

I affirm

The single standard is rejection of capitalist expansion.

1. Educational discussions of class oppression work to deconstruct neoliberal social relations and are the goal of critical pedagogy.

(McLaren 05)

(Peter McLaren is Professor at the Graduate School of Education at UCLA, “Teaching Against Global Capitalism and the New Imperialism: A Critical Pedagogy” 2005, pg. 6-11, 2005) ZS

As U.S. imperialism sinks its claws deeper into the rich oil fields of the Middle East, foreign policy pundits in the White House brandish the bragging rights of belonging to the one and only uncontested imperial power of the twenty-first century. In the wake of the recent invasion, occupation, and brutish colonization of Iraq, not to mention Afghanistan and Haiti, **there's** an unforgiving yet understandable **reluctance** on the part of some **educators** in graduate schools of education and teacher education programs **to engage in** political and **ideological debates** over the current social, political, and economic **crisis of capitalism** which Marxists claim are dangerously moving us closer to a final collision course with capitalism's own internal contradictions. Fewer still have seen fit to inquire into and oppose the harmful erosion of human rights that have been provided by the **discourse of neutrality** and objectivity **allows** educators to **distance** themselves from the larger set of social and political contradictions and **antagonisms that are generated by capitalist social relations of production** It also enables them to reduce the risks of having their **there exists** too **little genuine** discussion or **debate over** the **globalization of poverty** the exploitation of labor in Third World countries, or the Wall-Martization of the American workplace in the domestic frontiers. Given that most universities are now under corporate board-like management, this comes as little surprise. That a significant amount of scholarship churned out of graduate schools of education across the United States continues to operate from within the parameters drawn by capitalist social relations of production is simply restating a truism that holds for most of the academy. But what disturbs us is that this situation equally holds true for much of today's radical and progressive scholarship, which has largely failed to offer a critical and incisive criticism of capitalism. This is because learning for class questioning the social, political, cultural, and economic arrangements under capitalism constitutes a form of political dissent and activism that for many educators is simply too risky. Indeed, many engage in a form of "self-censorship" that severely restricts the surface of the mainstream dialogue. Thus, practices **educators** divorce political and ideological questions from pedagogical questions and **reduce pedagogy to** a congeries of prescribed methods and **techniques that sacrifice theory and reflection** for the sake of the high profits and profits of practice. Thus we are referring to those self-proclaimed practitioners who advocate conscious applications of teaching and learning over theory and self-reflection. We do not deny the importance of practice. In fact, we believe that theory must serve practice, and vice versa, for questions raised in practice must be answered by theory, which underscores the dialectical relationship between theory and practice. However, the theoretical and the practical dimensions of pedagogy can never be reduced to each another. This is because they exist in dialectical tension. In the absence of a theoretical understanding of the world, or a conceptual framework where we can reflect upon our experiences, or a discourse that enables us to examine our positionality, or an opportunity to explore and rethink the ways in which we interact and relate to the world, **practical tools** and applications of pedagogy work **only** to **reproduce and maintain capitalist social relations** production. In many instances, teacher education programs have failed to engage students in dialogues about class exploitation and oppression. Oftentimes, class power is minimized and its powerful effect on the life chances of working-class students is downplayed or made invisible. As Paul Lantieri (1998) has cogently expressed: "Class" remains that unaddressed member of that now-famous trio: "race, gender, class." Over the last two decades, there has been

for more widespread acknowledgment of and open discussion of race and gender in the classroom, which class has generally remained the ethical subject. In fact, in classrooms, people have learned about to talk about class. They often don't know [how] to acknowledge economic difference and economic privilege—with their arrangements of conflicting social and cultural forms. Regrettably, many **progressive** teacher **education programs** too often **divorce the causes** of cultural, racial, and gender oppression **from class oppression** As a result, the struggle for social justice oftentimes is reduced to a truncated and dogmatically fatalist strategy of attrition that fails, in the main, to challenge and expose the mechanisms responsible for reproducing capitalist

