#### I affirm the resolution “The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.”

#### Observation One: The resolution is a values question which means that the aff’s burden is to prove the statement true and the neg’s burden is to prove it false. The aff does not have to prove solvency but only that appropriation of outer space is unjust.

#### The resolution lacks and actor and a verb. Forcing the aff to prove solvency is impossible since the resolution doesn’t provide an action to solve or an actor to even engage in that action. Proving solvency would require the tacking on of words which is infinitely regressive and renders the resolution meaningless.

#### This ensures equitable division of ground – aff proves it is unjust and the neg proves its just. Guarantees an equal split of ground and prevents the neg from having access to solvency deficits which gives them an unfair advantage given the aff cannot implement a policy to solve.

## Part One: Space Imperialism

#### There is no longer an ‘outside’ to capitalism. The existence of an ‘outside’ noncapitalist market required to realize surplus value is immediately and simultaneously internalized as the surplus value is transformed back into capital. An expansive totalizing economic system settles for nothing but totality – the occupation of all space and the consumption of all things
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For a large portion of the twentieth century, the critique of imperialism has been among the most active and urgent arenas of Marxist theory.1 Many of these arguments are today certainly outdated and the situation they refer to is utterly transformed. This does not mean, however, that we have nothing to learn from them. These critiques of imperialism can help us understand the passage from imperialism to Empire because in certain respects they anticipated that passage. One of the central arguments of the tradition of Marxist thinking on imperialism is that there is an intrinsic relation between capitalism and expansion, and that capitalist expansion inevitably takes the political form of imperialism. Marx himself wrote very little about imperialism, but his analyses of capitalist expansion are central to the entire tradition of critique. What Marx explained most clearly is that capital constantly operates through a reconfiguration of the boundaries of the inside and the outside. Indeed, capital does not function within the confines of a fixed territory and population, but always overflows its borders and internalizes new spaces: ‘‘The tendency to create the world market is directly given in the concept of capital itself. Every limit appears as a barrier to be overcome.’’2 This restive character of capital constitutes an ever-present point of crisis that pertains to the essence of capital itself: constant expansion is its always inadequate but nonetheless necessary attempt to quench an insatiable thirst. We do not mean to suggest that this crisis and these barriers will necessarily lead capital to collapse. On the contrary, as it is for modernity as a whole, crisis is for capital a normal condition that indicates not its end but its tendency and mode of operation. Capital’s construction of imperialism and its move beyond it are both given in the complex play between limits and barriers. Marx analyzes capital’s constant need for expansion first by focusing on the process of realization and thus on the unequal quantitative relationship between the worker as producer and the worker as consumer ofcommodities.3 The problem of realization is one of the factors that drives capital beyond its boundaries and poses the tendency toward the world market. In order to understand the problem we have to start out from exploitation. ‘‘To begin with,’’ we read in the Grundrisse, ‘‘capital forces the workers beyond necessary labour to surplus labour. Only in this way does it realize itself, and create surplus value’’ (p. 421). The wage of the worker (corresponding to necessary labor) must be less than the total value produced by the worker. This surplus value, however, must find an adequate market in order to be realized. Since each worker must produce more value than he or she consumes, the demand of the worker as consumer can never be an adequate demand for the surplus value. In a closed system, the capitalist production and exchange process is thus defined by a series of barriers: ‘‘Capital, then, posits necessary labour time as the barrier to the exchange value of living labour capacity; surplus labour time as the barrier to necessary labour time; and surplus value as the barrier to surplus labour time’’ (p. 422). All these barriers flow from a single barrier defined by the unequal relationship between the worker as producer and the worker as consumer. Certainly, the capitalist class (along with the other classes that share in its profits) will consume some of this excess value, but it cannot consume all of it, because if it did there would be no surplus value left to reinvest. Instead of consuming all the surplus value, capitalists must practice abstinence, which is to say, they must accumulate.4 Capital itself demands that capitalists renounce pleasures and abstain as much as possible from ‘‘wasting’’ the surplus value on their own consumption. This cultural explanation of capitalist morality and abstinence, however, is just a symptom of the real economic barriers posed within capitalist production. On the one hand, if there is to be profit, then the workers must produce more value than they consume. On the other hand, if there is to be accumulation, the capitalist class and its dependents cannot consume all of that surplus value. If the working class together with the capitalist class and its dependents cannot form an adequate market and buy all the commodities produced, then even though exploitation has taken place and surplus value has been extracted, that value cannot be realized.5 Marx points out further that this barrier is continually exacerbated as labor becomes ever more productive. With the increase of productivity and the consequent rise in the composition of capital, variable capital (that is, the wage paid the workers) constitutes an increasingly small part of the total value of the commodities. This means that the workers’ power of consumption is increasingly small with respect to the commodities produced: ‘‘The more productivity develops, the more it comes into conflict with the narrow basis on which the relations of consumption rest.’’6 The realization of capital is thus blocked by the problem of the ‘‘narrow basis’’ of the powers of consumption. We should note that this barrier has nothing to do with the absolute power of production of a population or its absolute power of consumption (undoubtedly the proletariat could and wants to consume more), but rather it refers to the relative power of consumption of a population within the capitalist relations of production and reproduction. In order to realize the surplus value generated in the production process and avoid the devaluation resulting from overproduction, Marx argues that capital must expand its realm: ‘‘A precondition of production based on capital is therefore the production of a constantly widening sphere of circulation, whether the sphere itself is directly expanded or whether more points within it are created as points of production’’ (p. 407). Expanding the sphere of circulation can be accomplished by intensifying existing markets within the capitalist sphere through new needs and wants; but the quantity of the wage available to workers for spending and the capitalists’ need to accumulate pose a rigid barrier to this expansion. Alternatively, additional consumers can be created by drafting new populations into the capitalist relationship, but this cannot stabilize the basically unequal relationship between supply and demand, between the value created and the value that can be consumed by the population of proletarians and capitalists involved.7 On the contrary, new proletarians will themselves always be an inadequate market for the value of what they produce, and thus they will always only reproduce the problem on a larger scale.8 The only effective solution is for capital to look outside itself and discover noncapitalist markets in which to exchange the commodities and realize their value. Expansion of the sphere of circulation outside the capitalist realm displaces the destabilizing inequality. Rosa Luxemburg developed Marx’s analysis of the problem of realization, but she changed the inflection of that analysis. Luxemburg casts the fact that ‘‘outside consumers qua other-than-capitalist are really essential’’ (pp. 365–66) in order for capital to realize its surplus value as an indication of capital’s dependence on its outside. Capitalism is ‘‘the first mode of economy which is unable to exist by itself, which needs other economic systems as a medium and a soil.’’9 Capital is an organism that cannot sustain itself without constantly looking beyond its boundaries, feeding off its external environment. Its outside is essential. Perhaps this need constantly to expand its sphere of control is the sickness of European capital, but perhaps it is also the motor that drove Europe to the position of world dominance in the modern era. ‘‘Perhaps then the merit of the West, confined as it was on its narrow ‘Cape of Asia,’ ’’ Fernand Braudel supposes, ‘‘was to have needed the world, to have needed to venture outside its own front door.’’10 Capital from its inception tends toward being a world power, or really the world power. Capital expands not only to meet the needs of realization and find new markets but also to satisfy the requirements of the subsequent moment in the cycle of accumulation, that is, the process of capitalization. After surplus value has been realized in the form of money (through intensified markets in the capitalist domain and through reliance on noncapitalist markets), that realized surplus value must be reinvested in production, that is, turned back into capital. The capitalization of realized surplus value requires that for the subsequent cycle of production the capitalist will have to secure for purchase additional supplies of constant capital (raw materials, machinery, and so forth) and additional variable capital (that is, labor power)—and eventually in turn this will require an even greater extension of the market for further realization. The search for additional constant capital (in particular, more and newer materials) drives capital toward a kind of imperialism characterized by pillage and theft. Capital, Rosa Luxemburg asserts, ‘‘ransacks the whole world, it procures its means of production from all corners of the earth, seizing them, if necessary by force, from all levels of civilisation and from all forms of society . . . It becomes necessary for capital progressively to dispose ever more fully of the whole globe, to acquire an unlimited choice of means of production, with regard to both quality and quantity, so as to find productive employment for the surplus value it has realised.’’11 In the acquisition of additional means of production, capital does relate to and rely on its noncapitalist environment, but it does not internalize that environment—or rather, it does not necessarily make that environment capitalist. The outside remains outside. For example, gold and diamonds can be extracted from Peru and South Africa or sugarcane from Jamaica and Java perfectly well while those societies and that production continue to function through noncapitalist relations. The acquisition of additional variable capital, the engagement of new labor power and creation of proletarians, by contrast, implies a capitalist imperialism. Extending the working day of existing workers in the capitalist domain can, of course, create additional labor power, but there is a limit to this increase. For the remainder of this new labor power, capital must continually create and engage new proletarians among noncapitalist groups and countries. The progressive proletarianization of the noncapitalist environment is the continual reopening of the processes of primitive accumulation—and thus the capitalization of the noncapitalist environment itself. Luxemburg sees this as the real historical novelty of capitalist conquest: ‘‘All conquerors pursued the aim of dominating and exploiting the country, but none was interested in robbing the people of their productive forces and in destroying their social organisation.’’12 In the process of capitalization the outside is internalized. Capital must therefore not only have open exchange with noncapitalist societies or only appropriate their wealth; it must also actually transform them into capitalist societies themselves. This is what is central in Rudolf Hilferding’s definition of the export of capital: ‘‘By ‘export of capital’ I mean the export of value which is intended to breed surplus value abroad.’’13 What is exported is a relation, a social form that will breed or replicate itself. Like a missionary or vampire, capital touches what is foreign and makes it proper. ‘‘The bourgeoisie,’’ Marx and Engels write, ‘‘compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilisation into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In one word, it creates the world after its own image.’’14 In economic terms, this civilization and modernization mean capitalization, that is, incorporation within the expanding cycle of capitalist production and accumulation. In this way the noncapitalist environment (territory, social forms, cultures, productive processes, labor power, and so forth) is subsumed formally under capital. We should note here that European capital does not really remake noncapitalist territories ‘‘after its own image,’’ as if all were becoming homogeneous. Indeed, when the Marxist critics of imperialism have recognized the processes of the internalization of capital’s outside, they have generally underestimated the significance of the uneven development and geographical difference implicit in them.15 Each segment of the noncapitalist environment is transformed differently, and all are integrated organically into the expanding body of capital. In other words, the different segments of the outside are internalized not on a model of similitude but as different organs that function together in one coherent body. At this point we can recognize the fundamental contradiction of capitalist expansion: capital’s reliance on its outside, on the noncapitalist environment, which satisfies the need to realize surplus value, conflicts with the internalization of the noncapitalist environment, which satisfies the need to capitalize that realized surplus value. Historically these two processes have often taken place in sequence. A territory and population are first made accessible as an outside for exchange and realization, and then subsequently brought into the realm of capitalist production proper. The important point, however, is that once a segment of the environment has been ‘‘civilized,’’ once it has been organically incorporated into the newly expanded boundaries of the domain of capitalist production, it can no longer be the outside necessary to realize capital’s surplus value. In this sense, capitalization poses a barrier to realization and vice versa; or better, internalization contradicts the reliance on the outside. Capital’s thirst must be quenched with new blood, and it must continually seek new frontiers. It is logical to assume that there would come a time when these two moments of  the cycle of accumulation, realization and capitalization, come into direct conflict and undermine each other. In the nineteenth century, the field for capitalist expansion (in material resources, labor power, and markets) seemed to stretch indefinitely, both in Europe and elsewhere. In Marx’s time, capitalist production accounted for very little of global production. Only a few countries had substantial capitalist production (England, France, and Germany), and even these countries still had large segments of noncapitalist production—peasant-based agriculture, artisanal production, and so forth. Luxemburg argues, however, that since the earth is finite, the logical conflict will eventually become a real contradiction: ‘‘The more violently, ruthlessly and thoroughly imperialism brings about the decline of non-capitalist civilisations, the more rapidly it cuts the ground from under the feet of capitalist accumulation. Though imperialism is the historical method for prolonging the career of capitalism, it is also the sure means of bringing it to a swift conclusion.’’16 This contradictory tension is present throughout the development of capital, but it is revealed in full view only at the limit, at the point of crisis—when capital is faced with the finitude of humanity and the earth. Here the great imperialist Cecil Rhodes appears as the paradigmatic capitalist. The spaces of the globe are closing up and capital’s imperialist expansion is confronting its limits. Rhodes, ever the adventurer, gazes wistfully and yearningly at the stars above, frustrated by the cruel temptation of those new frontiers, so close and yet so far. Even though their critiques of imperialism and capitalist expansion are often presented in strictly quantitative, economic terms, the stakes for Marxist theorists are primarily political. This does not mean that the economic calculations (and the critiques of them) should not be taken seriously; it means, rather, that the economic relationships must be considered as they are really articulated in the historical and social context, as part of political relations of rule and domination.17 The most important political stake for these authors in the question of economic expansion is to demonstrate the ineluctable relationship between capitalism and imperialism. If capitalism and imperialism are essentially related, the logic goes, then any struggle against imperialism (and the wars, misery, impoverishment, and enslavement that follow from it) must also be a direct struggle against capitalism. Any political strategy aimed at reforming the contemporary configuration of capitalism to make it nonimperialist is vain and naive because the core of capitalist reproduction and accumulation necessarily implies imperialist expansion. Capital can- not behave otherwise—this is its nature. The evils of imperialism cannot be confronted except by destroying capitalism itself.

