# Marx AC

[brackets for clarification]

### Framing

#### I affirm the resolution –

#### The value is Justice as explained by

Meyer et al 14 [Manuel Velasquez, Claire Andre, Thomas Shanks, S.J., and Michael J. Meyer, Markkula Center for Applied Ethics at Santa Clara University, “Justice and Fairness,” August 1st 2014, [https://www.scu.edu/ethics/ethics-resources/ethical-decision-making/justice-and-fairness/]/](https://www.scu.edu/ethics/ethics-resources/ethical-decision-making/justice-and-fairness/%5d/) lm

Justice means giving each person what he or she deserves or, in more traditional terms, giving each person his or [the[i]r due. Justice and fairness are closely related terms that are often today used interchangeably. There have, however, also been more distinct understandings of the two terms. While justice usually has been used with reference to a standard of rightness, fairness often has been used with regard to an ability to judge without reference to one's feelings or interests; fairness has also been used to refer to the ability to make judgments that are not overly general but that are concrete and specific to a particular case. In any case, a notion of being treated as one deserves is crucial to both justice and fairness.

The most fundamental principle of justice—one that has been widely accepted since it was first defined by Aristotle more than two thousand years ago—is the principle that "equals should be treated equally and unequals unequally." In its contemporary form, this principle is sometimes expressed as follows: "Individuals should be treated the same, unless they differ in ways that are relevant to the situation in which they are involved." For example, if Jack and Jill both do the same work, and there are no relevant differences between them or the work they are doing, then in justice they should be paid the same wages. And if Jack is paid more than Jill simply because he is a man, or because he is white, then we have an injustice—a form of discrimination—because race and sex are not relevant to normal work situations.

The foundations of justice can be traced to the notions of social stability, interdependence, and equal dignity. As the ethicist John Rawls has pointed out, the stability of a society—or any group, for that matter—depends upon the extent to which the members of that society feel that they are being treated justly. When some of society's members come to feel that they are subject to unequal treatment, the foundations have been laid for social unrest, disturbances, and strife. The members of a community, Rawls holds, depend on each other, and they will retain their social unity only to the extent that their institutions are just. Moreover, as the philosopher Immanuel Kant and others have pointed out, human beings are all equal in this respect: they all have the same dignity, and in virtue of this dignity they deserve to be treated as equals. Whenever individuals are treated unequally on the basis of characteristics that are arbitrary and irrelevant, their fundamental human dignity is violated.

Justice, then, is a central part of ethics and should be given due consideration in our moral lives. In evaluating any moral decision, we must ask whether our actions treat all persons equally. If not, we must determine whether the difference in treatment is justified: are the criteria we are using relevant to the situation at hand? But justice is not the only principle to consider in making ethical decisions. Sometimes principles of justice may need to be overridden in favor of other kinds of moral claims such as rights or society's welfare. Nevertheless, justice is an expression of our mutual recognition of each other's basic dignity, and an acknowledgement that if we are to live together in an interdependent community we must treat each other as equals.

#### Justice should be valued a-priori.

#### 1] Textuality – the resolution specifies justice, and it’s the only stable starting point in the round.

#### 2] Predictability – Justice as giving each their due is the most common interpretation.

#### And Justice is intrinsic to institutions, not based off consequences.

#### 1] It’s unjust to imprison a wrongly accused person in order to deter others from committing crimes.

#### 2] Separateness of persons – individuals have subjective scales of pain and pleasure – there’s no way to weigh consequences since there’s no omniscient god’s eye.

#### Since the resolution specifies ‘private entities’ and ‘appropriation,’ we must analyze the institutions of capitalism. Thus, the standard is consistency with Marxist Justice.

Veer 73 [Donald van der Veer, Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, “Marx’s View of Justice,” March 1973, [https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2106949.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A488a355aa7ede629f078077831d75601]/](https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2106949.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A488a355aa7ede629f078077831d75601%5d/) lm

That the Gotha program principle did not take into account relevant differences in the needs of different workers was a defect, but in Marx's view in the first or lower phase of the emergence of communism such a principle will be the only principle which it is empirically possible to implement. This, I think, makes it evident that Marx, in claiming S, is maintaining that the most equitable distribu- tion realizable is not the fairest one but the "most right" one that can be attained in a communist society just emerging after the "prolonged birth pangs from capitalist society." Thus, S must be understood as asserting a claim like that of S.. Because of this S cannot be con- strued as supporting Tucker's claim that, for Marx, there is no stan- dard of justice superior to the one implicit in the capitalist laws of exchange of commodities. In fact, Marx regarded the Gotha principle as superior to the standard implicit in capitalist practice; in Marx's words it was an "advance." Thus, for Marx there was a standard of justice superior to that invoked in the Gotha program, one taking into account relevant differences in the needs of workers but one incapable of implementation in the first phase of communist society. Only in the higher phase of communist development can this optimal standard of equitable distribution be realized; as Marx states, ". . only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be crossed in its entirety and society inscribe on its banners; 'From each according to [t]h[e]i[r]s ability, to each according to [t]h[e]ir]s needs!' "25 Clearly, this undermines the view that Marx was averse to the idea of justice; Marx was averse only to inadequate principles of justice. Similarly, the above remarks reveal (so far as verbal behavior can reveal) that it was a concern for justice that led Marx to condemn capitalist distribution as exploita- tion; it was evil because it was inequitable when "equity" and "fair distribution" are rightly understood.

Tucker next raises the question as to whether Marx considered the capitalist system unjust and condemned it on that ground. He acknowledges that Marx defined capitalism as a way of production founded on the exploitation of wage labor for the accumulation of capital, and admits that part of the conventional connotation of the term "exploitation" is injustice."2 One is tempted to think that here, where one party, the exploiter, receives something that rightfully belongs to others, the exploited, we surely have a Marxian condem- nation of capitalism based on some principle of distributive justice. But, alas, Tucker maintains that the tempting view is a false one.

