SS Lab – Capitalism Kritik

SS Lab – Capitalism Kritik 1

1NC 3

Link—Generic 5

Link—Exploration 9

Link—Development 14

Link—NASA 17

Link—Human Missions 18

Link—Science 19

Link—SPS 21

Link—Satellites 22

Link—Space Weaponization 23

Link—Mining 24

Link—Shuttles 26

Link—SETI 27

Link—Property Rights 28

Link—International Law 29

Link—Tourism 30

Link—GIS 31

Link—China 32

Link—Trade Off 33

Link—Frontierism 34

Link—Hegemony 38

Link—Foreign Policy 39

Link—Neoliberalism 40

Link—Public-Private 41

Alternative—Do Nothing 42

Alternative—Structural/Historical 43

Alternative—Solvency 44

Impact—Inequality 45

Impact—Social Issues/War 48

Impact—War 49

Impact—Bare Life 50

Impact—Environment/War 51

Impact—Laundry List 52

Impact—Value to Life 53

Impact—Nuclear War 54

A2 Perm 55

A2 Exploration Biological 56

A2 Alt Causes 57

A2 No Link – Other Motivations 58

A2 No Link – We Don’t Exploit Resources 60

Aff - Perm 61

Aff – Alt Fails 63

Aff – Rejection Fails 64

Aff – Transition Wars 65

Aff – Capitalism Inevitable 66

Aff – Resistance Fails 67

Aff – Capitalism Not Root Cause 68

Aff – Capitalism Solves Warming 69

Aff – Capitalism Solves War 70

1NC

[INSERT SPECIFIC LINK]

A state policy cannot solve war or the environmental catastrophe–the aff’s policies are just excuses to continue our out of control consumerism. Continued growth is death, allowing the capitalist system to collapse is the only chance we have at survival.

Dr. Glen **Barry** March 21 **2009** <http://www.newearthrising.org/2009/03/continued-industrial-capitalism-is-assured-death.asp>, “New Green Deal or Not: Industrial Capitalism Is Assured Death”. PhD in land resources from Wisconson-Madison, Masters in "Conservation Biology and Sustainable Development", and a BA in "Political Science" from Marquette University, President and Founder of Ecological Internet (EI).

Besides being entirely inadequate in scale and ambition, what is most disconcerting about these green spending initiatives is the lack of ambitious ecologically based policies to provide context and support for the funding. There is a complete disregard for ecological science and what is known about the immediacy of threats to global ecological sustainability. The simplistic assumption is that simply throwing token money at global ecological crises while fundamentally changing very little else can return us to growth, provide jobs and is simultaneously the best way to save the Earth. We are not going to grow our way to ecological sustainability. Simply, a Green New Deal that focuses upon economic stimulus to promote more growth without providing the necessary additional supportive policies necessary to rein in consumption, natural resource use and ecosystem destruction will make things worse. In just over three hundreds years, the world has experienced explosive growth in population, consumption, resource extraction and loss of ecosystems. While heralded as progress by the elite and the temporarily burgeoning middle class, it has meant impoverishment and death for most others -- particularly of different colors and religions than the ecological imperialists. For every family able to fleetingly enjoy modern technological comforts, there have been many more that have had their persons violated and seen their land stolen, stripped of its life, and left barren. Billions live in extreme poverty on a dollar or two a day while an equal number panic as their excessive, conspicuous and destructive consumption falters. Industrial capitalism is based not only upon institutionalizing massive economic inequities; it is also dependent upon the three lies of endless: 1) growth, 2) extraction of resources from, and pollution into, natural ecosystems, and 3) technological innovations. It is supposed that technological solutions exist for any human ecological or social problem, and that we will be able to engineer a biosphere and its attendant ecological services including seasonality, rainfall, pollination and many others. In order to maximize profits for the few, the simple exchange of goods in markets has instead become a massive Ponzi scheme based upon liquidating ecosystems, exploiting others, and development of ever more arcane financial instruments detached from actual sustainable production of social goods. The house of cards is coming tumbling down. Perhaps by spending trillions to subsidize consumers to spend ever more to buy crap on credit they do not need, and that comes from destroying the Earth, a few more years of growth can be coaxed from further diminishing an exhausted Earth. But now, or in the near future, this ecologically terrible economic system is going to collapse. I have said it before and I repeat, if humanity and the Earth are to survive, it would be much better if the current system collapses sooner rather than later. Continued industrial and speculative capitalism is assured death. Given continued failure to have prices reflect environmental externalities, including assigning a price to carbon emissions, there is no reason to believe that capitalism's excesses can be reformed in time to maintain an operable biosphere. Obama's tepid climate policies including a cap and trade proposal, and renewable energy investments (while inexplicably continuing coal and tar sands), are being portrayed as allowing us to solve critical ecological issues while continuing to boost economic growth. We can have our cake and eat it too (now that is hope I can believe in)! Obama is doing nothing to change American history of unbridled, aggressive and speculative economic growth at the expense of natural ecosystems, which is precisely what brought us to this world of over-population, inequitable consumption, economic failure and ecosystem collapse in the first place. And he is definitely not acting with a sense of urgency to pursue sufficient policies such as a carbon tax. Again, please note the patently obvious observation that nothing grows forever, and trying always destroys the growing system and its surroundings. I cannot say it enough: the shared root of humanity's current ecological and economic crises is our addiction to growth -- namely economic, population and consumption on the basis of liquidation of natural capital. There is no indication that calls for a "Green New Deal" are concerned with fundamental, sufficient transformation required to bring human society into a steady state economy required to achieve and maintain global ecological sustainability. Paltry expenditures of less than 1% of GDP upon relatively ecologically sustainable economic activities, while allowing the other 99% of industrial activity to continue unreformed, will keep the emphasis for economic well-being on unsustainable growth. It will not even make a piddling contribution to stopping the habitat loss, ocean impoverishment, fouling of water, and collapsing atmosphere upon which all life depends. Indeed, by allowing the technocrats to steal our green rhetoric, the truly ecologically sufficient policies necessary -- returning to the land to protect and restore ecosystems, to save being while making an honest living from our hands and minds and surplus natural capital -- are put off until after it is almost certainly too late. Doing not enough, diverting from what must be done, is worse than doing nothing. Plans for green jobs and green stimulus, to simultaneously lift us from economic recession while pursuing climate change and other ecological policies, are doomed to failure if they are not accompanied by some additional fundamental transformations of the social and economic order. We know we must reduce human population and inequitable consumption. There is no future for logging old forests, burning coal or industrial agriculture including biofuels and biochar. And energy efficiency, conservation and renewables -- while we immediately end the use of fossil fuels and industrial biofuels -- are the only road to keeping the lights on, within a habitable Earth. We can pursue these sufficient ecological policies with a revolutionary spirit of action, or we can roll over and die. We still have the power and time to stop the ecological bubble, but just barely.
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The alternative is to refuse action in the face of the crisis presented by the affirmative and do nothing.

Questioning the underlying assumptions of capitalism is key to challenge the logic of constant expansion and exploitation that the affirmative brings to space.

Peter Dickens, Affiliated Lecturer in the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Politics, Psychology, Sociology and International Studies, Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex , University of Cambridge, November 2010, “The Humanization of the Cosmos: To What End?” <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end>

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.8 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 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. Military power will inevitably be made an integral part of this process, governments protecting the zones for which they are responsible. 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.”

Link—Generic

Space is the next frontier—the affirmative’s calls for exploration are an attempt to create an outside for capitalism to expand into and consume.

Peter Dickens. Universities of Brighton and Essex. 15 May 2009. The Sociological Review. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01817.x/full

Can capitalism go on expanding forever? It is a question many people have asked for many years. It is also a relevant question when considering the prospect of capitalism’s potentially infinite expansion into the cosmos. In the early decades of the 20th century, Rosa Luxemburg suggested that capitalism always needs an ‘outside’, a zone of non-capitalism in which people would buy goods made in capitalist societies (Luxemburg, 2004). To continue expanding, capitalism needs to continue placing a large part of its surplus into the means of production, machines and technology. Imperialism, according to Luxemburg, is the competitive struggle between capitalist nations for what remains of the non-capitalist ‘outside’. And yet, Luxemburg also argued, there is a fundamental contradiction, one ultimately leading to capitalism’s collapse. As it increasingly draws its ‘outside’ into itself, capitalism also destroys the very demand it needs for its products. The surplus value produced by capitalism simply cannot be absorbed. This is not the place to assess in detail Luxemburg’s arguments or the debates she has generated. Suffice to note that many Marxists now argue that, while crises of underconsumption are important, crises stemming from overaccumulation of capital and the need for ‘outside’ regions in which to invest are even more significant as regards the further expansion of capitalism (Brewer, 1990; Harvey, 2003). Luxemburg was nevertheless the first attempt explicitly to raise the question of how capitalism relates to a non-capitalist ‘outside’ and whether capitalism can, in principle, last forever as it colonizes its outside. The question of capitalism’s ‘outside’ is now being asked again, albeit in a rather different form. Hardt and Negri, in their influential text Empire, tell us that ‘there is no more outside.’ They state that ‘in the passage from modern to postmodern, from Imperialism to Empire, there is progressively less distinction between inside and outside’ (2000: 187). They make this case in relation to the economy, politics and militarism in today’s form of globalization. As regards economics, Hardt and Negri admit that the capitalist market has always run counter to any division between ‘inside’ and ‘outside’. It has been constantly expanded globally and yet has encountered barriers. But at the same time it has also thrived on overcoming such barriers, reorganizing itself to overcome these limits. But now the global market is so dominant that it is even more difficult to envisage a distinction between an ‘inside’ and an ‘outside’ market waiting to be subjugated, made part of the capitalist market and in due course reorganized as a site of capitalist production. There is no ‘outside’ left and capital is reduced to re-engaging in a form of ‘primitive accumulation’; privatizing publicly-owned assets, making them into commodities to be bought and sold. As regards politics, Hardt and Negri argue that sovereignty has in the past invariably been conceived in terms of territory and its relation to an ‘outside’. The Enlightenment ideal is one in which civil order and sovereignty are established within an inside region, while ‘social disorder’ and ‘nature’ are an outside still to be controlled and exploited. Such, according to Hardt and Negri, is the old model of empire, one in which there was a radical distinction between an imperializing inside and a dominated outside. But the old model has now gone, there being no ‘outside’ left in our globalized society and with opposition in its many forms as likely to be within the nation states it is opposing. In military terms too there is no longer, according to Hardt and Negri, any distinction to be made between inside and outside. The ‘enemy’ is as likely to be ‘within’ a nation state as located in an outside, hostile, region or an outside state. ‘The history of imperialist, inter-imperialist and anti-imperialist wars’, Hardt and Negri assert, ‘is over.’ (2000: 189). This makes every war into an internal, domestic or civil strife. ‘In the smooth space of Empire, there is no place of power – it is both everywhere and nowhere.’ (2000: 190). At the same time, and as part of this incorporation of warfare into nation states, militarization has been made permanently integral to the whole of economic, social and political life. Hardt and Negri go on to argue that resistance to capitalism is everywhere and nowhere. A ‘multitude’ is emerging within the new ‘smooth space of Empire’, one capable of overturning the social system of which it is part (Hardt and Negri, 2006). The cosmos as capitalism’s outside 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.

Link—Generic

Space exploration is based on a flawed ideology that justifies infinite consumption and objectification of the universe.

Peter Dickens. Universities of Brighton and Essex. 15 May 2009. The Sociological Review. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01817.x/full

Many nation-states, including relatively minor countries such as Korea as well as the USA, Russia and China nevertheless insist on projecting one or more of their citizens into the cosmos. In the end, the explanation of this phenomenon may have much more to do with governments generating public support for space programmes rather than any purely ‘economic’ rationale. Projecting citizens into the cosmos helps legitimate the huge amounts of public money involved. As the slogan often used to promote manned space flight puts it, ‘no bucks without Buck Rogers’. Most older people actually have no desire to travel into outer space themselves (Dickens and Ormrod, 2007). But it may be that space programmes using humans in the cosmos appeal to a narcissistic streak in the human personality, perhaps most amongst younger people. The humanization of the cosmos is arguably creating a new kind of galactic personality, one taking possessive individualism to new extremes, by conquering, controlling and consuming not only the Earth but now the Universe. Yet separating the narcissistic self from society as a whole and treating the cosmos as a mere object creates an ultimately unsatisfying form of subjectivity. Perhaps older generations in particular recognise that disconnecting the self and objectifying the cosmos will result not in emancipation but enslavement (Slijper, 2005: 28). Why humanize society’s ‘outside’? If Rosa Luxemburg’s theory of imperialism is correct, space-humanization will hasten the collapse of capitalism. The competitive struggle for the non-capitalist environment will only lead to the erosion of this ‘outside’. War and social upheaval will ensue, the alternative to capitalism being global resistance and the creation of a new, socialist, society. If Harvey’s theory is correct the cosmos might at best offer a series of temporary ‘fixes’ to the central crisis of capital’s over-accumulation. But, meanwhile, growing social injustice, conflict and environmental degradation can be expected to worsen, especially under current neo-liberal regimes. In the meantime elites will make their way from Earth into the nearby cosmos to create yet another ‘outer spatial fix’ or to relax from their endeavours in one of Richard Branson’s spaceships. 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. Similar questions need asking now. Why is space travel happening? Who is benefiting? Whose problems is it solving? As things stand it is the already powerful who stand to gain most. Shareholders investing in the militaryindustrial- space-complex remain largely content. Investors in companies extracting resources from the asteroids, the Moon and Mars will presumably be happy in the longer-term. But empire-making has always been a highly questionable process and the case for a future galactic imperialism has not been convincingly made. The arguments for stopping the humanization of outer space completely and focussing back on the relationships and crises on Planet Earth are becoming far more compelling.

Link—Generic

Outer space is the new ‘outside’ that will allow for the expansion of capitalism.

Peter Dickens, Affiliated Lecturer in the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Politics, Psychology, Sociology and International Studies, Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex , University of Cambridge 5-15-2009, “The cosmos as capitalism's outside”, published in “The Sociological Review” Volume 57, Issue Supplement s1, pages 66–82

Can capitalism go on expanding forever? It is a question many people have asked for many years. It is also a relevant question when considering the prospect of capitalism's potentially infinite expansion into the cosmos. In the early decades of the 20th century, Rosa Luxemburg suggested that capitalism always needs an ‘outside’, a zone of non-capitalism in which people would buy goods made in capitalist societies (Luxemburg, 2004). To continue expanding, capitalism needs to continue placing a large part of its surplus into the means of production, machines and technology. Imperialism, according to Luxemburg, is the competitive struggle between capitalist nations for what remains of the non-capitalist ‘outside’. And yet, Luxemburg also argued, there is a fundamental contradiction, one ultimately leading to capitalism's collapse. As it increasingly draws its ‘outside’ into itself, capitalism also destroys the very demand it needs for its products. The surplus value produced by capitalism simply cannot be absorbed. This is not the place to assess in detail Luxemburg's arguments or the debates she has generated. Suffice to note that many Marxists now argue that, while crises of underconsumption are important, crises stemming from over-accumulation of capital and the need for ‘outside’ regions in which to invest are even more significant as regards the further expansion of capitalism (Brewer, 1990; Harvey, 2003). Luxemburg was nevertheless the first attempt explicitly to raise the question of how capitalism relates to a non-capitalist ‘outside’ and whether capitalism can, in principle, last forever as it colonizes its outside. The question of capitalism's ‘outside’ is now being asked again, albeit in a rather different form. Hardt and Negri, in their influential text Empire, tell us that ‘there is no more outside.’ They state that ‘in the passage from modern to postmodern, from Imperialism to Empire, there is progressively less distinction between inside and outside’ (2000: 187). They make this case in relation to the economy, politics and militarism in today's form of globalization. As regards economics, Hardt and Negri admit that the capitalist market has always run counter to any division between ‘inside’ and ‘outside’. It has been constantly expanded globally and yet has encountered barriers. But at the same time it has also thrived on overcoming such barriers, reorganizing itself to overcome these limits. But now the global market is so dominant that it is even more difficult to envisage a distinction between an ‘inside’ and an ‘outside’ market waiting to be subjugated, made part of the capitalist market and in due course reorganized as a site of capitalist production. There is no ‘outside’ left and capital is reduced to re-engaging in a form of ‘primitive accumulation’; privatizing publicly-owned assets, making them into commodities to be bought and sold. As regards politics, Hardt and Negri argue that sovereignty has in the past invariably been conceived in terms of territory and its relation to an ‘outside’. The Enlightenment ideal is one in which civil order and sovereignty are established within an inside region, while ‘social disorder’ and ‘nature’ are an outside still to be controlled and exploited. Such, according to Hardt and Negri, is the old model of empire, one in which there was a radical distinction between an imperializing inside and a dominated outside. But the old model has now gone, there being no ‘outside’ left in our globalized society and with opposition in its many forms as likely to be within the nation states it is opposing. In military terms too there is no longer, according to Hardt and Negri, any distinction to be made between inside and outside. The ‘enemy’ is as likely to be ‘within’ a nation state as located in an outside, hostile, region or an outside state. ‘The history of imperialist, inter-imperialist and anti-imperialist wars’, Hardt and Negri assert, ‘is over.’ (2000: 189). This makes every war into an internal, domestic or civil strife. ‘In the smooth space of Empire, there is no place of power – it is both everywhere and nowhere.’ (2000: 190). At the same time, and as part of this incorporation of warfare into nation states, militarization has been made permanently integral to the whole of economic, social and political life. Hardt and Negri go on to argue that resistance to capitalism is everywhere and nowhere. A ‘multitude’ is emerging within the new ‘smooth space of Empire’, one capable of overturning the social system of which it is part (Hardt and Negri, 2006). 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.