**Outer space has turned into capital’s new internalized “outside”, a new domain into which it can expand for further exploitation of resources and investment of surplus capital – space development and exploration are mere “spatial fixes” for capitalism to postpone its inevitable internal contradictions: the emptying out of all productive possibility**
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The Cosmos: Capitalism’s New “Outside” Instead of indulging in over-optimistic and fantastic visions, we should take a longer, harder, and more critical look at what is happening and what is likely to happen. We can then begin taking a more measured view of space humanization, and start developing more progressive alternatives. At this point, we must return to the deeper, underlying processes which are at the heart of the capitalist economy and society, and which are generating this demand for expansion into outer space. Although the humanization of the cosmos is clearly a new and exotic development, the social relationships and mechanisms underlying space-humanization are very familiar. In the early twentieth century, Rosa Luxemburg argued that an “outside” to capitalism is important for two main reasons. First, it is needed as a means of creating massive numbers of new customers who would buy the goods made in the capitalist countries.7 As outlined earlier, space technology has extended and deepened this process, allowing an increasing number of people to become integral to the further expansion of global capitalism. Luxemburg’s second reason for imperial expansion is the search for cheap supplies of labor and raw materials. Clearly, space fiction fantasies about aliens aside, expansion into the cosmos offers no benefits to capital in the form of fresh sources of labor power.8 But expansion into the cosmos does offer prospects for exploiting new materials such as those in asteroids, the moon, and perhaps other cosmic entities such as Mars. Neil Smith’s characterization of capital’s relations to nature is useful at this point. The reproduction of material life is wholly dependent on the production and reproduction of surplus value. To this end, capital stalks the Earth in search of material resources; nature becomes a universal means of production in the sense that it not only provides the subjects, objects and instruments of production, but is also in its totality an appendage to the production process…no part of the Earth’s surface, the atmosphere, the oceans, the geological substratum or the biological superstratum are immune from transformation by capital. 9 Capital is now also “stalking” outer space in the search for new resources and raw materials. Nature on a cosmic scale now seems likely to be incorporated into production processes, these being located mainly on earth. Since Luxemburg wrote, an increasing number of political economists have argued that the importance of a capitalist “outside” is not so much that of creating a new pool of customers or of finding new resources.10 Rather, an outside is needed as a zone into which surplus capital can be invested. Economic and social crisis stems less from the problem of finding new consumers, and more from that of finding, making, and exploiting zones of profitability for surplus capital. Developing “outsides” in this way is also a product of recurring crises, particularly those of declining economic profitability. These crises are followed by attempted “fixes” in distinct geographic regions. The word “fix” is used here both literally and figuratively. On the one hand, capital is being physically invested in new regions. On the other hand, the attempt is to fix capitalism’s crises. Regarding the latter, however, there are, of course, no absolute guarantees that such fixes will really correct an essentially unstable social and economic system. At best, they are short-term solutions. The kind of theory mentioned above also has clear implications for the humanization of the cosmos. Projects for the colonization of outer space should be seen as the attempt to make new types of “spatial fix,” again in response to economic, social, and environmental crises on earth. Outer space will be “globalized,” i.e., appended to Earth, with new parts of the cosmos being invested in by competing nations and companies. Military power will inevitably be made an integral part of this process, governments protecting the zones for which they are responsible. Some influential commentators argue that the current problem for capitalism is that there is now no “outside.”11 Capitalism is everywhere. Similarly, resistance to capitalism is either everywhere or nowhere. But, as suggested above, the humanization of the cosmos seriously questions these assertions. New “spatial fixes” are due to be opened up in the cosmos, capitalism’s emergent outside. At first, these will include artificial fixes such as satellites, space stations, and space hotels. But during the next twenty years or so, existing outsides, such as the moon and Mars, will begin attracting investments. The stage would then be set for wars in outer space between nations and companies attempting to make their own cosmic “fixes.”

