## Contention 1: Capitalism

#### **Private space development – driven by a handful of space billionaires like Musk and Bezos – will expand terrestrial labor abuse into the endless bounds of space through Martian indentured servitude and trillions of orbital laborers.**

Marx 20 Paris Marx [sadly not that one] is a socialist writer and host of the Tech Won't Save Us podcast. "Yes to Space Exploration. No to Space Capitalism." June 2020, jacobinmag.com/2020/06/spacex-elon-musk-jeff-bezos-capitalism. [Quality Control]

The space billionaires — Musk and Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos foremost among them — have little stake in the well-being of the majority of the population. Their space visions are designed for wealthy people like themselves, with little mention of where the working class would fit in. They’ve built their wealth on exploitation, and their visions of the future are little more than an extension of their present actions. A History of Violence The business practices of Musk and Bezos are increasingly well known and have been on clear display during the pandemic. Musk tried to claim Tesla’s Fremont, California factory was “essential” until authorities forced him to close it; then he reopened it in defiance of health orders. As Tesla CEO, Musk has a long history of opposing the unionization of workers, presiding over a high rate of worker injuries (which the company tried to cover up), and even having a former worker hacked and harassed after he became a whistleblower. Meanwhile, Bezos has a similar history of abusing Amazon workers. Amazon’s warehouses are known for having higher injury rates than the industry average, the company has fought unionization, and the stories of the terrible conditions experienced by workers are legendary. During the pandemic, that has continued, with the company failing to enforce social distancing or provide adequate protective equipment until workers began walking out, refusing to be open about infection information, and firing workers who dared criticize the company, all while Bezos’s wealth has increased by more than $30 billion. But it goes beyond that, because the worldviews of these billionaires began to be formed long before they started the empires they currently lord over. Musk did not have a regular childhood, but rather a wealthy upbringing in apartheid South Africa. His father was an engineer and owned part of an emerald mine in Zambia, telling Business Insider, “We were very wealthy. We had so much money at times we couldn’t even close our safe.” In Elon Musk: Tesla, SpaceX, and the Quest for a Fantastic Future, Ashlee Vance describes how Musk got money from his father when he was starting one of his original ventures. He also had a particular admiration for his grandfather, who moved to apartheid South Africa from Canada after rallying “against government interference in the lives of individuals.” Bezos has a not dissimilar story. His father was a well-off oil engineer in Cuba while Fulgencio Batista was in power. In Bit Tyrants, Rob Larson explains that Bezos’s father left the island after the Cuban Revolution and passed his libertarian views down to his son. Bezos’s parents invested nearly $250,000 in Amazon in 1995 as it was getting started. These space barons made their billions through the exploitation of their workers and came from well-off backgrounds made possible from resource extraction. When digging into their visions for a future in space, it’s clear that they seek to extend these conditions into the cosmos, not challenge them in favor of space exploration for the benefit of all. The Future They Want Musk and Bezos are the leading drivers of the modern push to privatize and colonize space through their respective companies, SpaceX and Blue Origin. Their visions differ slightly, with Musk preferring to colonize Mars, while Bezos has more interest in building space colonies in orbit. In 2016, Musk claimed he would begin sending rockets to Mars in 2018. That never happened, but it hasn’t ended his obsession. Musk is determined to make humans a multi-planetary species, framing our choice as either space colonization or the risk of extinction. Bezos says that Earth is the best planet in our solar system, but if we don’t colonize space we doom ourselves to “stasis and rationing.” These framings serve the interests of these billionaires, and make it seem like colonizing space is an obvious and necessary choice when it isn’t. It ignores their personal culpability and the role of the capitalist system they seek to reproduce in causing the problems they say we need to flee in the first place. Billionaires have a much greater carbon footprint than ordinary people, with Musk flying his private jet all around the world as he claims to be an environmental champion. Amazon, meanwhile, is courting oil and gas companies with cloud services to make their business more efficient, and Tesla is selling a false vision of sustainability that purposely serves people like Musk, all while capitalism continues to drive the climate system toward the cliff edge. Colonizing space will not save us from billionaire-fueled climate dystopia.But these billionaires do not hide who would be served by their futures. Musk has given many figures for the cost of a ticket to Mars, but they’re never cheap. He told Vance the tickets would cost $500,000 to $1 million, a price at which he thinks “it’s highly likely that there will be a self-sustaining Martian colony.” However, the workers for such a colony clearly won’t be able to buy their own way. Rather, Musk tweeted a plan for Martian indentured servitude where workers would take on loans to pay for their tickets and pay them off later because “There will be a lot of jobs on Mars!” Bezos is even more open about how the workforce will have to expand to serve his vision, but has little to say about what they’ll be doing. His plan to maintain economic “growth and dynamism” requires the human population to grow to a trillion people. He claims this would create “a thousand Mozarts and a thousand Einsteins” who would live in space colonies that are supposed to house a million people each, with the surface of Earth being mainly for tourism. Meanwhile, industrial and mining work would move into orbit so as not to pollute the planet, and while he doesn’t explicitly acknowledge it, it’s likely that’s where you’ll find many of those trillion workers toiling for their space overlord and his descendants. Space Shouldn’t Serve Capitalists In 1978, Murray Bookchin skewered a certain brand of futurism that sought to “extend the present into the future” and desired “multinational corporations to become multi-cosmic corporations.” Much of this future thinking obsesses about possible changes to technology, but seeks to preserve the existing social and economic relations — “the present as it exists today, projected, one hundred years from now,” as Bookchin put it. That’s at the core of the space billionaires’ vision for the future. Space has been used by past US presidents to bolster American power and influence, but it was largely accepted that capitalism ended at the edge of the atmosphere. That’s no longer the case, and just as past capitalist expansions have come at the expense of poor and working people to enrich a small elite, so too will this one. Bezos and Trump may have a public feud, but that doesn’t mean that their mutual interest isn’t served by a renewed US push into space that funnels massive public funds into private pockets and seeks to open celestial bodies to capitalist resource extraction. This is not to say that we need to halt space exploration. The collective interest of humanity is served by learning more about the solar system and the universe beyond, but the goal of such missions must be driven by gaining scientific knowledge and enhancing global cooperation, not nationalism and profit-making.Yet that’s exactly what the space billionaires and American authoritarians have found common cause in, with Trump declaring that “a new age of American ambition has now begun” at a NASA press briefing just hours before cities across the country were placed under curfew last week. Before space can be explored in a way that benefits all of humankind, existing social relations must be transformed, not extended into the stars as part of a new colonial project.

