

Cap K AC

ROB: challenge capitalist ideology

The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best challenges capitalist ideology; anything else means the support of ongoing oppression and exploitation

Prefer our ROB for 2 reasons:

Whether you accomplish an end is irrelevant. You must act and join our protest -- Even under conditions of social pessimism, the moral obligation to reduce oppression still persists through embodied political resistance. This precedes theory as critiques of styles of debate can only be validated after the debate space is fixed.

Butler 16 (Judith Butler, writes comparative literature on gender theory and is a gender theorist who works at UC Berkeley, Hannah Arendt Chair at the European Graduate School, Developed the theory on Gender Performativity, LGBTQ activist, "Notes Toward A Performative Theory of Assembly", First Harvard University Press paperback edition published in 2018, original 2016 (copyright by the President and Fellows of Harvard College in 2015), pg. 117-119, MB)

We know this from some of the extraordinary reports from the concentration camps. In the work of Robert Antelme, for instance, it could be the exchange of a cigarette between those who share no common language, but find themselves in the same condition of imprisonment and peril in the concentration camp. Or in the work of Primo Levi, the response to the other can take the form of simply listening to, and recording, the details of the story that the other might tell, letting that story become part of an undeniable archive, the enduring trace of loss that compels the ongoing obligation to mourn; or in the work of Charlotte Delbo, the sudden offering to another of the last piece of bread that one desperately needs for oneself. And yet in these same accounts, there are also those who will not extend the hand, who will take the bread for oneself, hoard the cigarette, and sometimes suffer the anguish of depriving another under conditions of radical destitution. In other words, **[BUT] we must not falter, we must not fall to this pessimistic futurism under conditions of extreme peril** and heightened protest. **y. the moral dilemma does not pass away; it persists** precisely in the tension between wanting to live and wanting to live in a certain way with others. **The construct that moral obligations die when we have no hope concedes the hopeless futurism of the Other. Fight despite no logical reason because your own logic of hopeless is subservient to the forces of supremacy.** One is still in small and vital ways "leading a life" as one recites or hears the story, as one affirms whatever occasion there might be to acknowledge the life and suffering of another. Even the utterance of a name can come as the most extraordinary form of recognition, especially when one has become nameless or when one's name has been replaced by a number, or when one is not addressed at all. At a controversial moment, in speaking about the Jewish people, Hannah Arendt made clear that it was not enough for the Jews to struggle for survival, and that survival cannot be the end or goal of life itself.⁷ Citing Socrates, she insisted on the crucial distinction between the desire to live and the desire to live well or, rather, the desire to live the good life.⁸ For Arendt, survival was not, and should not be, a goal in itself, since life itself was not an intrinsic good. Only the good life makes life worth living. She resolved that Socratic dilemma quite easily but perhaps too quickly, or so it seems to me. I am not sure her answer can work for us, nor am I convinced that it ever did quite work. For Arendt, the life of the body had for the most part to be separated from the life of the mind, which is why in *The Human Condition* she drew a distinction between the public and private spheres. The private sphere included the domain of need, the reproduction of material life, sexuality, life, death, and transience. She clearly understood that the private sphere supported the public sphere of action and thought, but in her view, the political is defined by action, including the active sense of speaking. So the verbal deed became the action of the deliberative and public space of politics. Those who entered into the public sphere did so from the private sphere, so the public sphere depended fundamentally on the reproduction of the private, and the clear passageway that led from the private to the public. Those who could not speak Greek, who came from elsewhere and whose speech was not intelligible, were considered barbarians, which means that the public sphere was not conceived as a space of multilingualism and so failed to imply the practice of translation as a public obligation. And yet, we can see that the efficacious verbal act depended on (a) a stable and sequestered private sphere that reproduced the masculine speaker and actor and (b) a language designated for verbal action, the defining feature of politics, that could be heard and understood because it conformed to the demands of monolingualism. The public sphere, defined by an intelligible and efficacious set of speech acts, was thus perpetually shadowed by the problems of unrecognized labor (women and slaves) and multilingualism. And the site where both converge was precisely the situation of the slave, one who could be replaced, whose political status was null, and whose language was considered no language at all. Of course, Arendt understood that the body was important to any conception of action, and that even those who fight in resistances or in revolutions had to undertake bodily actions to claim their rights and to create something new.⁹ And the body was certainly important to public speech, understood as a verbal form of action. The

Pedagogical spaces like debate are the crucial staging ground for a radical interrogation of capitalism. The debate space is a crucial educational plane in resisting capitalism and imagining crucial alternatives

McLaren, Distinguished Fellow – Critical Studies @ Chapman U and UCLA urban schooling prof, and Scatamburlo-D'Annibale, associate professor of Communication – U Windsor, **'4**

(Peter and Valerie, "Class Dismissed? Historical materialism and the politics of 'difference'," *Educational Philosophy and Theory* Vol. 36, Issue 2, p. 183-199)//RM