## Part Two: Impacts of Space

#### Defense contractors and space corporations have captured the US congress with massive lobbying to ensure their control of outer space at the expense of social programs – ensures that the wars that plagued the Earth will be exported to the heavens
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“Rigged Game in Washington” The Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space was formed in 1992 at a meeting in Washington, D.C., and has been the leading group internationally challenging the weaponization and nuclearization of space. Its coordinator, Bruce Gagnon, in a 2021 interview with me, said: “The aerospace industry has long proclaimed that ‘Star Wars’ would be the largest industrial project in human history. Add the nuclear industry’s ambition to use space as its ‘new market,’ and one can imagine the money that would be involved. These two industry giants have put their resources together to ensure their ‘control and domination’ of the U.S. Congress. Both political parties are virtually locked down when it comes to appropriating funds to move the arms race into space and to colonize the heavens for corporate profits. Just one example is the recent approval in Congress of the creation of the ‘Space Force’ as a new service branch in the military.” “During the Trump administration (with the Democrats in control of the House of Representatives) the Space Force was ‘stood up’ as they like to say in the biz,” said Gagnon. “The Democrats could have stopped the creation of this new military branch. During the little congressional debate that did occur, the only thing the Democrats requested was to call it the ‘Space Corps’ (like the Marine Corps). It’s a rigged game in Washington when it comes to handing out money to the aerospace industry.” Gagnon continued: “In his book, [The Pentagon’s New Map: War and Peace in the 2lst Century](https://www.amazon.com/Pentagons-New-Map-Twenty-First-Century/dp/0425202399), former Navy War College Professor Thomas Barnett writes that, under globalization of the world economy, every country will have a different role. We won’t produce shoes, cars, phones, washing machines and the like in the U.S. anymore because it is cheaper for industry to exploit labor in the global south. Our role in the U.S., Barnett says, will be ‘security export.’ That means we will endlessly fight wars in the parts of the world where nations are not yet ‘fully integrated’ into corporate capitalism. Having a dominant military in space would enable the U.S. to see, hear and target everything on the Earth.” “In order to put together a global ‘Leviathan’ military capability,” Gagnon continued, “space must be militarized and weaponized. The cost of doing so is enormous and requires cuts in social and environmental spending and larger contributions from NATO member nations.” “In addition to using space technology to control Earth on behalf of corporate capital, the new Space Force will have another key job. They will be tasked with attempting to control the pathway on and off the planet Earth. In the 1989 Congressional Study entitled [Military Space Forces: The Next 50 Years](http://coat.ncf.ca/our_magazine/links/55/Articles/55_12-13.pdf), congressional staffer John Collins writes on pages 24 and 25: “[Nature reserves decisive advantage for L4 and L5, two allegedly stable [space] libration points that theoretically could dominate Earth and moon, because they look down both gravity wells. No other location is equally commanding](https://coat.ncf.ca/our_magazine/links/55/Articles/55_12-13.pdf)…. Armed forces might lie in wait at that location to hijack rival shipments on return.” Privatized Gold Rush “The Pentagon is looking to a future where space would be fully privatized and a new gold rush would ensue. Corporations and rich fat-cats like Jeff Bezos, Elon Musk and Richard Branson, while ignoring the UN’s Outer Space and Moon Treaties that call the heavens the ‘province of all mankind,’ would move to control the shipping lanes from Earth into space. The Space Force would be used by these ‘space entrepreneurs’ as their own private pirate forces to ensure they controlled the extraction of resources mined from planetary bodies. This provocative vision would in the end recreate the global war system, which has been deeply embedded into the culture and consciousness here on Earth. Russia, China and other space-faring nations are not going to allow the U.S. to be the ‘Master of Space.’” Says Gagnon: “I call this the bad seed of greed, war and environmental devastation that we are poised to plant into the heavens.” “It is my hope that the global public would quickly awaken to a deep understanding and not allow corporate oligarchs or the military to encircle our planet with so much space junk that we would be forever entombed on Earth, or continue to punch a hole in the Earth’s delicate ozone layer from toxic rocket exhaust after each of their tens of thousands of coming launches, or ruin the sacred night sky with blinking satellites for 5G that will in the end be used by the Space Force for expanded ‘space situational awareness’ and targeting capabilities.” “We have reached the point in human history where we need the immediate intervention by the citizen taxpayers of the planet to ensure that our tiny orbiting satellite called Earth remains livable for the future generations,” Gagnon declared. “We can’t fall for the public relations story-line of the cowboy sailing off into space to discover the new world. We know how that movie turns out in the end—just ask the Native American people.” U.S. Army Colonel John Fairlamb (Ret.), in 2021 wrote in The Hill, the Washington, D.C., news website: “Let’s be clear: Deploying weapons in space crosses a threshold that cannot be walked back.” Fairlamb’s background includes being International Affairs Specialist for the Army Space and Missile Defense Command and Military Assistant to the U.S. Secretary of State for Political Military Affairs. “Given the implications for strategic stability, and the likelihood that such a decision [to deploy weapons in space] by any nation would set off an expensive space arms race in which any advantage gained would likely be temporary, engaging now to prevent such a debacle seems warranted,” wrote Fairlamb. His piece was headed: “The U.S. should negotiate a ban on basing weapons in space.” “It’s time,” Fairlamb wrote, “for arms control planning to address the issues raised by this drift toward militarization of space. Space is a place where billions of defense dollars can evaporate quickly and result in more threats about which to be concerned. Russia and China have been proposing mechanisms for space arms control at the United Nations for years; it’s time for the U.S. to cooperate in this effort.” As Alice Slater, a member of the boards of both the Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space and the organization World BEYOND War, says: “The U.S. mission to dominate and control the military use of space has been, historically and at present, a major obstacle to achieving nuclear disarmament and a peaceful path to preserve all life on Earth. Reagan rejected Gorbachev’s offer to give up ‘Star Wars’ as a condition for both countries to eliminate all their nuclear weapons … Bush and Obama blocked any discussion in 2008 and 2014 on Russian and Chinese proposals for a space-weapons ban in the consensus-bound Committee on Disarmament in Geneva.” “At this unique time in history when it is imperative that nations of the world join in cooperation to share resources to end the global plague assaulting its inhabitants and to [avoid catastrophic climate destruction or Earth-shattering nuclear devastation,”](https://worldbeyondwar.org/time-to-negotiate-for-peace-in-space/) said Slater, “we are instead squandering our treasure and intellectual capacity on weapons and space warfare.” And yet far worse is to come—unless there is a return to the vision of the Outer Space Treaty of 1967. The latter needs to be expanded, U.S. Space Force dismantled, and a full global commitment made to keep space for peace. As we go to press, Breaking Defense published an article: [“Pentagon Poised To Unveil, Demonstrate Classified Space Weapon.” This was its headline. Above the headline it stated: “Show Coverage: Space Symposium 2021”](https://breakingdefense.com/2021/08/pentagon-posed-to-unveil-classified-space-weapon/?utm_campaign=Breaking%20News&utm_medium=email&_hsmi=151302334&_hsenc=p2ANqtz-_WjJRXNH7oSN8eQo0iMMC52dIbrytHkcSOFjM1_zECxrz5zqaTLiWTN0lmaYIYa35tfuqxon2uOPfvbhS1zFeBwuIlrg&utm_content=151302334&utm_source=hs_email) The piece begins: [“For months, top officials at the Defense Department have been working toward declassifying the existence of a secret space weapon program and providing a real-world demonstration of its capabilities.”](https://breakingdefense.com/2021/08/pentagon-posed-to-unveil-classified-space-weapon/?utm_campaign=Breaking%20News&utm_medium=email&_hsmi=151302334&_hsenc=p2ANqtz-_WjJRXNH7oSN8eQo0iMMC52dIbrytHkcSOFjM1_zECxrz5zqaTLiWTN0lmaYIYa35tfuqxon2uOPfvbhS1zFeBwuIlrg&utm_content=151302334&utm_source=hs_email) It continues: [“The system in question long has been cloaked in the blackest of black secrecy veils—developed as a so-called Special Access Program known only to a very few, very senior government leaders.”](https://breakingdefense.com/2021/08/pentagon-posed-to-unveil-classified-space-weapon/?utm_campaign=Breaking%20News&utm_medium=email&_hsmi=151302334&_hsenc=p2ANqtz-_WjJRXNH7oSN8eQo0iMMC52dIbrytHkcSOFjM1_zECxrz5zqaTLiWTN0lmaYIYa35tfuqxon2uOPfvbhS1zFeBwuIlrg&utm_content=151302334&utm_source=hs_email) The August 20th article features below its headline a large illustration of—as its caption reads—“Directed energy anti-satellite weapons for the future (Lockheed Martin)” Space Symposium 2021 was to be held in Colorado Springs, Colorado between August 23 and 26. A main speaker was to be General John W. “Jay” Raymond, chief of space operations of the U.S. Space Force. Breaking Defense describes itself as “the digital magazine on the strategy, politics and technology of defense,” adding: “It’s a new era in defense, where new technologies, new warfare domains and a rapidly shifting military and political landscape have profound implications for national security.” Profound, indeed!

