalist structures (corporations, governments, banks, schools, etc.) are notseized so much as simply abandoned. Capitalist relations are not fought so much as they are simply rejected. We stop participating in activities that support (finance, condone) the capitalist world and start participating in activities that build a new world while simultaneously undermining the old. We create a new pattern of social relations alongside capitalist relations and then we continually build and strengthen our new pattern while doing everything we can to weaken capitalist relations. In this way our new democratic, non-hierarchical, non-commodified relations can eventually overwhelm the capitalist relations and force them out of existence.This is how it has to be done. This is a plausible, realistic strategy. To think that we could create a whole new world of decent social arrangements overnight, in the midst of a crisis, during a so-called revolution, or during the collapse of capitalism, is foolhardy. Our new social world must grow within the old, and in opposition to it, until it is strong enough to dismantle and abolish capitalist relations. Such a revolution will never happen automatically, blindly, determinably, because of the inexorable, materialist laws of history. It will happen, and only happen, because we want it to, and because we know what we’re doing and know how we want to live, and know what obstacles have to be overcome before we can live that way, and know how to distinguish between our social patterns and theirs.

## AT: Perm --- Complete Rejection Key

### **Perms can’t solve- there must be complete rejection of capitalism**

Herod 4 (James, “Section 6. of Getting Free” University of Massachusetts Boston http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\_g/Strate/GetFre/06.htm)

Thus capitalist structures (corporations, governments, banks, schools, etc.) are not seized so much as simply abandoned. Capitalist relations are not fought so much as they are simply rejected. We stop participating in activities that support (finance, condone) the capitalist world and start participating in activities that build a new world while simultaneously undermining the old. We create a new pattern of social relations alongside capitalist relations and then we continually build and strengthen our new pattern while doing every thing we can to weaken capitalist relations. In this way our new democratic, non-hierarchical, non-commodified relations can eventually overwhelm the capitalist relations and force them out of existence. This is how it has to be done. This is a plausible, realistic strategy. To think that we could create a whole new world of decent social arrangements overnight, in the midst of a crisis, during a so-called revolution, or during the collapse of capitalism, is foolhardy. Our new social world must grow within the old, and in opposition to it, until it is strong enough to dismantle and abolish capitalist relations. Such a revolution will never happen automatically, blindly, determinably, because of the inexorable, materialist laws of history. It will happen, and only happen, because we want it to, and because we know what we’re doing and know how we want to live, and know what obstacles have to be overcome before we can live that way, and know how to distinguish between our social patterns and theirs. But we must not think that the capitalist world can simply be ignored, in a live and let live attitude, while we try to build new lives elsewhere. (There *is* no elsewhere.) There is at least one thing, wage-slavery, that we can’t simply stop participating in (but even here there are ways we can chip away at it). Capitalism must be explicitly refused and replaced by something else. This constitutes War, but it is not a war in the traditional sense of armies and tanks, but a war fought on a daily basis, on the level of everyday life, by millions of people. It is a war nevertheless because the accumulators of capital will use coercion, brutality, and murder, as they have always done in the past, to try to block any rejection of the system. They have always had to force compliance; they will not hesitate to continue doing so. Nevertheless, there are many concrete ways that individuals, groups, and neighborhoods can gut capitalism, which I will enumerate shortly.

## AT: Perm --- Complete Rejection Key

**Any trace of capitalism triggers the impact – radical treatment is key**

**Blackledge 8** (Paul is a Senior Lecturer in Politics at Leeds Metropolitan University. http://www.socialistreview.org.uk/article.php?articlenumber=10634)