Before proceeding to Tucker's argument on this point, let us simply outline Marx's position on the nature of this exploitation. In essence, it is that the exchange value of a commodity exceeds the exchange value of the labor that the worker put into the production of the commodity. The excess or "surplus value" which rightfully belongs to the laborer is then, according to Marx, expropriated by the capitalist for himself; for Marx this is exploitation and it is the very essence of capitalism. As Tucker describes the problem, "the question at issue here is whether a concern for justice underlies this value judgment.""3 At this point Tucker claims that an affirmative answer ". . . flies in the face of the most emphatic and unequivocal assertions by both Marx and Engels that their condemnation of capitalist exploitation has nothing whatever to do with justice and injustice."114 I have maintained that thus far no such unequivocal as- sertions have been produced by Tucker. He claims that, for Marx, such exploitation cannot be described as unjust because it is perfectly just or equitable in accordance with the only applicable norms of justice - those actually operating in the existing mode of production and exchange."5 He appeals here to Marx's comment on the process, "So much the better for the purchaser, but it is nowise an injustice (Unrecht) to the seller."1 This is admirably explicit, but if there is no injustice what was the Marxist fuss about? Why regard the process as one of exploitation? A possible reply to Tucker is that Marx was, at this point, only claiming that the capitalist mode of distribution was fair or just when judged by capitalist criteria of fairness, and that Marx adhered to a different and superior principle of distribution in the light of which the process must be regarded as unjust. Tucker anticipates such a suggestion and claims that, according to Marx, there is no standard of justice superior to the one implicit in the capi- talist law of exchange of commodities." To support this view Tucker quotes a passage he regards as clearly and definitively showing that Marx thought there was no such superior standard, "Right can never be higher than the economic structure of society and the cultural development conditioned by it.""8 His general conclusion is that, for Marx, each mode of production has its own form of equity and it is meaningless to pass judgment on it from some other point of view; it is, for Marx, evil but not inequitable."9

#### Prefer –

#### 1] Other forms of justice are incomplete because they rely on capitalism as a starting point – Marxist Justice is a higher order principle that takes all other concepts into account.

Xinsheng 15 [Wang Xinsheng (2015) A Fourfold Defense of Marx’s Theory of Justice, Social Sciences in China, 36:2, 5-21, DOI: 10.1080/02529203.2015.1029662,,]/ lm

Seen in terms of conceptual form, Marx’s concept of justice and that of liberalism and other political philosophies are of different orders: the latter is a lower-order concept while the former is a higher-order concept with a broader meaning. A higher-order concept covers many lower-order concepts, whereas a lower-order concept is only one of the principles embodied in a higher-order concept. Since a higher-order concept of justice covers a much broader sphere, it cannot be explained by a lower-order concept of justice, but can provide a basis for the latter’s interpretation. Compared with Aristotle’s concept of justice as desert, Plato’s concept of justice is of a higher order: justice as an “absolute good” not only has its own meaning but also offers a basis for the concept of desert. Compared with the liberal concept[s] of justice, Marx’s concept of justice is of a higher order: it starts from human society or socialized humanity, is based on the organic social cooperation of free men and depicts the highest principle of justice possible in human society. This principle is the result of the logical and historical sublation of all previous principles of justice in human history. Therefore, the desert justice principle is not only a part of its historical incarnation but also a link in its logical progress. In fact, it is precisely this concept of justice that can avoid[s] the ensuing dilemmas of liberalism and other political philosophies [where]: on the one hand, individual rights are taken as the ultimate foundation of desert; on the other hand, [while] cooperation is taken as the sine qua non for the final realization of justice, thus rejecting the basis of desert.

If Marx’s concept of justice is understood as a high-order concept, then it should contain different layers of value that can be further distinguished. As “fruit” comprises “nuts,” “berries” and so on, this concept contains “rights-based justice,” “transcendent justice” and other conceptual levels and types. Why does Marx’s critique of political economy start with private property and civil society? This is because their analysis i[t]s the gateway and the key to understanding “equal rights,” the lower-order value of equality. Why does Marx oppose “verbal rubbish” about right and so on, and at the same time ask the working class to “vindicate the simple laws or morals and justice”12 in their struggle? This is because he opposes making the lower-order value of justice fundamental but does not oppose the lower-order value itself. Today, we are still in the historical circumstances of civil society. If we use the principles of historicism to interpret the Marxist individual rights-based theory of justice, this is not counter to Marx’s intentions, but on the contrary reflects the rightful meaning of Marxist political philosophy.

Without doubt, liberalism has made a contribution to the development of the theory of justice by highlighting the importance of equal rights for all and elaborating desert on this basis. However, in real life, the huge contrast between the concept of equal rights and the reality of inequality shows the self-imposed limitations of the liberal pursuit of justice through equality. As a liberal with egalitarian tendencies, Rawls aims for substantive equality. In order to achieve this goal, he needs to restrict and amend the rights-based desert value of justice. His attempt at such a theory is embodied in his two famous principles of justice, the first of which reflects the political rights of citizens and the second their social and economic interests. To correct the bias of desert justice, Rawls can no longer seek a single standard of justice, as did utilitarianism and the doctrine of the highest good; he has to use the second principle to supplement and amend the first principle, sacrificing the logical consistency of liberalism. Rawls’s theory of justice has been successful in the contemporary world, but he embroils his own theoretical arguments in many difficulties because his program compromises with intuitionism and even risk relativism. He has no choice but to use a series of complementary arguments to compensate for the theoretical problems incurred by his deviation from the principle of rights. His second principle is to ensure “the greatest benefit to the least-advantaged,” but here again he has to revert to insisting on “right has priority over good” to set limits for this principle. This “retreat” reflects not only his liberal insistence on right and the desert principle of justice but also his methodological difficulties.