#### Financial frenzy will turn to bloodlust, outer space privatization is the most likely cause of armed conflict
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These fixes could easily become the basis for a new global war, one in which a militarized outer space would be an important part. This is because there is a potential and actual contradiction between regional ‘fixes’ such as those attempted by China, India and Japan and the demands for capital to find new sources of accumulation. A regional fix is often made ‘autarchic’: a zone that, on account of active state intervention, allows limited trade with the outside world. As Harvey (2006) suggests, this may not be a problem so long as there are sufficient resources of capital and labour in the region in question for local capital to continue accu- mulation. But, if this is not the case, capital will inevitably move elsewhere. In the process, however, it confronts other capitalist enterprises over access to labour and resources. Nationally based private enterprises therefore finish up competing for shrinking opportunities for accumulation and this indeed is a recipe for potential armed conflict. As the next chapter discusses in more detail, China, Japan and India are amongst the countries now attempting to secure military presences in outer space. If Harvey’s theory is correct, these are means of protecting regional interests by ensuring that capital in these regions will have ready access to resources and labour beyond their own limits. Regional investments in outer space could thereby form an important form of future wars over resources, hostilities which could even include confrontations with the military might of the United States. Initially these conflicts might be land-based with satellites engaged in surveillance and the guid- ing of Earth-based weapons, but later they could easily be of a ‘star wars’ type with hostilities taking place in outer space. As Harvey points out, war can be seen as the ultimate and most catastrophic form of ‘devaluation’: one in which whole societies are obliterated and the prospects for a new round of investment and accumulation may be started. But regional, government-organized alliances do not have to be formed for military and surveillance purposes. Europe can also be seen as an attempted autar- chy. It is making, albeit rather gradually, its own regional fix while raising trade barriers and pressurizing developing countries to open up markets. On the other hand, its outer space policy seems quite distinctive from that of other regions. The European Space Agency (ESA) does not appear to be imperialist in intent. It is relatively collaborative, allowing access to a range of players. These include public and private sector organizations and, perhaps surprisingly, a very substantial investment from China. ESA’s Galileo system of thirty satellites circling the globe is to be used for peaceful purposes such as environmental monitoring and the satellite guidance of private vehicles. It is set to radically change how physical movements, especially on the roads, will be tracked. It will also pave the way for individualized road pricing, insurance pricing and monitoring. From a geopolitical viewpoint, however, the importance of Galileo is that it opens up the possibility of an independent force in outer space. It is will allow, for example, surveillance that cannot be controlled by the US. This is making American authorities treat the Galileo system with a high degree of suspicion (Mean and Wilsdon 2004).

#### Outer Space is a limitless void where capitalism can divert resources from climate change and reify earthly inequality

Temmen 21 Temmen, Jens. "Why Billionaires In Space Are Not Going To Make The World A Better Place - De Gruyter Conversations". De Gruyter Conversations, 2021, <https://blog.degruyter.com/today-space-is-virgin-territory-why-billionaires-in-space-are-not-going-to-make-the-world-a-better-place/>. Jens Temmen is an [assistant professor for American Literature and Culture](https://www.anglistik2.hhu.de/en/anglistik-ii-american-studies/faculty/staff/dr-jens-temmen) at Heinrich-Heine University Düsseldorf (Germany). Using an ecocritical and posthuman studies lens, his research focuses on narratives of Mars colonization in the North American context.

The private space races of billionaires like Richard Branson, Elon Musk and Jeff Bezos are staged as humanity‘s ticket to progress, transformation, and even immortality in outer space. The colonial rhetoric that continues to accompany this new industry, however, is a reminder that their plans are neither altruistic visions nor merely harmless pet projects of the super-rich. On July 11th 2021, Virgin Galactic founder, billionaire and self-declared new space tourism pioneer Richard Branson staged the first commercial flight of his company’s supersonic space-plane Unity – with Branson aboard himself and thus upstaging Amazon founder Jeff Bezos‘ own flight by just a few days. Virgin Galactic lauded the perfectly orchestrated performance as following the path of the Apollo missions, while also heralding a new and invigorated phase of space exploration – this time with commercial flights and space tourism leading the way. Branson and the other so-called New Space Entrepreneurs, Elon Musk and Jeff Bezos, might be competitors in their private race to space, yet all of them are deeply invested in surrounding their private enterprises with a shared narrative of a utopian future for humanity in outer space, and even as much as humanity‘s survival in face of climate change on Earth, by way of becoming a multiplanetary species. For the most part that story isn’t new, of course. The idea that entering and colonizing outer space provides a unifying experience for humanity has been popularized by science-fiction for quite a while now – a tune that many planetary scientists, by the way, have happily sung along with. What has changed is that in the latest version of that popular narrative, the only path leading towards utopia goes through a privatized space industry. Yet in spite of allegedly pointing the way into a better, more just, and more sustainable future for humanity, most of these imaginaries tend to wrap their visions into the rather stale and very earthly language of discovery and exploration, of new frontiers, terra nullius (“nobody’s land“), and of colonization – imageries and terms which have and continue to justify removal, extraction, exploitation and genocide. The billionaires’ space race is no exception to that rule: the quote that marked Branson’s entry into sub-orbital height – “Today space is Virgin territory“ – is not just a clever pun on the company’s name, but also revealingly invokes the misogynist and colonial notions of “untouched“ land and people that are ready for the taking. These notions have served Euro-American empires for centuries as justification for brutally claiming new territories and racially hierarchizing their population. But what’s the harm, one might ask, in rehashing these concepts in context of the exploration of outer space? With no Indigenous population (that we know of) that can be removed, no pre-colonial civilization in the way of Earth’s future colonies on Moon and Mars, isn’t space colonialism something truly new, completely divorced from the history of terrestrial colonialism? Branson, Musk and Bezos would most certainly agree. The question ignores the fact that contrary to what the private space industry (and national space agencies, for that matter) wants us to believe, the exploration and colonization of outer space is a very terrestrial undertaking. Steeped in capitalism – a system that Branson, Musk and Bezos have mastered and thrived in – and the geopolitical stratagems of Earth’s nation-states, space exploration today is not so much driven by changing humanity as it goes into space, but rather by changing outer space to make it fit into the logics of profit and territorial control on Earth. And we are in the thick of it: Branson’s latest attempt to establish space travel as a new branch of the tourism industry is just one of many recent steps – including the establishment of US Space Force, the ratification of the Artemis Accords, and the signing on of Musk’s SpaceX as a contractor for NASA – to make outer space safe for capitalism. The point of the performative character of the billionaires’ space race, the images of grandeur and individualism, the bells and whistles, its alleged subscription to a more just future for humanity, is to distract, then. It is a shiny packaging that wraps-up and obscures the mundane fact that if colonizing outer space is allegedly about fundamentally changing societally structures that govern Earth and humanity, the New Space Entrepreneurs are certainly not the ones to bring about that change – it would simply be against their self-interest. In Earth’s past and present, the colonial language of virgin land and terra nullius served to obscure the human cost of colonization by dehumanizing colonized peoples. Space exploration, as imagined by Branson, Musk and Bezos, also has a cost. The wealth that all three of them have acquired through their business ventures, which puts them into the position to reach for the stars (and greater profits), builds on unleashed neoliberalism, capitalist exploitation, and, overall, less-than altruistic business models. Their vision of humanity in space is likewise designed for the few and wealthy, and built on the back of the many. And the cost could increase even further. While all of humanity is facing the unprecedented threat of climate change, which urges us to find sustainable solutions fast, Elon Musk and others offer us the seemingly quick fix of abandoning Earth altogether and to weather out the storm on Mars. In spite of being completely unfeasible from a scientific standpoint, the idea has still gained traction among technoliberalists, and is thus withdrawing attention and resources from communities mostly in the Global South for whom climate change is not a threat in the distant future. In addition, the noise and smoke created by the hyper-masculine performances of Branson, Musk and Bezos block our view of the tangible benefits that space exploration has to offer and that we should readily invest in. Current Mars exploration projects, for example, offer insights into how atmospheric changes impact planetary climates – information that could prove invaluable in our battle against climate change on Earth. All of this is a reminder that we should not abandon the idea altogether that space exploration can offer us new and vital insights. Space exploration is, however, not going to magically change humanity or how we live. If we want to continue to hope that space exploration will fulfill the promise of a better future for humanity, changing our perspectives on life on Earth must come first.