Since 1971 István Mészáros has been centrally concerned to explain and combat what he calls the "global structural crisis of capital". His attempt to understand this phenomenon informed the publication of two important books, *The Power of Ideology* and *Beyond Capital*. These works were written from a classical Marxist perspective and were intended to renew Marxist ideas in the modern context. And, whatever their faults, they show the continuing vitality of Marx's revolutionary theory. *Beyond Capital* especially is an incredibly impressive work, although at almost 1,000 closely typed and philosophically dense pages it is not the easiest of reads. *The Challenge and Burden of Historical Time* by contrast is a much more user friendly book. As John Bellamy Foster writes in the foreword, it is perhaps best read as a more accessible complement, introduction or afterword to *Beyond Capital*. As such, although some parts of this book assume a more than passing knowledge of a number of the great names of social, political and economic theory, its attempt to provide a readable extension and application of classical Marxism to the contemporary world means it deserves attention. The central message of this book is that Margaret Thatcher's old mantra that "there is no alternative", which has been taken up and embraced not only by New Labour but by neoliberal politicians the world over, is a lie. Mészáros confronts the common sense assumption that capitalism and antagonistic individualism are natural and that, consequently, realistic politics must be limited by the parameters of what can be done within the system. He shows not only that capitalism is a product of human history, but also that it generates a series of fundamental problems which ensure that it has no long-term viability. As a result, although "capital has the upper hand everywhere" far from it being able to overcome these contradictions it can only "fiddle with effects and surface manifestations" in a way that "continues to generate them on an ever increasing scale". If the present economic crisis tends to confirm this general perspective, these recurrent and systemic problems ensure that however many times the left suffer defeats, socialism can never be completely wiped from the political agenda. Nevertheless, Mészáros has no truck with the idea that socialism will inevitably follow from the crisis of capitalism. He simply points to the increasingly obvious fact that capitalism cannot continue on its destructive path indefinitely. Moreover, he shows that socialism is not merely an abstract dream of a better world. Rather, because capitalism creates a class for whom solidarity becomes a basic need, the rule of capital brings in its train transformations which make a socialist alternative to modern antagonistic individualism both desirable and possible. Like Rosa Luxemburg, therefore, Mészáros believes that the long-term choice for humanity is between socialism or barbarism, and that because "the long run is becoming ever shorter...our responsibility is to do something before we run out of time". This sense of political urgency infuses the entire book. Mészáros compares capital's relentless drive for growth with a cancer. He insists that we have reached a point at which some form of radical treatment is absolutely necessary. Concretely, capitalism's essence as a system of growth for growth's sake means that despite the greater potential for free time which increased labour productivity should entail, capitalism forces us to work longer and harder while simultaneously eating into the free time we have outside of work. This free time becomes increasingly commercialised and reduces us to the status of consumers. If this erosion of free time is one consequence of the power of capital, another is the developing environmental crisis. Mészáros shows it is no mere product of industrialisation, but is a more specific consequence of the system's need to "grow inexorably or perish". And if the dehumanisation of free time and the destruction of nature are two sides of capitalist alienation, so long as we confront this world as atomised individuals nothing seems more realistic than the idea that this is a natural system. Hope in such a situation takes the form of the spontaneous collectivist movements against the consequences of the rule of capital. One aspect of the structural crisis of capitalism is the massive levels of unemployment experienced even before the present recession. Commenting on the demand for a 35 hour week in this situation, Mészáros argues that, whatever its limitations, this and similar demands cannot be sustained by traditional forms of trade unionism which hoped to benefit from capitalist growth. He argues that what is necessary today is a more directly political and indeed socialist form of trade unionism - one that is linked to a revolutionary strategy that overcomes the opposition between Luxemburg and Lenin. Such a strategy, by overcoming the reformist separation between politics and economics, can challenge the logic of capital in the here and now in a way that points beyond it to a real socialist alternative.

## AT: Capitalism = Inevitable

### Capitalism will destroy the environment and itself

Foster 09 (John Bellamy, Professor of sociology at University of Oregon, “The Ecology of Destruction”, Monthly Review, February 09, <http://monthlyreview.org/2007/02/01/the-ecology-of-destruction>) Connor Smith