For well over two decades we have witnessed the jubilant liberal and conservative pronouncements of the demise of socialism. Concomitantly, history's presumed failure to defang existing capitalist relations has been read by many self-identified 'radicals' as an advertisement for capitalism's inevitability. As a result, the chorus refrain 'There Is No Alternative', sung by liberals and conservatives, has been buttressed by the symphony of post-Marxist voices recommending that we give socialism a decent burial and move on. Within this context, to speak of the promise of Marx and socialism may appear anachronistic, even naïve, especially since the post-al intellectual vanguard has presumably demonstrated the folly of doing so. Yet we stubbornly believe that the chants of T.I.N.A. must be combated for they offer as a fait accompli, something which progressive **Leftists should refuse to accept**—namely **the triumph of**

capitalism and its political bedfellow neo-liberalism, which have worked together to naturalize suffering, undermine collective struggle, and obliterate hope. We concur with Amin (1998), who claims that such chants must be defied and revealed as absurd and criminal, and who puts the challenge we face in no uncertain terms: humanity may let itself be led by capitalism's logic to a fate of collective suicide or it may pave the way for an alternative humanist project of global socialism. The grotesque conditions that inspired Marx to pen his original critique of capitalism are present and flourishing. The inequalities of wealth and the gross imbalances of power that exist today are leading to abuses that exceed those encountered in Marx's day (Greider, 1998, p. 39). Global capitalism has paved the way for the obscene concentration of wealth in fewer and fewer hands and created a world increasingly divided between those who enjoy opulent affluence and those who languish in dehumanizing conditions and economic misery. In every corner of the globe, we are witnessing social disintegration as revealed by a rise in abject poverty and inequality. At the current historical juncture, the combined assets of the 225 richest people is roughly equal to the annual income of the poorest 47 percent of the world's population, while the combined assets of the three richest people exceed the combined GDP of the 48 poorest nations (CCPA, 2002, p. 3). Approximately 2.8 billion people—almost half of the world's population—struggle in desperation to live on less than two dollars a day (McQuaig, 2001, p. 27). As many as 250 million children are wage slaves and there are over a billion workers who are either un- or under-employed. These are the concrete realities of our time—realities that require a vigorous class analysis, an unrelenting critique of capitalism and an oppositional politics capable of confronting what Ahmad (1998, p. 2) refers to as 'capitalist universality.' They are realities that require something more than that which is offered by the prophets of 'difference' and post-Marxists who would have us relegate socialism to the scrapheap of history and mummify Marxism along with Lenin's corpse. Never before has a Marxian analysis of capitalism and class rule been so desperately needed. That is not to say that everything Marx said or anticipated has come true, for that is clearly not the case. Many critiques of Marx focus on his strategy for moving toward socialism, and with ample justification; nonetheless Marx did provide us with fundamental insights into class society that have held true to this day. Marx's enduring relevance lies in his indictment of capitalism which continues to wreak havoc in the lives of most. While capitalism's cheerleaders have attempted to hide its sordid underbelly, Marx's description of capitalism as the sorcerer's dark power is even more apt in light of contemporary historical and economic conditions. Rather than jettisoning Marx, decentering the role of capitalism, and discrediting class analysis, radical educators must continue to engage Marx's oeuvre and extrapolate from it that which is useful pedagogically, theoretically, and, most importantly, politically in light of the challenges that confront us. The urgency which animates Amin's call for a collective socialist vision necessitates, as we have argued, moving beyond the particularism and liberal pluralism that informs the 'politics of difference.' It also requires challenging the questionable assumptions that have come to constitute the core of contemporary 'radical' theory, pedagogy and politics. In terms of effecting change, what is needed is a cogent understanding of the systemic nature of exploitation and oppression based on the radical political economy approach (outlined above) and one that incorporates Marx's notion of 'unity in difference' in which people share widely common material interests. Such an understanding extends far beyond the realm of theory, for the manner in which we choose to interpret and explore the social world, the concepts and frameworks we use to express our sociopolitical understandings, are more than just abstract categories. They imply intentions, organizational practices, and political agendas. Identifying class analysis as the basis for our understandings and class struggle as the basis for political transformation implies something quite different than constructing a sense of political agency around issues of race, ethnicity, gender, etc. Contrary to 'Shakespeare's assertion that a rose by any other name would smell as sweet,' it should be clear that this is not the case in political matters. Rather, in politics 'the essence of the flower lies in the name by which it is called' (Bannerji, 2000, p. 41). The task for progressives today is to seize the moment and plant the seeds for a political agenda that is grounded in historical possibilities and informed by a vision committed to overcoming exploitative conditions. These seeds, we would argue, must be derived from the tree of radical political economy. For the vast majority of people today—people of all 'racial classifications or identities, all genders and sexual orientations'—the common frame of reference arcing across 'difference', the 'concerns and aspirations that are most widely shared are those that are rooted in the common experience of everyday life shaped and constrained by political economy' (Reed, 2000, p. xxvii). While post-Marxist advocates of the politics of 'difference' suggest that such a stance is outdated, we would argue that the categories which they have employed to analyze 'the social' are now losing their