#### The Earth is barreling towards existential climate change caused by capitalism – we have 4 years

Barry 21 Barry, John. "The Latest Terrifying Climate Report: Fiddling While The Planet Burns?". Queen's Policy Engagement, 2021, <http://qpol.qub.ac.uk/the-latest-terrifying-climate-report-fiddling-while-the-planet-burns-code-red-for-humanity-or-capitalism-and-carbon/>. John Barry is a Professor in the School of History, Anthropology, Philosophy and Politics at Queen's University Belfast. His research interests include: green political theory, politics and political economy of sustainability, greening the economy, environmental and sustainable development policy-making, environmental ethics, transition to a low-carbon/renewable energy economy.

The latest Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report launched on Monday 9th August was a significant event. It has been viewed as indicating a [‘code red’ for humanity](https://www.un.org/press/en/2021/sgsm20847.doc.htm) by UN General Secretary António Guterres, while others have interpreted it as indicating we are on the ‘brink of catastrophe’, such as [Alok Sharma](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/aug/07/were-on-the-brink-of-catastrophe-warns-tory-climate-chief), the former Conservative Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, and now lead for the upcoming climate summit in Glasgow, COP26 in November. To jump straight in to the politics of this, developed further below, I note that Minister Sharma, even as he says that we are on the brink of catastrophe, says the COP26 meeting is the ‘last chance’ to avoid this, and he also sees this as compatible with him backing UK plans for new oil and gas exploration and development. If this were one of my student essays, I’d fail it, and ask the student to rewrite it for being fundamentally contradictory. While the report itself (officially titled [AR6 Climate Change 2021: the Physical Science Basis,](https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/) from the IPCC’s Working Group I) contained nothing new to previous reports (in many respects the IPCC has been a little like Van Morrison in its output – repetition rather than development – (other non-Health minister singer-songwriters are available…), it does provide even more scientific certainty, clarity and understanding of the causes of (if not the solutions to… and we’ll get to that shortly) climate breakdown. As Prof Valérie Masson-Delmotte, IPCC Working Group I Co-Chair that produced the report said at its launch: “This report is a reality check. We now have a much clearer picture of the past, present and future climate”. Main findings of the report include: Climate change is affecting every region on Earth and in complex and multiple ways. The changes will increase and become more intense with additional warming. Climate change is intensifying the water cycle, bringing more intense rainfall and associated flooding, as well as more intense drought in many regions. Coastal areas will see continued sea level rise throughout the 21st century, contributing to more frequent and severe coastal flooding in low-lying areas and coastal erosion. Extreme sea level events that previously occurred once in 100 years could happen every year by the end of this century. Further warming will amplify permafrost thawing, and the loss of seasonal snow cover, melting of glaciers and ice sheets, and loss of summer Arctic sea ice. Changes to the ocean, including warming, more frequent marine heatwaves, ocean acidification, and reduced oxygen levels have been clearly linked to human influence. These changes affect both ocean ecosystems and the people that rely on them, and they will continue throughout at least the rest of this century. For cities, some aspects of climate change may be amplified, including heat (since urban areas are usually warmer than their surroundings), [flooding from heavy precipitation events and sea level rise in coastal cities](https://www.ipcc.ch/2021/08/09/ar6-wg1-20210809-p). Like the last two reports from the IPCC in 2014 and 2018, this recent one does not say it directly in the text, but you can clearly infer from the numbers and the modelling for greenhouse gas emissions reduction, that to have anything like a decent chance of limiting warming to 1.5°C – the goal of the 2015 Paris Agreement – [global emissions need to peak by 2025 and then plunge rapidly towards zero](https://theconversation.com/ipcc-report-how-to-make-global-emissions-peak-and-fall-and-whats-stopping-us-165830). So to recap. We had 11 years to reach that peak when the IPCC issued their 2014 report and turn it around. Now we have 4. Let that sink in….. The report contains the clearest and most comprehensive scientific evidence that human activities are the main cause of global heating, especially the continued burning of fossil fuels for energy and deforestation. The burning of fossil fuels produces carbon dioxide (the main greenhouse gas that we should be concerned about, followed by methane), increasing the likelihood of extreme weather events such as heatwaves and flooding. Both of which we’ve recently experienced in Britain and Ireland (we’ll return to this in a moment). As the report puts it, “[recent changes in the climate are widespread, rapid and intensifying, and unprecedented in thousands of years”](https://www.ipcc.ch/2021/08/09/ar6-wg1-20210809-pr). Let that sink in…. It is clear, as it has been from previous climate science evidence, that we need to transition faster and with more ambition to reduce GHG emissions, begin the immediate phasing out of fossil fuels and decarbonise our entire economies. We also have to adapt to a climate-changed world, given that as the report says we will have to live with the impacts of climate breakdown for hundreds, if not thousands of years. As the report puts it: “Many of the changes observed in the climate are unprecedented in thousands, if not hundreds of thousands of years, and some of the changes already set in motion – such as continued sea level rises – are irreversible over hundreds to thousands of years”. While disturbing and sobering, the report does not suggest solutions, given the remit of the IPCC is to produce the scientific evidence upon which solutions should be based. Nor does it look at the underlying political economic drivers of climate breakdown, given that the IPCC’s reports have to be agreed by governments, thus meaning they are ‘apolitical’. However, as I read the report, I take from it the urgency that we use science-based targets and evidence to identify and tackle these underlying political economic drivers (including powerful political and economic interests), and outdated views and ways of working and organising the economy, how we feed ourselves, how we move about, heat and cool our homes and so on. The report by itself identifies correctly, from a biophysical point of view, that the causes of the climate crisis are the burning of fossil fuels, land use changes, deforestation and so on. But we need to go further, much further, and ask what are the causes and drivers of these? And this is not a biophysical question, but a political, and more specifically a political economic issue that we have to address and understand. Just as the impacts of the climate crisis are political (not least in the uneven ways they affect different regions, classes and communities), equally the causes are also political. And climate science by itself cannot solve these political issues of the causes and consequences of climate breakdown. In this way, climate science should be on tap not on top as it were, and help to inform what, at the end of the day, must be political and economic analyses of, and solutions to, the crisis. We are in a climate emergency, [as declared by over 75% of UK local authorities](https://pcancities.org.uk/trends-local-climate-action-uk), [the NI Assembly](https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-northern-ireland-51364077) and Belfast City Council. But many of us have now experienced this emergency first hand: think of the recent heat waves and weather warnings we have experience here in Ireland and the UK, then the flash flooding in many parts of Belfast and elsewhere. I note here that my own university has, thus far, resisted the invitation and demand from me and others to declare, as other universities have done, a ‘climate and ecological emergency’. This IPCC report has provided the compelling evidence that we are in such an emergency, declaring one is simply a recognition of reality, not declaring one is a wilful ignoring of that reality… let that sink in. One example of the need for a political framing of climate is that the IPCC report tells us we are almost certain to reach 1.5 degrees before 2050. But if we look at Climate Action Tracker’s analysis of countries’ latest emission reduction pledges under the Paris Agreement, [they show the world on track for 2.7 to 3.6°C of warming by 2100](https://climateactiontracker.org/global/temperatures/). This is an uninhabitable world and it’s not due to the science, but the very political economic system of capitalism and economic growth, something I have spent my entire academic career on. My Inaugural Professorial lecture in 2014 was entitled [‘Carbon, Capitalism and the Transition from Unsustainability’](https://sluggerotoole.com/2014/11/12/carbon-capitalism-and-the-transition-from-unsustainability-prof-john-barry/). So while the report gives the evidence for the pathways to reducing greenhouse emissions over the coming decades, it says nothing about how that might happen and whether that transition and decarbonisation pathway will be just or not, for example. If, as the evidence suggests, most people, governments, political parties, civil society organisations, trade unions all want a ‘[just transition’](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0301421517303683) to the climate crisis, we need to accept that this is a political and not a scientific or technical issue, indeed one that will have to be struggled for and demanded by citizens and not something that will be automatic or can be assumed. Ultimately we need to ask what are the drivers of our carbon based and unsustainable ways of life, and this leads (or should lead) us to critically look at capitalism, i.e. the current way our economic system is organised and structured. And in looking at this system more closely we can see that its structural dependence on, and promotion of, endless economic growth (itself based on cheap and abundant carbon energy, which we now need to leave in the ground), globalisation and unsustainable trade. A capitalist organised economy is one oriented towards monetary objectives such as GDP growth, and not on improving the wellbeing and health of people, or on maintaining and sustaining the real, material resources of the planet or sustainably managing the planet’s capacity to absorb our waste, such as GHG emissions… We need to focus on measuring what matters for people and the planet, and not ‘fairy tales of economic growth’ as [Greta Thunberg](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TMrtLsQbaok) has rightly said. For me, based on this latest climate science – it’s not about ‘greening the current structure of our economies and societies’. We need to move beyond ‘[bio-fuelling the hummer’](https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315550206-6/bio-fuelling-hummer-john-barry) and accept (difficult of course though this is) that we need deeper structural changes in our economic system and related systems of transportation, food, housing and energy. We urgently need an economic upgrade, an economy ‘fit for purpose’ for the 21st century and effectively and equitably tackling our planetary crisis. A key part of that is a transition beyond endless economic growth, carbon energy and capitalism. So let’s start joining the dots, and start discussing economic growth in the context of the climate crisis, and the climate crisis in relation to its deeper causes in the structure of our capitalist economies. Without this, we, as researchers on this topic, are not fully informing the public, and we will have a weaker basis for making effective and equitable decisions. We need in other words to start talking about capitalism as well as carbon and climate. Climate breakdown is not simply ‘another issue’ to be placed along with pension reform or decent wages for precarious workers: it is THE overarching context within which ALL policy issues need to be placed. If policies are not climate proofed, they are limited at best, or counterproductive and part of the problem at worse. Just as we need to leave fossil fuels in the ground, we also need to leave carbon and climate illiteracy behind. So, from my point of view, this latest IPCC report indicated that we can attempt the biophysical impossibility of ‘greening’ capitalism, growth and ‘business as usual’ or the politically difficult (perhaps impossible?) task of transcending ecocidal, growth and carbon-based, capitalism. I know which one I think we should try….what about you?