Ironically, this destructive relation of capitalism to the environment was probably understood better in the nineteenth century—at a time when social analysts were acutely aware of the issue of revolutionary changes taking place in the mode of production and how this was transforming the human relation to nature. As a result, environmental sociologists of the more radical stamp in the United States, where the contradiction between economy and ecology nowadays is especially acute, draw heavily on three interrelated ideas derived from Marx and the critique of capitalist political economy dating back to the nineteenth century: (1) the treadmill of production, (2) the second contradiction of capitalism, and (3) the metabolic rift. The first of these, the treadmill of production, describes capitalism as an unstoppable, accelerating treadmill that constantly increases the scale of the throughput of energy and raw materials as part of its quest for profit and accumulation, thereby pressing on the earth’s absorptive capacity. “Accumulate, Accumulate!” Marx wrote, “that is Moses and the prophets!” for capital.12The second of these notions, the second contradiction of capitalism, is the idea that capitalism, in addition to its primary economic contradiction stemming from class inequalities in production and distribution, also undermines the human and natural conditions (i.e, environmental conditions) of production on which its economic advancement ultimately rests. For example, by systematically removing forests we lay the grounds for increasing scarcities in this area—the more so to the extent that globalization makes this contradiction universal. This heightens the overall cost of economic development and creates an economic crisis for capitalism based on supply-side constraints on production.13The third notion, the metabolic rift, suggests that the logic of capital accumulation inexorably creates a rift in the metabolism between society and nature, severing basic processes of natural reproduction. This raises the issue of the ecological sustainability—not simply in relation to the scale of the economy, but also even more importantly in the form and intensity of the interaction between nature and society under capitalism.14

### It’s happening --- global ecological disaster is impending

Foster 09 (John Bellamy, Professor of sociology at University of Oregon, “The Ecology of Destruction”, Monthly Review, February 09, <http://monthlyreview.org/2007/02/01/the-ecology-of-destruction>) Connor Smith

In the almost five years that have elapsed since the second earth summit it has become increasingly difficult to separate the class and imperial war inherent to capitalism from war on the planet itself. At a time when the United States is battling for imperial control of the richest oil region on earth, the ecology of the planet is experiencing rapid deterioration, marked most dramatically by global warming. Meanwhile, neoliberal economic restructuring emanating from the new regime of monopoly-finance capital is not only undermining the economic welfare of much of humanity, but in some regions is removing such basic ecological conditions of human existence as access to clean air, drinkable water, and adequate food. Ecologists who once warned of the possibility of future apocalypse now insist that global disaster is on our doorstep.

## AT: Capitalism Inevitable

**Space based empires are not inevitable**

**Duvall and Havercroft 6** (Taking Sovereignty Out of This World: Space Weapons and Empire of the Future\* Raymond Duvall Jonathan Havercroft University of Minnesota University of British Columbia October 2006 <http://www.ligi.ubc.ca/sites/liu/files/Publications/Havercroft_paper.pdf>)

Given these grim prospects for a de-territorialized global rule of late-modern empire, are there any possibilities for resistance? Historically, every advance in the weaponry of imperial powers has always been met with an advance in counter hegemonic weaponry. Most recently, insurgents in Afghanistan and Iraq have been able to counter the technological superiority of the U.S. forces with very simple yet effective Improvised Explosive Devices. As such, it is reasonable to conclude that space weaponry could be countered through a variety of asymmetrical tactics such as disabling space weapons while in orbit through energy, kinetic or even nuclear anti-satellite attacks, attacking the locations where space weapons are produced or launched, attack the research and development centers (such as universities) that are integral to the production of these systems, organizing strikes for the workers involved in harvesting the raw materials for these systems, and refusing to pay taxes to the political apparatuses that control these systems. While it is difficult to imagine what precise form resistance to these systems might take, it is not unreasonable to conclude that even in a context of space-based empire, some for of political and military resistance will be possible. That being said, just because resistance to space-based empire is a possibility, **it by no means follows that such space-based empires are** either **inevitabl**e or desirable. That is why we believe that resistance to placing weapons in space must begin now. Such resistance could take several forms. In the last 15 years social constructivists have made a convincing case that taboos against the use of chemical weapons, nuclear weapons and land mines have shamedstatesintoabstainingfromusingtheseweapons.76 IR scholars should build on this research to focus on creating a taboo against the use and hopefully even the development of space weapons. Second, there is a need to educate the public about the dangerous consequences of placing weapons in space. As of this moment, most information about weapons in space is produced by defense agencies and related think tanks with a vested interest in them. As such, most research largely ignores the dangers of these weapons. An increased awareness of those dangers, not only to those potentially targeted by such weapons but also citizens of countries such as the U.S. that may deploy them, may create public pressure to cut funding to the development programs. If action is not taken now, we believe that the possibilities for resistance to these weapons will decrease dramatically once they are placed in orbit. The state of global domination constituted by such a weapons regime would mean that those who dared to speak out against such a regime might themselves become potential targets of such weapons