Breaking through the barriers set up by liberalism for itself, Marx resets the foundation of justice from the standpoint of human society, therefore building up a totally new framework of argument for the theory of justice. In this framework, the principle of right itself is not ultimate and eternal; it needs to be modified and regulated by higher-order standards of justice. Only in this framework can the principle of justice go beyond the self-imposed limits of the principle of right and avoid the methodological dilemma of intuitionism or relativism.

#### 2] Capitalism is inherently unjust and side constrains all moral theories because it denies human worth by commodifying everything.

Morgareidge 0 [Clayton Morgareidge, Teaching Philosophy, “Imposing Value on Others,” 2000]/lm

Under capitalism, Marx writes, everything in nature and everything that human beings are and can do becomes an object: a resource for, or an obstacle, to the expansion of production, the development of technology, the growth of markets, and the circulation of money. For those who manage and live from capital, nothing has value of its own. Mountain streams, clean air, human lives — all mean nothing in themselves, but are valuable only if they can be used to turn a profit.

#### 3] Rejection of Marxism causes epistemological collapse and relativism.

Zucker and Thompson 15 (Gregory, Adjunct Prof. of Philosophy @Baruch and Michael J., Associate prof. Political Theory @William Patterson http://logosjournal.com/2015/thompson-zucker/)

The collapse of Marxism not only weakened labor movement radicalism, it caused a more general intellectual breakdown on the left. With its emphasis on science and knowledge of objective social processes, Marxism’s disintegration left a[nd] theoretical vacuum that was now to be filled by the very cultural concerns produced by capitalist economic life itself. The post-Fordist, flexible accumulation of late capitalism, its emphasis on ephemeral fashion, personalized technology, and mass consumption, has led to an anomic self-absorption where objective political concerns have [to] become abstract. As consumerism and mass culture continues to weaken class consciousness the social order becomes increasingly legitimized forcing radical politics into the domain of the mind and the realm of spectacle. The political now morphs into the personal, and class has dropped out as a category of power-analysis and as an organizing variable of society. Theory now follows the superstructural stream of consciousness and politics becomes, for the new radical mandarins, a sphere of self-promotional platitudes. What is left over from these two intellectual-political shifts is the context within which the new radicalism begins.

#### 4] Scholarship first – our engagement with Marxism in debate spills up to real world activism by generating collective narratives in education.

Giroux 16 [Henry A. Giroux, McMaster University Chair for Scholarship in the Public Interest @ McMaster University, Ph.D. from Carnegie-Mellon, former professor of education at Boston University, professor of education and renowned scholar in residence at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, Waterbury Chair Professorship at Penn State University (“Writing the Public Good Back into Education: Reclaiming the Role of the Public Intellectual,” Ch 1, pg 3-28, <http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007%2F978-1-137-58162-4_1>)]

Conclusion

In conclusion, I want to return to my early reference to the global struggles being waged by many young people. I believe that while it has become more difficult to imagine a democratic future, we have entered a period in which poor minority youth, students, and other disenfranchised young people all over the world are protesting against a range of policies imposed under regimes of neoliberalism, extending from state terrorism and the abolishing of civil liberties to the destruction of the planet and a range of punishing austerity measures. Police violence in Ferguson and Baltimore has mobilized a range of groups that view such violence as endemic to the system and far from simply the consequence of a few bad apples. In Greece, Spain, and Italy social movements are gaining momentum fighting against the defunding or elimination of social services and the ongoing privatization of public goods. In Chile, the United States, Canada, and England students are taking a stand against the neoliberal war against higher education. Refusing to remain voiceless and powerless in determining their future, these young people are organizing collectively in order to create the conditions for societies that refuse to view politics as an act of war and markets as the measure of democracy. And while such struggles are full of contradictions and setbacks, they have opened up a new conversation about politics, poverty, inequality, class warfare, and ecological devastation. These ongoing protests make clear that this is not—indeed, cannot be— only a short-term project for reform, but a political movement that needs to intensify, accompanied by the reclaiming of public spaces, the progressive use of digital technologies, the development of public spheres, the production of new modes of education, and the safeguarding of places where democratic expression, new identities, and collective hope can be nurtured and mobilized. A formative culture must be put in place pedagogically and institutionally in a variety of spheres extending from churches and public and higher education to all those cultural apparatuses engaged in the production and circulation of knowledge, desire, identities, and values. Clearly, such efforts need to address the language of democratic revolution rather than the seductive incremental adjustments of liberal reform. This suggests pedagogies of resistance and disruption that promote policies that insure a living wage; jobs programs, especially for the young; the democratization of power; economic equality; and a massive shift in funds away from the machinery of war and big banks but also new alliances and a social movement that both engages in critique and makes hope a real possibility by organizing for the creation of a radical democracy along with the institutions, social relations, and modes of justice that support it. We need collective narratives that inform concrete struggles. In this instance, public intellectuals can play a crucial role in providing theoretical resources and modes of analyses that can help to shape such narratives along with broader social movements and collective struggles. Academics, artists, journalists, and other cultural workers can help put into place the formative cultures, necessary to further such efforts through the production and circulation of the knowledge, values, identities, and social relations crucial for such struggles to succeed. Writing in 1920, H. G. Wells insisted that “History is becoming more and more a race between education and catastrophe.”61 I think Wells got it right but what needs to be acknowledged is that there is more at stake here than the deep responsibilities of academics to defend academic freedom, the tenure system, and faculty autonomy, however important. The real issues lie elsewhere and speak to preserving the public character of higher education and recognizing that defending it as a public sphere is essential to the very existence of critical thinking, dissent, dialogue, engaged scholarship, and democracy itself. Universities should be subversive in a healthy society; they should push against the grain, and give voice to the voiceless, the unmentionable, and the whispers of truth that haunt the apostles of unchecked power and wealth. These may be dark times, as Hannah Arendt once warned, but they don’t have to be, and that raises serious questions about what educators are going to do within the current historical climate to make sure that they do not succumb to the authoritarian forces circling the university, waiting for the resistance to stop and for the lights to go out. Resistance is no longer an option, it is a necessity. Academics in their role as public intellectuals can exercise a formidable influence both in and outside of public schools, colleges, and universities in raising critical questions, connecting critical modes of education to social change, and making clear that the banner of critical independence and civic engagement, “ragged and torn though it may be, is still worth fighting for.”62