hegemony. In fact, **such programs serve as a recipe for inaction.** Educators in our view need to shoulder the courage to question and to problematize the intensification of class antagonisms, the reproduction of the sexual division of labor, and the stubborn persistence of institutional racism that nourishes the ever-decaying roots of capitalism in its latest metabolic stage, namely, the new imperialism. As educators, we need to take the moral and ethical responsibility to question why the United States, the wealthiest nation on the planet, continues to have the highest child poverty rate among Western industrialized countries. We need to question why 34.6 million Americans are living in poverty. We need to question why 43.6 million American-ians are lacking any access to health insurance. And why is the combined income of the three wealthiest individuals on the planet equal to the combined national income of the poorest forty-nine countries? A historical comparison by Mathew Fox may shed some light on the issues. Fox (2004) notes that "in the 1960s, the overall income of the richest 20 percent of the world's population was thirty times that of the poorest 20 percent. Today, it is 224 times larger! In the 1960s, the richest 20 percent held 70 percent of the world's revenues; in 1999 it was 85 percent"(42). Those of us who teach in graduate schools of education, and whose work is informed and guided by the principles of critical pedagogy, feel a sense of urgency in drawing attention to the growing class inequalities. Take for example, access to higher education, which now more than ever is beyond the reach of working-class high school graduates. In a recent issue of BusinessWeek, Jessi Hempel (2004) notes that in a study of the country's top 146 colleges and universities, only 5 percent of the student body came from families in the bottom quarter of wage earners. A more disturbing trend is the growing number of entering freshman who are from families earning \$100,000 or more. Hempel writes that in the nation's top forty-two state universities, the number of entering fresh-man in this category jumped from 32 percent to 40 percent in less than five years. Finally, critical pedagogy needs to be a creative process by integrating elements of popular culture (i.e., drama, music, oral history, narratives) as educational tools that can successfully raise the level of political consciousness of students and teachers. In our view, critical pedagogy must be animated by a passionate and critical-minded optimism. In the chapters that follow, we attempt to expand on this approach to pedagogy as a means of challenging current social relations of production and incarnations of imperialism worldwide.

2. Capitalism destroys the value to life of the capitalist and the worker, making consciousness another tool for profit. We cannot weigh any other framework when a rational actor becomes nothing but a cog in a machine.

(Marsh '95) (James Marsh, Professor of Philosophy at Fordham University, PhD from Northwestern University, Critique Action and Liberation, p 277)

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

3. No prereq arguments- capitalism will always be the root of any form of evil we see in the world making the framework debate a sequencing question we will always win because capitalism causes every impact—Capitalism is unsustainable and causes existential environmental obliteration, global structural violence, and imperial expansion.

Robinson 18 (William, Prof. of Sociology, Global and International Studies, and Latin American Studies, @ UC-Santa Barbara, "Accumulation Crisis and Global Police State," 2018, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0896920518757054>)

Each major episode of **crisis in the** world **capitalist system** has presented the potential for systemic change. Each has **involved** the breakdown of state legitimacy, **escalating** class and social **struggles, and military conflicts**, leading to a restructuring of the system, including new institutional arrangements, class relations, and accumulation activities that eventually result in a restabilization of the system and renewed capitalist expansion. The current crisis shares aspects of earlier system-wide structural crises, such as of the 1880s, the 1930s or the 1970s. But there are six interrelated dimensions to the current crisis that I believe sets it apart from these earlier ones and suggests that **a simple restructuring of the system will not lead to its restabilization** –

that is, our very survival now requires a revolution against global capitalism (Robinson, 2014). These six dimensions, in broad strokes, present a “big picture” context in which a global police state is emerging.

First, the system is fast reaching the ecological limits of its reproduction. We have already passed tipping points in climate change, the nitrogen cycle, and diversity loss. For the first time ever, human conduct is intersecting with and fundamentally altering the earth system in such a way that threatens to bring about a sixth mass extinction (see, e.g., Foster et al., 2011; Moore, 2015). These ecological dimensions of global crisis have been brought to the forefront of the global agenda by the worldwide environmental justice movement. Communities around the world have come under escalating repression as they face off against transnational corporate plunder of their environment. While capitalism cannot be held solely responsible for the ecological crisis, it is difficult to imagine that the environmental catastrophe can be resolved within the capitalist system given capital's implacable impulse to accumulate and its accelerated commodification of nature.

Second, the level of global social polarization and inequality is unprecedented. The richest one percent of humanity in 2016 controlled over half of the world's wealth and 20 percent controlled 95 percent of that wealth, while the remaining 80 percent had to make do with just five percent (Oxfam, 2017). These escalating inequalities fuel capitalism's chronic problem of overaccumulation: the TCC cannot find productive outlets to unload the enormous amounts of surplus it has accumulated, leading to chronic stagnation in the world economy (see next section). Such extreme levels of social polarization present a challenge of social control to dominant groups. As Trumpism in the United States as well as the rise of far-right and neo-fascist movements in Europe so well illustrate, cooptation also involves the manipulation of fear and insecurity among the downwardly mobile so that social anxiety is channeled towards scapegoated communities. This psychosocial mechanism of displacing mass anxieties is not new, but it appears to be increasing around the world in the face of the structural destabilization of capitalist globalization. Extreme inequality requires extreme violence and repression that lend themselves to projects of 21st century fascism.