**Capitalism is not common everywhere which proves that capitalism is disliked**

Di Tella and MacCulloch 2009 (Rafael, Harvard Business School, Robert, Imperial College London, Brookings Paper on Economy, Brookings Institution, 2009, <http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/journals/brookings_papers_on_economic_activity/v2009/2009.1.di-tella.html>)

We show that capitalism is far from common around the world. Outside a small group of rich countries, heavy regulation of business, leftist rhetoric, and interventionist beliefs flourish. We relate these phenomena to the presence of corruption, with causality running in both directions. The paper presents evidence that, within a country, those who perceive widespread corruption also tend to demand more regulation. As regulation is held constant within a country, this finding is hard to explain if one assumes that causality runs only from regulation to corruption. We also find that over time, increases in corruption in a country precede increases in left-wing voting. To explain our findings, we present a model where corrupt capitalists are disliked, and voting for left-wing policies is a form of punishment available to voters even in weak judicial systems. Evidence on emotions supports this explanation: the frequency with which people report experiencing anger is positively correlated with perceived corruption, but this relationship is significantly weaker when business is heavily regulated.

**Capitalism causes hate, anger, and corruption leading to the downfall of capitalism**

Di Tella and MacCulloch 2009 (Rafael, Harvard Business School, Robert, Imperial College London, Brookings Paper on Economy, Brookings Institution, 2009, <http://muse.jhu.edu.turing.library.northwestern.edu/journals/brookings_papers_on_economic_activity/v2009/2009.1.di-tella.html>)

U.S.-style, pro-capitalist political ideas face electoral difficulties in poor countries. The first part of this paper showed, using data on business entry regulation, on the ideological orientation of political parties, and on people's beliefs about the benefits of private versus government ownership of business, that intrusive regulation and left-wing rhetoric and beliefs are more common in poor countries than in rich ones. The second part of the paper suggested an explanation for these phenomena based on the idea that corruption plays a role in shaping ideologies. We then presented a model in which corruption generates the perception that capitalists are "undeserving" (for example, of their wealth and of the freedom to run their businesses without supervision). When the legal system is slow to punish them, the demand for more regulation, higher taxes, and government intervention to make the environment less business-friendly increases, even if this has material costs. Thus, corruption, even when limited to a small group of businesspersons, might interfere with the spread of capitalism. In some circumstances, however, the government can preserve capitalism by punishing only those capitalists whom the voters perceive as corrupt—as Teddy Roosevelt did almost a century ago. We have presented suggestive evidence consistent with this "unpleasant capitalists" hypothesis. First, we showed that increases in aggregate (country-level) corruption tend to precede electoral gains by left-wing parties in national elections. Second, we showed that in a given country at a given time, people who perceive corruption to be widespread also tend to place themselves toward the left of the ideological spectrum and to demand more government ownership of business and industry. We also found cross-country data on reported emotions, from the Gallup World Poll, to be consistent with the mechanisms involved in our explanation: anger is associated with perceptions of widespread business corruption, but the presence of regulation that makes life harder for business weakens this correlation. We interpret our findings to mean that voters get angry when they see businesspeople engaging in corrupt behavior, and that they are then more likely to elect left-wing governments that will more stringently regulate business, thus reducing their anger. More broadly, the paper shows that corruption has an ideological side to it, eroding the legitimacy of business and hampering the electoral performance of pro-capitalist parties. [End Page 316]

## AT: Capitalism = Inevitable

### Capitalism is in its predatory phase, signaling the weakness of the system. The embracing of socialism is key to end this phase and collapse the system.