### Case

#### Now affirm –

#### Private property is inherently unjust – that means you reject capitalist appropriation a-priori.

Wright 1 [Will Wright, Sage publications, “The Wild West: The Mythical Cowboy and Social Theory,” pgs. 90-91, 2001]/ lm

All forms of class structure are unjust for Marx, but the structure of private property is the most oppressive and unjust, the most alienating. Humans are ‘naturally’, essentially productive according to Marx. Humans produce what they need to live, and individuals can only be fully human when they are not structurally separated from the products they make. Society can only be just and individuals truly fulfilled when they all have a sense of ownership and control over the products they make. Any structure of class control, therefore, distorts this human essence since the privileged class owns and controls what the working class produces. In all class structures before capitalism, however, the lower class lived on the land and thus had some degree of direct control over what they produced. As a result, they could build their own homes, grow their own food, cut wood for heat, and make their own clothes. But private property inevitably creates industry, and in an industrial structure of private property, workers are completely separated, completely alienated, from the products they make. Unlike feudal peasants, industrial workers have no traditional rights, no minimal control, over their own products. They are fully alienated from these products; therefore, for Marx, they are also alienated from their labor, from their own human essence, from all other humans, from all social relations. This is the structure of alienation for Marx, the structure of capitalist oppression, and it arises from the structure of private property. Private property is uniquely oppressive because workers are separated from all productive property – the means of production – and owners can only be self-interested, with no traditional, moral constraints. This means workers become commodities to be bought and sold, and this is another way of saying they are alienated. In another version of this same analysis, Marx argues that private property is a form of theft[!!!] where owners are stealing from the workers. The idea of alienation is Marx’s social critique of the market, and this idea of theft is his economic critique of the market.

#### New Space serves as a spatial fix, crucial for sustaining it’s logic and preserving it’s systems of exploitation.

Shammas and Holen 19

[Victor L. Shammas Oslo Metropolitan University, Work Research Institute (AFI), Oslo, Norway, Tomas B. Holen Independent scholar, Oslo, Norway, nature, Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, “One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space,” January 29 2019, [https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9]/lm](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9%5d/lm)

But how are we to understand NewSpace? In some ways, NewSpace signals the emergence of capitalism in space. The production of carrier rockets, placement of satellites into orbit around Earth, and the exploration, exploitation, or colonization of outer space (including planets, asteroids, and other celestial objects), will not be the work of humankind as such, a pure species-being (Gattungswesen), but of particular capitalist entrepreneurs who stand in for and represent humanity. Crucially, they will do so in ways modulated by the exigencies of capital accumulation. These enterprising capitalists are forging a new political-economic regime in space, a post-Fordism in space aimed at profit maximization and the apparent minimization of government interference. A new breed of charismatic, starry-eyed entrepreneurs, including Musk’s SpaceX, Richard Branson’s Virgin Galactic, and Amazon billionaire Jeff Bezos’s Blue Origin, to name but a selection, aim at becoming ‘capitalists in space' (Parker, [2009](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR49)) or space capitalists. Neil Armstrong’s famous statement will have to be reformulated: space will not be the site of ‘one giant leap for [hu]mankind', but rather one giant leap for capitalistkind.[Footnote5](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#Fn5) With the ascendancy of NewSpace, humanity’s future in space will not be ‘ours', benefiting humanity tout court, but will rather be the result of particular capitalists, or capitalistkind,[Footnote6](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#Fn6) toiling to recuperate space and bring its vast domain into the fold of capital accumulation: NewSpace sees outer space as the domain of private enterprise, set to become the ‘first-trillion dollar industry', according to some estimates, and likely to produce the world’s first trillionaires (see, e.g., Honan, [2018](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR30))—as opposed to Old Space, a derisive moniker coined by enthusiastic proponents of capitalism-in-space, widely seen to have been the sole preserve of the state and a handful of giant aerospace corporations, including Boeing and Lockheed Martin, in Cold War-era Space Age.

No longer terra nullius, space is now the new terra firma of capitalistkind: its naturalized terroir, its next necessary terrain. The logic of capitalism dictates that capital should seek to expand outwards into the vastness of space, a point recognized by a recent ethnography of NewSpace actors (Valentine, [2016](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR66), p. 1050). The operations of capitalistkind serve to resolve a series of (potential) crises of capitalism, revolving around the slow, steady decline of spatial fixes (see e.g., Harvey, [1985](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR21), p. 51–66) as they come crashing up against the quickly vanishing blank spaces remaining on earthly maps and declining (terrestrial) opportunities for profitable investment of surplus capital (Dickens and Ormrod, [2007a](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR12), p. 49–78).