Third, the sheer magnitude of the means of violence and social control is unprecedented, as well as the magnitude and concentrated control over the means of global communication and the production and circulation of symbols, images, and knowledge. Computerized wars, drone warfare, robot soldiers, bunker-buster bombs, a new generation of nuclear weapons, satellite surveillance, cyberwar, spatial control technology, and so forth, have changed the face of warfare, and more generally, of systems of social control and repression. We have arrived at the panoptical surveillance society, a point brought home by Edward Snowden's revelations in 2013, and the age of thought control by those who control global flows of communication and symbolic production. If global capitalist crisis leads to a new world war the destruction would simply be unprecedented.

Fourth, we are reaching limits to the extensive expansion of capitalism, in the sense that there are no longer any new territories of significance to integrate into world capitalism and new spaces to commodify are drying up. The capitalist system is by its nature expansionary. In each earlier structural crisis, the system went through a new round of extensive expansion – from waves of colonial conquest in earlier centuries, to the integration in the late 20th and early 21st centuries of the former socialist countries, China, India and other areas that had been marginally outside the system. There are no longer any new territories to integrate into world capitalism. At the same time, the privatization of education, health, utilities, basic services, and public lands is turning those spaces in global society that were outside of capital's control into “spaces of capital,” so that intensive expansion is reaching depths never before seen. What is there left to commodify? Where can the system now expand? New spaces have to be violently cracked open and the peoples in these spaces must be repressed by the global police state.

The contention is environmental destruction.

Current environmental crises driven by capitalism are accelerating in the status quo, eventually leading to planetary destruction and increased war - causing extinction

Kahn '3 (Richard KAHN, Ph.D. in Social Sciences and Comparative Education, Ph.D. Philosophy, Cosmology & Consciousness, Baccalaureate in Philosophy, Master of Arts in Liberal Arts, assistant professor at University of North Dakota, "Towards Ecopedagogy: Weaving a Broad-based Pedagogy of Liberation for Animals, Nature, and the Oppressed People of the Earth", Journal For Critical Animal Studies, Volume 1, Issue 1, 2003, http://www.criticalanimalstudies.org/JCAS/Journal_Articles_download/Issue_1/kahn.pdf) [Brick]