#### Capitalism ensures 100s of millions live in extreme poverty and perpetuates oppression – any action that sustains this 100 percent probability impact is unjust

LaBeouf ‘17--(Workshy, Leninist anti-imperialism @ Guevarista economics, “The Decaying Nature of Capitalism Poses Only Two Possible Futures: Socialism or Barbarism”, January 4th, 2017, <https://medium.com/@JoinedAtTheArse/the-decaying-nature-of-capitalism-poses-only-two-possible-futures-socialism-or-barbarism-b3a144432320>) kb

So far I have focused on the inevitable developments which are once again making socialism increasingly desirable and necessary. Of at least equal importance is a moral imperative that means it’s never a bad time to become a communist. That’s because, as with poverty and war, the capitalist mode of production is the primary source of racism, ableism and sexism (and by extension, homophobia and transphobia). We have already seen how imperialism impoverishes 100s of millions of people around the world (21,000 a day are starved to death) without a care for their religion, race, gender or sexuality. Racism inside the imperialist countries is primarily an extension of national oppression/neo-colonialism. When imperialist countries experience labour shortages at home, workers from the oppressed nations are ‘imported’ in larger numbers for cheap labour (thus constantly reproducing racism’s material basis by creating a ‘super-exploited’, ‘super-oppressed’ layer of the working class). The greatest example of this in Britain took place after WW2, when the country needed to be rebuilt as cheaply as possible. When there is more of a labour surplus, such as the present period, deportations increase and border controls tighten. For example, after the 1973 recession, deportations increased 11-fold over the next seven years. The overall number of people allowed to settle fell by 20% (by 42% in terms of people from the Commonwealth). Migrant workers, and women generally, tend to be the least well supported by the big trade unions, experience the worst jobs and living conditions, and are the easiest to throw out of employment and into the ‘reserve army of labour’ that capitalism needs to function (because unemployment holds down wages and ‘disciplines’ workers). The capitalist mode of production is the primary source of women’s oppression. Women have been oppressed in all class societies throughout history, and women’s oppression under capitalism takes a particular form in relation to how social production is organised — a dual oppression that compels women to reproduce the working class gratis at home (privatised labour), while also comprising part of a cheap reserve army of labour ready to serve capital as workers. This material basis for the oppression of women is fundamental and can only be changed by the overthrow of capitalism and its replacement by socialist relations of production, which will socialise house and care work, liberate the family from its status as an economic unit and therefore women from their status as solely instruments of production. Discrimination is primarily the expression of ideologies which in turn express class privilege, however they are dressed up, necessarily invented to justify economic and political exclusion. White supremacy was the invented justification for colonialism, for instance. This may sound crude or simplistic but stripping politics down to its foundations is what makes materialism so enlightening. Rather than making the argument that imperialist controls on the movement of oppressed people is racist, the best defence of immigration offered by social democrats tends to be that immigrants contribute more to the economy than vice-versa, reflecting the fact that the exploitation of cheap foreign labour contributes to the material basis of a labour aristocracy. Various racist ideologies are drummed into the population through ruling class media outlets in order to keep the masses divided among themselves instead of united against capital. While ‘intersectional feminism’ is an excellent tool for exposing unexamined prejudices and challenging state or societal discrimination, a materialist, class-based and anti-imperialist analysis is also needed to overcome its sometimes essentialising limitations. That sexism and racism are intrinsic to the capitalist system has been shown again by the necessity of austerity. As this LSE study states: “Austerity has had a greater adverse impact on women, especially ethnic minority and low-income families, who have born 78.9 per cent of the welfare cuts in the 2015 government budget.” Likewise, disabled people have suffered greatly from austerity. By the Department for Work and Pensions’ own admission, 90 people per month are dying after being told they are fit for work. Capital is happy to see the end of an abundant supply of labour die off — disabled people have been savagely targeted because they are the most vulnerable and least ‘productive’ for capital. In fact, it is society under capitalism which disables people through structures of exclusion, and by literally limiting the accessibility of public spaces and services. In Britain, half of the people living in poverty either live with a disabled person or are themselves disabled. What’s more, the above factors combined with the alienating effects of capitalist society — where individualism is sacred and collectivism belittled, where stress is normalised and rest is mocked — degrades mental wellbeing on a widespread scale. This is exacerbated by the fact that social and mental health care services under capitalism are woefully inadequate. None of this is to say that racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia and ableism will disappear the night after a revolution, but to argue that the economic foundations that constantly reproduce these forms of oppression will be dismantled during the process of building socialism.