usefulness, particularly in light of actual contemporary 'social movements.' All over the globe, there are large anti-capitalist movements afoot. In February 2002, chants of 'Another World Is Possible' became the theme of protests in Porto Allegre. It seems that those people struggling in the streets haven't read about T.I.N.A., the end of grand narratives of emancipation, or the decentering of capitalism. It seems as though the struggle for basic survival and some semblance of human dignity in the mean streets of the dystopian metropolises doesn't permit much time or opportunity to read the heady proclamations emanating from seminar rooms. As E. P. Thompson (1978, p. 11) once remarked, sometimes 'experience walks in without knocking at the door, and announces deaths, crises of subsistence, trench warfare, unemployment, inflation, genocide.' This, of course, does not mean that socialism will inevitably come about, yet a sense of its nascent promise animates current social movements. Indeed, noted historian Howard Zinn (2000, p. 20) recently pointed out that after years of single-issue organizing (i.e. the politics of difference), the WTO and other anti-corporate capitalist protests signaled a turning point in the 'history of movements of recent decades,' for it was the issue of 'class' that more than anything 'bound everyone together.' History, to paraphrase Thompson (1978, p. 25) doesn't seem to be following Theory's script. Our vision is informed by Marx's historical materialism and his revolutionary socialist humanism, which must not be conflated with liberal humanism. For left politics and pedagogy, a socialist humanist vision remains crucial, whose fundamental features include the creative potential of people to challenge collectively the circumstances that they inherit. This variant of humanism seeks to give expression to the pain, sorrow and degradation of the oppressed, those who labor under the ominous and ghastly cloak of 'globalized' capital. It calls for the transformation of those conditions that have prevented the bulk of humankind from fulfilling its potential. It vests its hope for change in the development of critical consciousness and social agents who make history, although not always in conditions of their choosing. The political goal of socialist humanism is, however, 'not a resting in difference' but rather 'the emancipation of difference at the level of human mutuality and reciprocity.' This would be a step forward for the 'discovery or creation of our real differences which can only in the end be explored in reciprocal ways' (Eagleton, 1996, p. 120). Above all else, the enduring relevance of a radical socialist pedagogy and politics is the centrality it accords to the interrogation of capitalism. We can no longer afford to remain indifferent to the horror and savagery committed by capitalist's barbaric machinations. We need to recognize that capitalist democracy is unrescuably contradictory in its own self-constitution. Capitalism and democracy cannot be translated into one another without profound efforts at manufacturing empty idealism. Committed Leftists must unrelentingly cultivate a democratic socialist vision that refuses to forget the 'wretched of the earth,' the children of the damned and the victims of the culture of silence—a task which requires more than abstruse convolutions and striking ironic poses in the agnostic arena of signifying practices. Leftists must illuminate the little shops of horror that lurk beneath 'globalization's' shiny façade; they must challenge the true 'evils' that are manifest in the tentacles of global capitalism's reach. And, more than this, Leftists must search for the cracks in the edifice of globalized capitalism and shine light on those fissures that give birth to alternatives. Socialism today, undoubtedly, runs against the grain of received wisdom, but its vision of a vastly improved and freer arrangement of social relations beckons on the horizon. Its unwritten text is nascent in the present even as it exists among the fragments of history and the shards of distant memories. Its potential remains untapped and its promise needs to be redeemed.

Neoliberal capitalism requires the generation and accumulation of excess through constant expropriation and exploitation

Fraser 16

Fraser, N. (2016). Expropriation and exploitation in racialized capitalism: A reply to Michael Dawson. *Critical Historical Studies*, 3(1), 163-178.

Far from being sporadic, moreover, expropriation has always been part and parcel of capitalism's history, as has the racial oppression with which it is linked. No one doubts that racially organized slavery, colonial plunder, and land enclosures generated much of the initial capital that kick-started the system's development. But even "mature" capitalism relies on regular infusions of commandeered capacities and resources, especially from racialized subjects, in both its periphery and core. Historically, accordingly, expropriation has always been

entwined with exploitation in capitalist society—just as capitalism has always been entangled with racial oppression. But the connection is not just historical. On the contrary, there are structural reasons for capital's ongoing recourse to expropriation—hence, as we shall see, for its persistent entwinement with racial oppression. By definition, a system devoted to the limitless expansion and private appropriation of surplus value gives the owners of capital a deep-seated interest in acquiring labor and means of production below cost, if not wholly gratis—and not simply by virtue of greed. Expropriation lowers capitalists' costs of production, supplying inputs for whose reproduction they do not fully pay. This is the case when owners funnel confiscated assets, such as energy and raw materials, directly into industrial production. But it holds as well when they use commandeered assets, such as land and dependent agricultural labor, to generate low-cost means of subsistence for waged workers—for example, in the form of cheap food and textiles. In that case, expropriation cheapens the cost of reproducing labor power and thus of wages. In effect, it raises the rate of exploitation and counters the tendency of the rate of profit to fall. Advantageous even in “normal” times, expropriation becomes especially tempting in periods of crisis, when competition is intense, recent productivity gains are generalized, ecological degradation raises costs, and/or rates of profit fall below what are considered acceptable levels. In those times, which occur periodically and for nonaccidental reasons in the course of capitalist development, expropriation serves as a critical, albeit temporary, fix for restoring profitability and navigating crisis. Absent the ability to commandeer the labor and natural resources of dispossessed and often racialized populations, individual firms would perish, and the system's recurrent profitability crises would be harder to resolve. The same is true for political crises, which can sometimes be tempered or averted by transferring value confiscated from populations that appear not to threaten capital to those that do—another distinction that often correlates with “race.”

Capitalism feeds off of the commons, fundamentally destroys society

Hardt & Negri 19

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. “Michael Hardt & Antonio Negri, Empire, Twenty Years on, NLR 120, November–December 2019.” New Left Review, 2019, <https://newleftreview.org/issues/ii120/articles/empire-twenty-years-on>.