Link—Generic

The expansion of US sovereignty into space reinforces the US as the state of global capitalism.

Raymond Duvall and Jonathan Havercroft; Duvall: Professor of political science @ University of Minnesota, PhD from Northwestern University; Havercroft: works in Department of political science @ University of Oklahoma, PhD in political science from University of Minnesota; October, 2006, “Taking Sovereignty Out of this World: Space Weapons and Empire of the Future”, <http://www.ligi.ubc.ca/sites/liu/files/Publications/Havercroft_paper.pdf>

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.

Capitalism requires an ‘outside’ to survive. This necessity for expansion will ensure the commodification of space.

Will Wlizlo, writer for UTNE Magazine, 11-12-2010, “Space – The Final Bourgeois Frontier”, <http://www.utne.com/Science-Technology/Capitalist-Expansion-Into-Space.aspx#ixzz1PrbcMpOP>

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. What lies beyond the cosmos? And where can we go when we’ve stripped the universe of its resources? Any science-fiction fan could answer that. When the galaxies are barren, we’ll set our sights on the untapped riches of alternate universes and time-travel to pilfer past and future energy sources. There is always an outside.

Link—Exploration

Space exploration imposes terrestrial norms on space, spreading and strengthening capitalism as humans attempt to impose order and structure.

Timothy L. Hubbard. Department of Psychology, Texas Christian University. 2008. Avances en Psicologia Latinoamericana. http://redalyc.uaemex.mx/pdf/799/79926105.pdf

In his Prolegomenon to Any Future Metaphysics, the 18th century philosopher Immanuel Kant (1783; trans. in Campbell, 1986, p. 27) asked “How is it that in this space, here, we can make judgments that we know with apodictic certainty will be valid in space, there." In the centuries since Kant, scientifi c understanding of the universe has greatly increased, and many fi ndings and theories suggest that the sa- me physical and chemical laws operate across the breadth of the observable universe. Kant’s analysis suggested to him that the laws of space are known to the mind because those laws are actually of the mind, and so knowledge of space re. ects an a priori knowledge (i.e., a knowledge prior to experience and thus possibly innate to the organism). Such an a priori knowledge could be construed to be a part of human nature. Therefore, by considering humanity’s views of a distant “there" which is as yet not experienced, we might glean some insight into human nature “here," that is, by considering our views of the objects and events of the celestial realm, we might deepen our understanding of hu- man nature. Seeing patterns and meaning in the sky Even the most casual and . fleeting examination of the night sky reveals countless objects, but such objects are not seen as meaningless stimuli, nor are the stars, planets, and other celestial objects generally perceived to be randomly placed. Ra- ther, human observers see patterns in the positions and movements of objects within the sky, and such observers impose meaning on the forms and patterns they perceive within the sky. These forms and patterns unfold in a single instant (e.g., cons- tellations) as well as across time (e.g., phases of the moon). The celestial realm serves as a source of information regarding time (e.g., seasons) and space (e.g., navigation) on Earth, and also provides a potent source of metaphor. Although objects and events in the celestial realm have been at least par- tially demythologized by developments in science, throughout much of human history a perceived co- nnection of a person to some celestial element or a perceived passage of a person through the celestial realm were considered meaningful experiences that imbued that person with great power. Structuring the sky Every known human culture has developed grou- pings of stars into constellations that re. ect familiar individuals, objects, and shapes. The constella- tions of contemporary Western culture are based on groupings of stars made by Greek and Roman sources over two thousand years ago, but the cons- tellations of Western culture are by no means the only way of structuring the night sky. For example, the belt of the Greek constellation of Orion forms the “turtle" constellation in Mayan astronomy, and the belt and lower portion of Orion form the “hand" constellation in Lakota astronomy. In most cases, the assignment of a given identity to a given grou-ping of stars by a given culture re. ects individuals or objects of that culture. Just as Greek and Roman constellations re. ect fi gures in Greek and Roman mythology, the European names of constellations in the sky over the southern hemisphere re. ect common objects from the Age of Exploration du- ring which those constellations were fi rst viewed by Europeans. The tendency of humans to impose order and structure on the celestial realm reflects a more general tendency of humans to order and structure their environment (e.g., Kubovy & Po- merantz, 1981; Lockhead & Pomerantz, 1991). Thus, structuring of the stars in the night sky into constellations may re. ect a basic part of our hu- man nature.

Link—Exploration

The process of exploration reinforces state power—the affirmative fails to recognize the historically capitalist structures that drive space exploration.

Timothy L. Hubbard. Department of Psychology, Texas Christian University. 2008. Avances en Psicologia Latinoamericana. http://redalyc.uaemex.mx/pdf/799/79926105.pdf

Even though changes in the confi gurations or appea- rances of elements in the celestial realm provided ca- lendrical or other information that helped frame and structure life in many human cultures, the Earth and sky were often viewed as separate, and the celestial realm was generally considered beyond the reach of typical earthbound humans. One exception to the general separation of Earth and sky involved the possibility that angels, extraterrestrials, or other beings from the celestial realm could journey to Earth. A second exception to the general separa- tion of Earth and sky involved the possibility of a journey to the celestial realm by those few humans who received special training or assistance (e.g., in Hebrew mythology, Ezekiel and Enoch). Numerous legends of shamans and priests spoke of bridges between the stars and Earth, and individuals who during their life on Earth could cross such bridges and journey to the celestial realm and then return to Earth were viewed as able to draw on sources of great power and knowledge. Indeed, “skywalking" or “journeying the sky" remains a potent source of power in shamanic cultures. Unless the possibility of an actual physical journey to the celestial realms is acknowledged, the experiences during such an alleged journey would re. ect the nature of the per- son who experienced the journey rather than the nature of the actual elements of the sky. The importance of “journeying the sky" may also be found in a more literal sense in contempo- rary scientifi c culture. During the Cold War of the 1960s, the United States sought to demonstrate the superiority of its democratic and capitalist go- vernment over the form of government of Commu- nist countries, and one of the prime demonstrations was the Apollo program in which the United States landed astronauts on the moon and then safely re- turned those astronauts to Earth. The astronauts of the Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo programs were revered as cultural heroes, and the “space race" bet- ween the United States and the Soviet Union was a contest not only for dominion of the sky, but for dominion of the political landscape of the Earth. In this case, journeying the sky was a literal physical voyage potent with political meaning. Similarly, the docking of American and Soviet spacecraft in the Apollo-Soyuz mission, the presence of internatio- nal crews on the Soviet Mir station and American shuttle, and the construction of an international space station can be seen as political symbols. In ancient shamanic practices and in contemporary politics, the sky is conceived to be a realm of power, and by visiting the sky, both shaman and statesman gain in power and in stature. Only the vehicle of the metaphor has changed, the basic nature of the human who undertakes the voyage has not: in both ancient and contemporary cultures, one who jour- neys the sky becomes powerful.

Link—Exploration

Expansion into space is driven by capitalist motivations of profit and economic advantage.

Alan Marshall, worked at the Institute of Development Studies at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand, February 1995, “Development and Imperialism in Space” in Space Policy Journal Volume 11, Issue 1, pgs. 41-52

While the cost of extracting Solar System resources may be prohibitively high to enable profitability, the astronautics industry itself is extremely profitable because of its link with the supply of military hardware. This may be viewed as an example of Rosa Luxemburg’s model of the association of militarism with imperialism.6 According to this model of economic imperialism, military expenditure plays a part in substituting for the lack of consumption in a free market since it absorbs much surplus capital and acts to produce economic growth as registered in the national accounts. Of course, national accounting systems, such as Gross Domestic Product, fail to register the opportunity cost of state-funded investment; ie whether the same government investment could have yielded a greater return in other sectors. With the end of the Cold War, those companies that made a living from the supply of military hardware to governments have experienced a drop in demand for their military goods and an associated drop in profitability. Thus they are seeking to extend their interests in the space part of their markets in order to secure profits from building rockets and space stations rather than missiles and military aircraft. The same companies that championed the causes of national defence against the communist threat through massive military deterence now extol the virtues of the benefits to be gained from massive investment in space activities.’ In the light of this analysis, it can be explained that the search for new fields into which surplus capital can be invested, may in fact be promoting human space expansion (despite the dubiety of it ever becoming a self-funding process). But its lack of success as a singly powerful enough motivator of Solar System development is shown by the torpidity of current human expanionist practices into space. Another model of imperialism worthy of attention with regard to outer space development is that originally put forward by Hobson.\* The Hobsonian thesis basically states that imperialism is the manifestation of the search for new markets. Within the historical period with which Hobson himself was dealing (the Victorian era) this search was undertaken by the state on behalf of, and for the benefit of, the bourgeois classes. Geopolitical imperialism was merely a way of ensuring the continued economic expansion of the nation state. In many situations, however, geopolitical expansion, was not regarded as important as capitalist penetration into foreign markets, which may or may not have required direct political control. In space, the search for new markets as a predictive model of imperialism will only find relevance on the very long timescale involving the settling of extraterrestrial bodies and the growth of these as colonial societies. As there are no commercial reasons for colonizing the planets (given the lack of resources and the impossibility of drawing an economic surplus) a model of expansionist development in the Solar System based upon the search for new markets is not an adequate predictive model. It is evident that no government administration is likely to advocate the settling of other planets in the hope that they will one day give rise to a lucrative market for the home nations goods. It is often implicitly accepted within the astronautics community that space ventures beyond Earth orbit are not of a commercially viable nature, but that there are secondary benefits to be realized from a strong expansionist space programme that justify its pursuit - benefits that will supposedly spin-off to contribute to a nation’s wealth. For instance, the US Office of Technology Assessment, in identifying rationales for the human exploration of the Moon and Mars, declared that human exploration of the planets would spark interest in science, education and technology within American society and that it could improve US economic competitiveness.” This is a view espoused by many Aerospace companies through their advertising. However, the OTA’s publication goes on to say: ‘It is not clear that investment in the technologies which must be supported primarily from public funds, would necessarily contribute to the US’s competitive position in advanced markets’. The vagaries of such economic spin-offs certainly point to the fact that astronautics companies must continually grasp at economic straws when justifying Solar System space development. Most space advocates in the USA would claim that a national space policy aimed at setting up permanent lunar settlements or Martian bases would reestablish America’s technological and engineering excellence and that this would afford the nation with considerable economic advantage in the global market place. However, it is doubtful that many of the world’s consumers are going to select to buy an American good just because it was developed in a nation technologically proficient in putting humans on Mars when they could buy a cheaper alternative from an East Asian nation. The commercial and economic inviability of extraterrestrial resource use dictates that space programmes have to be justified upon secondary benefits, in the realms of science, technology and education spin-offs. To justify outer space development on purely secondary benefits points to the realization that more than economic interests lie at the heart of development in space. Other motives for space development must be operating and other models of imperialism in space must be employed in explaining them.

Link—Exploration

Space exploration is bound to be governed by capitalist economic motivations.

Alan Marshall, worked at the Institute of Development Studies at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand, February 1995, “Development and Imperialism in Space” in Space Policy Journal Volume 11, Issue 1, pgs. 41-52

However, if there are economically valuable resources beyond Earth orbit, and this is an ‘if’ of celestial proportions, then space expansionism may be unstoppable. What will be the nature of such development? Given that space expansion is only ever likely to proceed due to economic forces, space development must thereby operate by economic principles, which themselves are regulated by political regimes. Currently the political regimes in place (notably the Outer Space Treaty) dictate that solar system development will be undertaken in an imperialistic manner. Space advocates are not necessarily malevolently predisposed towards the welfare of the world’s poor, but to hold to the view that extraterrestrial resource utilization is capable of positively contributing the global community with the Outer Space Treaty intact is to bask in a vat of optimism so large as to be unsupportable.

Link—Exploration

Space exploration is linked to capitalist and militaristic motivations, as history proves.

Dr. John Parrington, PhD from the University of London, 1999, “Dark Side of the Moon” <http://pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/sr232/parrington.htm>

No one likes being deceived. One of the distressing features of coming to terms with the reality of capitalist society is learning that events which inspired us as children were based on quite different motives than we perceived at the time. Thirty years ago this month, on 20 July 1969, a human being stood on the surface of the moon for the very first time. I cannot have been the only child who truly believed Neil Armstrong when he stepped out from the lunar lander and uttered those famous words, 'One small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.' The drive to discover and explore the natural world is surely one of humanity's endearing attributes. Who but a total cynic could not be moved by the beauty of our solar system as it has unfolded over the past few decades? Whether it is the awesome volcanoes and canyons of Mars, the boiling hell of Venus, the aquamarine beauty of the blue gas giant Uranus or its strange, scrambled moon, Miranda, it is hard to know whether to class these images as science or art. Yet space exploration has been inextricably bound up with another rather more sinister tendency the drive within capitalism towards war. The pioneering efforts in rocketry of characters like the American Robert H Goddard were largely ignored or ridiculed by the establishment. What helped to change this attitude was the very practical wartime demonstration, by the German V-2 missile, that rockets could be powerful weapons of mass destruction. After the war everyone wanted to be friends with the V-2's architect, Wernher von Braun. The fact that the missiles had left 2,770 Britons dead and 21,000 wounded made any advances that the British government would have liked to have made towards von Braun and his team a little awkward. In any case, the US had the money, and for the next 20 years von Braun was at the centre of the US space effort. He designed the Saturn V rocket which carried the astronauts to the moon. The link between space exploration and military aims did not disappear after the war. In one of the first interviews given in the US in 1945, von Braun envisaged an orbiting rocket, a primary task of which would be the observation of 'troop movements' on the earth below. In 1946 a highly confidential US government report drew attention to the 'great military value, of satellites. It also suggested that this potential be deliberately underplayed, the emphasis being put instead on the peaceful uses of this 'remarkable technological advance'. At the height of the Cold War the announcement, in 1954, of plans for an International Geophysics Year seemed heaven sent. Every country in the world was invited to try its hand at launching a research satellite during 1957-58. What a perfect cover! In 1955 President Eisenhower approved the secret plans for the first US spy satellite. It seemed certain that the US would be making all the running in the race into space. What no one expected was that the Russians might get there first. The successful launch of the Russian Sputnik satellite on 4 October 1957 sent a tremor through the US establishment. The Russians were supposed to be a race of backward farmers, whose country's technology was being stretched to the limit just keeping their tractors running. And yet here they were launching a 183 pound satellite into space, while the US was still struggling to get a five pound one off the ground. Democrat Lyndon B Johnson was one US politician willing to provide a voice for the hysteria which swept the US caused by the launch of Sputnik. Johnson talked of how the sky above his Texas ranch was now full of ominous question marks: 'I don't want to go to sleep by a Communist moon.' In the midst of his tirades Johnson let slip the real reasons behind the space race: 'If, out in space, there is the ultimate position--from which total control of the earth may be exercised--then our national goal... must be to win and hold that position.'

Link—Development

Development of space will inevitably be both capitalist and imperialist. It will also result in the subjugation of non-space capable nations.

Alan Marshall, worked at the Institute of Development Studies at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand, February 1995, “Development and Imperialism in Space” in Space Policy Journal Volume 11, Issue 1, pgs. 41-52

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. The highly technological nature of satellite launching and operations not only means that poorer nations have less access to the benefits of satellite technology, but also that they are unlikely to initiate their own independent satellite operations. Even when they do, they come up against the rules and practices of space operations as governed by the world’s dominant nations, which are often inimical to Third World space development.

Link—Development

Space development is motivated by the capitalist desires for exploitation.

Alan Marshall, worked at the Institute of Development Studies at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand, February 1995, “Development and Imperialism in Space” in Space Policy Journal Volume 11, Issue 1, pgs. 41-52

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. 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—Development

Space development enables the expansion of capitalism into outer space.