## Part Three: Framing

#### The Role of the Ballot is to vote for the debater who best critiques capitalism

Renstrom 21 Renstrom, Joelle. "We Shouldn't Invoke Colonialist Language To Justify Missions To The Cosmos - The Wire Science". The Wire Science, 2021, <https://science.thewire.in/the-sciences/why-should-we-invoke-colonialist-language-to-justify-missions-to-the-cosmos/>. Joelle Renstrom is a science writer who focuses on robots, AI, and space exploration. She teaches at Boston University.

Last month, NASA’s [Perseverance rover](https://www.nasa.gov/feature/jpl/7-things-to-know-about-the-nasa-rover-about-to-land-on-mars) landed on the surface of Mars to much fanfare, just days after probes from the [UAE](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/02/09/uae-hope-probe-mars-success/) and [China](https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-56013041) entered orbit around the Red Planet. The surge in Martian traffic symbolises major advancements in space exploration. It also presents an opportune moment to step back and consider not only what humans do in space, but how we do it – including the words we use to describe human activities in space. The conversation around the language of space exploration has already begun. NASA, for instance, has been rooting out the gendered language that has plagued America’s space program for decades. Instead of using “[manned](https://www.sapiens.org/column/wanderers/outer-space-and-gendered-language/)” to describe human space missions, it [has shifted to using](https://www.planetary.org/articles/10050900-finding-new-language) gender-neutral terms like “piloted” or “crewed.” But our scrutiny of language shouldn’t stop there. Other words and phrases, particularly those that invoke capitalism or colonialism, should receive the same treatment. To some extent, language influences the way we think and understand the world around us. A dramatic example comes from the Pirahã tribe of the Brazilian Amazon, whose language contains [very few terms for describing numbers or time](https://www.spiegel.de/international/spiegel/brazil-s-piraha-tribe-living-without-numbers-or-time-a-414291.html). A capitalist culture in which time equals money likely wouldn’t make sense to them. Similarly, language likely affects humans’ thoughts and beliefs about outer space. The words scientists and writers use to describe space exploration may influence who feels included in these endeavours – both as direct participants and as benefactors — and alter the way people interact with the cosmos. Take, for example, John F. Kennedy’s [1962 Moon Speech](https://er.jsc.nasa.gov/seh/ricetalk.htm), in which he three times used the words “conquer” and “conquest.” While Kennedy’s rhetoric was intended to bolster U.S. morale in the space race against the USSR, the view of outer space as a venue for conquest evokes subjugation and exploitation and exemplifies an attitude that has resulted in much destruction on Earth. By definition, conquering involves an assertion of power and mastery, often through violence. Similarly, former [President Donald Trump](https://www.politico.com/interactives/2020/trump-state-of-the-union-2020-live-fact-check-transcript-2-4-20/) is the most recent American president to use the term “Manifest Destiny” to describe his motives for exploring space, tapping into a philosophy that suggests humanity’s grand purpose is to expand and conquer, regardless of who or what stands in the way. In a recent [white paper](https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.08344), a group comprising subject-matter experts at NASA and other institutions warned of the hazards of invoking colonial language and practice in space exploration. “The language we use around exploration can really lead or detract from who gets involved and why they get involved,” [Natalie B. Treviño](https://www.linkedin.com/in/natalie-trevino/?originalSubdomain=ca), one of the paper’s coauthors, told me. Treviño, who researched decolonial theory and space exploration for her PhD at Western University in Canada, is a member of an [equity, diversity and inclusion working group](https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2020DPS....5250204R/abstract) that makes equity-related recommendations in the planetary science research community. She notes that certain words and phrases can be particularly alienating for Indigenous people. “How is an Indigenous child on a reserve in North America supposed to connect with space exploration if the language is the same language that led to the genocide of his people?” In a 2020 perspective for [Nature Astronomy](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41550-020-01238-3.epdf), Aparna Venkatesan of the University of San Francisco, also a coauthor of the recent white paper, wrote with colleagues that in the dialects of the Indigenous Lakota and Dakota, the concept of thought being rooted in language, space, and place “is epitomised by the often used phrase mitakuye oyasin, explained by Lakota elders as a philosophy that reminds everyone that we all come from one source and so need to respect each other to maintain wolakota or peace.” It’s difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile the ideas of wolakota and conquest, especially given the increasing [weaponisation of space](https://ndupress.ndu.edu/Portals/68/Documents/jfq/jfq-74/jfq-74_110-115_DeFrieze.pdf). Treviño argues that the word “[frontier](https://slate.com/technology/2017/03/why-we-need-to-stop-talking-about-space-as-a-frontier.html),” the guiding metaphor for American space exploration, is also problematic. The crossing of new frontiers – because frontiers always must be pushed or crossed – is inevitably “tied to nationalism, and nationalism is tied to conquest, and conquest is tied to death,” she says. When humans push frontiers, they often do so with the belief that it is their right as individuals or as representatives of a country or state. Throughout history, this sense of entitlement has been taken as license to wipe out Indigenous people and fauna, pollute rivers, and otherwise demonstrate ownership and mastery. Foundational concepts such as “conquest,” “frontier,” and “Manifest Destiny,” can affect not only how people think about space but also how they act toward it. In their Nature Astronomy paper, Venkatesan and her colleagues argue that in addition to promoting colonialist ideals, such concepts promote space capitalism and a lack of regulation. Potent symbols of this trend are the [more than 3,000 operational satellites](https://www.ucsusa.org/resources/satellite-database) currently orbiting Earth, many of them privately owned. For people who use the stars to navigate, or who incorporate celestial bodies into cultural, spiritual, and religious practices, this intrusion into the skies threatens to compromise a way of life. And it is a sobering reminder that space and the sky don’t really belong to everyone after all. The lack of protections and regulations for the night sky – as well as monetary incentives for commercial satellites, which make up almost 80 percent of U.S. satellites – make it vulnerable to the highest bidder. “Treating space as the ‘Wild West’ frontier that requires conquering continues to incentivise claiming by those who are well-resourced,” writes Venkatesan and her colleagues. In fact, the staking of claims in space has already begun, with [space tourism](https://www.cnbc.com/2020/09/26/space-tourism-how-spacex-virgin-galactic-blue-origin-axiom-compete.html) predicted to develop into a lucrative industry, and with the U.S. government opening the doors to commercial endeavours such as the [mining of asteroids](https://www.wbur.org/cognoscenti/2015/12/09/asteroid-mining-joelle-renstrom) and the [colonisation of Mars](https://www.businessinsider.com/worlds-richest-person-elon-musk-dedicate-wealth-mars-colony-2021-1). While scientists often devote themselves to questions of feasibility, scalability, and affordability, they rarely give as much thought and effort to questions of inclusivity and morality. “In the space community, when ethics or values or planetary protection come up, they’re immediately coded as feminine and they’re immediately coded as not as important,” Treviño told me. For many scientists, she says, “thinking about ethics isn’t nearly as important as building the rovers that are going to go to the moon.” The “act first, ask questions later” approach typifies the mindset that has led some to argue that humans [need to colonise space](https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/22/17991736/jeff-bezos-elon-musk-colonizing-mars-moon-space-blue-origin-spacex) to survive. But attitudes and ethics cannot be applied retroactively. Science might get people to Mars, but without ethics, what are the chances of survival? In Kennedy’s words, space exploration is our species’ most “dangerous and greatest adventure.” It makes sense to address factors that influence human behaviour in space – and that will ultimately determine our odds of success there – sooner rather than later. That includes asking everyone, not just NASA or Elon Musk, what we want an interplanetary future of humanity to look like. Would we want futuristic Mars settlements to operate like modern-day Earth towns, or could we do better? Crafting a code of ethics for space exploration may seem daunting, but our words offer a potential starting point. Space is one of few places humans have gone that thus far remains peaceful. Why, then, use the language of war, imperialism, or colonialism to describe human actions there? Eliminating the language of genocide and subordination from the space discourse is one easy step anyone can take to encourage the great leaps for humankind that we dream of for the future, on Earth and beyond.