These analyses of extraction resonate strongly with what David Harvey aptly calls accumulation by dispossession. Such processes operate chiefly through new enclosures of the commons and the extraction of wealth, which may reside in the earth or in public infrastructures. 23 Finally, while condemning the exploitation and social and ecological destruction which they wreak, we emphasize that every form of extraction draws upon values produced externally to its direct sphere of management. Extractivism preys on the various forms of the common—ecological, social and biopolitical. 24 This process of predation points towards a potential that resides within the common, to which we will return. A second set of analyses highlights the role of the common in biopolitical relations, covering cognitive forms of production and the generation of affects and care, which spans the productive and reproductive realms. Studies of cognitive capitalism generally analyse the role of knowledge, intelligence and science in contemporary production, emphasizing the extent to which the ‘general intellect’—that is, the knowledges accumulated in society that have become in some sense common—has become directly productive of value. 26

Others focus on digital labour and the production of value through digital networks and platforms, which in some cases rely on the value generated by the attention of users. 27 Along with intelligence and attention, affects are also increasingly put to work in capitalist society, most often according to established gender hierarchies. Jobs that involve a large portion of affect production—nurses, home-care workers, administrative-support staff, waged domestic workers, primary-school teachers, food servers—are low paid, highly precarious and, accordingly, predominantly filled by women. The production of affects is also central to the unpaid realm of social reproduction, including domestic labour, which continues to be defined by a gender division of labour. 28 In these analyses, we recognize new and **intensified forms of exploitation and domination**, along with new forms of **biopolitical control**, and the **colonization and commodification of** further realms of **human existence**. Today, as the studies show, biopolitical productive forces are enclosed within private-property relations, labouring for a wage, or subordinated and discounted while the value they produce is still expropriated and accumulated. But here too we recognize the social nature of the common, since intelligence, knowledge, attention, affect and care are all immediately social capacities, defined by collective actions and interdependence. Great biopolitical reservoirs of the **common are constructed in** these resources of shared knowledge, collective intelligence, **decommodified relations** of affect and care, and, ultimately, the circuits of social cooperation; these have the potential to become autonomous from capitalist control. A third terrain of analysis addresses the common even more directly, by investigating the myriad ways in which the **development of capital destroys the earth and its ecosystems**. Analyses of climate change, in particular, demonstrate how intimately the history of capitalist development is tied to the extraction of fossil fuels. Many authors point out that saying human actions cause climate change or that we have entered an Anthropocene age, as if the species as a whole was equally responsible for the decisions that created our present predicament, masks the fact that a relatively small class of capitalists in the dominant countries are really responsible. As these studies make clear, a **necessary precondition** for any project to **preserve** the long-term health of **the planet is challenging** and overcoming the primacy of **capitalist rule**. 29 That the common is at stake in this domain is immediately recognizable, as vital realms of life that were once shared—the earth, the seas, the atmosphere—are closed off or degraded. The poor will suffer most and first from the effects of climate change, but eventually all will succumb. The common is central not only to what we have lost, however, but also to the alternatives we might construct. **Indigenous protests against capitalist destruction** pose most clearly the need for humans to establish a new relationship with the earth, characterized by relations of interdependence and care—to make the earth common. 30 What stands out in all these analyses of contemporary capital is the power of the common in all its forms, from earth and water to the metropolitan circuits of social cooperation, from shared knowledges and intelligence to affective relations and social reproduction. **Capital** has **increasingly** become an apparatus of capture that **prey on the common**, extracting the values produced there, and **creating** myriad **forms of suffering and destruction** in the process. But all these realms of the common, especially when mobilized and brought together in relations of interdependence, have the potential for autonomy—the potential to create social relations beyond capitalist rule.

Thus I affirm Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust. I defend the aff as a general principle but I will grant you links to DAs and CPs. CX checks on spec shells otherwise I meet – key to discussing the aff and they're infinitely regressive. This is the most consistent interp of the rez -

The aff identifies appropriation as being unjust - is pretense of be

Webster ND Definition of IS," Merriam Webster, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/is> IS is **Definition of is** (Entry 1 of 4) present tense third-person singular of BE **dialectal present tense** first-person and third-person **singular of BE** dialectal present tense plural of BE

Dialectical present tense means logical coherence which implies no implementation

Your Dictionary ND, "Dialectical Meaning," No Publication,

<https://www.yourdictionary.com/dialectical> Cho

The **definition of dialectical** is a discussion that includes logical reasoning and dialogue, or something having the sounds, vocabulary and grammar of a specific way of speaking. An **example of something dialectical is a Lincoln Douglass style of debate, where both parties argue a point in a logical order**. Of, or pertaining to dialectic; **logically reasoned** through the **exchange of opposing ideas**.

"BE" is a linking verb, not an action verb so implementation is incoherent

Grammar Monster ND "Linking Verbs," Grammar Monster,

https://www.grammar-monster.com/glossary/linking_verbs.htm CHO

What Are Linking Verbs? (with Examples) **A linking verb is used** to re-identify or to **describe its subject**. A linking verb is called a linking verb because it links the subject to a subject complement (see graphic below). Infographic Explaining Linking Verb A linking verb tells us what the subject is, not what the subject is doing. Easy Examples of Linking Verbs In each example, the linking verb is highlighted and the subject is bold. **Alan is a vampire**. (Here, the **subject is re-identified as a vampire**.) Alan is thirsty. (Here, the subject is described as thirsty.)