Peter Dickens, Affiliated Lecturer in the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Politics, Psychology, Sociology and International Studies, Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex , University of Cambridge 5-15-2009, “The cosmos as capitalism's outside”, published in “The Sociological Review” Volume 57, Issue Supplement s1, pages 66–82

Imperialism on earth and outer space should be seen within the above context of an ever-expanding capitalism, economic-cum-social-cum-resource crises and new wars. Space tourism and the search for new materials are indicators of how capitalism and imperialism are now developing in outer space. But imperialism involves more than the expansion of an economic structure. It entails a competitive struggle between capitalist states. This involves the constant upgrading of technologies and social relations and continuing conflict over ownership of territory and resources. These processes necessarily involve the political power of competing nation states. If we are adequately to understand the tensions and conflicts arising from imperialisms on Earth and in outer space, the notion of ‘spatial fixes’ therefore needs combining with an understanding of capitalist states (or in some cases, such as the European Union, a fusion of states) and their relationships with different social interests. This is one way in which Harvey's analysis can be taken forward. Harvey's book Limits to Capital certainly concludes with a discussion of inter-imperialist rivalry and outright war as the most sinister means imaginable of destroying one set of spatial fixes prior to reinvestment in new fixes. And there are a number of allusions to competing capitalist states in his The New Imperialism (2003). The emphasis of Harvey's work is nevertheless on the purely economic and global level, when politically and culturally-orchestrated growth poles and regional coalitions are integral to processes of capital-accumulation and continuing social crises threaten to disrupt movements of capital within and between the three circuits. To use a phrase in Jessop's critique of Harvey, there is ‘an inescapable political dimension to the historical materialist critique of capitalism’ (2006: 162). We now further pursue this political dimension, and specifically its ‘inter-imperialist rivalries’.

Link—NASA

NASA is embracing capitalism, especially after recent changes.

Peter Diamandis, Chairman and CEO of the X-Prize Foundation, 2-1-2010, “NASA Embraces American Capitalism and Entrepreneurship”, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/peter-diamandis/nasa-embraces-american-ca\_b\_444673.html

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.

Link—Human Missions

Human missions into space, particularly space tourism, facilitate the expansion of capitalism into space.

Peter Dickens, Affiliated Lecturer in the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Politics, Psychology, Sociology and International Studies, Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex , University of Cambridge 5-15-2009, “The cosmos as capitalism's outside”, published in “The Sociological Review” Volume 57, Issue Supplement s1, pages 66–82

Perhaps the most obvious current switches of capital into outer space projects are those associated with the burgeoning space tourism industry. This is one of the most wasteful forms of conspicuous consumption imaginable though it does indicate how outer space might in due course be made the site of new production-processes. The idea of putting hotels in space was first mentioned by Barron Hilton, president of Hilton Hotels, as long ago as 1967 (Spencer and Rugg, 2004: 160). In addressing the American Astronautical Society, he assured them that ‘when space scientists make it physically feasible to establish hotels in space, the hotel industry will meet the challenge’ (Billings, 2006: 162). Designs for hotels incorporate large viewing windows and, in an extended weightless stay, the space tourism visionaries can imagine even more fantastic leisure pursuits and games to be enjoyed in zero gravity. Ashford (2002) elaborates two of these ideas as he describes how orbital hotels will allow tourists to fly with wings and play in cylindrical zero-gravity swimming pools. In similar vein, Collins et al. (2000) have produced a design for an orbital sports stadium. These fantastic orbital hotels sound like something of the distant future, but again research and design work is already well under way. Bob Bigelow, the leading contender, is spending $500 million on a space hotel and has already built working 1:3 scale models. He is now planning a cruise ship designed to ferry tourists the moon. Some of these visions are now coming to pass as a result of switches in Harvey's ‘secondary circuit.’ Richard Branson is currently switching capital from his other Virgin enterprises to set up the Virgin Galactic space tourism company. PayPal founder Elon Musk and Amazon.com entrepreneur Jeff Bezos have also drawn surplus capital from their other investments and ploughed it into developing the infrastructure and vehicles for space tourism.

Link—Science

The pursuit of science is an attempt by elites to justify the social and economic abuses of capitalism

Peter Dickens. Universities of Brighton and Essex. 15 May 2009. The Sociological Review. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01817.x/full

If regional coalitions of political, industrial and financial elites are responsible for promoting (via taxation and public spending) ‘successful’ circuits of capital, they are also responsible for legitimating the social and economic system they are supporting. How can massive public expenditures be couched in ways other than handouts to the shareholders of Boeing, EADS and the other major corporations outlined in Table 1? How can these shareholders’ investments be seen as other than profiting from the labour of workers in Lockheed Martin, Boeing and the like? As Marx pointed out in his early writings, capitalism survives because elites and capitalist states couch their practices in terms of general, universal values rather than the competing values of factional and warring interests (Marx, 1975) To varying extents all the regional rivals above, and the industrial elites with which they are associated, engage in a range of universalizing practices. First, there is considerable emphasis on the ‘pure’, universal, scientific knowledge to be supposedly gained by outer space exploration. It is argued, for example, that NASA’s $300 million Dawn Project will ‘characterize the conditions and processes of the solar system’s earliest epoch by investigating in detail two of the largest protoplanets remaining intact since their formations.’ (NASA, 2007). (A similar rationale pervades the private space tourism industry, Space Adventurers assuring their wealthy clients that they will be able to conduct ‘scientific experiments’, thereby benefitting others besides themselves). Science is also used by NASA as a means of capturing the public imagination. The latest dramatic pictures of asteroids, the Moon and Mars are readily available on the NASA website.

Link—Science

The desire to ‘explore’ and the desire for ‘scientific discoveries’ disguise our true capitalist motivation to go into outer space.

Alan Marshall, worked at the Institute of Development Studies at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand, February 1995, “Development and Imperialism in Space” in Space Policy Journal Volume 11, Issue 1, pgs. 41-52

In the fifth chapter of his book, Modes of Imperialism, Charles Reynolds speaks of sociobiological models of imperialism.13 With regard to space development, the expansion of humans into space can be viewed by the sociobiological model, as just another natural progression of an advanced organism extending its ecological range. Or as Grey14 states ‘expansion into space is the next logical extension of our past movements on land, over seas and into the atmosphere of our home planet. And as with all growing organisms this expansion is inevitable’. From this perspective, imperialism is just the manifestation of naturally selected behavior present in humans as in other living beings. Humans moving into space to colonize other planets is essentially the same phenomenon as a coconut falling into an ocean to be transported to a new island or continent on which it shall germinate and instigate colonization. This ‘coconut hypothesis’ evades the central point that extraterrestrial expansion by humans is a social phenomenon and not a biological one. The forces that induce a coconut tree to disperse it’s seeds are quite different to the forces involved in outer space development. A coconut tree acts according to genetically and ecologically prescribed rules which have been arrived at through millions of years of evolution. A nation, or a corporation, are social entities that act according to social, economic and political forces arrived at through the course of social, economic and political history (a process quite different to biological evolution). The coconut hypothesis argues that the expansion of humanity into space is a natural phenomenon, just as it is natural for a coconut to colonize a new land mass. However, a human embryo does not happen to fall into space and begin to colonize another planet. Biological models of human space extension are favorite theories within the space advocacy community since they bypass the need to do social analyses with naturalistic interpretations of imperialism.‘” Sociopsychological models of imperialism attempt to explain imperialistic endeavours by concentrating on the sociopsychological characteristic within an individual or a society that compel it to pursue an expansionist agenda. A common example with reference to space activities is that humans are naturally curious and ‘have a fundamental desire to explore the unknown’.i6 One of the manifestations of the sociopsychological model is the justification of space activities for the benefits it offers for scientific advance. Throughout much of the history of western science such scientific imperialism has been associated with the European expansion into other parts of the world, involving the desire to categorize nature and render its secrets knowable. However, the search for scientific understanding has not been a prime force behind expansionist development by itself, although, from Joseph Banks to Harrison Schmidt, its presence close behind imperialistic endeavours motivated by other rationales is demonstrable. Because the basis of human survival and prosperity is essentially a function of economic welfare it is arguable that the ‘desire to explore’ is not an inherently prime concern for most individuals (except those whose economic wellbeing depends on it). Given this, and given the fact that curiosity about the unknown is a variable trait between different individuals and societies (to the point that some individuals and some societies are unable to comprehend what all the fuss is about with regards to space exploration) the ‘desire to explore’ rationale can also not be considered a prime motivator of outer space development. It is doubtful that many political figures in history have decided on expansionist policies to satiate their own curiosity or that of their subjects. Having said this, though, it is possible that expansionist endeavours in the Solar System based on other rationales (such as the need to find an outlet for surplus capital or the search for new resources) might occur under the cover of sociopsychological ‘desire to explore’ reasons. This is evident in Antarctica, where geopolitical and geostrategic imperialist policies are pursued by a number of nations in the guise of scientific exploration.

Link—SPS

Focusing on supplying global energy ignores and justifies the inherent inequality of resource distribution of capitalism

Peter Dickens. Universities of Brighton and Essex. 15 May 2009. The Sociological Review. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01817.x/full

Second, there is considerable stress on the benefits of outer spatial fixes to the global environment and to the world population. The European Space Agency, for example, emphasizes the ‘multi-scale monitoring’ of ecological conditions in the context of ‘the challenge to the planetary environment.’ This aspect of space-humanization also includes the proposed collection of solar energy for use by a globe fast running out of resources (ESA, 2000). Rather than developing countries receiving a share of the economic benefits of space exploitation as proposed in the UN Moon Agreement, these kinds of environment- saving projects supported by the UN Programme on Space Applications, were considered sufficient. The massive military investments benefiting the large military corporations as shown in Table 1 are meanwhile also couched in universalizing, non-military, ‘defence’ terms. And, by the same token, arms lobbyists have recently been recommended by the European Space Agency to use ‘civil society language’. ‘Protecting civil society and the freedom of citizens’ is deemed a better alternative to ‘macho ads with missiles and fighter planes’ (Slijper, 2005: 78).

Link—Satellites

Satellites and space mining manifest the expansion of capitalism into outer space.

Peter Dickens, Affiliated Lecturer in the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Politics, Psychology, Sociology and International Studies, Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex , University of Cambridge, November 2010, “The Humanization of the Cosmos: To What End?” <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end>

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.8 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 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. Military power will inevitably be made an integral part of this process, governments protecting the zones for which they are responsible. 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.”

Link—Space Weaponization

Space weaponization establishes the US as the space-controlling state and the sovereign power of the capitalist global structure. It reduces other states to empty shells of sovereignty and reduces their citizens to a state of bare life.

Raymond Duvall and Jonathan Havercroft; Duvall: Professor of political science @ University of Minnesota, PhD from Northwestern University; Havercroft: works in Department of political science @ University of Oklahoma, PhD in political science from University of Minnesota; October, 2006, “Taking Sovereignty Out of this World: Space Weapons and Empire of the Future”, <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!

Link—Mining

Further exploration into space is done in an effort to discover valuable materials for exploitation by the capitalist state.

Alan Marshall, worked at the Institute of Development Studies at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand, February 1995, “Development and Imperialism in Space” in Space Policy Journal Volume 11, Issue 1, pgs. 41-52

In the light of this, we must admit that the idea that space development is bound to occur due to the search for new raw materials is erroneous. Because there are no raw materials in the Solar System capable of supporting profit-making enterprises, economic development into outer space based upon the search for resources is extremely doubtful. We must be aware, however, of the existence of a pervasive concept in resource economics which critics of the above analysis might be quick to point out. The conception of what constitutes a ‘resource’ is somewhat dynamic due to changes in technology, demand and information. This is to say that while no commercially viable resources appear to exist in the solar system that warrant expansionist space ventures yet, it is possible that at some date in the future advances in technology, scientific knowledge or changes in relative demand or scarcity will make a valuable resource out of extraterrestrial materials that previously had no economic value.3 If we follow the perspectives of economic imperialism as theorized by Baran and Lenin,4 we have the view that imperialistic expansion is the political and military manifestation of the search by nations for economic surplus. Economic surplus is defined by Baran as the difference between a nation’s output and its consumption.’ Given the impossibility of a nation milking an economic surplus from the trading of extraterrestrial resources, any search for an economic surplus through the medium of space activities must lie in another direction. Allied to the Leninist and Baranesque view of imperialism is that of other Marxist theorists, such as Bukharin, Hilferding and Luxemburg, who perceive imperialist expansion as the continual search by capitalist entities (nations, individual investors and multi-national companies, etc.) to invest surplus capital into profitable fields. This may be made increasingly difficult due to the saturation of the original market and due to diminishing marginal returns.

Link—Mining

Resource exploitation in outer space guarantees the infinite continuation of capitalism.

Peter Dickens, Affiliated Lecturer in the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Politics, Psychology, Sociology and International Studies, Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex , University of Cambridge 5-15-2009, “The cosmos as capitalism's outside”, published in “The Sociological Review” Volume 57, Issue Supplement s1, pages 66–82

The resources to be incorporated within future circuits of capital will take a range of forms. As regards the secondary circuit, capital is now starting to flow into forms of outer space activity other than tourism. For example, Declan O'Donnell and his United Societies in Space (an organisation of space lawyers) have attempted to establish an International Space Development Authority corporation (ISDAC) similar in function to the World Bank. This would operate as a space bank for investment in a future space colonization programme. Loans would be made to developing countries, assisting them to invest in outer space. On a more superficial level, companies such as Pizza Hut have paid (via intermediaries such as Space Marketing Inc.) to put their logos on space rockets. 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—Shuttles

Shuttle missions were a product of capitalism, and they are not possible without capitalist greed.

Martin Parker, University of Leicester School of Management, paper published in the Sociological Review, 5-15-2009, “Capitalists in Space”, <https://lra.le.ac.uk/bitstream/2381/7966/1/6.%20Parker.pdf> pp. 83-97.

It should be clear enough that NASA, for a while, was a very effective way for a whole host of organizations to get secure contracts from the state. The politics of this were clear enough to the participants, as a speech by Werner Von Braun to a banquet for what he called „the leaders and captains of the mainstream of American industry and life‟ the day before Apollo 11 lifted off suggests. „Without your success in building the economic foundations of this nation, the resources for mounting tomorrow‟s expedition to the moon would have never been committed.‟ (in Mailer 1971:73) Norman Mailer‟s beautiful analysis of the contradictions of Apollo, „of the real and true tasty beef of capitalism (…) the grease and guts of it‟ makes the clear point that Apollo would not have been possible without „a capitalist who risks all the moral future of his soul on the gamble that God believes in capitalism and wants each man to enrich himself as part of God‟s design‟ (op cit: 158). For Mailer, the sublime strangeness and mystery of Apollo – the fire on the moon - was only possible because of this combination of scientific rationalism and corporate greed. It was a sacred effort, held together by the most profane of motives. In addition, the high end research and development that Big Defence were being paid to do could also feed into the manufacture and sales of many other products. It was, effectively, an extra „civilian‟ funding stream in addition to the general budget for military hardware. By the late 1960s, as the Vietnam war became more and more expensive, the state gradually shrunk NASAs budget, though this did not damage the profitability of many of the aerospace and defence contractors because they were now selling more jets, bombers and missiles for the killing fields of South-East Asia.

Link—SETI

The aff’s benevolence towards the other only serves to temporarily hide guilt. It makes us complacent – only rejecting capitalism will solve in the long term.