#### Capitalism relies on constant but unsustainable expansion into new spaces of resource extraction and capital manipulation, called ‘spatial fixes’. Outer space is the next preeminent terrain for capital due to new resources and spaces to export excess capital accumulation but absent these novel but temporary spatial fixes, capital’s unsustainability becomes inevitable

**Shammas and Holen 19** Shammas, Victor L. and Tomas B. Holen. Victor L. Shammas, Oslo Metropolitan University, Work Research Institute (AFI), Oslo, Norway. Tomas B. Holen, Independent scholar, Oslo, Norway. "One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space." Palgrave Commun., vol. 5, no. 10, 29 Jan. 2019, pp. 1-9, doi:10.1057/s41599-019-0218-9. [Quality Control]

No longer terra nullius, space is now the **new terra firma** of capitalistkind: its naturalized terroir**, its next necessary terrain**. The logic of capitalism dictates that capital should seek to **expand outwards** into the vastness of space, a point recognized by a recent ethnography of NewSpace actors (Valentine, 2016, p. 1050). The operations of capitalistkind serve to resolve a series of (potential) **crises of capitalism**, revolving around the slow, steady decline of **spatial fixes** (see e.g., Harvey, 1985, p. 51–66) as they come crashing up against the quickly vanishing blank spaces remaining on earthly maps and declining (terrestrial) opportunities for profitable investment of surplus capital (Dickens and Ormrod, 2007a, p. 49–78).

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

Historically, spatial fixes have played an important role in conserving the capitalist system. As Jessop (2006, p. 149) points out, ‘The export of surplus money capital, surplus commodities, and/or surplus labour-power outside the space(s) where they originate enabled capital to avoid, at least for a period, the threat of devaluation'. But these new spaces for capital are not necessarily limited to physical terrains, as with colonial expansion in the nineteenth century; as Greene and Joseph (2015) note, various digital spaces, such as the Internet, can also be considered as spatial fixes: the Web absorbs overaccumulated capital, heightens consumption of virtual and physical goods, and makes inexpensive, flexible sources of labor available to employers. Greene and Joseph offer the example of online high-speed frequency trading as a digital spatial fix that **furthers the ‘annihilation of space by time'** first noted by Marx in his Grundrisse (see Marx, 1973, p. 524).

Outer space serves at least two purposes in this regard. In the short-to medium-term, it allows for the export of surplus capital into emerging industries, such as satellite imaging and communication. These are **significant sites of capital accumulation**: global revenues in the worldwide satellite market in 2016 amounted to $260 billion (SIA, 2017, p. 4). Clearly, much of this activity is taking place ‘on the ground'; it is occurring in the ‘terrestrial economy'. But all that capital would have to find some other meaningful or productive outlet were it not for the expansion of capital into space. Second, outer space serves as an arena of technological innovation, which feeds back into the terrestrial economy, helping to **avert crisis by pushing capital out of technological stagnation and innovation shortfalls.**

In short, **outer space serves as a spatial fix**. It swallows up surplus capital, promising to deliver valuable resources, technological innovations, and communication services to capitalists back on Earth. This places outer space on the **same level as traditional colonization**, analyzed in Hegel’s Philosophy of Right, which Hegel thought of as a product of the ‘inner dialectic of civil society', which drives the market to ‘push beyond its own limits and seek markets, and so its necessary means of subsistence, in other lands which are either deficient in the goods it has overproduced, or else generally backward in creative industry, etc.' (Hegel, 2008, p. 222). In this regard, SpaceX and related ventures are not so very different from maritime colonialists and the trader-exploiters of the British East India Company. But **there is something new at stake**. As the Silicon Valley entrepreneur Peter Diamandis has gleefully noted: ‘There are twenty-trillion-dollar checks up there, waiting to be cashed!' (Seaney and Glendenning, 2016). Capitalistkind consists in the **naturalization of capitalist consciousness and practic**e, the (**false) universalization** of a particular mode of political economy as inherent to the human condition, **followed by the projection of this naturalized universality into space**—**capitalist humanity** as a Fukuyamite ‘end of history', the end-point of (earthly) historical unfolding, **but the starting point of humanity’s first serious advances in space.**

#### Economic racism is central to capitalism – it facilitates minorities being disproportionately affected by climate change

Faber ’18 (Daniel, Director of the Northeastern Environmental Justice Research Collaborative in Boston. He co-founded the international journal Capitalism, Nature, Socialism and is the author or editor of several books, “Global Capitalism, Reactionary Neoliberalism, and the Deepening of Environmental Injustices,” June 14 2018, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10455752.2018.1464250)/ly