Einstein 49 (Albert Einstein, 1921 Nobel Physics Prize Winner, awarded the Max Planck medal for excellence in theoretical physics, awarded the Franklin Medal for work on the theory of relativity, Time Magazine’s Person of the Century, pretty much the smartest dude ever, May 1949, “Why Socialism?,” The Monthly Review, <http://monthlyreview.org/2009/05/01/why-socialism>)

It might appear that there are no essential methodological differences between astronomy and economics: scientists in both fields attempt to discover laws of general acceptability for a circumscribed group of phenomena in order to make the interconnection of these phenomena as clearly understandable as possible. But in reality such methodological differences do exist. The discovery of general laws in the field of economics is made difficult by the circumstance that observed economic phenomena are often affected by many factors which are very hard to evaluate separately. In addition, the experience which has accumulated since the beginning of the so-called civilized period of human history has—as is well known—been largely influenced and limited by causes which are by no means exclusively economic in nature. For example, most of the major states of history owed their existence to conquest. The conquering peoples established themselves, legally and economically, as the privileged class of the conquered country. They seized for themselves a monopoly of the land ownership and appointed a priesthood from among their own ranks. The priests, in control of education, made the class division of society into a permanent institution and created a system of values by which the people were thenceforth, to a large extent unconsciously, guided in their social behavior. But historic tradition is, so to speak, of yesterday; nowhere have we really overcome what Thorstein Veblen called “the predatory phase” of human development. The observable economic facts belong to that phase and even such laws as we can derive from them are not applicable to other phases. Since the real purpose of socialism is precisely to overcome and advance beyond the predatory phase of human development, economic science in its present state can throw little light on the socialist society of the future Second, socialism is directed towards a social-ethical end. Science, however, cannot create ends and, even less, instill them in human beings; science, at most, can supply the means by which to attain certain ends. But the ends themselves are conceived by personalities with lofty ethical ideals and—if these ends are not stillborn, but vital and vigorous—are adopted and carried forward by those many human beings who, half unconsciously, determine the slow evolution of society. For these reasons, we should be on our guard not to overestimate science and scientific methods when it is a question of human problems; and we should not assume that experts are the only ones who have a right to express themselves on questions affecting the organization of society. Innumerable voices have been asserting for some time now that human society is passing through a crisis, that its stability has been gravely shattered. It is characteristic of such a situation that individuals feel indifferent or even hostile toward the group, small or large, to which they belong. In order to illustrate my meaning, let me record here a personal experience. I recently discussed with an intelligent and well-disposed man the threat of another war, which in my opinion would seriously endanger the existence of mankind, and I remarked that only a supra-national organization would offer protection from that danger. Thereupon my visitor, very calmly and coolly, said to me: “Why are you so deeply opposed to the disappearance of the human race?”

## AT: Case Outweighs/Case Solves

### Space is a waste- takes away from earthly problems and historically fails on all promises

Dickens 07 (Peter, Professor of Sociology – University of Brighton and Cambridge, UK, “The cosmos as capitalism’s outside”, Sociological Review, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01817.x/pdf>)

Over forty years ago Amitai Etzioni roundly criticized the space race as a ‘monumental misdecision’ (1964). On the one hand, he argued, resources had been switched away from pressing Earthly needs such as much-improved healthcare, education and civil rights. On the other hand, it had failed in virtually all of its promises. It had not stimulated economic growth in the United States. Productivity was not raised ‘since orbiting objects or miniature atomic warheads do not have an automatic stimulant effect on consumers’ (1964: 73–4). ‘Spin-offs’ to the economy in the form of, for example, miniaturization and new materials had been marginal and even trivial. ‘Some are safely projected into a remote and dateless future, others should never have been made; still others are exaggerated out of proportion to their real value’ (ibid.: 90). Another claim was that space exploration would help humanity to understand the evolution of the cosmos. But this too turned out to be a chimera; another grand promise to attract public funds but never delivered on.