Zizek, Senior Researcher, Institute for Social Studies, Ljubljana, 20**06** “Nobody Has to be Vile,” London Review of Books, Vol. 28 No. 7

**Liberal communists are pragmatic; they hate a doctrinaire approach. There is no exploited working class today, only concrete problems to be solved: starvation in Africa**, the plight of Muslim women, religious fundamentalist violence. **When there is a humanitarian crisis in Africa (liberal communists love a humanitarian crisis; it brings out the best in them), instead of engaging in anti-imperialist rhetoric, we should get together and work out the best way of solving the problem, engage people, governments and business in a common enterprise, start moving things instead of relying on centralised state help, approach the crisis in a creative and unconventional way.** Liberal communists like to point out that the decision of some large international corporations to ignore apartheid rules within their companies was as important as the direct political struggle against apartheid in South Africa. Abolishing segregation within the company, paying blacks and whites the same salary for the same job etc: this was a perfect instance of the overlap between the struggle for political freedom and business interests, since the same companies can now thrive in post-apartheid South Africa. Liberal communists love May 1968. What an explosion of youthful energy and creativity! How it shattered the bureaucratic order! What an impetus it gave to economic and social life after the political illusions dropped away! Those who were old enough were themselves protesting and fighting on the streets: now they have changed in order to change the world, to revolutionise our lives for real. Didn’t Marx say that all political upheavals were unimportant compared to the invention of the steam engine? And would Marx not have said today: what are all the protests against global capitalism in comparison with the internet? Above all**, liberal communists are true citizens of the world – good people who worry.** They worry about populist fundamentalism and irresponsible greedy capitalist corporations. They see the ‘deeper causes’ of today’s problems: mass poverty and hopelessness breed fundamentalist terror. Their goal is not to earn money, but to change the world (and, as a by-product, make even more money). Bill Gates is already the single greatest benefactor in the history of humanity, displaying his love for his neighbours by giving hundreds of millions of dollars for education, the fight against hunger and malaria etc. **The catch is that before you can give all this away you have to take it (or, as the liberal communists would put it, create it). In order to help people, the justification goes, you must have the means to do so, and experience** – that is, recognition of the dismal failure of all centralised statist and collectivist approaches **– teaches us that private enterprise is by far the most effective way.** By regulating their business, taxing them excessively, the state is undermining the official goal of its own activity (to make life better for the majority, to help those in need). Liberal communists do not want to be mere profit-machines: they want their lives to have deeper meaning. They are against old-fashioned religion and for spirituality, for non-confessional meditation (everybody knows that Buddhism foreshadows brain science, that the power of meditation can be measured scientifically). Their motto is social responsibility and gratitude: they are the first to admit that society has been incredibly good to them, allowing them to deploy their talents and amass wealth, so they feel that it is their duty to give something back to society and help people. This beneficence is what makes business success worthwhile. This isn’t an entirely new phenomenon. Remember Andrew Carnegie, who employed a private army to suppress organised labour in his steelworks and then distributed large parts of his wealth for educational, cultural and humanitarian causes, proving that, although a man of steel, he had a heart of gold? In the same way, today’s liberal communists give away with one hand what they grabbed with the other. **There is a chocolate-flavoured laxative available on the shelves of US stores which is publicised with the paradoxical injunction:** Do you have constipation? Eat more of this chocolate! – i.e. **eat more of something that itself causes constipation. The structure of the chocolate laxative can be discerned throughout today’s ideological landscape; it is what makes a figure like Soros so objectionable. He stands for ruthless financial exploitation combined with its counter-agent, humanitarian worry about the catastrophic social consequences of the unbridled market economy. Soros’s daily routine is a lie embodied: half of his working time is devoted to financial speculation, the other half to ‘humanitarian’ activities** (financing cultural and democratic activities in post-Communist countries, writing essays and books) **which work against the effects of his own speculations**. The two faces of Bill Gates are exactly like the two faces of Soros: on the one hand, a cruel businessman, destroying or buying out competitors, aiming at a virtual monopoly; on the other, the great philanthropist who makes a point of saying: ‘What does it serve to have computers if people do not have enough to eat?’ **According to liberal communist ethics, the ruthless pursuit of profit is counteracted by charity: charity is part of the game, a humanitarian mask hiding the underlying economic exploitation. Developed countries are constantly ‘helping’ undeveloped ones (with aid, credits etc), and so avoiding the key issue: their complicity in and responsibility for the miserable situation of the Third World**. As for the opposition between ‘smart’ and ‘non-smart’, outsourcing is the key notion. You export the (necessary) dark side of production – disciplined, hierarchical labour, ecological pollution – to ‘non-smart’ Third World locations (or invisible ones in the First World). The ultimate liberal communist dream is to export the entire working class to invisible Third World sweat shops.

Link—Property Rights

Establishing property rights in outer space is one of the truest forms of capitalism.

Jonathan F. Galloway, works in Department of Politics @ Lake Forest College, 2004, “Game theory and the law and policy of outer space”, published in Space Policy Journal (20) pgs. 87-90

Given the history of the Space Age, we can expect more and more commercial competition. At the beginning there were very few commercial competitors and they were heavily subsidized and regulated by governments. Now there are many more and many government ventures have been partly or wholly privatized. In US law, there has been a push towards privatization since the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 and more recently with the 1998 Commercial Space Act.31 Even international organizations—e.g. Intelsat and Inmarsat have been privatized.32 But for true capitalism to occur in outer space, there must not only be privatization on earth but property rights in space. ‘‘However, in common law countries such as the United States, legal theory dictates that the government must have sovereignty over territory before it can confer title on its citizens.’’33 Thus there can be no real property rights in outer space because of Article II of the Outer Space Treaty. On the other hand, Wayne White contends that ‘‘jurisdictional authority under the Outer Space Treaty provides most of the protections traditionally associated with property rights.’’34 And James E. Dunstan argues that ‘‘customary international law, consistent with the Outer Space Treaty, has come to develop a regime for property use that is compatible with private investment.’’35 The evidence he uses to support this thesis is the practice of states owning moon rocks, controlling frequency spectrum and orbital slots, doing business on Mir, and providing for property rights on the International Space Station. Dunstan argues that real property rights are not necessary because their functional equivalent already exists. This is related to the argument Sterns and Tennen make when they say, ‘‘The corpus juris spatialis, and the Outer Space Treaty in particular, contain several provisions which recognize and promote the role of private entities in space.’’36 Sterns and Tennen make clear that ‘‘claims of fee simple ownership of space property are unnecessary and ineffective to protect private interests from interference.’’ What exists to protect space commerce are national licensing regimes which are compatible with Articles VI and IX of the Outer Space Treaty.

Link—International Law

International human rights regimes are designed to smooth the political terrain for the forces of economic globalization

Tony **Evans**, “Citizenship and Human Rights in the Age of Globalization,” ALTERNATIVES: SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION & HUMANE GOVERNANCE v. 25 n. 4, October/December 20**00**, pp. 415-436.

Underpinning the move to a global economy is an ideology of modernity, which rests upon the twin goals of economic growth and development, defined as increasing global capital accumulation and consumption. The central means of achieving these goals in all countries, whether the wealthy North or the impoverished South, is strategic planning at the global level, global management, and the creation of global regimes and agreements. Ideological convergence has the effect of homogenizing and limiting the policy choices of governments. The global human-rights regime provides the quintessential values on which this program of convergence and homogenization is built. Global management requires adherence to rules that ensure all countries conform to the development model so that the "hidden hand" of the market can operate efficiently. Consequently, responsibility for defining and implementing the rules governing the international economy shift away from the state toward international institutions. Where in the past the state could hope to adopt national strategies for ordering the national economy--including perhaps the nationalization of key industries--the global organization of production and finance means that the state no longer initiates policy; rather, it reacts to global economic decision-making forces against which it can mount little resistance. The WTO speeches of President Clinton and Prime Minister Blair cited earlier seem to confirm this.

International neoliberal political rights are a vehicle for the denial of economic and political rights and a resource grab by the first world

Tony **Evans**, “Citizenship and Human Rights in the Age of Globalization,” ALTERNATIVES: SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION & HUMANE GOVERNANCE v. 25 n. 4, October/December 20**00**, pp. 415-436.

Although the neoliberal consensus accepts the universality and unity of all internationally agreed human rights in formal and legal terms, the political practice of promoting civil and political rights to the exclusion of economic and social rights has a long history within the modern human-rights regime. We have only to recall that the decision to draft a nonbinding Universal Declaration of Human Rights, rather than a single, legally binding covenant, was itself a consequence of disagreements between Western countries who sought to prioritize civil and political rights and Socialist and less-developed countries who favored economic, social, and cultural rights.[21] With the collapse of the Cold War and the increasing pace of globalization, the role of universal human rights seems to have taken a new turn in world politics. Instead of fulfilling its intention of offering protection to the weak and the vulnerable, neoliberal interests have co-opted the idea of human rights as a justification for grabbing "even more of the world's (and their own nations') resources than they previously had" and to "steal back the concessions to social democracy that were forced out of them at the end of the Second World War."[22]

Link—Tourism

Tourism is dual use—it enables increased surveillance in the interest of knowing and controlling the consumer.

Peter Dickens. Universities of Brighton and Essex. 15 May 2009. The Sociological Review. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01817.x/full

Yet there are now also signs that the technology and expertise gained in the relatively benign space tourism industry are possibly being adopted for more sinister purposes. Northrop-Grumman, a leading US defence manufacturer, has recently bought outright Scaled Composites. The latter company has pioneered the use of lightweight materials for outer space vehicles, materials eventually used in the manufacture of Richard Branson’s space vehicles. The reasons for this purchase are not clear at the time of writing. But Northrop-Grumman has for years made huge profits by the construction of satellite-guided Unmanned Air Vehicles. These are used by the USAF for surveillance and what their website terms ‘precision strike missions.’ This switch of capital into a company which has pioneered lightweight materials for space vehicles is creating another example of a familiar phenomenon. In a similar way to surveillance satellites being simultaneously used for military and civil purposes (see Collis, this volume), the technologies used for helping wealthy people to take vacations to increasingly exotic zones in space are also being used for observing, regulating and even eliminating warlords and other supposedly ‘undesirable’ populations scattered over the earth.

Link—GIS

GIS key to target marketing—an increase in GIS allows the consumer to be known and controlled.

Caren Kaplan. Director of the Cultural Studies Graduate Group and associate professor in women and gender studies at the University of California. September 2006. American Quarterly. http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?Ver=1&Exp=07-24-2016&FMT=7&DID=1144471271&RQT=309&cfc=1

When U.S. President Dwight Eisenhower and his speechwriter Malcolm Moos coined the term "military-industrial complex" in 1961, they described a moment poised between the aftermath of the world wars and the advent of the conflicts to come in which the U.S.-based armaments industries could combine their influence with those in the military and the government, who would come to gain from such an alliance. Eisenhower argued that this kind of war corporatism could tip the hallowed liberal balance between defense and social programs, leading to a war economy without end. Over the last forty years, the hybrid form of governmentality that Eisenhower delineated in his speech materialized as Congress, industry, and the military created a culture of cooperation that overcame any internal tensions to produce a normalization of what could be construed as conflict of interest, or even cronyism. As the work of James Der Derian, Tim Lenoir, Jennifer Terry, and others demonstrates so powerfully, for people in the United States war is not at all elsewhere but is, in fact, deeply imbricated in everyday life as a "military-industrial-media-entertainment network."2 Who becomes a militarized subject through this network in the United States today? Two primary ways in which militarization operates in U.S. contemporary culture are the pervasive use of Geographic Information Systems (GIS), the primary model of data collection, sorting, and storage in use for over thirty years, and the practice of so-called target marketing, a geographically based form of classifying neighborhoods through subsets of demographic information. The same year that Eisenhower critiqued the military-industrial complex, scientist Jonathan Robbin founded General Analytics Corporation (GAC-the forerunner of Claritas, Inc.) to explore the industry potential of a new science-geodemography, the use of the computer to identify and map subsets of the U.S. population by zip code and neighborhood. Throughout the 1960s and into the 1970s, GAC/Claritas linked geography to demography by drawing on the statistics and classification system used in the biological sciences to categorize plants and animals by species and by fine-tuning the zoning capacities of U.S. Postal Service zip codes. By the 1970s, Claritas was applying multivariate regression analysis to census and marketing survey data and "target marketing" could be said to be in full swing.3 Geodemography and target marketing could come about, however, only as an outgrowth of GIS. The power of GIS lies in its ability to link information and inquiries of various kinds to location. The flexibility of its analytical capacities can be attributed to the ways in which the system combines layers of information, including visual material, to answer complex questions in increasingly precise registers. As John Pickles has argued, GIS "contributes to a (re)placing of the 'visual' and the 'spatial' at the center of social life through its role as an element in the restructuring of global, regional, and local geographies, the assertion of new disciplinary codes and practices, and the constitution of new images of earth and society."4 It is difficult to imagine the Web-based Internet with all of its graphic interfaces without the cultural shift engendered by GIS. Indeed, it could be said that the centrality of geographical images in information sciences helped to create the visual logics of contemporary U.S. subjectivity.

Link—China

Chinese space program is based on expansionary and capitalist logic justifying militaristic and economic dominance

Peter Dickens. Universities of Brighton and Essex. 15 May 2009. The Sociological Review. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01817.x/full

The imperializing tendencies of the United States and Russia were originally the chief generators of the state-driven Chinese space programme in the 1950s. Nuclear armed ballistic missiles were seen by the Chinese authorities as the way to counter both the American threat in Taiwan and the supposed threat from the Soviet Union (Dellios, 2005). The form of the military industrial complex now appears to be changing, largely as a result of broader attempts to marketize the Chinese economy, including its space and military sectors. On the one hand China possesses what one commentator calls ‘one of the oldest, largest, and most diversified military industrial complexes in the world’, consisting of some 300,000 engineers and technicians working in about 1,000 enterprises employing a total of three million workers (Bitzinger, 2005). These supply a complete range of weaponry from small arms to intercontinental ballistic missiles (Simons et al., 2007). Yet these enterprises are widely seen by the Chinese authorities as inefficient, technologically-backward and too big a drain on public resources (Canadian Security, 2003). As an indication of ongoing reforms, ten new ‘defence industry enterprise groups’ have recently been made, these arguably being the first signs of a state-led ‘tertiary circuit’. The eventual form of the Chinese military-industrial-space-complex is unclear but the fact that China recently destroyed one of its old weather satellites with a ground-based missile means it certainly cannot be dismissed as ‘backward’ from a purely military perspective. Such are the key imperialist rivals, each seeking to make spatial fixes either on earth or in outer space. These rivalries are essential to the system as outlined by Harvey, each coalition responding in competitive military and economic fashion to the perceived challenges of others. Economic and military overlaps It is sometimes difficult to disentangle the ‘military’ from the ‘economic’ aspects of these rivalries. Chinese strategists, for example, are attempting to build a successful military-industrial-space-complex by focussing on technologies (such as satellite communications) serving both civil and military ends. (Simons, 2007). A similar example of military-cum-industrial example is Europe’s Global Positioning System (GPS), due to be completed by 2010. This looks at first like a straightforward case of economic competition between the European and an older US system. The American system was, however, originally developed by the US military and can still be controlled by US military authorities. The European system, on the other hand, is intended to be run by a private consortium. The US military authorities have let it be known that they see the European system as a potential military threat to American interests. Competing military-industrial-space complexes may, in the longer term, turn into outright armed wars, especially if US-style unilateralism returns along the lines represented by Paul Wolfowitz. A single industrial source could nevertheless easily finish up funding two or more states engaging in such wars. It is instructive to note that the industrial part of the ‘US’ complex is not averse to profiting from states supposedly in competition. Lockheed Martin and Boeing, the world’s largest arms producers, are actively lobbying in Brussels for contracts, ‘trying to reap the rewards afforded by Europe’s military ambitions.’(Slijper, 2005: 28). Global capital, as Harvey and others point out, is incredibly fluid and flexible. It has seemingly few compunctions as to precisely which military-industrial- space-complex it invests in.

Link—Trade Off

The investment necessary for space exploration trades off with addressing inequalities and crises on earth—the expansion of capitalism into space neglects the underlying structures that created their impacts.

Peter Dickens. Universities of Brighton and Essex. 15 May 2009. The Sociological Review. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01817.x/full

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’? Social crises, outer spatial fixes and galactic imperialism 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. ‘Outer spatial fixes’ are investments in outer space intended to solve capitalism’s many crises. At one level they may be simply described as crises of economic profitability. But ‘economic’ can cover a wide array of issues such as crises of resource-availability and potential social and political upheavals resulting from resource-shortages. Furthermore, there is certainly no guarantee that these investments will actually ‘fix’ these underlying economic, political and social crises. The ‘fix’ may well be of a temporary, sticking-plaster, variety.

Link—Frontierism

The frontierist approach to space will inevitably lead to a mentality that views it as an exploitable, disposable resource.

Alan Marshall, worked at the Institute of Development Studies at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand, February 1995, “Development and Imperialism in Space” in Space Policy Journal Volume 11, Issue 1, pgs. 41-52

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. Because frontierism is ultimately an economic philosophy its success as a rationale for extraterrestrial development relies on economic forces. As such, it is as doomed a rationale as the other economic 46 models of space development discussed earlier. But what of the socio-psychological and socio-biological aspects inherent in modern frontierist thought. Might they offer a convincing rationale for Solar System development?

Link—Frontierism

Space is the new capitalist frontier. It represents a new market and opportunity for exploitation.