The New Space age has transformed outer space into the next space for the development of capital via commercialization and appropriation

Shammas & Holen 19

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

In this sense, SpaceX's Falcon Heavy also carried a crucial ideological payload: **the very idea of private enterprise and capitalist relations overtaking outer space**. 3 The Falcon Heavy conveyed this idea quite concretely. Onboard the rocket was an electric car, a Tesla Roadster (said to be Elon Musk's personal vehicle), which functioned as the rocket's 'dummy load', playing David Bowie's 'Space Oddity' and 'Life on Mars?' on repeat on the car's stereo system. An enticing marketing stunt viewed by millions online through SpaceX's YouTube live stream—with 2.3 million concurrent views, it was the second biggest live stream in YouTube history (Singleton, 2018)—the Falcon Heavy test flight embraced the logic of 'cool capitalism' (Schleusener, 2014), with in-jokes referencing Douglas Adam's Hitchhiker's Guide to the

Galaxy, while heralding the arrival of a commercialized space age, dubbed by industry insiders as the age of 'NewSpace'.⁴ 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) or space capitalists. Neil Armstrong's famous statement will have to be reformulated: space will not be the site of 'one giant leap for mankind', but rather one giant leap for capitalistkind.⁵ 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,⁶ 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)—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. Under Donald Trump's presidency, the adherents of NewSpace have found a ready political partner. The commercialization of outer space was already well under way with Obama's 2010 National Space Policy, which emphasized 'promoting and supporting a competitive U. S. commercial space sector', which was 'considered vital to...continued progress in space' (Tronchetti, 2013, p. 67–68). But the Trump administration has aggressively pursued the deregulation of outer space in the service of profit margins. Wilbur Ross, President Trump's Secretary of Commerce, has eagerly supported the private space industry by pushing the dismantling of regulatory frameworks. As Ross emphatically stated, 'The rate of regulatory change must accelerate until it can match the rate of technological change!' (Foust, 2018a). Trump has proposed privatizing the provision of supplies to the International Space Station (ISS) while re-establishing the Cold War-era National Space Council, which includes members from Lockheed Martin, Boeing, ULA, and a series of NewSpace actors, such as SpaceX and Blue Origin. Ross was visibly enthusiastic about SpaceX's Falcon Heavy launch in February 2018 and seemed to embrace Musk's marketing ploy. 'It was really quite an amazing thing', Ross said. 'At the end of it, you have that little red Tesla hurdling [sic] off to an orbit around the sun and the moon' (Bryan, 2018). That same month, Ross spoke before the National Space Council, commenting appreciatively that 'space is already a \$330 billion industry' that was set to become a 'multitrillion-dollar one in coming decades'. He noted that private corporations needed 'all the help we can give them' and said it was 'time to unshackle business activity in space' (Department of Commerce, 2018).

HOWEVER, Charismatic accumulation is the driving force behind capitalist outer space; reaffirming capitalism on Earth while providing no net benefit

Shammas & Holen 19

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

In early 2018, astronomers across the world learned that a New Zealand start-up, Rocket Lab, which aimed to launch thousands of miniature satellites into orbit around Earth (so-called 'smallsats'), had planned to launch a giant, shining 'disco ball'—the 'Humanity Star'—into orbit around Earth. It was an elaborate marketing stunt masked by humanistic idealism. 'No matter where you are in the world, or what is happening in your life', said Rocket Lab CEO Peter Beck, 'everyone will be able to see the Humanity Star in the night sky' (Amos, 2018). Many astronomers expressed outrage at these plans, fearing that the light from the Human Star would threaten their ability to carry out scientific observations. But while these astronomers were incensed by the idea of a bright geodesic object disrupting their ability to carry out observations, concerns with the effects of the arrival of capitalistkind on their ability to collect data were non-existent. The astronomical community was angered by the idea of a material, concrete, visible object polluting "pure" scientific data, but it paid less attention to the (invisible and abstract) recuperation of the night sky as it was brought into the fold of capitalism. In an interview, Beck was quizzed about the Humanity Star and asked by a reporter about the difficulties of generating profits in space (Tucker, 2018). To this Beck replied, 'It [Space] has always been a government domain, but we're witnessing the democratization of it...[It is] turning into a commercially dominated domain'. Beck established an equivalence established between the dissolution of space as the rightful domain of states and the advent of profit-making ventures as signs of 'democratization'. In space, according to Beck's logic, democratization involves the disappearance of the state and the rise of capital. The argument, of course, is impeccably post-statist: on this account, states are monolithic, conservative Leviathans beyond the reach of popular control; corporations, on the other hand, are in principle representatives of the everyman: in the age of the start-up, any humble citizen could in theory become an agent of disruption, a force for change, an explorer of space, and a potential member of the cadre of capitalistkind. Following this logic, the question for the entrepreneurs of NewSpace is how to monetize outer space, which means turning space into a space for capital; their question is how they can deplanetarize capital and universalize it, literally speaking, that is, turn the Universe into a universe for capital. In this light, Peter Beck's distortion of democratic ideals appears eminently sensible, equating democratization with monetization, that is, capital liberated from its earthly tethers. Emblematic of this capitalist turn in space was the founding of Moon Express in 2011, composed of a 'team of prominent Silicon Valley entrepreneurs...shooting for the moon with a new private venture aimed at scouring the lunar surface for precious metals and rare metallic elements' (Hennigan, 2011). Following Google's Lunar XPRIZE—an intertwining of Silicon Valley and NewSpace's capitalistkind—which promised a \$20 million prize for the first private company to land a spacecraft on the Moon, travel 500 meters, and transmit high-definition images back to Earth, all by March 2018, 9 Moon Express claimed that it would be capable of landing on the lunar surface and earn the cash prize. Their stated goal was twofold: first, to mine rare resource like Helium-3 (a steadily dwindling scarce resources on Earth), gold, platinum group metals, and water, and, second, to carry out scientific work that would 'help researchers develop human space colonies for future generations' (Ioannou, 2017). The ordering is telling: first profits, then humanity. These were the hollow, insubstantial promises of a venture-capitalized NewSpace enterprise: in early 2018, Google announced that none of the five teams competing for the Lunar XPRIZE, including Moon Express, would reach their stated objectives by the 31 March deadline and they were taking their money back (Grush, 2018). In this sense, it was typical for NewSpace in its formative years: a corporate field populated by (overly exuberant) private enterprises who promised more than