#### Centering debate on a critique is critical to combat capitalism — educators need to support class analysis

McLaren and Farahmandpur ‘7—(P. McLaren, Critical Studies @ Chapman U and UCLA urban schooling prof, R. Farahmandpur, Scatamburlo-D’Annibale, associate professor of Communication – U Windsor, “More Unequal: Aspects of Class in the United States”, 2007, pg. 10-12) kb

As the drums of war drown out dissent and as accountability and testing regimes are imposed upon public schools, critical educators advocate for a curriculum that enables students to conceptualize, analyze, theorize, and critically reflect upon their experiences in the world. Despite their seeming singularity, experiences are not fashioned in isolation. Because experiences, though idiosyncratic, are part of a larger ensemble of social relations, it is important for students to interrogate their own experiences in the context of understanding how oppression and exploitation function within the larger totality of capitalist society. The long-term goal of education is the transformation of the existing social order. And that means teachers and students should have a number of theoretical approaches to work from—with a Marxist analysis of class as the centerpiece. This approach is not new, having been developed over the years by exponents of the work of the late Brazilian educator Paulo Freire. Fortunately, the work of Freire has managed to avoid the halting attention to which many other radical educators seem depressingly prone. For decades his work has been at the helm of critical pedagogy and popular education and his legacy seems assured. That is good news for the educational Left. Although insufficienly heralded in the United States, Freire's masterwork, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, can claim a one-of-a-kind status in the annals of the educational Left. More than any other single book, Freire's signature opus continues to shape the ways in which many leftist teachers and educators frame political and ideological questions related to teaching and learning in their classrooms.23 Freirean pedagogy has inspired and motivated a new generation of educators and activists to defend democratic principles, values, and practices in their classrooms and schools against the neoliberal onslaught in an age of terror, fear, and permanent war. Viewing human beings as a "presence in the world" (this holds true even in a consumer- driven, mass-produced culture run by taste merchants and reality-television producers), Freire maintains that taking risks is an essential characteristic of our "existing being."24 He reminds us that education, both as a political and ideological activity, involves taking risks. Our presence in the world is not a neutral presence. As political and ideological agents, we are compelled to take a stance within it. As Freire notes: "Nobody can be in the world, with the world, and with others in a neutral manner."25 Thus "being" is a being in the world. Freire sees history impregnated with possibility and hope. However, to make that possibility tangible in the lives of the oppressed, he believes that we must actively engage and intervene in the world. What does "being in the world" entail? Freire explains that our presence in the world is not to adapt to it but to work toward transforming it. Freire emphasizes that adapting to the world is only a process—a temporary phase—toward intervening and transforming the world. Thus adaptation is a "moment in the process of intervention^6 Furthermore, Freire argues that we live in an ethical world. Our ideological and political orientation compels us to make moral and ethical decisions. Freire reminds us that our actions have a universal dimension, and that "being in the world" entails recognizing our responsibilities and commitments toward other human beings. Freire views human beings as both subjects and objects of history. In other words, though the forces of history shape our past and present, we can change the course of history, and in the process make history. As Freire puts it, "The future does not make us, we make ourselves in the struggle to make it."27 We can break away from the chains of history passed down to us from previous generations and make our own history. In short, Freire acknowledges that human beings are conditioned by history, but he refuses to accept that they are determined by it, because for Freire history is possibility. Freire maintains that a critical reading of the world involves denouncing the existing oppression and injustices in the world. At the same time, it involves announcing the possibility of a more humane and just world. For Freire, reading the world is both a pedagogical-political and a political-pedagogical undertaking. Denouncing the world is an act that involves criticizing, protesting, and struggling against domination and domestication. The act of announcing a new world entails hope and possibility, and this stipulates envisioning a new democratic society outside of capitalism's law of value. Elsewhere, Freire makes an important distinction between the role of education in helping students develop critical thinking skills and as training and preparation for entering the workforce.28 He cautions us against reducing education to a set of techniques and skills. Freire incessantly asserts that education can effectively be employed to "make and remake" ourselves. Education, as Freire conceives it, involves knowing that you know, and knowing that you don't know. It entails developing a "critical curiosity" and a radical reorientation toward the world. For Freire, critical pedagogy involves learning to question the world by cultivating an "epistemological curiosity." He encourages teachers and educators to imagine, dream, and struggle toward building the foundations of a new democratic society. They must also be willing to be a "presence" in the world by engaging in a dialectical process of what he calls "reading the word and the world." Donaldo Macedo and Ana Maria Araujo Freire underscore what is meant by "reading the word and the world" when they assail those literacy specialists who teach reading as a method disarticulated from the world of exploitation and oppression, antiseptically detached from the totality of capitalist social relations. Specialists who equate the process of becoming literate to acquiring a discrete set of cognitive skills "domesticate the consciousness via a constant disarticulation between the reductionistic and narrow reading of one's field of specialization and reading of the universe within which one's specialization is situated."29 Such "pseudocritical educators" are thus "semiliterate"—they can read the word but are woefully unable to read the world, that is, they are able to read the texts of their specialty but remain "ignorant of all other bodies of knowledge that constitute the world of knowledge."30 Jose Ortega y Gasset calls such a specialist a "learned ignoramus" who—as Macedo and Freire explain—is "mainly concerned with his or her own tiny portion of the world, disconnected from other bodies of knowledge .. . [and] never able to relate the flux of information to gain a critical reading of the world."31 Paulo Freire emphasized that a critical reading of the world implies "a dynamic comprehension between the least coherent sensibility of the world and a more coherent understanding of the world."32. Learned ignoramuses are all around us. For instance, how can education specialists in science and math and computer technology ignore how teaching advances in these areas have aided the military industrial complex that enables the United States to exercise its domination of less developed countries of the world, that allows industry to subject the poor to the ravages of capital, that facilitates the devastation of our ecosystems, and that makes possible breakthroughs in medicine that benefit only those who can afford to pay for treatment? In our own classrooms we are careful not to approach the struggle for socialism from the Olympian standpoint of eternity—as a primrose path that leads the faithful to that luminous workers' council on the hill. We eschew Utopian blueprints in favor of serious discussions that deal with questions of power, the state, and various forms for organizing for socialist democracy. For instance, we explore the current debate between the Zapatistas (who do not wish to take state power) and the supporters of Hugo Chavez (Chavistas who believe that the state can be transformed from the bottom up by taking state power). In some cases we have traveled with our students to Venezuela and Mexico and have participated in such debates firsthand. The critical revolutionary pedagogy that we support advances these and other issues from the perspective of a problem-posing rather than a solution-giving pedagogy. It eschews magic bullet solutions and instead favors the practice of historical materialist critique. It mandates approaching the process of teaching and learning within the larger context of certain fundamental questions. In the wake of the dictatorship of the financial markets, where, in the words of Robert Went, the "invisible hand" of the market is mercilessly arid ruthlessly strangling millions of working-class men, women, and children, how do we liberate creative human powers and capacities from their inhumane form, namely, capital?33 What does it mean to be human? How can we live humanely? What ethical and moral actions must we take to live humanely? How can teachers recognize the important role they play in the battle between labor and capital? These questions along with others can only be answered in the course of revolutionizing educational practices, which will largely depend on the willingness of teachers to join anti- imperialist struggles. Teachers need to support de-colonizing pedagogies and make efforts to work with new social movements, including indigenous groups, in their fight against capital's deadly assault on the poor and the planet that sustains all of us. Teachers must recognize that, as workers, their interests and those of their fellow educators worldwide are tied to the defeat of neoliberal capitalism and the creation of a post-capitalist, socialist society.