Mark Baard, staff writer for wired.com, 11-17-2004, “The Final Capitalist Frontier”, <http://www.wired.com/science/space/news/2004/11/65729>

Space scientists and entrepreneurs are envisioning much more than tourists taking pictures, and planting flags and footprints, as they plan humanity's off-world future. They also want to mine the solar system for its abundant natural resources to make space travel self-sustaining, and to generate profits for corporations back on Earth. The Cold War between the United States and the USSR drove engineers to work around the clock during the glory days of NASA's Apollo missions. "But now the spark is global competition," said Paul Spudis, a planetary scientist at the Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory in Laurel, Maryland. "We could draw on unlimited materials and energy for sustainable space exploration," said Spudis. "We will find new worlds, new markets and new growth." Spudis, who served on the President's Commission on Implementation of U.S. Space Exploration Policy, was speaking at SpaceVision2004, a space-exploration conference hosted by MIT last week, where scientists and engineers shared their dream of building self-sustaining outposts on the moon and Mars in the coming decades. The conference's attendees predicted that tomorrow's interplanetary explorers will be packing lightly for their extended stays on other worlds. Robots and humans will uncover and exploit in situ all of the ice and hydrogen they need to support their activities on the moon and Mars, the attendees said. And, as they have on Earth, asteroid impact sites (and the asteroids themselves) should yield rich deposits of copper, nickel and other metals for trade. Space pioneers could ship those mineral products back to Earth for a good profit, said a conference organizer. "It's simply a question of economics," said Joshua Neubert, the chairman of Students for the Exploration and Development of Space, or SEDS, a co-sponsor of the SpaceVision conference. "If the metals are valuable enough, and the costs of transporting them back to Earth are cheap enough, then why not?" If the moon and Mars hold any mineral riches, they should be easy to find. Impact craters on many other bodies in the solar system "are right there, in plain view," said Neubert.

Link—Frontierism

The affirmative’s call for innocent exploration ignores historical precedent—space exploration is predicated on a system of imperialism and consumerism that reinforces capitalist structures.

Linda Billings. SETI Institute. 2006. Bulletin of Science, Technology,& Society. http://bst.sagepub.com/content/26/5/430.full.pdf+html

Although the social, political, economic, and cultural context for the U.S. civil space program has changed since the 1960s, the rhetoric, and, arguably, the substance, of space policy making has not. The space program and many of its advocates appear to be stuck in the 20th century in some important respects. In the 21st century, politicians and other space enthusiasts have been promoting “the Moon-Mars thing” as exploration for the sake of exploring and also as a means of opening up the solar system to private property claims, resource exploitation, and commercial development. In the words of one space advocate, “The solar system is like a giant grocery store. It has everything we could possibly want.”12 This analogy has its weaknesses: for example, in a grocery store one must, of course, pay for what one wants. And in this vision, those with the means to get to the store first get all the goods; those who get there late may get nothing—a system more in the spirit of imperialism than of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty. The rhetoric of space advocacy highlighted herein reflects an assumption that the values of materialism, consumerism, and hyperconsumption prevalent today are values worth extending into the solar system. The conception of outer space advanced by these advocates \*embodies the idea of a solar system (and beyond) of wide-open spaces and limitless resources—a space frontier. This frontier rhetoric, with its images of pioneering, homesteading, claim staking, and conquest, has been persistent in American history, and the frontier metaphor has been, and still is, a dominant metaphor in rhetoric about space exploration (see, e.g., National Commission, 1986). Space frontier means different things to different people, and it is worth thinking about meanings invoked by the metaphor in considering what values are or might be embodied in the human endeavor of space exploration. American historian Frederick Jackson Turner’s (1994) turn-of-the-century essay, “The significance of the frontier in American history,” is perhaps the bestknown articulation of the metaphor. Later historians of the American West have deemed the idea of the frontier a “myth,” embodying a worldview in which the United States is “a wide-open land of unlimited opportunity forthe strong, ambitious self-reliant individual to thrust his way to the top” (Slotkin, 1973, p. 5; also see Slotkin, 1985, 1990). Historian Patricia Nelson Limerick (1994) observed that space advocates have tended to cling to the frontier metaphor, continuing to conceive of “American history [as] a straight line, a vector of inevitability and manifest destiny linking the westward expansion of Anglo-Americans directly to the exploration and colonization of space” (p. 13). Critiquing this vision of a space frontier, Limerick observed: In using this analogy, space advocates have built their plans for the future on the foundation of a deeply flawed understanding of the past, [and] the blinders worn to screen the past have proven to be just as effective at distorting the view of the future. (p. 13; also see Limerick, 1999) Historian Stephen Pyne (Sagan & Pyne, 1988) examined space exploration as a “cultural invention” (p. 18) that “reinforces and reinterprets . . . myths, beliefs, and archetypes basic to its originating civilization” (p. 37). Modern Western (European-American) exploration functioned as “a means of knowing, of creating commercial empires, of outmaneuvering political economic, religious, and military competitors – it was war, diplomacy, proselytizing, scholarship, and trade by other means” (Pyne, 2003, p. 5). The postmodern exploration of space is different, Pyne argued. Rationales advanced for space settlement, he said, are ultimately “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” (p. 15). In the current cultural environment, he concluded, “with neither a rambunctious imperialism nor an eager Enlightenment” (p. 12) the case for colonizing space is not “compelling” (p. 15).

Link—Frontierism

The capitalist forces propelling space weaponization will result in a new war with no way to achieve peace.

Admiral Vishnu Bhagwat, writer for the Center of Research on Globalization, 10-17-2010, “The Weaponization of Space: Corporate Driven Military Unleashes Pre-emptive Wars”, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=21432

First a brief examination of the backdrop of the political power relations at play today and their impact on forces that are propelling the inductions of weapons in Space that are likely to lead to an arms race in space akin to a cold war in a hitherto ‘sanctuary of peace’ and consequently to a situation of ‘Mutually Assured Destruction’ ( MAD ), of the planet. India’s historical experience has taught us, that superiority in weapon systems, was the cutting edge of the strategy of the imperial powers of fracturing the unity of societies sought to be colonized . Of course we are all too familiar with how and why atomic bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki to dominate, intimidate, induce fear and threaten other nations, in the intervening years, until parity was established. People have seen the results of the ruinous cold war and an unmatched arms race. There has been no peace dividend as propaganda would have us believe. In fact the cold war continues with ‘new enemies’ added as the ‘axis of evil’ and an all pervasive war on terror to terrorise the people of the world to maintain the obscene profits of the ‘war corporations’. The present reality is that to maintain the superiority in weapon systems the Pentagon spends not just $ 700 billion , but the United States over 1400 billion dollars on the entire security establishment or three times that of the rest of the countries put together . With this preamble let us go back to the international power play.

Link—Hegemony

Hegemony is a means of spreading global capitalism.

**Ferguson '04** (Niall Ferguson, Professor of History at Harvard University, 2004, "Colossus: The Rise and Fall of the American Empire, pg. 10)

To the majority of Americans, it would appear, there is not contradiction between the ends of global democratization and the means of American military power. As defined by their president, the democratizing mission of the United States is both altruistic and distinct from the ambitions of past empires, which (so it is generally assumed) aimed to impose their own rule on foreign peoples. The difficulty is that President Bush's ideal of freedom as a universal desideratum rather closely resembles the Victorian ideal of "civilization." "Freedom" means, on close inspection, the American model of democracy and capitalism; when Americans speak of "nation building" they actually mean "state replicating," in the sense that they want to build political and economic institutions that are fundamentally similar, though not identical, to their own. They may not aspire to rule, but they do aspire to have others rule themselves in the American way. Yet the very act of imposing "freedom" simultaneously subverts it. Just as the Victorians seemed hypocrites when they spread "civilization" with the Maxim gun, so there is something fishy about those who would democratize Fallujah with the Abrams tank. President Bush's distinction between conquest and liberation would have been entirely familiar to the liberal imperialists of the early 1900s, who likewise saw Britain's far-flung legions as agents of emancipation (not least in the Middle East during and after WWI.)

Hegemony causes the wars they seek to prevent—capitalism drives the need to grab resources at any cost and ensures escalating wars.

**Mészáros, 07** (Professor Emeritus in Philosophy and Political Theory, University of Sussex. “The Only Viable Economy” http://www.monthlyreview.org/0407meszaros.htm)

In our time, by contrast, we have to face up to the reality -- and the lethal dangers -- arising from global hegemonic imperialism, with the United States as its overwhelmingly dominant power.7 In contrast to even Hitler, the United States as the single hegemon is quite unwilling to share global domination with any rival. And that is not simply on account of political/military contingencies. The problems are much deeper. They assert themselves through the ever-aggravating contradictions of the capital system's deepening structural crisis. U.S. dominated global hegemonic imperialism is an -- ultimately futile -- attempt to devise a solution to that crisis through the most brutal and violent rule over the rest of the world, enforced with or without the help of slavishly "willing allies," now through a succession of genocidal wars. Ever since the 1970s the United States has been sinking ever deeper into catastrophic indebtedness. The fantasy solution publicly proclaimed by several U.S. presidents was "to grow out of it." And the result: the diametrical opposite, in the form of astronomical and still growing indebtedness. Accordingly, the United States must grab to itself, by any means at its disposal, including the most violent military aggression, whenever required for this purpose, everything it can, through the transfer of the fruits of capitalist growth -- thanks to the global socioeconomic and political/military domination of the United States -- from everywhere in the world. Could then any sane person imagine, no matter how well armored by his or her callous contempt for "the shibboleth of equality," that U.S. dominated global hegemonic imperialism would take seriously even for a moment the panacea of "no growth"? Only the worst kind of bad faith could suggest such ideas, no matter how pretentiously packaged in the hypocritical concern over "the Predicament of Mankind." For a variety of reasons there can be no question about the importance of growth both in the present and in the future. But to say so must go with a proper examination of the concept of growth not only as we know it up to the present, but also as we can envisage its sustainability in the future. Our siding with the need for growth cannot be in favor of unqualified growth. The tendentiously avoided real question is: what kind of growth is both feasible today, in contrast to dangerously wasteful and even crippling capitalist growth visible all around us? For growth must be also positively sustainable in the future on a long-term basis.

Link—Foreign Policy

Appealing to the state to solve through international politics is the worst form of action because: it occurs within a forum were we are voiceless it furthers statist war mobilization

Martin 90 (Assoc. Prof. Science, Tech. and Society, Univ. of Wallongong.) [Brian, Uprooting War, **http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/90uw/**]

The state is a symbol of strength and domination with which many individuals can identify. As the traditional sources of allegiance, such as the family, religion and local community, lose their force, the more abstract allegiance to country and state takes its place. Patriotism is the most obvious manifestation of the mobilisation of psychology to serve the state. More pervasive is the tendency to perceive the world from the viewpoint of one's state and to identify one's own interests with those of the state. The process of identifying with the state is most widespread in relation to international relations, where the influence of the individual is least. Individual powerlessness can promote identification with what is seen as the source of power, the state. Mobilisation of individual psychology helps mobilisation for war, and in turn war is a potent method for generating patriotism.

Ruling class foreign policy is systemic exploitation—individual agents and working classes are utilized as pawns in the service of markets and political hegemony

Lorimer, 02 (Doug, Political Committee of Australian Democratic Socialist Party, “Imperialism in the 21st Century, http://www.dsp.org.su/links/back/issue21/Lorimer.htm, uw/mjs).

Brzezinski's statement about the "grand imperatives" of US imperial policy gives a candid insight into how the us ruling elite views the world. The "vassals", among whom it is necessary to "prevent collusion and maintain security", are the other imperialist powers. Like the vassals of medieval Europe, the other imperialist powers hold sovereignty within their own "fiefs" but are required to render general support, and particularly military service, to the supreme lord in Washington. The "tributaries" who are to be kept "pliant and protected" are the semicolonial capitalist regimes of Asia. Africa and Latin America. from whom the imperialist powers extort tribute in the form of colonial super-profits, debt service payments and cheap raw materials, oil in particular. The "barbarians", whom it is necessary to keep "from coming together", are the oppressed and exploited mass of humanity, since when they do "come together-that is. Act collectively in their own interests-pose a threat to the very existence of "civilisation" as the Brzezinskis conceive of it. That this is the real view of the propertyless mass of humanity, of the workers and poor peasants of the world, held by imperialist statespeople and strategists is confirmed by the argument given to US President Woodrow Wilson by his wartime secretary of state, Robert Lansing, in 1918 as to why the United States should send troops, money and arms to Russia to overthrow the Bolshevik government. The Bolsheviks sought, Lansing wrote, "to make the ignorant and incapable mass of humanity dominant in the earth"; they were appealing "to a class and not to all classes of society, a class which does not have property but hopes to obtain a share by process of government rather than by individual enterprise. This is of course a direct threat at existing social order in all countries."

Link—Neoliberalism

Neoliberalism is not the same as capitalism–focusing on the fight against neoliberalism is a reform that distracts us from the focus on the anti-capitalist revolution

Chris Spanos, “Canada22: Envisioning Post-Neoliberalism,” Znet Mag, April 24th, 2006 (http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?ItemID=10151)

We all agree with the premise of this conference: we oppose and want to transcend neo-liberalism - its ideology, its institutions and its outcomes. We want to alleviate the vast disparities of wealth and power across the globe. But I also want to argue, that to aim beyond neo-liberalism is simply not enough. It's not enough if we want a world that's equitable, not enough if we want a world that's environmentally sustainable, it's not enough if we want a world that's diverse, it's not enough if we want a world with compassion and solidarity and it's still not enough if we want a world where people have democratic decision making input in proportion to how they are affected. The difference between fighting for a world beyond neo-liberalism and fighting for a world beyond capitalism is the difference between fighting for reform and fighting for revolution. These two different approaches taken separately have drastically different strategic consequences for our movement's struggle. Taken separately they are limited. But taken together they can mean successful strategy for social change. I'll touch on these strategic differences more in a moment. But first, let's consider reforms. Reforms to improve the welfare of those who suffer today, say by taxing the rich, have the potential to take us beyond neo- liberalism. But economic reform alone falls short of addressing the underlying structures of the economic system and its institutions. This is not revolution. Going further, reforms without considering alternatives to the underlying structure don't question the dominant economic institutions of our society. They assume these structures are a natural part of life, an inevitable outcome of evolution, or as equally accepted and unquestioned as the law of gravity. Acceptance of this status quo would be obscene in another time and place. An example would be like trying to improve the lives of serfs under feudalism without addressing the structure and institutions of feudalism. It would be like trying to win gains for slaves without ever attempting to abolish the system of slavery. This does not mean that reforms on their own are antithetical to revolution. It just means that reforms need to be consciously taken as part of a movement building strategy seeking both to improve people's lives today, but also for revolution tomorrow.

Link—Public-Private

The attempt to understand and interpret ourselves and extraterrestrials brings the private into the public, translating life into monetary worth. Political reasoning is justified entirely in concern for the publicized human and their consumption—their claims of solving anthropocentrism ignore larger capitalist power structures.

Freda A. Wynn. Communication Theses for the Department of Communication of Georgia State University. 2006. Georgia State University, Department of Communication. http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1003&context=communication\_theses&sei-redir=1#search=%22capitalism%20outer%20space%20SETI%22

The vox popili of the early 21st Century is that of “uncertainty”. This is not only due only to the fact that the line between reality and the unreal is blurred, but it harkens back to Heisenberg, the Principle of Uncertainty as applied to quantum mechanics, the fear of nuclear annihilation and the inability of social institutions to provide enough support for modern life. Postmodern theory prevalent since the seventies had been found to breed a despairing nihilism. It is in the changes of the media culture, exchange value, industrialization and urbanization that have prompted Baurillard to postulate that we have lost all sense of reality. As Bruce Sterling says, “The idea that there are sacred limits to human actions is simply a delusion. There are no sacred boundaries that protect us from ourselves”.134 The change in media culture is not a concern with relaying information and stories, but the increasing move toward interpreting these stories and our private selves. The media culture is now entertainment in the worse way and it is harbinger of our consumption. We consume because we are told to do so, not out of active individual choice. In exchange value we have lose the meaning of goods and their use value. Everything is translated into how much it is worth in a monetary sense and money becomes a universal equivalent against which everything in our lives is measured. We even think in those terms, e.g. how much is my time worth? As what we use is becomes ever more a product of complex industrial processes we lose touch with the underlying reality of the goods we consume. We lost the ability for the most part to recognize the source of the products we consume. We are losing touch with the natural world and urbanization with its signs that are our standard instructions for living.135 The world is now really for a sign of hope and we transverse into the age of Posthuman, a state of thinking in which anything and everything is possible just as all possible scenarios are depicted by the parallel worlds theory. Modern ideology involves a clash of many competing world-views. Unlike the premodern world, ideology now must reply on political reasoning instead of transcendental, ancestral or orthodox arguments. Political argument itself must be justified by the nature of human character, the attributes of human social and economic life, and the logic of human history and the vision of a human future.136

Alternative—Do Nothing

The alternative is to refuse action in the face of the crisis presented by the affirmative and do nothing

The Temptation to Act is Basis of Capitalist Economics—Only By Embracing Criticism and Resisting the Call to Praxis Can We Put Up a Truly Radical Politix Which Stands a Chance Against Capital

**ZIZEK 2004** [Slavoj, Serbian Nationalist and Historical Revisionist, Revolution at the Gates, p. 169-171 //wyo-tjc]

Indeed, since the “normal” functioning of capitalism involves some kind of disavowal of the basic principle of its functioning (today’s model capitalist is someone who, after ruthlessly generating profit, then generously shares parts of it, giving large donations to churches, victims of ethnic or sexual abuse, etc., posing as a humanitarian), the ultimate act of transgression is to assert this principle directly, depriving it of its humanitarian mask. I am therefore tempted to reverse Marx’s Thesis 11: the first task today is precisely not to succumb to the temptation to act, to intervene directly and change things {which then inevitably ends in a cul-de-sac of debilitating impossibility: “What can we do against global capital?”), but to question the hegemonic ideological co-ordinates. In short, our historical moment is still that of Adorno: to the Question “What should we do?” I can most often truly answer with “I don’t know.” I can only try to analyse rigorously what there is. Here people reproach me: When you practice criticism, you are also obliged to say how one should make it better. To my mind, this is incontrovertibly a bourgeois prejudice. Many times in history it so happened that the very works which pursued purely theoretical goals transformed consciousness and thereby also social reality. If, today, we follow a direct call to act, this act will not be performed in an empty space—it will be an act within the hegemonic ideological cooridinates: those who “really want to do something to help people” get involved in {undoubtedly honourable} exploits like *Medecins sans frontiers*, Greenpeace, feminist and anti-racist campaigns, which are all not only tolerated but even supported by the media, even if they seemingly encroach on economic territory (for example, denouncing and boycotting companies which do not respect ecological conditions, or use child labour) – they are tolerated and supported as long as they do not get too close to a certain limit. This kind of activity provides the perfect example of interpassivity? Of doing things not in order to achieve something, but to prevent something from really happening, really changing. All this frenetic humanitarian, politically correct, etc. activity fits the formula of “Let’s go on changing something all the time so that, globally, things will remain the same!” If standard cultural studies criticize capitalism, they do so in the coded way that exemplifies Hollywood liberal paranoia: the enemy is “the system”, the hidden “organization”, the anti-democratic “conspiracy” not simply capitalism and state apparatuses. The problem with this critical stance is not only that it replaces concrete social analysis with a struggle against abstract paranoic fantasies, but that – in a typical paranoic gesture – it unnecessarily redoubles social reality, as if there were a secret Organization behind the “visible” capitalist and state organs. What we should accept is that there is no need for a secret “organization-within-an-organization”: the “conspiracy” is already in the “visible” organization as such, in the capitalist system, in the way the political space and state apparatuses work.