In this light, environmental injustices are rooted in power structures and models of capital accumulation that confer social class advantages and racial/gender privileges (Sicotte 2016 Sicotte, Diane. 2016. From Workshop to Waste Magnet: Environmental Inequality in the Philadelphia Region. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press. [Google Scholar] , 13). And when analyzing environmental inequality, we should be aware that there are multiple political-economic forces at work that give the injustice a particular context and form (Holifield 2001 Holifield, Ryan. 2001. “Defining Environmental Justice and Environmental Racism.” Urban Geography 22 (1): 78–90. doi: 10.2747/0272-3638.22.1.78 . [Taylor & Francis Online], [Web of Science ®], , [Google Scholar] ). In the United States and the world economy racism is a “constituent logic” of capitalism and, as stated by Pulido, “creates a variegated landscape that cultures and capital can exploit to create enhanced power and profits” (Pulido 2016 Pulido, Laura. 2016. “Flint, Environmental Racism, and Racial Capitalism.” Capitalism Nature Socialism 27 (3): 1–16. doi: 10.1080/10455752.2016.1213013 . [Taylor & Francis Online], , [Google Scholar] , 7; see also Ranganathan 2016 Ranganathan, Malini. 2016. “Thinking with Flint: Racial Liberalism and the Roots of an American Water Tragedy.” Capitalism Nature Socialism 27 (3): 17–33. doi: 10.1080/10455752.2016.1206583 . [Taylor & Francis Online], , [Google Scholar] ). As we shall see, environmental racism facilitates capital accumulation in a variety of critically important ways, and is central to the reactionary neoliberal project. As a result, poorer people of color face a “quadruple exposure effect” to environmental health hazards. This first takes the form of higher rates of “on the job” exposure to dangerous substances used in the production process inside the factory; and the second consists in greater exposure to toxic pollutants in the community outside the factory (Morello-Froch 1997 Morello-Froch, Rachel. 1997. “Environmental Justice and California’s ‘Riskscape’: The distribution of Air Toxics and Associated Cancer and Non-Cancer Health Risks among Diverse Community.” PhD diss., School of Public Health, Environmental Health Sciences Division, University of California at Berkeley. ). Faulty cleanup efforts implemented by the government or the waste treatment industry often magnify these problems (Lavelle and Coyle 1992 Lavelle, Marianne, and Marcia Coyle. 1992. “Unequal Protection: The Racial Divide in Environmental Law.” National Law Journal 21: 2–12. ; O’Neil 2005 O’Neil, Sandra G. 2005. “Environmental Justice in the Superfund Clean-up Process,” PhD Diss., Department of Sociology, Boston College. ). Poorer communities, women, and people of color also face greater dislocation, health problems, and loss of livelihood as a result of energy and natural resource extraction (Martinez-Alier 2002 Martinez-Alier, Joan. 2002. The Environmentalism of the Poor: A Study of Ecological Conflicts and Valuation. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar. [Crossref], , ; Bell 2013 Bell, Shannon. 2013. Our Roots Run as Deep as Ironweed: Appalachian Women and the Fight for Environmental Justice. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press. ). The final piece to the quadruple exposure effect comes in the form of greater exposure to toxic chemicals in the household, commercial foods, and a variety of consumer products. As demonstrated in the case of Flint, Michigan, neoliberal policy cost-cutting measures continue to be a leading health threat to children, particularly poor children and children of color living in older, dilapidated housing with lead pipes (Pulido 2016 Pulido, Laura. 2016. “Flint, Environmental Racism, and Racial Capitalism.” Capitalism Nature Socialism 27 (3): 1–16. doi: 10.1080/10455752.2016.1213013 . [Taylor & Francis Online], , ). Black children are now five times more likely than white children to have lead poisoning. Taken together, it is clear that racial capitalism is causing people of color to experience a disparate exposure to environmental hazards where they “work, live, and play” (Alston 1990 Alston, Dana. 1990. We Speak for Ourselves: Social Justice, Race, and Environment. Washington, DC: The Panos Institute.) Below I will quickly sketch out five processes by which reactionary neoliberal capitalism is likely to exacerbate environmental injustices in the United States: (1) by further promoting the mobility of ecologically hazardous industries into communities of color and white working-class neighborhoods; (2) by restricting the ability of the subaltern to move out of dangerous areas for safer neighborhoods; (3) by facilitating the dislocation of the subaltern from ecologically revitalized communities; (4) by limiting the ability of workers of color to leave dangerous jobs for safer occupations; and (5) by facilitating the appropriation of land and resources by global capital in a manner detrimental to the subaltern and popular class formations. Although my focus here is on the United States, it should be remembered that environmental injustices are being displaced in a very similar manner onto disempowered communities in neoliberal nations across the globe.

#### Capitalism causes nonwhite bodies to become commodified and treated as objects

**Leong, 13** - Professor Leong graduated magna cum laude from Northwestern University before attending Stanford Law School, where she graduated with distinction and was a member of the Stanford Law Review. Prior to joining the University of Denver faculty, Professor Leong was an Assistant Professor at the William & Mary School of Law and an Adjunct Professor at the American University Washington College of Law. Professor Leong is the author of over thirty law review articles and essays. Professor Leong is the recipient of numerous awards and honors. She received the University-wide Distinguished Scholar Award for the 2017-2018 academic year. (Nancy. “RACIAL CAPITALISM.” *Harvard Law Review*, vol. 126, no. 8, 2013, pp. 2151–2226. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/23415098.)//jl