It's official: **the era of resource wars is upon us**. In a major London address, British Defense Secretary John Reid warned that global **climate change and dwindling natural resources are combining** to increase the likelihood of violent conflict over land, water and energy. Climate change, he indicated, "will make scarce resources, clean water, viable agricultural land even scarcer" -- and this will "make the emergence of violent conflict more rather than less likely." Although not unprecedented, Reid's prediction of an upsurge in resource conflict is significant both because of his senior rank and the vehemence of his remarks. "The blunt truth is that the **lack of water and agricultural land is a significant** contributory factor to the tragic conflict we see unfolding in Darfur," he declared. "We should see this as a warning sign." Resource conflicts of this type are most likely to arise in the developing world, Reid indicated, but the more advanced and affluent countries are not likely to be spared the damaging and destabilizing effects of global climate change. With sea levels rising, **water and energy becoming increasingly scarce** and prime agricultural lands turning into deserts, internecine warfare over access to vital resources will become a global phenomenon. Reid's speech, delivered at the prestigious Chatham House in London (Britain's equivalent of the Council on Foreign Relations), is but the most recent expression of a growing trend in strategic circles to view environmental and resource effects -- rather than political orientation and ideology -- as the most potent source of armed conflict in the decades to come. With the world **population rising, global consumption rates soaring, energy supplies disappearing and climate change eradicating valuable farmland**, the stage is being set for persistent and worldwide struggles over vital resources. Religious and political strife will not disappear in this scenario, but rather will be channeled into contests over valuable sources of water, food and energy. Prior to Reid's address, the most significant expression of this outlook was a report prepared for the U.S. Department of Defense by a California-based consulting firm in October 2003. Entitled "An Abrupt Climate Change Scenario and Its Implications for United States National Security," the report warned that global **climate change is more likely to result** in sudden, cataclysmic environmental events than a gradual (and therefore manageable) rise in average temperatures. Such events could include a substantial increase in global sea levels, intense storms and hurricanes and continent-wide "dust bowl" effects. This would trigger pitched battles between the survivors of these effects for access to food, water, habitable land and energy supplies. "Violence and disruption stemming from the stresses created by abrupt changes in the climate pose a different type of threat to national security than we are accustomed to today," the 2003 report noted. "Military confrontation may be triggered by a desperate need for natural resources such as energy, food and water rather than by conflicts over ideology, religion or national honor." Until now, this mode of analysis has failed to command the attention of top American and British policymakers. For the most part, they insist that ideological and religious differences -- notably, the clash between values of tolerance and democracy on one hand and extremist forms of Islam on the other -- remain the main drivers of international conflict. But Reid's speech at Chatham House suggests that a major shift in strategic thinking may be under way. Environmental perils may soon dominate the world security agenda. This shift is due in part to the growing weight of **evidence point[s] to a significant human role in altering the planet's basic climate systems**. Recent **studies** showing the rapid shrinkage of the polar ice caps, the accelerated melting of North American glaciers, the increased frequency of severe hurricanes and a number of other such effects all suggest that dramatic and potentially harmful changes to the global climate have begun to occur. More importantly, they **conclude** that **human** behavior -- most importantly, the **burning of fossil fuels** in factories, power plants, and motor vehicles -- **is the** most likely **cause** of these changes. This assessment may not have yet penetrated the White House and other bastions of head-in-the-sand thinking, but it is clearly gaining ground among scientists and thoughtful analysts around the world. For the most part, public discussion of global climate change has tended to describe its effects as an environmental problem -- as a threat to safe water, arable soil, temperate forests, certain species and so on. And, of course, climate change is a potent threat to the environment; in fact, the greatest threat imaginable. But viewing climate change as an environmental problem fails to do justice to the magnitude of the peril it poses. As Reid's speech and the 2003 Pentagon study make clear, the greatest danger posed by global climate change is not the degradation of ecosystems per se, but rather the disintegration of entire human societies, producing wholesale starvation, mass migrations and recurring conflict over resources. "As famine, disease, and weather-related disasters strike due to abrupt climate change," the Pentagon report notes, "many **countries' needs will exceed their capacity**" -- that is, their ability to provide the minimum requirements for human survival. **This "will** create a sense of desperation, which is likely to **lead to offensive aggression" against countries with** a greater stock of vital **resources**. "Imagine eastern European countries, struggling to feed their populations with a falling supply of food, water, and energy, eyeing Russia, whose population is already in decline, for access to its grain, minerals, and energy supply." Similar scenarios will be replicated all across the planet, as those without the means to survive invade or migrate to those with greater abundance -- producing endless struggles between resource "haves" and "have-nots." It is this prospect, more than anything, that worries John Reid. In particular, he expressed **concern over** the **inadequate capacity of poor and unstable countries to cope with the effects of climate change, and the resulting risk of**

state collapse, civil war and mass migration. "More than 300 **million[s]** people in Africa currently **lack** access to safe **water**," he observed, and "**climate change will worsen this** dire situation" -- provoking more wars like Darfur. And even if these social disasters will occur primarily in the developing world, the wealthier **countries will** also be caught up in them, whether by participating in peacekeeping and humanitarian aid operations, by fending off unwanted migrants or by **fighting for access to overseas supplies of food, oil, and minerals**. When reading of these nightmarish scenarios, it is easy to conjure up images of desperate, starving people killing one another with knives, staves and clubs -- as was certainly often the case in the past, and could easily prove to be so again. But these scenarios also envision the use of more deadly weapons. "**In this world of warring states,**" the 2003 Pentagon report predicted, "**nuclear arms proliferation is inevitable.**" **As oil and natural gas disappears**, more and **more** countries **will rely on nuclear power** to meet their energy needs -- and this "will **accelerat[ing] nuclear proliferation** as countries develop enrichment and reprocessing capabilities to ensure their national security."

Capitalism perpetuates environmental destruction by abandoning everything in pursuit of profit resulting in extinction

Cook 6 (Deborah Cook, Professor of Philosophy, University of Windsor, 2006, "Staying Alive: Adorno and Habermas on Self-Preservation Under Late Capitalism.")