Alternative—Structural/Historical

The Alternative: Vote Negative to validate and adopt the method of structural/historical criticism that is the 1NC.

Focusing on Method as the Basis for Criticism is the Only Way to Formulate Politics—Social Theory, Piecemeal Reform and Identity are Helpless in the Face of Capital

**TUMINO** (Prof. English @ Pitt) **2001** [Stephen, “What is Orthodox Marxism and Why it Matters Now More than Ever”, Red Critique, p. online //wyo-tjc]

Any effective political theory will have to do at least two things: it will have to offer an integrated understanding of social practices and, based on such an interrelated knowledge, offer a guideline for praxis. My main argument here is that among all contesting social theories now, only Orthodox Marxism has been able to produce an integrated knowledge of the existing social totality and provide lines of praxis that will lead to building a society free from necessity.

But first I must clarify what I mean by Orthodox Marxism. Like all other modes and forms of political theory, the very theoretical identity of Orthodox Marxism is itself contested—not just from non-and anti-Marxists who question the very "real" (by which they mean the "practical" as under free-market criteria) existence of any kind of Marxism now but, perhaps more tellingly, from within the Marxist tradition itself. I will, therefore, first say what I regard to be the distinguishing marks of Orthodox Marxism and then outline a short polemical map of contestation over Orthodox Marxism within the Marxist theories now. I will end by arguing for its effectivity in bringing about a new society based not on human rights but on freedom from necessity.

I will argue that to know contemporary society—and to be able to act on such knowledge—one has to first of all know what makes the existing social totality. I will argue that the dominant social totality is based on inequality—not just inequality of power but inequality of economic access (which then determines access to health care, education, housing, diet, transportation, . . . ). This systematic inequality cannot be explained by gender, race, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, or nationality. These are all secondary contradictions and are all determined by the fundamental contradiction of capitalism which is inscribed in the relation of capital and labor. All modes of Marxism now explain social inequalities primarily on the basis of these secondary contradictions and in doing so—and this is my main argument—legitimate capitalism. Why? Because such arguments authorize capitalism without gender, race, discrimination and thus accept economic inequality as an integral part of human societies. They accept a sunny capitalism—a capitalism beyond capitalism. Such a society, based on cultural equality but economic inequality, has always been the not-so-hidden agenda of the bourgeois left—whether it has been called "new left," "postmarxism," or "radical democracy." This is, by the way, the main reason for its popularity in the culture industry—from the academy (Jameson, Harvey, Haraway, Butler,. . . ) to daily politics (Michael Harrington, Ralph Nader, Jesse Jackson,. . . ) to. . . . For all, capitalism is here to stay and the best that can be done is to make its cruelties more tolerable, more humane. This humanization (not eradication) of capitalism is the sole goal of ALL contemporary lefts (marxism, feminism, anti-racism, queeries, . . . ).

Such an understanding of social inequality is based on the fundamental understanding that the source of wealth is human knowledge and not human labor. That is, wealth is produced by the human mind and is thus free from the actual objective conditions that shape the historical relations of labor and capital. Only Orthodox Marxism recognizes the historicity of labor and its primacy as the source of all human wealth. In this paper I argue that any emancipatory theory has to be founded on recognition of the priority of Marx's labor theory of value and not repeat the technological determinism of corporate theory ("knowledge work") that masquerades as social theory.

Alternative—Solvency

We need to question the underlying assumptions at the heart of capitalism and which generate our constant demand to expand into outer space. Outer space will otherwise be inevitably turned into a new field into which capitalism can expand.

Peter Dickens, Affiliated Lecturer in the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Politics, Psychology, Sociology and International Studies, Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex , University of Cambridge, November 2010, “The Humanization of the Cosmos: To What End?” <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end>

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.8 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 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. Military power will inevitably be made an integral part of this process, governments protecting the zones for which they are responsible. 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.”

Impact—Inequality

Capitalism and imperialism in outer space will increase on-earth economic inequalities.

Alan Marshall, worked at the Institute of Development Studies at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand, February 1995, “Development and Imperialism in Space” in Space Policy Journal Volume 11, Issue 1, pgs. 41-52

Returning to extra-orbital space development, many are bound to enquire: ‘what is wrong with imperialism in outer space if there are no indigenous peoples there?’ Apart from the anthropocentrism inherent in this question,‘s what is problematic about extraterrestrial imperialism is that it will increase economic inequalities between the Earth’s nations by giving inequitable access to, what may eventually be, significant amounts of resources. What also has to be noted is that imperialism involves dominion over territory and not just people. The outcome of this dominion being that others who have legitimate claim on the resources within those (extraterrestrial) territories are effectively excluded from using them. The politico-legal mechanism for the control of space development in the solar system is the international treaty. Herein lies another problem, since the attitude of the space-capable nations to the various space treaties reflects their imperialist tendencies. The main international treaty dealing with the development and exploitation of extra-orbital space at the present time is the 1967 Outer Space Treaty. While this treaty places a prohibition on national or private appropriation of areas on extraterrestrial bodies, it can still be regarded as a regime that facilitates imperialism since it allows an interpretation if its premises that indicate that when materials of extraterrestrial bodies are removed they become the property of the remover. In essence, the Outer Space Treaty makes provision for usufructory rights, in the same vein as much modern day minerals prospecting.

Impact – Inequality

Space exploration will primarily benefit the powerful and exclude the socially marginalized and less privileged.

Peter Dickens, Affiliated Lecturer in the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Politics, Psychology, Sociology and International Studies, Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex , University of Cambridge, November 2010, “The Humanization of the Cosmos: To What End?” <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end>

Society is increasingly humanizing the cosmos. Satellites have for some time been central to the flow of information, to surveillance, and to the conduct of warfare. As these examples suggest, however, the humanization of the cosmos is primarily benefiting the powerful. These include major economic and military institutions. Furthermore, the forthcoming commodification and colonization of the cosmos is again likely to enhance the interests of the powerful, the major aerospace companies in particular. The time has come to consider alternative forms of cosmic humanization. These would enhance the prospects of the socially marginalized. They would also allow humanity to develop a better understanding of the cosmos and our relationship to it.1

Impact – Inequality

Capitalism exacerbates social problems by running away from them. Extending it into space will destroy the environment and create a larger rich-poor gap.

Peter Dickens, Affiliated Lecturer in the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Politics, Psychology, Sociology and International Studies, Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex , University of Cambridge, November 2010, “The Humanization of the Cosmos: To What End?” <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-humanization-of-the-cosmos-to-what-end>

The Medicis and individuals such as Leonardo are often celebrated as examples of “The Renaissance Universal Man,” one capable of spanning every kind of human practice such as art, music, and politics. This “Man” is perhaps best symbolized by Leonardo’s famous image of a male human being, stretched over the circle of the cosmos, his head in the heavens and his bowels located in earthly regions. But this Renaissance Man—or Woman—can also be seen as prefiguring the self-centered, narcissistic individualism of our own day, one seeing the whole of the cosmos at his or her command. This kind of modern human identity has since been enhanced by consumer-based capitalism and, given the problems it creates both for ourselves and our environment, there seems rather little reason to celebrate or restore it. The general point is that the vision of the Space Renaissance Initiative, with its prime focus on the power of the supposedly autonomous and inventive individual, systematically omits questions of social, economic, and military power. Similarly, the Initiative’s focus on the apparently universal benefits of space humanization ignores some obvious questions. What will ploughing large amounts of capital into outer space colonization really do for stopping the exploitation of people and resources back here on earth? The “solution” 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? The Space Renaissance Initiative argues that space-humanization is necessarily a good thing for the environment by introducing new space-based technologies such as massive arrays of solar panels. But such “solutions” are again imaginary. Cheap electricity is most likely to increase levels of production and consumption back on earth. Environmental degradation will be exacerbated rather than diminished by this technological fix.

Impact—Social Issues/War

The expansion of capitalism into space is a huge diversion from crucial social problems on earth. It can also spark imperial wars.

Peter Dickens, Affiliated Lecturer in the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Politics, Psychology, Sociology and International Studies, Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex , University of Cambridge 5-15-2009, “The cosmos as capitalism's outside”, published in “The Sociological Review” Volume 57, Issue Supplement s1, pages 66–82

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.

Impact—War

Technology built for capitalist use will also be exploited for more sinister purposes.

Peter Dickens, Affiliated Lecturer in the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Politics, Psychology, Sociology and International Studies, Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex , University of Cambridge 5-15-2009, “The cosmos as capitalism's outside”, published in “The Sociological Review” Volume 57, Issue Supplement s1, pages 66–82

Projections for the future of privately-financed space tourism nevertheless remain ambitious. Spencer and Rugg (2004) make the analogy between the growth of luxury cruising on the oceans and that in space. They argue that Tito's flight was a ‘pioneering phase’. In ten years or so the International Space Station will have been converted into the first ‘private orbital yacht’ and around one thousand private citizens will have travelled ‘off world’. In the next ‘exclusive’ phase, wealthy individuals and corporations will, it is projected, be engaging in orbital yacht racing and celebrities will be making outer space their preferred venue for weddings. The ‘mature phase’ will be one in which cruise ships seating one hundred persons and offering a range of recreational facilities will be available. By 2050, one million people will be touring off-world and ‘the year 2075 could see 3,000 to 5,000 tourists and sports fans going every day’ (Spencer and Rugg, 2004: 52). Yet there are now also signs that the technology and expertise gained in the relatively benign space tourism industry are possibly being adopted for more sinister purposes. Northrop-Grumman, a leading US defence manufacturer, has recently bought outright Scaled Composites. The latter company has pioneered the use of lightweight materials for outer space vehicles, materials eventually used in the manufacture of Richard Branson's space vehicles. The reasons for this purchase are not clear at the time of writing. But Northrop-Grumman has for years made huge profits by the construction of satellite-guided Unmanned Air Vehicles. These are used by the USAF for surveillance and what their website terms ‘precision strike missions.’ This switch of capital into a company which has pioneered lightweight materials for space vehicles is creating another example of a familiar phenomenon. In a similar way to surveillance satellites being simultaneously used for military and civil purposes (see Collis, this volume), the technologies used for helping wealthy people to take vacations to increasingly exotic zones in space are also being used for observing, regulating and even eliminating warlords and other supposedly ‘undesirable’ populations scattered over the earth.

Impact—Bare Life

Expansion of US capitalism into space reduces other states to empty shells of sovereignty and reduces their citizens to a state of bare life.

Raymond Duvall and Jonathan Havercroft; Duvall: Professor of political science @ University of Minnesota, PhD from Northwestern University; Havercroft: works in Department of political science @ University of Oklahoma, PhD in political science from University of Minnesota; October, 2006, “Taking Sovereignty Out of this World: Space Weapons and Empire of the Future”, <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!

Impact—Environment/War

Capitalism in space is a way for human progress in science and technology to be harnessed for exploitation and the benefit of a small financial elite. This results in the murder of civilian populations, war, and environmental destruction.

Admiral Vishnu Bhagwat, writer for the Center of Research on Globalization, 10-17-2010, “The Weaponization of Space: Corporate Driven Military Unleashes Pre-emptive Wars”, 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. “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:

Impact—Laundry List

Prolonging the collapse of the system leads to nuclear wars, racism, poverty, patriarchy, and environmental destruction which will end in planetary extinction

Charles **Brown**, Professor of Economics and Research Scientist at the University of Michigan, May 13th 2005, http://archives.econ.utah.edu/archives/pen-l/2005w15/msg00062.htm)

The capitalist class owns the factories, the banks, and transportation-the means of production and distribution. Workers sell their ability to work in order to acquire the necessities of life. Capitalists buy the workers' labor, but only pay them back a portion of the wealth they create. Because the capitalists own the means of production, they are able to keep the surplus wealth created by workers above and beyond the cost of paying worker's wages and other costs of production. This surplus is called "profit" and consists of unpaid labor that the capitalists appropriate and use to achieve ever-greater profits. These profits are turned into capital which capitalists use to further exploit the producers of all wealth-the working class. Capitalists are compelled by competition to seek to maximize profits. The capitalist class as a whole can do that only by extracting a greater surplus from the unpaid labor of workers by increasing exploitation. Under capitalism, economic development happens only if it is profitable to the individual capitalists, not for any social need or good. The profit drive is inherent in capitalism, and underlies or exacerbates all major social ills of our times. With the rapid advance of technology and productivity, new forms of capitalist ownership have developed to maximize profit. The working people of our country confront serious, chronic problems because of capitalism. These chronic problems become part of the objective conditions that confront each new generation of working people. The threat of nuclear war, which can destroy all humanity, grows with the spread of nuclear weapons, space-based weaponry, and a military doctrine that justifies their use in preemptive wars and wars without end. Ever since the end of World War II, the U.S. has been constantly involved in aggressive military actions big and small. These wars have cost millions of lives and casualties, huge material losses, as well as trillions of U.S. taxpayer dollars. Threats to the environment continue to spiral, threatening all life on our planet. Millions of workers are unemployed or insecure in their jobs, even during economic upswings and periods of "recovery" from recessions. Most workers experience long years of stagnant real wages, while health and education costs soar. Many workers are forced to work second and third jobs to make ends meet. Most workers now average four different occupations during their lifetime, being involuntarily moved from job to job and career to career. Often, retirement-age workers are forced to continue working just to provide health care for themselves. With capitalist globalization, jobs move as capitalists export factories and even entire industries to other countries. Millions of people continuously live below the poverty level; many suffer homelessness and hunger. Public and private programs to alleviate poverty and hunger do not reach everyone, and are inadequate even for those they do reach. Racism remains the most potent weapon to divide working people. Institutionalized racism provides billions in extra profits for the capitalists every year due to the unequal pay racially oppressed workers receive for work of comparable value. All workers receive lower wages when racism succeeds in dividing and disorganizing them. In every aspect of economic and social life, African Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, Asian a nd Pacific Islanders, Arabs and Middle Eastern peoples, and other nationally and racially oppressed people experience conditions inferior to that of whites. Racist violence and the poison of racist ideas victimize all people of color no matter which economic class they belong to. The attempts to suppress and undercount the vote of the African American and other racially oppressed people are part of racism in the electoral process. Racism permeates the police, judicial and prison systems, perpetuating unequal sentencing, racial profiling, discriminatory enforcement, and police brutality. The democratic, civil and human rights of all working people are continually under attack. These attacks range from increasingly difficult procedures for union recognition and attempts to prevent full union participation in elections, to the absence of the right to strike for many public workers. They range from undercounting minority communities in the census to making it difficult for working people to run for office because of the domination of corporate campaign funding and the high cost of advertising. These attacks also include growing censorship and domination of the media by the ultra-right; growing restrictions and surveillance of activist social movements and the Left; open denial of basic rights to immigrants; and, violations of the Geneva Conventions up to and including torture for prisoners. These abuses all serve to maintain the grip of the capitalists on government power. They use this power to ensure the economic and political dominance of their class. Women still face a considerable differential in wages for work of equal or comparable value. They also confront barriers to promotion, physical and sexual abuse, continuing unequal workload in home and family life, and male supremacist ideology perpetuating unequal and often unsafe conditions. The constant attacks on social welfare programs severely impact single women, single mothers, nationally and racially oppressed women, and all working class women. The reproductive rights of all women are continually under attack ideologically and politically. Violence against women in the home and in society at large remains a shameful fact of life in the U.S.