A white man posts an ad on Craigslist explaining that he wants to make black friends.2 A political figure accused of racial indifference casually refers to a black friend while addressing the NAACP.3 Ad ministrators at a predominantly white university, concerned that pro spective students will be deterred by the school's racial homogeneity, authorize the use of Photoshop to add a black student to the photo on the cover of the university's application brochure.4 A predominantly white company, facing an array of lawsuits alleging race discrimina tion,5 aggressively recruits and hires nonwhite employees in order to create a track record of minority representation.6 Each of these incidents involves what I will call racial capitalism — the process of deriving social or economic value from the racial identity of another person.7 A person of any race might engage in racial capitalism, as might an institution dominated by any racial group. But in this Article, my focus is on the version of racial capitalism in which a white individual or a predominantly white institution derives social or economic value from associating with individuals with nonwhite racial identities. Such racial capitalism is common. In a society preoccupied with diversity, nonwhiteness is a valued commodity. And where that society is founded on capitalism, it is un surprising that the commodity of nonwhiteness is exploited for its market value. This Article is the first to identify racial capitalism as a systemic phenomenon and the first to describe the way that white people and predominantly white institutions derive value from nonwhiteness. Of course, assigning value to race is nothing new in America. Whiteness has been a source of value throughout our history, conferring power and privilege on the possessor. For centuries, American courts explicitly recognized the value of whiteness — for example, numerous courts held that calling a white person "black" constituted defamation and therefore qualified for legal redress.10 Litigants have also acknowledged the value of whiteness — for example, in Plessy v. Ferguson,n Homer Plessy referred to the perception of his whiteness as the "most valuable sort of property. . . the master-key that unlocks the golden door of opportunity."12 And scholars have examined the value of whiteness — for example, Cheryl Harris's acclaimed work Whiteness as Property posits that whiteness is a kind of "status property" that can be both analogized to conventional forms of property and literally converted to those forms.1 Nonwhiteness has been valued differently and more ambiguously. The practice of using nonwhiteness as a justification for the commodification of nonwhite individuals is older than America itself, as our bitter history of slavery demonstrates. For centuries, nonwhiteness was used as a basis for withholding value by denying nonwhite people legal rights and privileges. More recently, however, nonwhiteness has been considered a source of value; decisions such as Regents of the University of California v. Bakke14 and Grutter v. Bollinger15 have validated affirmative action programs in the interest of fostering racial diversity in colleges and universities. This rationale both reflects and reifies the premium that privileged segments of American society place upon diversity, both within and beyond institutions of higher education. In part as a result of judicial action, nonwhiteness has acquired a new sort of value. We have internalized the idea that racial diversity is a social good, and as a result, we assign value to the inclusion of nonwhite individuals in our social milieu, our educational institutions, and our workplaces. Nonwhiteness has therefore become something desirable — and for many, it has become a commodity to be pursued, captured, possessed, and used. To be clear, I see nothing inherently problematic in encouraging racial diversity within social groups and formal institutions, and I am convinced that such diversity is a necessary prerequisite to improving racial relations in America. The efforts of colleges and universities, employers, and other institutions to promote racial diversity should be celebrated, not disparaged. But problems with racial capitalism arise when white individuals and predominantly white institutions seek and achieve racial diversity without examining their motives and practices. Striving for numerical diversity, without more, results in awareness of nonwhiteness only in its thinnest form — as a bare marker of difference and a signal of presence. This superficial view of diversity consequently leads white individuals and predominantly white institutions to treat nonwhiteness as a prized commodity rather than as a cherished and personal manifestation of identity. Affiliation with nonwhite individuals thus becomes merely a useful means for white individuals and predominantly white institutions to acquire social and economic benefits while deflecting potential charges of racism and avoiding more difficult questions of racial equality. This instrumental view is antithetical to a view of nonwhiteness — and race more generally — as a personal characteristic intrinsically deserving of respect. Worse still, the instrumental view of nonwhiteness inhibits efforts at genuine racial inclusiveness and the irony, then, is that our legal and social emphasis on diversity — while intended to produce progress toward a racially egalitarian society — has instead in many cases contributed to a state of affairs that degrades nonwhiteness by commodifying it and that relegates non white individuals to the status of "trophies" or "passive emblems."16 Racial capitalism frequently does not benefit the nonwhite individuals whose identities are the source of capital, nor does it necessarily benefit society as a whole. Racial capitalism is troubling on both a symbolic and a practical level. When white people and predominantly white institutions commodify nonwhiteness and exploit its value, even under the auspices of a well-intentioned diversity rationale, racial capitalism evokes one of the darkest eras in American history, during which nonwhiteness — and nonwhite human beings — were assigned value and transferred among white people as commodities. Racial capitalism also forecloses progress on a practical level, both by inflicting identity harms on nonwhite individuals and by displacing substantive antidiscrimination reform. We should therefore decline to engage in racial capitalism and should instead decline to engage in racial capitalism and should instead develop more meaningful mechanisms for improving racial relations in America.

#### **Capitalism is the root of racism and historical oppression**

[IBT](http://www.bolshevik.org/whats_new.html) 93 The International Bolshevik Tendency (IBT) is a revolutionary socialist organization I[nternational Bolshevik Tendency](http://www.bolshevik.org/whats_new.html) 1993, "Capitalism & Racism," No Publication, <http://www.bolshevik.org/1917/no12/no12capitalismandracism.html>

Racism is rooted in the historical development of capitalism as a world system. It has proved through several centuries to be a useful and flexible tool for the possessing classes. It justified the brutal wars of conquest and genocide, which established the European colonial empires. It rationalized the slave trade, which produced the primitive accumulation of capital necessary for the industrial revolution. Today racism in its various guises remains an important ideological mainstay for the capitalist elites, providing a rationale for the barbaric oppression of minorities. Racism "explains," for example, why black people in America fail to get a piece of the "American Dream" one generation after another. It can be used to "explain" why Japanese capitalism has been much more successful than its European and North American rivals. The arguments offered by racists, whether the psychotic ravings of a lumpenized skinhead or the "objective," pseudo-scientific scholarship of a Harvard professor, seek to direct popular anger away from the workings of an irrational and decaying capitalist system to some group of "outsiders."

#### Capitalism entrenches poverty.

**Dean 12** Jodi Dean is a political theorist and professor in the Political Science department at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, the position of Erasmus Professor of the Humanities in the Faculty of Philosophy at Erasmus University Rotterdam. B.A. Princeton University, M.A. & Ph.D. Columbia University, co-editor of Digital Barricades. “The Communist Horizon.” Published October 9th 2012. || COMRADE OES-SW

Why communism? Because the gross inequality ushered in by the extreme capitalism of neoliberal state policy and desperate financialism is visible, undeniable, and global. Increasing in industrialized countries over the last three decades, income inequality is particularly severe in Chile, Mexico, Turkey, and the US, the four industrialized countries with the largest income gaps (Portugal, the UK, and Italy also make the top ten).3 Inequality in the US is so extreme that its Gini coefficient (45) makes it more comparable to Cameroon (44.6) and Jamaica (45.5) than to Germany (30.4) and the UK (34).4 The antagonism that cuts across capitalist countries is so apparent that dominant ideological forces can't obscure it. The US typically positions extreme inequality, indebtedness, and decay elsewhere, offshore. The severe global economic recession, collapse in the housing and mortgage markets, increase in permanent involuntary unemployment, trillion-dollar bank bailouts, and extensive cuts to federal, state, and local budgets, however, have made what we thought was the third world into our world. Contra Zizek, the division cutting across capitalist societies is never visible, never palpable in the US and UK now than it's been since at least the 1920s. We learn that more of our children live in poverty than at any time in recent history (20 percent of children in the US as of 2010), that the wealth of the very, ve11' rich-the top 1 percent-has dramatically increased while income for the rest of us has remained stagnant or declined, that many of the foreclosures the banks force on homeowners are meaningless, illegal acts of expropriation (the banks can't document who owns what so they lack the paper necessary to justify foreclosure proceedings). We read of corporations sitting on piles of cash instead of hiring back their laidoff workforce. Under neoliberalism, they lavishly enjoy their profits rather than put them back into production -what Gerard Dumenil and Dominique Levy call an explicit strategy of "disaccumulation."·3