A ‘spatial fix' involves the geographic modulation of capital accumulation, consisting in the outward expansion of capital onto new geographic terrains, or into new spaces, with the aim of filling a gap in the home terrains of capital. Jessop ([2006](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR34), p. 149) notes that spatial fixes may involve a number of strategies, including the creation of new markets within the capitalist world, engaging in trade with non-capitalist economies, and exporting surplus capital to undeveloped or underdeveloped regions. The first two address the problem of insufficient demand and the latter option creates a productive (or valorizing) outlet for excess capital. Capitalism must regularly discover, develop, and appropriate such new spaces because of its inherent tendency to generate surplus capital, i.e., capital bereft of profitable purpose. In Harvey’s ([2006](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR23), p. xviii) terms, a spatial fix revolves around ‘geographical expansions and restructuring…as a temporary solution to crises understood…in terms of the overaccumulation of capital'. It is a temporary solution because these newly appropriated spaces will in turn become exhausted of profitable potential and are likely to produce their own stocks of surplus capital; while ‘capital surpluses that otherwise stood to be devalued, could be absorbed through geographical expansions and spatio-temporal displacements' (Harvey, [2006](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR23), p. xviii), this outwards drive of capitalism is inherently limitless: there is no end point or final destination for capitalism. Instead, capitalism must continuously propel itself onwards in search of pristine sites of renewed capital accumulation. In this way, Harvey writes, society constantly ‘creates fresh productive powers elsewhere to absorb its overaccumulated capital' (Harvey, [1981](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR24), p. 8).

Historically, spatial fixes have played an important role in conserving the capitalist system. As Jessop ([2006](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR34), p. 149) points out, ‘The export of surplus money capital, surplus commodities, and/or surplus labour-power outside the space(s) where they originate enabled capital to avoid, at least for a period, the threat of devaluation'. But these new spaces for capital are not necessarily limited to physical terrains, as with colonial expansion in the nineteenth century; as Greene and Joseph ([2015](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR19)) note, various digital spaces, such as the Internet, can also be considered as spatial fixes: the Web absorbs overaccumulated capital, heightens consumption of virtual and physical goods, and makes inexpensive, flexible sources of labor available to employers. Greene and Joseph offer the example of online high-speed frequency trading as a digital spatial fix that furthers the ‘annihilation of space by time' first noted by Marx in his Grundrisse (see Marx, [1973](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR40), p. 524).

In short, outer space serves as a spatial fix. It swallows up surplus capital, promising to deliver valuable resources, technological innovations, and communication services to capitalists back on Earth. This places outer space on the same level as traditional colonization, analyzed in Hegel’s Philosophy of Right, which Hegel thought of as a product of the ‘inner dialectic of civil society', which drives the market to ‘push beyond its own limits and seek markets, and so its necessary means of subsistence, in other lands which are either deficient in the goods it has overproduced, or else generally backward in creative industry, etc.' (Hegel, [2008](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR26), p. 222). In this regard, SpaceX and related ventures are not so very different from maritime colonialists and the trader-exploiters of the British East India Company. But there is something new at stake. As the Silicon Valley entrepreneur Peter Diamandis has gleefully noted: ‘There are twenty-trillion-dollar checks up there, waiting to be cashed!' (Seaney and Glendenning, [2016](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR54)). Capitalistkind consists in the naturalization of capitalist consciousness and practice, the (false) universalization of a particular mode of political economy as inherent to the human condition, followed by the projection of this naturalized universality into space—capitalist humanity as a Fukuyamite ‘end of history', the end-point of (earthly) historical unfolding, but the starting point of humanity’s first serious advances in space.

While some elements of the astrosociological community, such as the Astrosociology Research Institute (ARI),[Footnote14](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#Fn14) insist on elucidating the “human dimension” in outer space, Dickens and Ormrod recognize that this humanization-through-capitalism really involves the ‘commodification of the universe' ([2007b](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR13), p. 2). While Dickens and Ormrod develop similar arguments to those sketched here—from their concept of an ‘outer spatial fix' to their argument about outer space becoming woven into circuits of capital accumulation—they were writing at a time when their remarks necessarily remained speculative: the commercialization of space was still in its infancy. In an inversion of Hegel’s owl of Minerva, reality has since largely confirmed their ideas and caught up with theory. Above all, when considering the various ventures ongoing in space today, it is not so much the universalizing human dimension as the specifically capitalist dimension that is striking. With the advent of NewSpace, outer space is becoming not the domain of a common humanity but of private capital.

The very centrality of these maneuvers has initiated a new phase in the history of capitalist relations, that of ‘charismatic accumulation'—certainly not in the sense of any ‘objective' or inherent charismatic authority, but with a form of illusio, to speak with Bourdieu, vested in the members of capitalistkind by their uncanny ability to spin mythologizing self-narratives. This has always been part of the capitalist game, from Henry Ford and onwards, but the charismatic mission gains a special potency in the grandiose designs of NewSpace’s entrepreneurs. Every SpaceX launch is a quasi-religious spectacle, observed by millions capable of producing a real sense of wonder in a condition of (legitimizing) collective effervescence.