they could deliver. But the belief in NewSpace is real enough. In a tome bursting with the optimism of NewSpace, Wohlforth and Hendrix claim that 'the commercial spaceflight industry is transforming our sense of possibility. Using Silicon Valley's money and innovative confidence, it will soon bring mass space products to the market' (2016, p. 7). The trope of humanity plays a key role in the rhetoric of the adherents of NewSpace. To fulfill the objectives of NewSpace, including profit maximization and the exploitation of celestial bodies, the symbolic figure of a shared humanity serves a useful purpose, camouflaging the conquest of space by capitalism with a dream of humanity boldly venturing forth into the dark unknown, thereby also providing the legitimacy and enthusiasm needed to support bolster the legitimacy of NewSpace. So long as the stargazers and SpaceX watchers are permitted their fill of 'collective effervescence', to use Durkheim's (1995, p. 228) concept, capitalist entrepreneurs will be able to pursue their business interests more or less as they please. The spectacle of outer space is crucial in this regard. Crucially, however, and despite this spectacle, SpaceX's technology might not necessarily be more sophisticated than its competitors or predecessors. Some industry insiders have rebuffed some of the more the spectacular claims of NewSpace's proponents, arguing that launch vehicle reusability requires a (perhaps prohibitively) expensive refurbishing of the rocket engines involved in launches: 'The economics will depend on how many times a booster can be flown, and how much the individual expense will be to refurbish the booster...each time' (Chang, 2017). Reusability may be a technological dead-end because of the inherently stressful effects of a rocket launch on the launch vehicle's components, with extreme limitations on reusability beyond second-use as well as added risks of malfunctions that customers and insurers are likely to wish to avoid. Furthermore, the Falcon Heavy [SpaceX] still has not matched the power and payload capacity of NASA's Saturn V, a product of 1960s military-industrial engineering and Fordist state spending programs. What SpaceX and other NewSpace corporations do with great ingenuity, however, is to manage the spectacle of outer space, producing outpourings of public fervor, aided by a widespread adherence to the 'Californian Ideology' (Barbrook and Cameron, 1996), or post-statist techno-utopianism, in many postindustrialized societies. 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.

Outer space necessarily reduces inter-human difference to a common denominator or a shared species-being. An important leitmotiv in many Hollywood science fiction movies, including *Arrival* (2016), is that a first encounter with an alien species of intelligent beings tends to flatten all human difference (including ethnoracial and national categories), thereby restoring humankind to its proper universality (see also Novoa, 2016). Ambassadors of Earth as a whole, not representatives of particular nations, step forth to meet alien emissaries. But even in the absence of such an encounter, the search for habitable domains (or rather, profitable locales) beyond Earth will necessarily forge a shared conception of the human condition, initiated with the Pale Blue Dot photograph in 1990. Typical of this sentiment are the words of the astronomer Carl Sagan, who famously observed of this photograph: 'On it everyone you love, everyone you know, everyone you ever heard of, every human being who ever was, lived out their lives'. This naively humanistic vision has been one of the dominant tropes in the discourse on space since the 1950s, and it remains strong today, as with the claims of the United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs (UNOOSA) that their task is to 'uphold the vision of a more equitable future for all humankind through shared achievements in space'. This representational tendency mobilizes humanism to generate enthusiasm about space-related activities. But such representations are increasingly being recuperated by capitalist enterprise, so that it is not humankind but its modulation by space capitalists that will launch into the dark unknown. It is not humankind but capitalistkind that ventures forth. In early 2018, NASA was set to request \$150 million in its 2019 budget to 'enable the development and maturation of commercial entities and capabilities which will ensure that commercial successors to the ISS...are operational when they are needed', only one of many signs that space is becoming a space for capitalism. According to one estimate, the value of just one single asteroid would be more than \$20 trillion in rare earth and platinum-group metals (Lewis, 1996), a precious prize indeed for profit-hungry corporations. 10 Even the UNOOSA spoke vociferously in favor of the commercialization of space, appealing variously to the 'industry and private sector' and elevating the 'space economy' to a central pillar in its Space2030 Agenda (including the 'use of resources that create and provide value and benefits to the world population in the course of exploring, understanding and utilizing space'), even as the UN agency falls back on a humanistic, almost social-democratic vision of the equitable distribution of benefits (and profits) from space mining, exploration, and colonization (UNOOSA, 2018).

Neoliberalism is no longer able to control its spiral into disaster. Massive structural violence and extinction are inevitable without a fundamental rethinking of the current system

Farbod '15 [Faramarz Farbod (PhD Candidate @ Rutgers, Prof @ Moravian College), Monthly Review, <http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2015/farbod020615.html>, 6-2)] [LAD!](#) recut PA