Impact—Value to Life

**The methodology of the capitalist system creates prisons of oppression that deny value to life and make the actions like “final solutions” possible – only through the complete rejection of this mode of thought is liberation possible**

Gilles **Deleuze** AND Felix **Guattari**, professor of philosophy at the University of Paris and schizoanalyst, worked at La Borde. Anti-Oedipus 19**72** pg 373

"**There is not one** of these aspects---not the least operation, the least industrial or **financial mechanism--that does not reveal the insanity of the capitalist machine** and the pathological character of its rationality: not at all a false rationality, but a true rationality of this pathological state, this insanity, "the machine works too, believe me". **The capitalist machine does not run the risk of becoming mad, it is mad from one end to the other and from the beginning, and this is the source of its rationality**, Marx's black humor, the source of Capital, is his fascination with such a machine: how it came to be assembled, on what foundation of decoding and deterritorialization; how it works, always more decoded, always more deterritorialized; how its operation grows more relentless with the development of the axiomatic, the combination of the flows; how **it produces the** terrible **single class of gray gentlemen who keep up the machine**; how **it does not run the risk of dying all alone, but rather of making us die, by provoking to the very end investements of desire that do not even go by way of a deceptive and subjective ideology, and that lead us to cry out to the very end, Long live capital** in all its reality, **in all its objective dissimulation**! Except in ideology, **there has never been a humane, liberal, paternal**, etc., **capitalism. Capitalism is defined by a cruelty having no parallel in the despotic regime of terror.** Wage increases and **improvements in** the standard of **living are realities, but realities that derive from a** given **supplementary axiom that capitalism is always capable of adding to its axiomatic in terms of an enlargement of its limits: let's create the New Deal; let's cultivate and recognize strong unions; let's promote participation**, the single class; let's take a step toward Russia, which is taking so many toward us; etc. But within the enlarged reality that conditions these islands, **exploitation grows constantly harsher, lack is arranged in the most scientific of ways, final solutions of the "Jewish problem" variety are prepared down to the last detail, and the Third World is organized as an integral part of capitalism. the reproduction** of the interior limits **of capitalism** on an always wider scale has several consequences: it **permits increases and improvements of standards at the center, it displaces the harshest forms of exploitation from the center to the peripher, but also multiplies enclaves of overpopulation in the center itself**, and easilty tolerates the so-called socialist formations. (It is not kibbutz-style socialism that troubles the Zionist state, just as it is not Russian socialism that troubles world capitalism.) There is no metaphor here: **the factories are prisons, they do not resemble prisons, they are prisons.**

Impact—Nuclear War

Turns case – capitalism causes nuclear war.

Sam **Webb**, National Chairman, Communist Party USA. “War, Capitalism, and George W. Bush.” 4-20-**04**. http://www.pww.org/article/view/ 4967/1/207/)

**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.

A2 Perm

The permutation is worse than the plan—it more strongly validates the ability of capitalism to fix it’s own problems—compromising our radical politics through any articulation of a specific short-term demands completely short-circuits the alternative

**MESZAROS** (Prof. Emeritus @ Univ. Sussex) **1995** [Istavan, Beyond Capital: Towards a Theory of Transition, // wyo] p. 930

THE difficulty is that the ‘moment’ of radical politics is strictly limited by the nature of the crises in question and the temporal determinations of their unfolding. The breach opened up at times of crisis cannot be left open forever and the measures adopted to fill it, from the earliest steps onwards, have their own logic and cumulative impact on subsequent interventions. Furthermore, both the existing socioeconomic structures and their corresponding framework of political institutions tend to act against radical initiatives by their very inertia as soon as the worst moment of the crisis is over and thus it becomes possible to contemplate again ‘the line of least resistance’. And no one can consider ‘radical restructuring’ the line of least resistance, since by its very nature it necessarily involves upheaval and the disconcerting prospect of the unknown. No immediate economic achievement can offer a way out of this dilemma so as to prolong the life-span of revolutionary politics, since such limited economic achievements made within the confines of the old premises — act in the opposite direction by relieving the most pressing crisis symptoms and, as a result, reinforcing the old reproductive mechanism shaken by the crisis. As history amply testifies, at the first sign of ‘recovery’, politics is pushed back Into its traditional role of helping to sustain and enforce the given socio-economic determinations. The claimed ‘recovery’ itself reached on the basis of the ‘well tried economic motivations’, acts as the self-evident ideological justification for reverting to the subservient, routine role of politics, in harmony with the dominant institutional framework. Thus, radical politics can only accelerate its own demise (and thereby shorten, instead of extending as it should, the favourable ‘moment’ of major political intervention) if it consents to define its own scope in terms of limited economic targets which are in fact necessarily dictated by the established socioeconomic structure in crisis.

A2 Exploration Biological

Exploration is not natural—there is no scientific rationale for space rationale other than the desire for continued expansion and exploitation

Peter Dickens. Universities of Brighton and Essex. 15 May 2009. The Sociological Review. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01817.x/full

Third is the insistence that outer space exploration realizes the supposed innate need of humanity to explore. In 1961, for example, NASA asserted ‘man’s questing spirit’ as a rationale for human visitation and exploration of the Moon. The notion of a biologically-engrained need of humans to conquer new horizons is also appealed to by the European Space Agency. They assert ‘the timeless thirst for exploration and discovery’ as a rationale for space exploration by the European Union (ESA, 2000: 18). Outer space exploration, according to this argument, releases human potential, specifically the rugged individualism which enabled earlier earthbound forms of colonialism to be so ‘successful’. Similarly, it is suggested that human beings’ adaptability makes them better than robots when it comes to exploration and colonization (Zubrin, 1999). The counter-argument is that there is actually little or no scientific rationale for putting humans into the solar system. ‘Humans’ as Steve Weinberg (a Nobel Prize winning particle physicist) puts it ‘don’t serve any useful function in space. They radiate heat, they’re very expensive to keep alive and desire to come back, so that anything involving human beings is enormously expensive’ (2007, see also Rees, 2008).

A2 Alt Causes

Even if there are other motivations for space exploration, capitalism is the most dominant one.

Martin Parker, University of Leicester School of Management, paper published in the Sociological Review, 5-15-2009, “Capitalists in Space”, <https://lra.le.ac.uk/bitstream/2381/7966/1/6.%20Parker.pdf> pp. 83-97.

This chapter explores a paradox1. I want to believe that the ends of space exploration rest on a certain orientation to the future, a possibility that what comes next might be substantially different from what happens at the present time. This, I believe, is a sort of utopian projection which lies at the heart of any radical politics. At the same time, the means for space exploration currently appear to require that certain rather everyday desires are projected outwards to a star as if it were a new market segment. So we imagine 42 light years, and see PepsiCo in space. But I do not think that this is merely reducible to a matter of means or ends, as if the two never met. At the beginning of the 20th century Max Weber made a nice distinction between technical rationality (zweckrational) and value rationality (wertrational). The former refers to the sort of efficiency and organization that it is rational to adopt once you have decided on a particular course of action, and he claims that this is epitomised by the bureaucratic organizational form. Bureaucracy connects means to means, without hatred or passion, in order that ramified chains of cause and effect can be built that would otherwise stumble and evaporate. Without bureaucratic reason, we would not be able to administer a state, or manufacture a corn chip, or a Saturn V rocket. But states, corn chips and Saturn V rockets are insufficient to explain themselves, so Weber suggests that values must be the ultimate ends of action. Values, desires, are not „rational‟ in themselves, but provide a target for technique. But, he says, there is a sense in which his age was becoming an age in which means were becoming ends in themselves, and notions of „calling‟, of value, were fading away. „Where the fulfilment of the calling cannot be directly related to the highest spiritual and cultural values, or when, on the other hand, it need not be felt simply as economic compulsion, the individual generally abandons the attempt to justify it at all. In the field of its highest development, in the United States, the pursuit of wealth, stripped of its religious and ethical meaning, tends to become associated with purely mundane passions, which often actually give it the character of sport.‟ (Weber 1930: 182). So the means become the end. The end is the playing of the game, and finds no justification beyond itself, and questions about ends, about values, are no longer asked. This, it seems to me, is the paradox of having capitalists in space. As if the distance between the Earth and 47 Ursae Majoris is a problem for marketing, and the sublime evaporates in the exhaust fumes of managerialism. But, at the same time, it is naïve to imagine that Apollo and the rest have been free from such earthly entanglements. In the context, it doesn‟t matter that much whether we articulate these entanglements as nation building; party political interest; hidden subsidy of the military industrial complex, or research institutes; career and identity projects; needing to pay the mortgage; or compensating for small penis size. All these, and many more, have undoubtedly driven human beings to work on space exploration projects. But now, in an era of globalising capitalism, it seems that matters of profit and loss are becoming more relevant than ever in driving human beings to such work. Commercial space tourist flights will be the first clear example of what has, so far, been a tendency partly concealed by state and state agency operations. But now, it seems, NASA is being pushed out of the way, in order that enterprise can be launched.

A2 No Link – Other Motivations

Capitalism survives because we mask what are capitalist motivations under the guise of scientific, social, and political interests. Don’t buy their no link arguments.

Peter Dickens, Affiliated Lecturer in the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Politics, Psychology, Sociology and International Studies, Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex , University of Cambridge 5-15-2009, “The cosmos as capitalism's outside”, published in “The Sociological Review” Volume 57, Issue Supplement s1, pages 66–82

If regional coalitions of political, industrial and financial elites are responsible for promoting (via taxation and public spending) ‘successful’ circuits of capital, they are also responsible for legitimating the social and economic system they are supporting. How can massive public expenditures be couched in ways other than handouts to the shareholders of Boeing, EADS and the other major corporations outlined in Table 1? How can these shareholders' investments be seen as other than profiting from the labour of workers in Lockheed Martin, Boeing and the like? As Marx pointed out in his early writings, capitalism survives because elites and capitalist states couch their practices in terms of general, universal values rather than the competing values of factional and warring interests (Marx, 1975) To varying extents all the regional rivals above, and the industrial elites with which they are associated, engage in a range of universalizing practices. First, there is considerable emphasis on the ‘pure’, universal, scientific knowledge to be supposedly gained by outer space exploration. It is argued, for example, that NASA's $300 million Dawn Project will ‘characterize the conditions and processes of the solar system's earliest epoch by investigating in detail two of the largest protoplanets remaining intact since their formations.’ (NASA, 2007). (A similar rationale pervades the private space tourism industry, Space Adventurers assuring their wealthy clients that they will be able to conduct ‘scientific experiments’, thereby benefitting others besides themselves). Science is also used by NASA as a means of capturing the public imagination. The latest dramatic pictures of asteroids, the Moon and Mars are readily available on the NASA website. Second, there is considerable stress on the benefits of outer spatial fixes to the global environment and to the world population. The European Space Agency, for example, emphasizes the ‘multi-scale monitoring’ of ecological conditions in the context of ‘the challenge to the planetary environment.’ This aspect of space-humanization also includes the proposed collection of solar energy for use by a globe fast running out of resources (ESA, 2000). Rather than developing countries receiving a share of the economic benefits of space exploitation as proposed in the UN Moon Agreement, these kinds of environment-saving projects supported by the UN Programme on Space Applications, were considered sufficient. The massive military investments benefiting the large military corporations as shown in Table 1 are meanwhile also couched in universalizing, non-military, ‘defence’ terms. And, by the same token, arms lobbyists have recently been recommended by the European Space Agency to use ‘civil society language’. ‘Protecting civil society and the freedom of citizens’ is deemed a better alternative to ‘macho ads with missiles and fighter planes’ (Slijper, 2005: 78). Third is the insistence that outer space exploration realizes the supposed innate need of humanity to explore. In 1961, for example, NASA asserted ‘man's questing spirit’ as a rationale for human visitation and exploration of the Moon. The notion of a biologically-engrained need of humans to conquer new horizons is also appealed to by the European Space Agency. They assert ‘the timeless thirst for exploration and discovery’ as a rationale for space ex-ploration by the European Union (ESA, 2000: 18). Outer space exploration, according to this argument, releases human potential, specifically the rugged individualism which enabled earlier earthbound forms of colonialism to be so ‘successful’. Similarly, it is suggested that human beings' adaptability makes them better than robots when it comes to exploration and colonization (Zubrin, 1999). The counter-argument is that there is actually little or no scientific rationale for putting humans into the solar system. ‘Humans’ as Steve Weinberg (a Nobel Prize winning particle physicist) puts it ‘don't serve any useful function in space. They radiate heat, they're very expensive to keep alive and desire to come back, so that anything involving human beings is enormously expensive’ (2007, see also Rees, 2008). Many nation-states, including relatively minor countries such as Korea as well as the USA, Russia and China nevertheless insist on projecting one or more of their citizens into the cosmos. In the end, the explanation of this phenomenon may have much more to do with governments generating public support for space programmes rather than any purely ‘economic’ rationale. Projecting citizens into the cosmos helps legitimate the huge amounts of public money involved. As the slogan often used to promote manned space flight puts it, ‘no bucks without Buck Rogers’. Most older people actually have no desire to travel into outer space themselves (Dickens and Ormrod, 2007). But it may be that space programmes using humans in the cosmos appeal to a narcissistic streak in the human personality, perhaps most amongst younger people. The humanization of the cosmos is arguably creating a new kind of galactic personality, one taking possessive individualism to new extremes, by conquering, controlling and consuming not only the Earth but now the Universe. Yet separating the narcissistic self from society as a whole and treating the cosmos as a mere object creates an ultimately unsatisfying form of subjectivity. Perhaps older generations in particular recognise that disconnecting the self and objectifying the cosmos will result not in emancipation but enslavement (Slijper, 2005: 28).

A2 No Link – Other Motivations

American motivations to go into space have historically been economic domination masked by a drive to benefit the greater good.

ICC Online, 10-25-2009, <http://en.internationalism.org/icconline/2009/10/apollo-11-lunar-landing>

In other words, the old empires (above all the French and British empires) have created a catastrophic situation in which national "revolutions" are likely to fall into the Soviet camp, not because they are conquered militarily but because the USSR represents a more attractive option for the new local bourgeois cliques emerging from the process of decolonisation. In this context, Kennedy put forward a whole series of measures for strengthening the US military, increasing military and civilian aid to friendly governments, etc. At the end of his speech came the Apollo programme: "Finally, if we are to win the battle that is now going on around the world between freedom and tyranny, the dramatic achievements in space which occurred in recent weeks should have made clear to us all, as did the Sputnik in 1957, the impact of this adventure on the minds of men everywhere, who are attempting to make a determination of which road they should take (...) No single space project in this period will be more impressive to mankind [than sending a man to the moon]" (ibid). Just like the "civilising mission" of the European colonial powers in the 19th century, the US commitment to this great "adventure for freedom" came with a big dose of hypocrisy: it certainly served as a mask to hide America's real imperialist aims in its struggle against the USSR for domination of the planet. In this sense, the real target of the Apollo 11 mission was not on the moon, but on Earth. 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 fromthe 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.

A2 No Link – We Don’t Exploit Resources

Space tourism and resource exploitation are mere examples of the broader expansion of capitalism into space through development.