## Contention 2: Space Gap

#### Private appropriation leaves low-income countries behind AND destroys their economies.

Dallas, et al. 19 (Dallas, J.A. (Australian Centre for Space Engineering Research, School of Minerals and Energy Resources Engineering, Sydney, Australia) et al. November 2, 2019, "Mining beyond earth for sustainable development: Will humanity benefit from resource extraction in outer space?," *Acta Astronautica*, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0094576519313839>)

The socioeconomic benefits experienced by spacefaring nations as a result of their participation in the space industry are numerous. In a report prepared for NASA in 2013 on the socioeconomic benefits created by the space agency; it was noted that NASA enhances the competitiveness of a number of industries including technology and manufacturing, spurs innovation and growth, promotes international collaboration, contributes to global emerging technologies, expands the scientific knowledge base, and creates employment (Tauri Group, 2013). Similarly, as noted by the European Space Agency (ESA), citizens of Europe reap the benefits brought about by the space industry daily, including technological advancements, employment opportunities, economic growth and enhanced competitiveness of European corporations in the global economy (ESA, 2018). A number of important technologies including communications systems, internet, satellite weather forecasts and GPS are reliant on space technology, resulting in unequal access to these technologies between spacefaring states and non-spacefaring states that cannot afford access. Many lower income nations are also nonspacefaring states that miss out on the socio-economic benefits of the space industry, along with access to important space technology, while spacefaring nations are reaping the many benefits of their participation in the space industry. This is known as the “Space Gap”. The exploitation of space resources is one of the next logical steps in humankind’s development. However, if only high-income, spacefaring nations participate in off-Earth mining and therefore profit from space resources, the space gap, i.e., economic inequality between states, is likely to widen. This is contrary to the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which sets out reduced inequalities as one of it’s 17 Sustainable Development Goals (United Nations, 2015). At a UN general assembly meeting in 2014, it was determined that the those living in poverty must benefit from the progress made in space science and technology, noting that space benefits should not be a cause of increasing economic and social inequality between nations (United Nations Press Release, 2014).

Off-Earth mining may not only provide a lucrative resource stream to countries with spacefaring capabilities, but also reduce high-income countries reliance on importing certain minerals from middle or low-income countries. The International Council on Mining and Metals has identified 25 mineral economies—countries where mineral exports comprised 20% or more of total merchandise exports or over 10% of GDP between the years 1995 and 2015 (ICMM, 2018). Given their dependence on mineral exports, mining resources in space and returning them to Earth has potentially serious economic and social implications for these mineral economies. Of the 25 countries with mineral economies identified by ICMM, only four have high income or upper-middle income economies, while 9 have lower-middle income economies, and the 12 remaining nations have low income economies (ICMM, 2018). This means that the majority of countries that have mineral economies are classified by the World Bank as middle-low to low income countries, while the majority of spacefaring nations are high-income countries (World Bank, 2018), (Figure 1). A reduction in mineral exports is likely to have serious economic and social implications for mineral economies. For example, South Africa supplies the majority of the world’s PGMs (Jones, 2005), and if importing nations begin to extract PGMs from metal rich asteroids and return them to Earth, this is likely to have significant economic consequences for South Africa on both the national and community levels. Reduced income from mineral exports will have knock-on effects for the economy, and at the local level a reduction in mining operations could result in unemployment and a reduction in services within mining communities, such as health care and education

#### Private appropriation would continue cycles of inequality by giving technologically and economically advantaged countries more ability to complete space ventures.

Chouhan 20 (Chouhan, Karan Singh, (Christ University) “Privatization of Outer-Space and Ownership: ISA as a Model of Regulation for Resource Exploitation” (December 1, 2020). CMR University Journal for Contemporary Legal Affairs, Vol 1, Issue 2, ISSN 2582-4805, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3832673>)

Another argument from the Global South that can be made against the privatization or appropriation is inequality that exists in the world. There are only few countries that have the technology and economy to conduct a space program. Outer Space treaty specifically says that any use and exploration should be done in the interest of the all countries, including developing countries. Similarly, there is a provision for equitable use and sharing of resources of celestial bodies for the developing countries under the moon agreement. The reason for this provision can be understood from a global justice perspective where large numbers of state were pillaged or subjugated hence they couldn’t be economically strong and now cannot take part in space ventures due to lack of capital and technology. Thus, it will be wrong to leave them behind. However, with the introduction of private property in space, it will become almost impossible for the developing or under-developed countries to use space for their own benefit as by the time they are able to conduct any space venture, most of the resource rich celestial bodies would already have been claimed by the technologically and economically strong (and mostly western) states, leaving nothing for the majority of the countries. Thus, a new cycle of inequality will be created where the haves (states with technology) will exploit the resource rich space and have not (developing or under-developed) will be left far behind in poverty.