We have already noted that it is not humanity, conceived as species-being, a Gattungswesen, that makes its way into space. The term Gattungswesen, of course, has a long intellectual pedigree, harking back to Hegel, Feuerbach, Marx, and others. The term can ‘be naturally applied both to the individual human being and to the common nature or essence which resides in every individual man and woman', Allan Wood ([2004](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR70), p. 17) writes, as well as ‘to the entire human race, referring to humanity as a single collective entity or else to the essential property which characterizes this entity and makes it a single distinctive thing in its own right'. Significantly, the adherents of NewSpace often resort to the idea of humanity in its broad universality (e.g., Musk, [2017](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR45)), but this denies and distorts the modulation of humanity by its imbrication with the project of global (and post-global, i.e., space-bound) capitalism. It is precisely th[is]e sort of false universality implied in the humanism of the supporters of NewSpace that Marx subjected to a scathing critique in the sixth of his Theses on Feuerbach. Here Marx noted that the human essence is not made up of some ‘abstraction inherent in each single individual' ([1998](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR42), p. 570). Instead, humans are defined by the ‘ensemble of social relations' in which they are enmeshed. Under NewSpace, it is not humanity, plain and simple, that ventures forth, but a specific set of capitalist entrepreneurs, carrying a particular ideological payload, alongside their satellites, instruments, and supplies, a point noted by other sociologists of outer space, or ‘astrosociologists' (Dickens and Ormrod, [2007a](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR12), [2007b](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR13)).

#### Space capitalism uses escapist logics that run away from the problems of earth – capitalism is the root cause of these problems and going to space on gives them room to expand.

Kriss 17 [Sam Kriss, Atlantic Writer and Journalist, The Atlantic, Science Section, “Think Twice About Escaping Earth to an Exoplanet,” March 8th 2017, [https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2017/03/space-travel-wont-save-you-from-capitalism/518853/]/](https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2017/03/space-travel-wont-save-you-from-capitalism/518853/%5d/) lm

Exploring the galaxy will only give our problems more room to expand.

Outer space was once the domain of myth and metaphors; the sun’s stern circuit around the sky told the stories of living and dying gods, the stars were immortalized heroes. These myths changed, as they always do: In the science-fiction mythology our galaxy would be a great adventure; we’d go out in search of green-skinned alien babes or make war against angry humanoids with weird foreheads. That’s gone now. Human beings look up at the night sky, through all its senseless intricacies, and don’t see anything else looking back. Instead, the entire infinite universe has become nothing more than a life raft.

What’s not explained is how we’re expected to avoid bringing the crop blight with us, or why agriculture would be more viable on a desert world than one that still has some harried remnants of life. Listen to these narratives for long enough and you start to think that the problem is our Earth itself, that there’s something evil buried deep below the soil, that it’s one giant haunted house to be fled. As if whatever ghosts swarm around this place were here before we created them. All these visions of humanity’s destiny in the stars, whether they’re brought on by curiosity or desperation, imagine that we could turn lifeless planets into gardens. But all that’s happened in living memory is the precise opposite. Wastelands are already growing on this earth, steadily drying out farmlands into scrub or burning forests into lifeless ashy mud. What will happen to an earth that’s wasteland already? Fleeing into outer space isn’t a solution to any of our problems; it’s not even running away from them. Exploring the galaxy just means giving the problem more room in which to expand.

Capitalism, as David Harvey once remarked, never solves its contradictions, it only moves them around. If it becomes impossible to make profits in Europe, you set up plantations in the New World, where you can work people to death for free. If you’re worried about socialist uprisings in your own country, you can move the production process to south-east Asia, where client states can brutalize their populations without the people that matter ever having to care about it. For centuries the capitalist mode of production has chased itself in tightening circles around a planet that’s starting to wear away under the strain, thinning out the biosphere, removing the conditions necessary for biological life out from under its own frantic legs. It’s run out of room; there are fewer and fewer places in which to lodge the permanent crisis. The only direction left is up and out. And so the idea starts to take hold that human destiny is to conquer the stars, that the darkness beyond our planet isn’t the home of gods or aliens, but infinite lifeless space. An empire waiting to be founded. And if we don’t create it soon, the empire we have now will kill us all.

But things won’t be different on those distant planets. They’ll be exactly the same, just worse, always worse. The logic of this model of space colonization assumes a society that expands constantly, pushing itself into every empty space it can find, because if it stops for even a moment, it’ll die. It’s a society that needs to spread itself infinitely, not for any articulable reason, but simply because that’s what it needs to do. And it’s a society that is always under threat of breaking under the weight of its own contradictions and always at war with the livability of life. In other words, the exact conditions we’re all living and dying under now. It’s capitalism; it could only ever be capitalism, turning itself into all the monsters it could once only imagine. Purified from any residual traces of the soil from which it rose, liberated from its parasitic dependence on Earth and its human labor by a glut of new planets, space capitalism could transform itself into something truly monstrous: a black and segmented carapace, vast beyond thought; nested jaws gnashing through the galaxies in a lifeless, merciless greed.

If you’re worried that reactionary leaders, climate change, and nuclear weapons have the power to destroy everything on this planet, the solution isn’t to conjure up a future in which they could destroy everything on all the other planets too. Our problems have to be solved, not fed, before we risk spreading the blight to rot away the entire sky. As things stand, going to TRAPPIST-1e will not save you from your fear of Donald Trump or anything else. That tourist poster needs updating; already, there should be a big gleaming gold skyscraper jutting out between the untouched hills, because he’s going with you, clinging to the hull of your spaceship as it crosses those 40 light years of black nothing, his hair finally freed from gravity and fanning into a predator’s frill.

#### Capitalism in outer space dramatically increases exploitation of workers and wealth inequality in the cosmos – Musks and Bezos prove.

Marx 20 [Paris Marx, Paris Marx is a freelance writer, host of left-wing tech podcast Tech Won't Save Us, and editor of Radical Urbanist, Jacobin, “Yes to Space Exploration. No to Space Capitalism.” 06/08/2020, [https://www.jacobinmag.com/2020/06/spacex-elon-musk-jeff-bezos-capitalism]/](https://www.jacobinmag.com/2020/06/spacex-elon-musk-jeff-bezos-capitalism%5d/) lm

The May 30 launch symbolized both Trump’s desire to project an image of revived American greatness and Musk’s need not only to bolster the myth that makes his wealth possible, but to set the foundations for a privatized space industry.