In the passage in Negative Dialectics where he warns against self-preservation gone wild, Adorno states that it is "only as reflection upon ... self-preservation that reason would be above nature" (1973, 289). To rise above nature, then, reason must become "cognizant of its own natural essence" (1998b, 138). To be more fully rational, we must reflect on what Horkheimer and Adorno once called our underground history (1972, 231). In other words, we must recognize that our behavior is motivated and shaped by instincts, including the instinct for self-preservation (Adorno 1998a, 153). In his lectures on Kant, Adorno makes similar remarks when he summarizes his solution to the problem of self-preservation gone wild. To remedy this problem, nature must first become conscious of itself (Adorno 2000, 104). Adopting the Freudian goal of making the unconscious conscious, Adorno also insists that this critical self-understanding be accompanied by radical social, political, and economic changes that would bring to a halt the self-immolating domination of nature. This is why mindfulness of nature is necessary but not sufficient to remedy unbridled self-preservation. In the final analysis, society must be fundamentally transformed in order rationally to accommodate instincts that now run wild owing to our forgetfulness of nature in ourselves. By insisting on

Because self-preservation remains irrational, we now encounter serious environmental problems like those connected with global warming and the greenhouse effect, the depletion of natural resources, and the death of more than one hundred regions in our oceans. Owing to self-preservation gone wild, we have colonized and destabilized large parts of the world, adversely affecting the lives of millions, when we have not simply enslaved or murdered their inhabitants outright. Famine and disease are often the result of ravaging the land in the name of survival imperatives. Wars are waged in the name of self-preservation: with his now notoriously invisible weapons of mass destruction, Saddam Hussein was said to represent a serious threat to the lives of citizens in the West. The war against terrorism, waged in the name of self-preservation, has seriously undermined human rights and civil liberties; it has also been used to justify the murder, rape, and torture of thousands. As it now stands, the owners of the means of production ensure our survival through profits that, at best, only trickle down to the poorest members of society.

Taken in charge by the capitalist economy, self-preservation now dictates that profits increase exponentially to the detriment of social programs like welfare and health care. In addition, self-preservation has gone wild because our instincts and needs are now firmly harnessed to commodified offers of satisfaction that deflect and distort them. Having surrendered the task of self-preservation to the economic and political systems, we remain in thrall to untamed survival instincts that could well end up destroying not just the entire species, but all life on the planet.

Space appropriation by private capitalist companies worsens the environment - it removes funding from environmental

protection and causes irreversible damage through technology.

(Shukla, 21) “The Environmental Costs of the Space Tourism Business” Nikita Shukla.

Nikita is currently an undergraduate student studying Economics at the University of Edinburgh. She is particularly interested in understanding the social impact of policy and achieving sustainable economic growth.

<https://earth.org/environmental-costs-of-space-tourism-business/> [Brick]

On July 20, Jeff Bezos, the founder of Amazon, flew into space along with three other companions in one of Blue Origin’s human-rated capsules. Just nine days prior, Richard Branson boarded the Virgin Galactic Unity 22 Spaceflight, which blasted off into suborbital space for a few minutes. Both companies plan on selling commercial tickets to their spacecraft soon. SpaceX, owned by Elon Musk, plans to launch its first civilian mission in September 2021. While much of the world watched in awe as these billionaires soared into space, scientists worry that the rise and future of space tourism business could harm the Earth’s atmosphere and exacerbate the effects of climate change. What are the Environmental Consequences of Space Tourism Business and Space Pollution? Space exploration pollution has been gaining more attention in recent years and should not be ignored. The **spacecraft** operated by Branson’s Virgin Galactic is powered by a hybrid engine. These **engines**

burn rubber and other fuels, and they **generat[ing] a lot of soot.** A space tourism flight, which lasts about an hour-and-a-half, generates as much pollution as a 10-hour trans-Atlantic flight. This raises concern considering Virgin Galactic’s ambitions to fly tourists several times a day. Small **particles such as soot** and aluminum oxides, can **have a severe impact on the atmosphere.** A 2010 research paper modeled the effects of **soot injected into the atmosphere** from a thousand private suborbital flights a year and found that it **would increase** the **temperature[s] over the poles** by 1 degree Celsius **and reduce polar sea ice levels** by 5%.