## FW

#### The standard is minimizing structural violence.

1. **Structural violence is cyclical and kills more people than extinction EVERY YEAR**

**Gilligan 96** (James Gilligan, Prof @ Harvard, Department of Psychiatry at Harvard Med and Director of the Center for the Study of Violence, 1996, Violence: Our Deadly Epidemic and its Causes p. 191-196)

The deadliest form of violence is poverty. You cannot work for one day with the violent people who fill our prisons and mental hospitals for the criminally insane without being forcible and constantly reminded of the extreme poverty and discrimination that characterizes their lives. Hearing about their lives, and about their families and friends, you are forced to recognize the truth in Gandhi’s observation that the deadliest form of violence is poverty. Not a day goes by without realizing that trying to understand them and their violent behavior in purely individual terms is impossible and wrong-headed. Any theory of violence, especially a psychological theory, that evolves from the experience of men in maximum security prisons and hospitals for the criminally insane must begin with the recognition that these institutions are only microcosms. They are not where the major violence in our society takes place, and the perpetrators who fill them are far from being the main causes of most violent deaths. Any approach to a theory of violence needs to begin with a look at the structural violence in this country. Focusing merely on those relatively few men who commit what we define as murder could distract us from examining and learning from those structural causes of violent death that are far more significant from a numerical or public health, or human, standpoint. By “structural violence” I mean the increased rates of death, and disability suffered by those who occupy the bottom rungs of society, as contrasted with the relatively lower death rates experienced by those who are above them. Those excess deaths (or at least a demonstrably large proportion of them) are a function of class structure; and that structure is itself a product of society’s collective human choices, concerning how to distribute the collective wealth of the society. These are not acts of God. I am contrasting “structural” with “behavioral violence,” by which I mean the non-natural deaths and injuries that are caused by specific behavioral actions of individuals against individuals, such as the deaths we attribute to homicide, suicide, soldiers in warfare, capital punishment, and so on. Structural violence differs from behavioral violence in at least three major respects. \*The lethal effects of structural violence operate continuously, rather than sporadically, whereas murders, suicides, executions, wars, and other forms of behavioral violence occur one at a time. \*Structural violence operates more or less independently of individual acts; independent of individuals and groups (politicians, political parties, voters) whose decisions may nevertheless have lethal consequences for others. \*Structural violence is normally invisible, because it may appear to have had other (natural or violent) causesThe finding that structural violence causes far more deaths than behavioral violence does is not limited to this country. Kohler and Alcock attempted to arrive at the number of excess deaths caused by socioeconomic inequities on a worldwide basis. Sweden was their model of the nation that had come closes to eliminating structural violence. It had the least inequity in income and living standards, and the lowest discrepancies in death rates and life expectancy; and the highest overall life expectancy in the world. When they compared the life expectancies of those living in the other socioeconomic systems against Sweden, they found that 18 million deaths a year could be attributed to the “structural violence” to which the citizens of all the other nations were being subjected. During the past decade, the discrepancies between the rich and poor nations have increased dramatically and alarmingly. The 14 to 18 million deaths a year caused by structural violence compare with about 100,000 deaths per year from armed conflict. Comparing this frequency of deaths from structural violence to the frequency of those caused by major military and political violence, such as World War II (an estimated 49 million military and civilian deaths, including those by genocide—or about eight million per year, 1939-1945), the Indonesian massacre of 1965-66 (perhaps 575,000) deaths), the Vietnam war (possibly two million, 1954-1973), and even a hypothetical nuclear exchange between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. (232 million), it was clear that even war cannot begin to compare with structural violence, which continues year after year. In other words, every fifteen years, on the average, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period. This is, in effect, the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war, or genocide, perpetrated on the weak and poor every year of every decade, throughout the world. Structural violence is also the main cause of behavioral violence on a socially and epidemiologically significant scale (from homicide and suicide to war and genocide). The question as to which of the two forms of violence—structural or behavioral—is more important, dangerous, or lethal is moot, for they are inextricably related to each other, as cause to effect.

#### Structural violence is embedded in society. Other frameworks ignores damage and continues the most violent impacts.

**Scheper-Hughes 7**—professor of Anthropology and director of the program in Medical Anthropology at the University of California at Berkeley (Nancy, The Shadow Side of Fieldwork Exploring the Blurred Borders between Ethnography and Life “Chapter 7, The Gray Zone: Small Wars, Peacetime Crimes, and Invisible Genocides,” 8/13/07, http://14.139.206.50:8080/jspui/bitstream/1/2701/1/McLean&Leibing%20-%20The%20Shadow%20Side%20of%20Fieldwork%20Exploring%20the%20Blurred%20Borders%20between%20Ethnography%20and%20Life.pdf)//JLE

Violence cannot be objectified and quantified so as to allow clear and positive criteria for defining any particular act as violent or not. Of course, police, social workers, therapists, and judges must decide whether spanking a child with a hand, a hairbrush, or a leather strap, or throwing a child across a room, or slamming him or her against a wall is a violent act or a culturally defined and legitimate expression of parental authority and responsibility. World courts must decide whether to include “dirty wars” and “ethnic cleansings” under the legalistic rubric of genocide. But violence itself defies easy categorization. Violence can be everything and nothing; legitimate or illegitimate; visible or invisible; meaningful or useless; gratuitous or utterly rational and strategic. Revolutionary violence, community-based massacres, and state repression are often painfully graphic and visible. The everyday violence of infant mortality, slow starvation, infectious disease, despair, and humiliation that destroys humans with even greater frequency **is usually invisible or misrecognized.** What constitutes violence is always mediated by an expressed or implicit dichotomy between legitimate or illegitimate, permissible or sanctioned acts. Most violent acts consist of conduct that is socially permitted, encouraged, or enjoined as a moral right or a duty. Often, violence is not deviant behavior, not disapproved of, but to the contrary is defined as virtuous action in the service of conventional social, economic, and political norms. The “ ‘legitimate’ ” violence of the militarized state is invariably differentiated from the unruly, illicit, violence of the mob, the dissenters.