Global capitalism is the 800-pound gorilla. The twin ecological and economic crises, militarism, the rise of the surveillance state, and a dysfunctional political system can all be traced to its normal operations. We need a transformative politics from below that can challenge the fundamentals of capitalism instead of today's politics that is content to treat its symptoms. The problems we face are linked to each other and to the way a capitalist society operates. We must make an effort to understand its real character. The fundamental question of our time is whether we can go beyond a system that is ravaging the Earth and secure a future with dignity for life and respect for the planet. What has capitalism done to us lately? The best science tells us that this is a do-or-die moment. We are now in the midst of the 6th mass extinction in the planetary history with 150 to 200 species going extinct every day, a pace 1,000 times greater than the 'natural' extinction rate.¹ The Earth has been warming rapidly since the 1970s with the 10 warmest years on record all occurring since 1998.² The planet has already warmed by 0.85 degree Celsius since the industrial revolution 150 years ago. An increase of 2° Celsius is the limit of what the planet can take before major catastrophic consequences. Limiting global warming to 2°C requires reducing global emissions by 6% per year. However, global carbon emissions from fossil fuels increased by about 1.5 times between 1990 and 2008.³ Capitalism has also led to explosive social inequalities. The global economic landscape is littered with rising concentration of wealth, debt, distress, and immiseration caused by the austerity-pushing elites. Take the US. The richest 20 persons have as much wealth as the bottom 150 million.⁴ Since 1973, the hourly wages of workers have lagged behind worker productivity rates by more than 800%.⁵ It now takes the average family 47 years to make what a hedge fund manager makes in one hour.⁶ Just about a quarter of children under the age of 5 live in poverty.⁷ A majority of public school students are low-income.⁸ 85% of workers feel stress on the job.⁹ Soon the only thing left of the American Dream will be a culture of hustling to survive. Take the global society. The world's billionaires control \$7 trillion, a sum 77 times the debt owed by Greece to the European banks.¹⁰ The richest 80 possess more than the combined wealth of the bottom 50% of the global population (3.5 billion people).¹¹ By 2016 the richest 1% will own a greater share of the global wealth than the rest of us combined.¹² The top 200 global corporations wield twice the economic power of the bottom 80% of the global population.¹³ Instead of a global society capitalism is creating a global apartheid. What's the nature of the beast? Firstly, the "egotistical calculation" of commerce wins the day every time. Capital seeks maximum profitability as a matter of first priority. Evermore "accumulation of capital" is the system's bill of health; it is slowdowns or reversals that usher in crises and set off panic. Cancer-like hunger for endless growth is in the system's DNA and is what has set it on a tragic collision course with Nature, a finite category. Secondly, capitalism treats human labor as a cost. It therefore opposes labor capturing a fair share of the total economic value that it creates. Since labor stands for the majority and

capital for a tiny minority, it follows that classism and class warfare are built into its DNA, which explains why the "middle class" is shrinking and its gains are never secure. Thirdly, private interests determine massive investments and make key decisions at the point of production guided by maximization of profits. That's why in the US the truck freight replaced the railroad freight, chemicals were used extensively in agriculture, public transport was gutted in favor of private cars, and big cars replaced small ones. What should political action aim for today? The political class has no good ideas about how to address the crises. One may even wonder whether it has a serious understanding of the system, or at least of ways to ameliorate its consequences. The range of solutions offered tends to be of a technical, legislative, or regulatory nature, promising at best temporary management of the deepening crises. The trajectory of the system, at any rate, precludes a return to its post-WWII regulatory phase. It's left to us as a society to think about what the real character of the system is, where we are going, and how we are going to deal with the trajectory of the system -- and act accordingly. The critical task ahead is to build a transformative politics capable of steering the system away from its destructive path. Given the system's DNA, such a politics from below must include efforts to challenge the system's fundamentals, namely, its private mode of decision-making about investments and about what and how to produce. Furthermore, it behooves us to heed the late environmentalist Barry Commoner's insistence on the efficacy of a strategy of prevention over a failed one of control or capture of pollutants. At a lecture in 1991, Commoner remarked: "Environmental pollution is an incurable disease; it can only be prevented"; and he proceeded to refer to "a law," namely: "if you don't put a pollutant in the environment it won't be there." What is nearly certain now is that without democratic control of wealth and social governance of the means of production, we will all be condemned to the labor of Sisyphus. Only we won't have to suffer for all eternity, as the degradation of life-enhancing natural and social systems will soon reach a point of no return.

Capitalism causes every impact - oppression unavoidable and ongoing

Foster 19

(John, PhD from York University, Professor at the University of Oregon Department of Sociology,

"Capitalism Has Failed—What Next?," Monthly Review, 2/1/19,

<https://monthlyreview.org/2019/02/01/capitalism-has-failed-what-next/>, JLin) recut PA

Less than two decades into the twenty-first century, it is evident that capitalism has failed as a social system. The world is mired in economic stagnation, financialization, and the most extreme inequality in human history, accompanied by mass unemployment and underemployment, precariousness, poverty, hunger, wasted output and lives, and what at this point can only be called a planetary ecological "death spiral."¹ The digital revolution, the greatest technological advance of our time, has rapidly mutated from a promise of free communication and liberated production into new means of surveillance, control, and displacement of the working population. The institutions of liberal democracy are at the point of collapse, while fascism, the rear guard of the capitalist system, is again on the march, along with patriarchy, racism, imperialism, and war. To say that capitalism is a failed system is not, of course, to suggest that its breakdown and disintegration is

imminent.² It does, however, mean that it has passed from being a historically necessary and creative system at its inception to being a historically unnecessary and destructive one in the present century. Today, more than ever, the world is faced with the epochal choice between “the revolutionary reconstitution of society at large and the common ruin of the contending classes.”³ Indications of this failure of capitalism are everywhere. Stagnation of investment punctuated by bubbles of financial expansion, which then inevitably burst, now characterizes the

so-called free market.⁴ Soaring inequality in income and wealth has its counterpart in the declining material

circumstances of a majority of the population. Real wages for most workers in the United States have

barely budged in forty years despite steadily rising productivity.⁵ Work intensity has increased, while

work and safety protections on the job have been systematically jettisoned. Unemployment data has become more and more