Peter Dickens, Affiliated Lecturer in the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Politics, Psychology, Sociology and International Studies, Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex , University of Cambridge 5-15-2009, “The cosmos as capitalism's outside”, published in “The Sociological Review” Volume 57, Issue Supplement s1, pages 66–82

Imperialism on earth and outer space should be seen within the above context of an ever-expanding capitalism, economic-cum-social-cum-resource crises and new wars. Space tourism and the search for new materials are indicators of how capitalism and imperialism are now developing in outer space. But imperialism involves more than the expansion of an economic structure. It entails a competitive struggle between capitalist states. This involves the constant upgrading of technologies and social relations and continuing conflict over ownership of territory and resources. These processes necessarily involve the political power of competing nation states. If we are adequately to understand the tensions and conflicts arising from imperialisms on Earth and in outer space, the notion of ‘spatial fixes’ therefore needs combining with an understanding of capitalist states (or in some cases, such as the European Union, a fusion of states) and their relationships with different social interests. This is one way in which Harvey's analysis can be taken forward. Harvey's book Limits to Capital certainly concludes with a discussion of inter-imperialist rivalry and outright war as the most sinister means imaginable of destroying one set of spatial fixes prior to reinvestment in new fixes. And there are a number of allusions to competing capitalist states in his The New Imperialism (2003). The emphasis of Harvey's work is nevertheless on the purely economic and global level, when politically and culturally-orchestrated growth poles and regional coalitions are integral to processes of capital-accumulation and continuing social crises threaten to disrupt movements of capital within and between the three circuits. To use a phrase in Jessop's critique of Harvey, there is ‘an inescapable political dimension to the historical materialist critique of capitalism’ (2006: 162). We now further pursue this political dimension, and specifically its ‘inter-imperialist rivalries’.

Aff - Perm

Space key to sustainable capitalism

Peter Dickens. Universities of Brighton and Essex. 15 May 2009. The Sociological Review. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01817.x/full

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.

Aff—Perm

Perm solves—political engagement key to breaking down capitalism

Peter Dickens. Universities of Brighton and Essex. 15 May 2009. The Sociological Review. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01817.x/full

But imperialism involves more than the expansion of an economic structure. It entails a competitive struggle between capitalist states. This involves the constant upgrading of technologies and social relations and continuing conflict over ownership of territory and resources. These processes necessarily involve the political power of competing nation states. If we are adequately to understand the tensions and conflicts arising from imperialisms on Earth and in outer space, the notion of ‘spatial fixes’ therefore needs combining with an understanding of capitalist states (or in some cases, such as the European Union, a fusion of states) and their relationships with different social interests. This is one way in which Harvey’s analysis can be taken forward. Harvey’s book Limits to Capital certainly concludes with a discussion of inter-imperialist rivalry and outright war as the most sinister means imaginable of destroying one set of spatial fixes prior to reinvestment in new fixes. And there are a number of allusions to competing capitalist states in his The New Imperialism (2003). The emphasis of Harvey’s work is nevertheless on the purely economic and global level, when politically and culturally-orchestrated growth poles and regional coalitions are integral to processes of capital-accumulation and continuing social crises threaten to disrupt movements of capital within and between the three circuits. To use a phrase in Jessop’s critique of Harvey, there is ‘an inescapable political dimension to the historical materialist critique of capitalism’ (2006: 162). We now further pursue this political dimension, and specifically its ‘inter-imperialist rivalries’.

Aff – Alt Fails

The state is necessary to produce change.

Alex **Callinicos**, Can We Change The World Without Taking Power?, 20**05**, <http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?ItemID=8520>

John [Hollaway] invites us essentially to turn our backs on the state. He says that we should carry out what he calls an ‘interstitial’ revolution. It’s been summed up by other thinkers sharing the same ideas as John as life despite capitalism. We should all try and cultivate our autonomous gardens despite the horrors of capitalism. The trouble is that the state won’t leave us alone and that is because capitalism itself, the system that different states sustain, won’t leave us alone. Capitalism today is invading the gardens of the world to carve them up and turn them into branches of agribusiness or suburban speculation and won’t leave us alone. We cannot ignore the state, because the state is the most concentrated single form of capitalist power. This means strategically we have to be against the state, to pursue the revolution against the state.

Aff – Rejection Fails

A mere rejection of capitalism will not solve for anything.

John **Ikerd**, 20**05**, Sustainable Capitalism: A Matter of Common Sense

**Total rejection of capitalism is not the solution because we can’t kill the cancer without risking the life of the host. But neither will we find a cure by rejecting the proper diagnosis – even if it was first made by a communist.** Ultimately, we must accept the fact that an unbridled capitalistic economy quite simply is not sustainable. We cannot internalize the externalities of a cancerous growth as a means of restoring health to its host. Instead, we must reestablish the internal mechanisms that naturally control growth and reproduction so that economic growth no longer depends upon externalizing costs to or internalizing benefits from the social and natural environment. **The cancerous cells of the old capitalistic economy must be replaced by healthy cells, with internal mechanisms for controlling growth and reproduction. In the case of cancer, the host cannot choose between cells that promote rapid growth and cells that promote good health, regardless of growth. In the case of capitalism, however, society has a choice. We can choose the rapid growth of unbridled capitalism, or we can choose the healthy growth of sustainable capitalism; but we can’t have both. We can cure the caner of capitalism, but only by restoring and sustaining the ecological and social health of the economy.** Cures are achieved first by acknowledging the cause and then by correcting it.

Aff – Transition Wars

The transition away from capitalism and its alternative will result in genocide and war.

Rudolph **Rummel**, [professor emeritus](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Professor_emeritus) of [political science](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Political_science) at the [University of Hawaii](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/University_of_Hawaii), The Killing Machine that is Marxism, Online

Of all religions, secular and otherwise, that of Marxism has been by far the bloodiest – bloodier than the Catholic Inquisition, the various Catholic crusades, and the Thirty Years War between Catholics and Protestants. In practice, Marxism has meant bloody terrorism, deadly purges, lethal prison camps and murderous forced labor, fatal deportations, man-made famines, extrajudicial executions and fraudulent show trials, outright mass murder and genocide. In total, Marxist regimes murdered nearly 110 million people from 1917 to 1987. For perspective on this incredible toll, note that all domestic and foreign wars during the 20th century killed around 35 million. That is, when Marxists control states, Marxism is more deadly then all the wars of the 20th century, including World Wars I and II, and the Korean and Vietnam Wars. And what did Marxism, this greatest of human social experiments, achieve for its poor citizens, at this most bloody cost in lives? Nothing positive. It left in its wake an economic, environmental, social and cultural disaster. The Khmer Rouge – (Cambodian communists) who ruled Cambodia for four years – provide insight into why Marxists believed it necessary and moral to massacre so many of their fellow humans. Their Marxism was married to absolute power. They believed without a shred of doubt that they knew the truth, that they would bring about the greatest human welfare and happiness, and that to realize this utopia, they had to mercilessly tear down the old feudal or capitalist order and Buddhist culture, and then totally rebuild a communist society. Nothing could be allowed to stand in the way of this achievement. Government – the Communist Party – was above any law. All other institutions, religions, cultural norms, traditions and sentiments were expendable. The Marxists saw the construction of this utopia as a war on poverty, exploitation, imperialism and inequality – and, as in a real war, noncombatants would unfortunately get caught in the battle. There would be necessary enemy casualties: the clergy, bourgeoisie, capitalists, "wreckers," intellectuals, counterrevolutionaries, rightists, tyrants, the rich and landlords. As in a war, millions might die, but these deaths would be justified by the end, as in the defeat of Hitler in World War II. To the ruling Marxists, the goal of a communist utopia was enough to justify all the deaths. The irony is that in practice, even after decades of total control, Marxism did not improve the lot of the average person, but usually made living conditions worse than before the revolution. It is not by chance that the world's greatest famines have happened within the Soviet Union (about 5 million dead from 1921-23 and 7 million from 1932-3, including 2 million outside Ukraine) and communist China (about 30 million dead from 1959-61). Overall, in the last century almost 55 million people died in various Marxist famines and associated epidemics – a little over 10 million of them were intentionally starved to death, and the rest died as an unintended result of Marxist collectivization and agricultural policies. What is astonishing is that this "currency" of death by Marxism is not thousands or even hundreds of thousands, but millions of deaths. This is almost incomprehensible – it is as though the whole population of the American New England and Middle Atlantic States, or California and Texas, had been wiped out. And that around 35 million people escaped Marxist countries as refugees was an unequaled vote against Marxist utopian pretensions. Its equivalent would be everyone fleeing California, emptying it of all human beings. There is a supremely important lesson for human life and welfare to be learned from this horrendous sacrifice to one ideology: No one can be trusted with unlimited power. The more power a government has to impose the beliefs of an ideological or religious elite, or decree the whims of a dictator, the more likely human lives and welfare will be sacrificed. As a government's power is more unrestrained, as its power reaches into all corners of culture and society, the more likely it is to kill its own citizens.

Aff – Capitalism Inevitable

Capitalism is inevitable because people will always be motivated by self-interest and self-improvement.

William J. Baumol, Officer of the Kauffman Foundation and a published author by Yale University, GOOD CAPITALISM, BAD CAPITALISM, AND THE ECONOMIES OF GROWTH AND PROSPERITY, 2007, page 16.

At the bottom, economic growth is essential not because humans are greedy or excessively materialistic, but because they want to better their lives. This is a natural aspiration and only with more economic output can more people live a more enjoyable and satisfying existence. Of course, economic growth is not the only goal in life. As economists will be the first to point out, there are always trade-offs: More work leaves less time for play and for family. More output often is accompanied by an increase in unwelcome side effects, such as pollution. But at the end of the day, the richer societies are, the more resources they will have to address the side effects of growth as well as the various maladies that shorten lives or make them less satisfying.

Aff – Resistance Fails

Resistance is the most dangerous alternative. Capitalism is inevitable, so we should try to work within the system.

Will **Wilkinson**, Academic Coordinator of the Social Change Project and the Global Prosperity Initiative at The [Mercatus Center](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mercatus_Center) at [George Mason University](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_Mason_University), Capitalism and Human Nature, 20**05**, [Cato Policy Report](http://www.cato.org/pubs/policy_report/pr-index.html) Vol. XXVII No. 1

Emory professor of economics and law Paul Rubin usefully distinguishes between "productive" and "allocative" hierarchies. Productive hierarchies are those that organize cooperative efforts to achieve otherwise unattainable mutually advantageous gains. Business organizations are a prime example. Allocative hierarchies, on the other hand, exist mainly to transfer resources to the top. Aristocracies and dictatorships are extreme examples. Although the nation-state can perform productive functions, there is the constant risk that it becomes dominated by allocative hierarchies. Rubin warns that our natural wariness of zero-sum allocative hierarchies, which helps us to guard against the concentration of power in too few hands, is often directed at modern positive-sum productive hierarchies, like corporations, thereby threatening the viability of enterprises that tend to make everyone better off**.** There is no way to stop dominance-seeking behavior. We may hope only to channel it to non-harmful uses. A free society therefore requires that positions of dominance and status be widely available in a multitude of productive hierarchies, and that opportunities for greater status and dominance through predation are limited by the constant vigilance of "the people"—the ultimate reverse dominance hierarchy. A flourishing civil society permits almost everyone to be the leader of something, whether the local Star Trek fan club or the city council, thereby somewhat satisfying the human taste for hierarchical status, but to no one's serious detriment.

Aff – Capitalism Not Root Cause

The root cause of the impacts is individual greed, not capitalism.

**Aberdeen, ’03** freedomtracks.com/uncommonsense/theway.html)

**A view** shared by many modern activists is **that capitalism**, free enterprise, multi-national corporations and globalization **are the primary cause of the current global Human Rights problem and that by striving to** change or **eliminate these, the root problem of what ills the modern world is being addressed.  This is a** rather unfortunate and **historically myopic view,** reminiscent of early “class struggle” Marxists who soon resorted to violence as a means to achieve rather questionable ends.  And like these often brutal early Marxists, **modern anarchists** who resort to violence to solve the problem **are** walking upside down and backwards, **adding to** rather than correcting, both **the** immediate and long-term **Human Rights problem.**  Violent revolution, including our own American revolution, becomes a breeding ground for poverty, disease, starvation and often mass oppression leading to future violence. **Large, publicly traded corporations are created by individuals** or groups of individuals, operated by individuals and made up of individual and/or group investors. **These business enterprises are** deliberately structured to be **empowered by individual (or group) investor greed.**  For example, a theorized ‘need’ for offering salaries much higher than is necessary to secure competent leadership (often resulting in corrupt and entirely incompetent leadership), lowering wages more than is fair and equitable and scaling back of often hard fought for benefits, is sold to stockholders as being in the best interest of the bottom-line market value and thus, in the best economic interests of individual investors.  Likewise, **major political and corporate exploitation of third-world nations is rooted in the individual and joint greed** of corporate investors and others who stand to profit from such exploitation**.**  More than just investor greed, **corporations are driven by the greed of all those involved,** including individuals outside the enterprise itself who profit indirectly from it. If one **examines “the course of human events”** closely, **it can** correctly **be surmised that the “root” cause of humanity’s problems comes from individual human greed and** similar negative **individual motivation.  The Marx/Engles view of history being a “class” struggle ¹  does not address the root problem and is thus fundamentally flawed from a true historical perspective** (see [Gallo Brothers](http://freedomtracks.com/uncommonsense/gallobrothers.html) for more details**).**So-called “classes” of people, unions, corporations and political groups are made up of individuals who support the particular group or organizational position based on their own individual needs, greed and desires and thus, **an apparent “class struggle” in reality, is an extension of individual motivation.  Likewise, nations engage in wars of aggression, not because capitalism or classes of society are at root cause, but because individual members of a society are individually convinced that it is in their own economic survival best interest.  War, poverty, starvation and lack of Human and Civil Rights have existed on our planet since long before the rise of modern capitalism,** free enterprise and multi-national corporation avarice, **thus the root problem obviously goes deeper than this.** Junior Bush and the neo-conservative genocidal maniacs of modern-day America could not have recently effectively gone to war against Iraq without the individual support of individual troops and a certain percentage of individual citizens within the U.S. population, each lending support for their own personal motives, whatever they individually may have been**.**  **While it is true that corrupt leaders often provoke war,** using all manner of religious, social and political means to justify, often as not, entirely ludicrous ends, **very rare indeed is a battle only engaged in by these same unscrupulous miscreants of power.  And though a few iniquitous elitist powerbrokers may initiate nefarious policies of global genocidal oppression, it takes a very great many individuals operating from individual personal motivations of survival, desire and greed to develop these policies into a multi-national exploitive reality. No economic or political organization and no political or social cause exists unto itself but rather, individual members power a collective agenda.**

Aff – Capitalism Solves Warming

Capitalism is key to solving global warming

Janet **Whitman**, February 19 20**08**, pg. <http://www.financialpost.com/story.html?id=317551>

**Global warming may soon get a saviour more effective than Al Gore** and his doomsday Power-Point presentations: **capitalism.** The former U.S. vice-president, who was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize last year for his work on climate change, is credited with bringing widespread attention to the issue. **But the huge moneymaking opportunity in going green will be the big driver that leads to the reining in of the release of greenhouse gasses,** experts say. **Money already is pouring into environmental initiatives and technologies in the U**nited **S**tates. **Experts expect investment in the area to explode over the next few years if, as anticipated, the government here imposes restrictions on the release of gases believed to be behind climate change. "Capitalism will drive this,**" said Vinod Khosla, founding chief executive of Sun Microsystems and a longtime venture capitalist. Mr. Khosla, speaking on a panel at a recent investment summit on climate change at United Nations headquarters here, said **getting consumers to curb their energy use has never worked -- unless they've had a financial incentive. "If we make it economic, it will happen,"** he said. The expected government-mandated cap on carbon emissions already is fueling innovation. **Venture capitalists,** for **instance, are investing in new technologies that would make cement -- a major producer of carbon emissions -- actually absorb carbon instead.** Cement makers could practically give the product away and reap the financial reward from government carbon credits.

Aff – Capitalism Solves War

**Capitalism solves war – it replaces the need to invade with the need to trade.**

Dale **Copeland,** Assistant professor in the Department of Government and Foreign Affairs at the University of Virginia, 19**96**, “International Security, Vol. 2, No. 4” Economic Interdependence and War, 19, pg 8

Economic interdependence lowers the likelihood of war by increasing the value of trading over the alternative of aggression: interdependent states would rather trade than invade. As long as high levels of interdependence can be maintained , liberals assert, we have reason for optimism.

Capitalism solves global war.

Dale **Copeland,** Assistant professor in the Department of Government and Foreign Affairs at the University of Virginia, 19**96**, “International Security, Vol. 2, No. 4” Economic Interdependence and War, 19, pg 8

The period from 1920 to 1940 seems to support liberalism over realism. In the 1920s, interdependence was high, and the world was essentially peaceful; in the 1930s, as entrenched protectionism caused interdependence to fall international tension rose to the point of world war. Yet the two most aggressive states in the system during the 1930s, Germany and Japan, were also the most highly dependent despite their efforts towards autarchy, relying on other states, including other great powers, for critical raw materials. Realism thus seems correct in arguing that high dependence may lead to conflict, as states use war to ensure access to vital goods. Realism’s problem with the interwar era, however, is that Germany and Japan had been even more dependent in the 1920s, yet they sought war only in the late 1930s when their dependence, although still significant, had fallen.