#### Prioritizing extinction ensures we never address the impacts.

**Munthe 15** – Christian Munthe, PhD, Practical Philosophy Professor Associate Head of Department for Research at the University of Gothenburg. [Why Aren't Existential Risk / Ultimate Harm Argument Advocates All Attending Mass? Philosophical Comment, 2-1-15, http://philosophicalcomment.blogspot.com/2015/02/why-arent-existential-risk-ultimate.html]//BPS

An increasingly popular genre in the sort of applied philosophy and ethics of technology, which does not so much engage with actual technological development as more or less wild phantasies about possibly forthcoming ones is the notions of "existential risks" or "ultimate harms", or similar expressions. The theme is currently inspiring several research environments at world-leading universities, such as this one and this one (where you can find many links to other sources, articles, blog posts, and so on), and given quite a bit of space in recent scholarly literature on a topic often referred to as the ethics of emerging technology. Now, personally and academically, as it has actually proceeded, I have found much of this development being to a large extent a case of the emperor's new clothes. The fact that there are possible threats to human civilizations, the existence of humanity, life on earth or, at least, extended human well-being, is not exactly news, is it? Neither is there any kind of new insight that some of these are created by humans themselves. Also, it is not any sort of recent revelation that established moral ideas, or theories of rational decision making, may provide reason for avoiding or mitigating such threats. Rather, both these theses follow rather trivially from a great many well-established ethical and philosophical theories, and are well-known to do so since hundreds of years. Still, piece after piece is being produced in the existential risk genre making this out as some sort of recent finding, and exposing grand gestures at proving the point against more or less clearly defined straw-men.

At the same time, quite a bit of what is currently written on the topic strikes me as philosophically shallow. For instance, the notion that the eradication of the human species has to be a bad thing seems to be far from obvious from a philosophical point of view - this would depend on such things as the source of the value of specifically human existence, the manner of the imagined extinction (it certainly does not have to involve any sort of carnage or catastrophe), and what might possibly come instead of humanity or currently known life when extinct and how that is to be valued. Similarly, it is a very common step in the typical existential risk line to jump rather immediately from the proposition of such a risk to the suggestion that substantial (indeed, massive) resources should be spent on its prevention, mitigation or management. This goes for everything from imagined large scale geo-engineering solutions to environmental problems, dreams of outer space migration, to so-called human enhancement to adapt people to be able to handle otherwise massive threats in a better way. At the same time, the advocates of the existential risk line of thought also urges caution in the application of new hitherto unexplored technology, such as synthetic biology or (if it ever comes to appear) "real" A.I. and android technology. However, also there, the angle of analysis is often restricted to this very call, typically ignoring the already since long ongoing debates in the ethics of technology, bioethics, environmental ethics, et cetera, where the issue of how much of and what sort of such caution may be warranted in light of various good aspects of different the technologies considered. And, to be frank, this simplification seems to be the only thing that is special with the existential risk argument advocacy: the idea that the mere possibility of a catastrophic scenario justifies substantial sacrifices, without having to complicate things by pondering alternative uses of resources.

Now, this kind of argument, is (or should be) well-known to anyone with a philosophical education, since it seems to share the basic form of the philosophical classic known as Pascal's Wager. In this argument, French enlightenment philosopher and mathematician, Blaise Pascal offered a "proof" of the rationality of believing in God (the sort of God found in abrahamitic monotheistic religion, that is), based on the possible consequences of belief or non-belief, given the truth or falsity of the belief. You can explore the details of Pascal's argument, but the basic idea is that in the face of the immense consequences of belief and non-belief if God exists (eternal salvation vs. eternal damnation), it is rational to bet on the existence of God, no matter what theoretical or other evidence for the truth of this belief exists and no matter the probability of this truth. It seems to me that the typical existential risk argument advocacy subscribes to a very similar logic. For instance, the standard line to defend that resources should be spent on probing and (maybe) facilitating), e.g., possible extraterrestial migration for humanity, seems to have the following form:

1) Technology T might possibly prevent/mitigate existential risk, E

2) It would be really, really, very, very bad if E was to be actualised

3) Therefore: If E was otherwise to be actualised, it would be really, really, very, very good if E was prevented

4) Therefore: If E was otherwise to be actualised, it would be really, really, very, very good if we had access to a workable T

5) Therefore: there are good reasons to spend substantial resources on probing and (maybe, if that turns out to be possible) facilitating a workable T

That is, what drives the argument is the (mere) possibility of a massively significant outcome, and the (mere) possibility of a way to prevent that particular outcome, thus doing masses of good. Now, I'm sure that everyone can see that this argument is far from obviously valid, even if we ignore the question of whether or not premise 2 is true, and this goes for Pascal's Wager too in parallel ways. For instance, the existential risk argument above seems to **ignore** that there seems to be an **innumerable amount** of thus **(merely) possible existential risk scenarios**, as well as **innumerable (merely) possibly workable technologies** that might help to prevent or mitigate each of these, and it is **unlikely (to say the least)** that we have resources to **bet substantially** on them **all**, unless we spread them **so thin** that **this action** becomes **meaningless**. Similarly, there are innumerable possible versions of the god that lures you with threats and promises of damnation and salvation, and what that particular god may demand in return, often implying a ban on meeting a competing deity's demands, so the wager doesn't seem to tell you to try to start believing in any particular of all these (merely) possible gods. Likewise, the argument above **ignores completely** the **(rather high) likelihood** that the mobilised resources will be **mostly wasted**, and that, therefore, there are **substantial opportunity costs** attached to not using these resources to use **better proven strategies** with better identified threats and problems (say, preventing global poverty) - albeit maybe not as **massive** as the outcomes in the **existential risk scenarios**. Similarly, Pascal's Wager completely ignores all the good things one needs to give up to meet the demands of the god promising eternal salvation in return (for instance, spending your Sundays working for the allieviation of global poverty). None of that is worth **any consideration**, the idea seems to be, in light of the **massive stakes** of the **existential risk** / **religious belief** or **non-belief scenarios**.

Now, I will not pick any quarrel with the existential risk argument as such on these grounds, although I do think that more developed ways to analyse risk-scenarios and the ethical implications of these already in existence and used in the fields I referred above will mean lots of troubles for the simplistic aspects already mentioned. What I do want to point to, however, is this: If you're impressed by the existential risk argument, you should be equally impressed by Pascal's Wager. Thus, in accordance with Pascal's recommendation that authentic religious belief can be gradually installed via the practice of rituals, you should – as should indeed the existential risk argument advocates themselves – spend your Sundays celebrating mass (or any other sort ritual demanded by the God you bet on). I **very much doubt**, however, that you (or they) in fact do that, or even accept the conclusion that you (or they) should be doing that.