## AT: We Make Capitalism Green/Tech Solves

### The Capitalist system cannot be made green

Foster 11( John Bellamy, Professor of Sociology at University of Oregon, “What every environmentalist needs to know about capitalism”, July 17 2011, <http://monthlyreview.org/press/books/pb2419/>) Connor Smith

There is a growing consensus that the planet is heading toward environmental catastrophe: climate change, ocean acidification, ozone depletion, global freshwater use, loss of biodiversity, and chemical pollution all threaten our future unless we act. What is less clear is how humanity should respond. The contemporary environmental movement is the site of many competing plans and prescriptions, and composed of a diverse set of actors, from militant activists to corporate chief executives. This short, readable book is a sharply argued manifesto for those environmentalists who reject schemes of “green capitalism” or piecemeal reform. Environmental and economic scholars Magdoff and Foster contend that the struggle to reverse ecological degradation requires a firm grasp of economic reality. Going further, they argue that efforts to reform capitalism along environmental lines or rely solely on new technology to avert catastrophe misses the point. The main cause of the looming environmental disaster is the driving logic of the system itself, and those in power—no matter how “green”—are incapable of making the changes that are necessary.

### Capitalism is a universal war against nature

Foster 09 (John Bellamy, Professor of sociology at University of Oregon, “The Ecology of Destruction”, Monthly Review, February 09, <http://monthlyreview.org/2007/02/01/the-ecology-of-destruction>) Connor Smith

Indeed, what all such analyses intentionally avoid is the fact that business as usual in our society in any fundamental sense means the capitalist economy—an economy run on the logic of profit and accumulation. Moreover, there is little acknowledgement or even appreciation of the fact that the Hobbesian war of all against all that characterizes capitalism requires for its fulfillment a universal war on nature. In this sense new technology cannot solve the problem since it is inevitably used to further the class war and to increase the scale of the economy, and thus the degradation of the environment. Whenever production dies down or social resistance imposes barriers on the expansion of capital the answer is always to find new ways to exploit/degrade nature more intensively. To quote Pontecorvo’s Burn!, “that is the logic of profit….One builds to make money and to go on making it or to make more sometimes it is necessary to destroy.”

# \*\*\*AFF ANSWERS\*\*\*

## Link Turn

### NASA projects hurt and go against the capitalistic society.

The Washington Times 2K, (Sunday, November 5, Final Edition, Space should be frontier for private industry as well as government SECTION: PART B; Pg. B2) Andrew Muo

Most recent press coverage of the historic occupancy of the International Space Station fails to address a relevant elections issue: how the government's operation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has hurt capitalism. The federally funded space station is costing tens of billions of dollars more than NASA initially promised, and its annual operating costs will be at least 30 times higher than that of the essentially privatized international space station Mir. The latter is actually superior in many respects, even though it does not directly drain away American tax dollars and thereby add to our $5.6 trillion national debt. Ironically, though, Mir must now struggle to attract capital while competing against a bloated and self-perpetuating U.S. federal government bureaucracy that hypocritically pretends to be a benign friend of private industry. The space stations issue may be somewhat debatable, perhaps, but there are many other examples that are not. Indeed, space entrepreneurs (especially Andrew Beal) would likely jump at the chance to secretively confirm that NASA regularly and opportunistically competes against the more economical private sector, from which it could instead outsource. As a former NASA headquarters employee who disapprovingly resigned months ago, I increasingly look forward to voting this Nov. 7 every time I discover yet another NASA crime against capitalism. RICH ROBINS Washington /

## Capitalism Good

### Capitalism increases competition which reverses its elitist effects

Taylor 4/8/11 (Paul, “Can Capitalism Save Space Travel?” The Globe and Mail http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/technology/science/can-capitalism-save-space-travel/article1977191/)