SpaceX plans on launching 395 flights in space annually. However, **a single flight** reportedly **can generate a carbon footprint equivalent of 278 people** combined. The fuel for its Falcon 9 engine consists of kerosene and liquid oxygen, which creates a lot of carbon dioxide when burnt. Holding 440 tons of fuel, SpaceX would release 4,000 tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere per year if its plans of launching every two weeks are achieved. Bezos’ New Shepard, on the other hand, has been hailed as one of the cleanest in the industry. Combining liquid hydrogen and liquid oxygen to generate thrust, the main emissions would consist of mainly water, some minor combustion products, and only a little bit of carbon dioxide. But that does not mean these space flights are totally clean, and the further down the supply chain you look, the more concerns pop up. Large amounts of electricity is required to make liquid hydrogen and oxygen for the propellant, while water from the rocket exhausts can increase the number of clouds in the atmosphere, thereby, impacting the upper atmospheric layers. Since there have been too few rocket launches, they were not regarded as a concern in climate modeling. **Too little is known about the impact of emitting pollutants in spaces** where you would not normally emit. Though it is predicted that space tourism business will expand and increase exponentially in the coming years, with the amount of fuel burned by the space industry being less than 1%, it is unknown at which point rocket launches will start to have a considerable effect on the environment. **While these billionaires pour billions of dollars to take part in this ego-fuelled race to space,** more than two hundred people have died due to extreme flooding in Germany and Belgium, **hundreds have lost their lives due to** record breaking

temperatures and wildfires in Canada, **and many more** fatalities due to other catastrophic disasters that have been intensifying around the world due to **climate change.** You might also like: How to Make Deep Decarbonisation A Reality Better Uses for Money Spent on Space Tourism Business Bezos thanked his Amazon staff who “paid for all of this”, which was understandably, met by criticisms as Amazon workers are notoriously underpaid and forced to work in exploitative work environments such as resorting to using bottles instead of having the time to take even bathroom breaks. **For** roughly **four minutes** of weightlessness **in space, Bezos**

had **spent** approximately **\$5.5 billion.** By redirecting **these expenses,** these are seven problems that **could have** been solved with Bezos’ space flight money: **Plant[ed] up to 5 billion trees,** which only cost around \$1 to \$3 to

plant. 37.5 million people could have been saved from starvation, **and** if each billionaire flying into space, Bezos, Musk, and Branson,

committed \$6 billion, 41 million people could have been prevented from starving this year. Fully funded COVAX, securing vaccines for 2 billion people in low-income countries. Bezos could have funded their initiative, which needs approximately \$2.6 billion, two times over in the time of a deadly pandemic instead of going to space. Working with the United Nations, he could fund humanitarian efforts in Nigeria (\$1 billion), the Democratic Republic of Congo (\$2 billion), Afghanistan (\$1.2 billion), Venezuela (\$0.7 billion), Yemen and the horn of Africa (\$0.6 billion). Fully funded the International Fund for Agricultural Development which is \$350 million short of its fundraising goal. Fully funded Education

Cannot Wait, providing education to children displaced by crises, nearly three times over. **Helped countries invest in renewable energy, restore ecosystems, and make buildings more energy efficient.**

Outer space will be an extension of capitalism if appropriated - ensuring outer space and colonized planets receive the same destructive fate as our world.

(Holen & Shammass, 19) Shammass, V.L., Holen, T.B. One giant leap for capitalist kind: private enterprise in outer space. *Palgrave Commun* 5, 10 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-019-0218-9>

Outer space is becoming a space for capitalism. We are entering a new era of the commercialization of space, geared towards generating profits from satellite launches, space tourism, asteroid mining, and related ventures. **This** era, driven by private corporations such as Elon Musk's SpaceX and Jeff Bezos's Blue Origins, **has been labeled** by industry insiders as **NewSpace**—in contrast to 'Old Space', a Cold War-era mode of space relations when (allegedly) slow-moving, sluggish states dominated outer space. **NewSpace marks the arrival of capitalism in space.** While challenging the libertarian rhetoric of its proponents—space enterprises remain enmeshed in the state, relying on funding, physical infrastructure, technology transfers, regulatory frameworks, and symbolic support—NewSpace nevertheless heralds a novel form of human activity in space. **Despite its humanistic, universalizing pretensions, however, NewSpace does not benefit humankind as such but rather a specific set of wealthy entrepreneurs, many of them originating in Silicon Valley, who strategically deploy humanist tropes to engender enthusiasm for their activities.** We describe this complex as 'capitalist kind'. Moreover, **the arrival of capitalism in space is fueled by the expansionary logic of capital accumulation.** Outer space serves as a spatial fix, allowing capital to transcend its inherent terrestrial limitations. In this way, the ultimate spatial fix is perhaps (outer) space itself.