#### Reducing structural violence comes prior to any conception of a moral society.

Deborah DuNann Winter and Dana C. Leighton[Psychologist that specializes in Social Psych, Counseling Psych, Historical and Contemporary Issues, Peace Psychology. Leighton: PhD graduate student in the Psychology Department at the University of Arkansas. Knowledgable in the fields of social psychology, peace psychology, and ustice and intergroup responses to transgressions of justice], 1999, Peace, conflict, and violence: Peace psychology in the 21st century, http://sites.saumag.edu/danaleighton/wp-content/uploads/sites/11/2015/09/SVintro-2.pdf

Finally, to recognize the operation of structural violence forces us to ask questions about how and why we tolerate it, questions which often have painful answers for the privileged elite who unconsciously support it. A final question of this section is how and why we allow ourselves to be so oblivious to structural violence. Susan Opotow offers an intriguing set of answers, in her article Social Injustice. She argues that our normal perceptual/cognitive processes divide people into in-groups and out-groups. Those outside our group lie outside our scope of justice. Injustice that would be instantaneusly confronted if it occurred to someone we love or know is barely noticed if it occurs to strangers or those who are invisible or irrelevant. We do not seem to be able to open our minds and our hearts to everyone, so we draw conceptual lines between those who are in and out of our moral circle. Those who fall outside are morally excluded, and become either invisible, or demeaned in some way so that we do not have to acknowledge the injustice they suffer. Moral exclusion is a human failing, but Opotow argues convincingly that it is an outcome of everyday social cognition. To reduce its nefarious effects, we must be vigilant in noticing and listening to oppressed, invisible, outsiders. Inclusionary thinking can be fostered by relationships, communication, and appreciation of diversity. Like Opotow, all the authors in this section point out that structural violence is not in- evitable if we become aware of its operation, and build systematic ways to mitigate its effects. Learning about structural violence may be discouraging, overwhelming, or maddening, but these papers encourage us to step beyond guilt and anger, and begin to think about how to reduce structural violence. All the authors in this section note that the same structures (such as global communication and normal social cognition) which feed structural violence, can also be used to empower citizens to reduce it. In the long run, reducing structural violence by reclaiming neighborhoods, demanding social justice and living wages, providing prenatal care, alleviating sexism, and celebrating local cultures, will be our most surefooted path to building lasting peace.

#### Probability - There is 100% probability of structural violence occurring - it occurs all around us everyday

#### Pre-requisite - each life improved could prevent catastrophe.

**Kaczmarek 17** – Patrick Kaczmarek, PhD at the University of Glasgow, a Senior Researcher at Effective Giving, Visiting Researcher at the Future of Humanity Institute at the University of Oxford and a Visiting Scholar at the Department of Philosophy at the University of Pittsburgh. [How Much is Rule-Consequentialism Really Willing to Give Up to Save the Future of Humanity? Utilitas, 29(2), https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/utilitas/article/how-much-is-ruleconsequentialism-really-willing-to-give-up-to-save-the-future-of-humanity/F867301151A79F7DA566A14DF71749B3]//BPS

Notice, the problem can be cast two different ways. First, the loss associated with humanity's premature extinction is so great that even if the probability of a catastrophic event is very low, an expected value calculation suggests that we should strive to prevent its possible occurrence. And yet, there is something deeply puzzling about ruining the lives of all actual persons for the sake of humanity eking out a longer stay in the universe.

Second, you may have realized that the above implication bears close resemblance to the dreaded Repugnant Conclusion. The Repugnant Conclusion states that for any population, all with a very high quality of life, there must be some larger imaginable population whose existence, all else being equal, would be better despite their lives being barely worth living.19The mistake, as countless critics have noted, is that quantity (that is, size of population) should not be able to compensate for a stark reduction to their average quality of life.

I'm inclined to agree that this looks worrisome. For some, if this were the end of the story, it would surely act as a reductio ad absurdum of the view. But this is not the full story.

AN INDIRECT APPROACH TO LOWERING THE THREAT OF EXTINCTION

In setting out our earlier comparison of the two populations it was assumed that only costs go up, never benefits. That is to say, A was fixed and the total sum of goods went up merely because the size of the population grew, despite internalization costs reducing average quality of life. Colouring in the picture, this corresponds to the scenario where, all else being equal, existential threats are directly targeted. To illustrate, this could amount to putting a lot of resources towards asteroid deflection programmes.20

I now wish to argue that we could instead reduce existential risk by indirect means, and in so doing make the world in two ways go better. As noted earlier, we would prolong humanity's place in the cosmos. Furthermore, an indirect approach improves the average welfare of persons, particularly the worse-off in our population.

Certainly, it would be a mistake to concentrate exclusively on indirectly lowering the probability of doomsday. Returning to our earlier example, reducing global poverty cannot prevent an Earth-bound asteroid the size of Texas from making impact. Nevertheless, if we were also to adopt an indirect approach, then this would contribute to existential risk reduction by curbing the negative ripple effects of readily preventable illnesses, global hunger, and so forth.

Ripple effects are a class of phenomena that affect the **far future** in significant ways, shaping how our history unfolds over time.21A ripple effect is initiated by a particular event that has some causal influence on the course of events that follow it. These events, in turn, may have their own impact on how further events play out. And so on it goes, reaching **wider and wider** as time passes.

Consider the following example. A doctor is in a position to cure some infant's blindness. Sure, the infant will probably have a better life after the operation. Most of us are quick to hone-in on this feature of the situation. And many other goods go unacknowledged by us as a result. Just a few of the proximate advantages we might reasonably expect to find after curing the infant's blindness include: her parents will be less worried about her, subsequently finding more free time to develop their own personal projects; the government will spend fewer resources on providing her education; this child will grow up with more opportunities, as well as perhaps being inspired to start a grassroots initiative or develop an **anti-malarial drug**. All of these consequences will have some role in shaping our future due to their own ripple effects. This network **of ripple effects** might go so far as causing '[her] country's economy to develop very slightly more quickly, or make certain **technological or cultural innovations** arrive **more quickly'**.22