The space billionaires — Musk and Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos foremost among them — have little stake in the well-being of the majority of the population. Their space visions are designed for wealthy people like themselves, with little mention of where the working class would fit in. They’ve built their wealth on exploitation, and their visions of the future are little more than an extension of their present actions.

The business practices of Musk and Bezos are increasingly well known and have been on clear display during the pandemic. Musk tried to claim Tesla’s Fremont, California factory was “essential” until [authorities forced him to close it;](https://www.sfchronicle.com/business/article/Tesla-s-Fremont-factory-ordered-to-shut-down-15137774.php) then he [reopened it in [for] defiance of health orders](https://www.vox.com/recode/2020/5/12/21255812/elon-musk-tesla-factory-coronavirus-reopening). As Tesla CEO, Musk has a long history of [opposing the unionization of workers](https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2018/sep/10/tesla-workers-union-elon-musk), presiding over a high rate of worker injuries ([which the company tried to cover up](https://www.revealnews.org/article/tesla-says-its-factory-is-safer-but-it-left-injuries-off-the-books/)), and even having a former worker [hacked and harassed](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/features/2019-03-13/when-elon-musk-tried-to-destroy-tesla-whistleblower-martin-tripp) after he became a whistleblower.

Meanwhile, Bezos has a similar history of abusing Amazon workers. Amazon’s warehouses are known for having [higher injury rates than the industry average](https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2019/11/amazon-warehouse-reports-show-worker-injuries/602530/), the company has [fought unionization](https://gizmodo.com/amazons-aggressive-anti-union-tactics-revealed-in-leake-1829305201), and the stories of the [terrible](https://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-warehouse-2011-9) [conditions](https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2020/feb/05/amazon-workers-protest-unsafe-grueling-conditions-warehouse) [experienced](https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/amazon-protests-workers-urinate-plastic-bottles-no-toilet-breaks-milton-keynes-jeff-bezos-a9012351.html) [by](https://www.theverge.com/2019/4/25/18516004/amazon-warehouse-fulfillment-centers-productivity-firing-terminations) [workers](https://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-warehouse-workers-share-their-horror-stories-2018-4) are legendary. During the pandemic, that has continued, with the company failing to enforce social distancing or provide adequate protective equipment [until workers began walking out](https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2020/mar/30/amazon-workers-strike-coronavirus), refusing to be [open about infection information](https://www.latimes.com/business/technology/story/2020-05-28/amazon-whole-foods-workers-track-coronavirus-cases), and firing workers who dared [criticize](https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2020/apr/02/amazon-chris-smalls-smart-articulate-leaked-memo) [the](https://www.theverge.com/2020/4/14/21220353/amazon-covid-19-criticism-protest-fired-employees-cunningham-costa-climate-change) [company](https://www.vice.com/en_ca/article/y3zd9g/whole-foods-just-fired-an-employee-who-kept-track-of-coronavirus-cases), all while Bezos’s wealth has increased by [more than $30 billion](https://www.cnbc.com/2020/05/21/american-billionaires-got-434-billion-richer-during-the-pandemic.html).

These space barons made their billions through the exploitation of their workers and came from well-off backgrounds made possible from resource extraction. When digging into their visions for a future in space, it’s clear that they seek to extend these conditions into the cosmos, not challenge them in favor of space exploration for the benefit of all.

Musk and Bezos are the leading drivers of the modern push to privatize and colonize space through their respective companies, SpaceX and Blue Origin. Their visions differ slightly, with Musk preferring to colonize Mars, while Bezos has more interest in building space colonies in orbit.

But these billionaires do not hide who would be served by their futures. Musk has given many figures for the cost of a ticket to Mars, but they’re never cheap. He told Vance the tickets would cost $500,000 to $1 million, a price at which he thinks “it’s highly likely that there will be a self-sustaining Martian colony.” However, the workers for such a colony clearly won’t be able to buy their own way. Rather, Musk tweeted a plan[s] for [Martian indentured servitude](https://gizmodo.com/elon-musk-a-new-life-awaits-you-on-the-off-world-colon-1841071257) where workers would take on loans to pay for their tickets and pay them off later because “There will be a lot of jobs on Mars!”

Bezos is even more open about how the workforce will have to expand to serve his vision, but has little to say about what they’ll be doing. His plan to maintain economic “growth and dynamism” requires the human population to [grow to a trillion people](https://jacobinmag.com/2019/07/space-colonies-jeff-bezos-blue-origin). He claims this would create “a thousand Mozarts and a thousand Einsteins” who would live in space colonies that are supposed to house a million people each, with the surface of Earth being mainly for tourism. Meanwhile, industrial and mining work would move into orbit so as not to pollute the planet, and while he doesn’t explicitly acknowledge it, it’s likely [that’s where you’ll find many of those trillion workers](https://jacobinmag.com/2019/12/jeff-bezos-the-expanse-space-fantasy-sci-fi-syfy/) toiling for their space overlord and his descendants.

Space has been used by past US presidents to bolster American power and influence, but it was largely accepted that capitalism ended at the edge of the atmosphere. That’s no longer the case, and just as past capitalist expansions have come at the expense of poor and working people to enrich a small elite, so too will this one. Bezos and Trump may have a public feud, but that doesn’t mean that their mutual interest isn’t served by a renewed US push into space that funnels massive public funds into private pockets and seeks to open celestial bodies to capitalist resource extraction.

This is not to say that we need to halt space exploration. The collective interest of humanity is served by learning more about the solar system and the universe beyond, but the goal of such missions must be driven by gaining scientific knowledge and enhancing global cooperation, not nationalism and profit-making.