Under Mr. Obama’s direction, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has introduced financial incentives to entice companies to transport American astronauts into space, and both established and maverick aerospace companies are eager to get a piece of the action. There are already proposals for a half-dozen different designs, ranging from Boeing’s CST-100 seven-person space capsule to Sierra Nevada Corp.’s Dream Chaser, which looks like a mini-shuttle. The initiative, known as the commercial crew development program, or CCDev, may achieve what NASA could never do – bring down the sky-high cost of space flight. And in so doing, it could finally make the heavens available to a lot more people – not just professional astronauts and a handful of hyper-rich space tourists. “Our whole concept for this commercial crew program is that competition is good and the more competition you have, the better off you will be,” said Edward Mango, director of NASA’s space transportation planning office at the [Kennedy Space Center](http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/technology/science/can-capitalism-save-space-travel/article1977191/) in Florida. Space travel has been a government-run enterprise since Soviet cosmonaut Yuri Gagarin became the first man in space 50 years ago this month. Only Russia, China and, at least for the next few months, the United States can put a human being into Earth orbit. It’s not simply faith in free-enterprise economics that is driving the Obama administration’s space policy. It’s also a matter of necessity. U.S. taxpayers and lawmakers are unwilling to finance NASA to the same extent that made it possible for America to land the first men on the moon in 1969. As Mr. Mango explains it, if NASA spends its limited funds building a new rocket system just to get a few hundred miles above the Earth, “there won’t be enough resources to do the exploration part.”

## Capitalism Defense

### **Capitalism inevitable- it’s a part of human rationale**

Wood 2 (Ellen M., Ph.D in political science from UCLA, *The Origin of Capitalism,* pg. 4-6)

These question-begging explanations have their origina in classical political economy and Enlightenment conceptions of progress. Together, they give an account of historical development in which the mergence and growth to maturity of capitalism are already prefigured in the earliest manifestations of human rationality, in the technological advances that began when Homo Sapiens first wielded a tool, and in the acts of exchange human beings have practised since time immemorial. History’s journey to that final destination, to ‘commercial society’ or capitalism, has, to be sure, been long and arduous, and many obstacles hace stood in its way. But its progress has nonetheless been natural and inevtiable. Nothing more is required, then, to explain the ‘rise of capitalism’ than an account of how many obstacles to its forward movement have been lifted- sometimes gradually, sometimes suddenly, with revolutionary violence.

In more accounts of capitalism and its origin, there really *is* no origin. Capitalism seems always to be there, somehwere; and it only needs to be realeased from its chains- for instance, from the fetters of fuedalism- to be allowed to grow and mature. Typically, these fetters are political: the parasitic powers of lordship, or the restrictions of an autocratic state. Sometimes they are cultural or ideological: perhaps the wrong religion. These contraints confine the free movement of ‘economic’ actors, the free expression of econmic rationality. The ‘economic’ in these formulations is identified with exchange or markets; and it is here that we can detect the assumption that the seeds of capitalism are contained in the most primitive acts of exchange, in any form of trade or market activity. That assumption is typically connected

With the other presupposition: that history has been an almost natural process of technological development. One way or another, capitalism more or less naturally appears when and where expanding markets and technological development reach the right level, allowing sufficient wealth to be accumulated so that is can be profitably reinvested. Many Marxist explanations are fundamentally the same- with the addition of bourgeois revolutions to help break the fetters.

The effect of these explanation is to stress the continuity between non-capitalist and capitalist societies, and to deny the disguise of the specificity of capitalism. Exchange has existed more or less forever, and it seems that the capitalist market is just more of the same. In this kind of argument, because capitalism’s specific and unique need constantly to revolutionize the forces of production is just an extension and an acceleration of universal and transhistorical, almost natural, tendencies, industrialization is the inevitable outcome of humanity’s most basic inclinations. So the lineage of capitalism passes naturally from the earliest Babylonian merchant through the medieval burgher to the early modern bourgeois and finally to the industrial capitalist.

There is similar logic in certain Marxist versions of this story, even though the narrative in more recent version often shifts from the town to the countryside, and merchants are replaced by rural commodity producers, small or ‘middling’ farmers waiting for the opportunity to blossom into full-blown capitalists. In this kind of narrative, petty commodity production, released from the bonds of feudalism, grows more or less naturally into capitalism, and petty commodity producers, just given the chance, will take the capitalist road.

Central to these conventional accounts of history are certain assumptions, explicit or implicit, about human nature and about how human beings will behave, if only given the chance. They will, so the story goes, always avail themselves of the opportunity to maximize profits through acts of exchange, and in order to realize that natural inclination, they will always find ways of improving the organization and instruments of work in order to enhance the productivity of labor.