Yet that’s exactly what the space billionaires and American authoritarians have found common cause in, with Trump declaring that “[a new age of American ambition has now begun](https://twitter.com/TeamTrump/status/1266846741787074560?s=20)” at a NASA press briefing just hours before cities across the country were placed under curfew last week. Before space can be explored in a way that benefits all of humankind, existing social relations must be transformed, not extended into the stars as part of a new colonial project.

#### Capitalist ventures in space are happening now – that results in massive spikes in inequality and fossil fuel consumption.

**Levine 15** [Nick Levine is an MPhil candidate in history of science at the University of Cambridge, Jacobin, “Democratize the Universe” 3/21/2015, [https://jacobinmag.com/2015/03/space-industry-extraction-levine]/](https://jacobinmag.com/2015/03/space-industry-extraction-levine%5d/) lm

The privatization of the Milky Way has begun.

Last summer, the bipartisan [ASTEROIDS Act](https://www.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/house-bill/5063) was introduced in Congress. The legislation’s aim is to grant US corporations property rights over any natural resources — like the platinum-group metals used in electronics — that they extract from asteroids.

Whether and how we should go to space are not profound philosophical questions, at least not primarily. What’s at stake is not just the “stature of man,” as Hannah Arendt [put it](http://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/the-conquest-of-space-and-the-stature-of-man), but a political-economic struggle over the future of the celestial commons, which could result in a dramatic intensification of inequality — or a small step for humankind toward a more egalitarian state of affairs on our current planet.

#### And

We might also question whether mining asteroids would be detrimental to our current planet’s environment in the medium term. If we don’t find a renewable way to blast off into outer space, the exploitation of these resources could lead to an intensification of, not a move away from, the fossil-fuel economy.

If the environmental impact of space mining turns out to be large, it would be analogous to fracking — a technological development that gives us access to new resources, but with devastating ecological side effects — and ought to be opposed on similar grounds. On the other hand, some speculate that mining the Moon’s Helium-3 reserves, for example, could provide an abundant [source of clean energy](https://io9.gizmodo.com/5908499/could-helium-3-really-solve-earths-energy-problems). The terrestrial environmental impact of space activity remains an open question that must be explored before we stake our hopes on the economic development of outer space.

Philosophers have suggested that we might have ethical duties to preserve the “natural” states of celestial bodies. Others fear that our activities might unknowingly wipe out alien microbial life. We should remain sensitive to the aesthetic and cultural value of outer space, as well as the potential for extinction and the exhaustion of resources misleadingly proclaimed to be limitless.

Of course, there’s nothing inevitable about the benefits of productivity gains being distributed widely, as we’ve seen in the United States over the past forty years. This is a problem not limited to space, and the myth of the “final frontier” must not distract us from the already existing problems of wealth and income distribution on Earth.

#### The logics of space capitalism intensify inequalities and environmental destruction which independently cause extinction.

Robinson 18 [William I, professor of sociology, global studies and Latin American studies at the University of California at Santa Barbara. 2018. “Accumulation Crisis and Global Police State.”<http://revolutionary-socialism.com/en/accumulation-crisis-and-global-police-state/>]

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[t] 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. Fifth, there is the rise of a vast surplus population inhabiting a “planet of slums” (Davis, 2007) pushed out of the productive economy, thrown into the margins, and subject to sophisticated systems of social control and to destruction, into a mortal cycle of dispossession-exploitation-exclusion. Crises provide capital with the opportunity to accelerate the process of forcing greater productivity out of fewer workers. The processes by which surplus labor is generated have accelerated under globalization. Spatial reorganization has helped transnational capital to break the territorial-bound power of organized labor and impose new capital–labor relations based on fragmentation, flexibilization, and the cheapening of labor. These developments, combined with a massive new round of primitive accumulation and displacement of hundreds of millions, have given rise to a new global army of superfluous labor that goes well beyond the traditional reserve army of labor that Marx discussed. Global capitalism has no direct use for surplus humanity. But indirectly, it holds wages down everywhere and makes new systems of 21st century slavery possible. Dominant groups face the challenge of how to contain both the real and potential rebellion of surplus humanity. In addition, surplus humanity cannot consume and so as their ranks expand the problem of overaccumulation becomes exacerbated. Sixth, there is an acute political contradiction in global capitalism: economic globalization takes places within a nation-state system of political authority. Transnational state apparatuses are incipient and have not been able to substitute for a leading nation-state with enough power and authority to organize and stabilize the system, much less to impose regulations on transnational capital. In the age of capitalist globalization governments must attract to the national territory transnational corporate investment, which requires providing capital with all the incentives associated with neoliberalism – downward pressure on wages, deregulation, austerity, and so on – that aggravate inequality, impoverishment, and insecurity for working classes. Nation-states face a contradiction between the need to promote transnational capital accumulation in their territories and their need to achieve political legitimacy. As a result, states around the world have been experiencing spiraling crises of legitimacy. This situation generates bewildering and seemingly contradictory politics and also helps explain the resurgence of far-right and neo-fascist forces that espouse rhetoric of nationalism and protectionism even as they promote neo-liberalism.

### Underview

#### 1] 1ar theory, aff gets it, its k2 preventing abuse in the 1n.

#### 2] Since the resolution specifies justice, this debate should center on whether or not space caps consistent with some theory of justice. If we wanted to debate plans and solvency, we’d be doing policy, anything else destroys the constitutive purpose of having LD as a separate form of debate.

#### 3] CX checks on all 1n theory, de-incentivizes friv theory dumps and solves shells on aff abuse.

#### 4] Give me an RVI, 4-minute time crunch in the 1ar is too short to fend off theory and win substance.