meaningless due to a new institutionalized underemployment in the form of contract labor in the gig economy.⁶ Unions have been reduced to mere shadows of their former glory as capitalism has asserted totalitarian control over workplaces. With the demise of Soviet-type societies, social democracy in Europe has perished in the new atmosphere of “liberated capitalism.”⁷ The capture of the surplus value produced by overexploited populations in the poorest regions of the world, via the global labor arbitrage instituted by multinational corporations, is leading to an unprecedented amassing of financial wealth at the center of the world economy and relative poverty in the periphery.⁸ Around \$21 trillion of offshore funds are currently lodged in tax havens on islands mostly in the Caribbean, constituting “the fortified refuge of Big Finance.”⁹ Technologically driven monopolies resulting from the global-communications revolution, together with

the rise to dominance of Wall Street-based financial capital geared to speculative asset creation, have further contributed to the riches of today’s “1 percent.” Forty-two

billionaires now enjoy as much wealth as half the world’s population, while the three richest men in the

United States—Jeff Bezos, Bill Gates, and Warren Buffett—have more wealth than half the U.S.

population.¹⁰ In every region of the world, inequality has increased sharply in recent decades.¹¹ The

gap in per capita income and wealth between the richest and poorest nations, which has been the

dominant trend for centuries, is rapidly widening once again.¹² More than 60 percent of the world’s

employed population, some two billion people, now work in the impoverished informal sector, forming a

massive global proletariat. The global reserve army of labor is some 70 percent larger than the active

labor army of formally employed workers.¹³ Adequate health care, housing, education, and clean water

and air are increasingly out of reach for large sections of the population, even in wealthy countries in

North America and Europe, while transportation is becoming more difficult in the United States and

many other countries due to irrationally high levels of dependency on the automobile and disinvestment

in public transportation. Urban structures are more and more characterized by gentrification and

segregation, with cities becoming the playthings of the well-to-do while marginalized populations are

shunted aside. About half a million people, most of them children, are homeless on any given night in

the United States.¹⁴ New York City is experiencing a major rat infestation, attributed to warming temperatures, mirroring trends around the world.¹⁵ In the United States and

other high-

income countries, life expectancy is in decline, with a remarkable resurgence of Victorian illnesses related to poverty and exploitation. In Britain, gout, scarlet fever, whooping cough, and even scurvy are now resurgent, along with tuberculosis. With inadequate enforcement of work health and safety regulations, black lung disease has returned with a vengeance in U.S. coal country.¹⁶ Overuse of antibiotics, particularly by capitalist agribusiness, is leading to an antibiotic-resistance crisis, with the dangerous growth of superbugs generating increasing numbers of deaths, which by mid-century could surpass annual cancer deaths, prompting the World Health Organization to declare a “global health emergency.”¹⁷ These dire conditions, arising from the workings of the system, are consistent with what Frederick Engels, in the Condition of the Working Class in England, called “social murder.”¹⁸ At the instigation of giant corporations, philanthrocapitalist foundations, and neoliberal governments, public education has been restructured around corporate-designed testing based on the implementation of robotic common-core standards. This is generating massive databases on the student population, much of which are now being surreptitiously marketed and sold.¹⁹ The corporatization and privatization of education is feeding the progressive subordination of children’s needs to the cash nexus of the commodity market. We are thus seeing a dramatic return of Thomas Gradgrind’s and Mr. M’Choakumchild’s crass utilitarian philosophy dramatized in Charles Dickens’s *Hard Times*: “Facts are alone wanted in life” and “You are never to fancy.”²⁰ Having been reduced to intellectual dungeons, many of the

poorest, most racially segregated schools in the United States are mere pipelines for prisons or the military.²¹ More than two million people in the United

States are behind bars, a higher rate of incarceration than any other country in the world, constituting a

new Jim Crow. The total population in prison is nearly equal to the number of people in Houston, Texas,

the fourth largest U.S. city. African Americans and Latinos make up 56 percent of those incarcerated,

while constituting only about 32 percent of the U.S. population. Nearly 50 percent of American adults,

and a much higher percentage among African Americans and Native Americans, have an immediate

family member who has spent or is currently spending time behind bars. Both black men and Native

American men in the United States are nearly three times, Hispanic men nearly two times, more likely to

die of police shootings than white men.²² Racial divides are now widening across the entire planet.

Violence against women and the expropriation of their unpaid labor, as well as the higher level of

exploitation of their paid labor, are integral to the way in which power is organized in capitalist society—and how it seeks to divide rather than unify the population. More than a third of women worldwide have experienced physical/sexual violence. Women’s bodies, in particular, are objectified, reified, and commodified as part of the normal workings of monopoly-capitalist marketing.²³ The mass

media-propaganda system, part of the larger corporate matrix, is now merging into a social media-based propaganda system that is more porous and seemingly anarchic, but more universal and more than ever favoring money and power. Utilizing modern marketing and surveillance techniques, which now dominate all digital interactions, vested interests are able to tailor their messages, largely unchecked, to individuals and their social networks, creating concerns about “fake news” on all sides.²⁴ Numerous business entities

promising technological manipulation of voters in countries across the world have now surfaced, auctioning off their services to the highest bidders.²⁵ The elimination of net neutrality in the United States means further concentration, centralization, and control over the entire Internet by monopolistic service providers. Elections are increasingly prey to unregulated “dark money” emanating from the coffers of corporations and the billionaire class. Although presenting itself as

the world’s leading democracy, the United States, as Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy stated in Monopoly Capital in 1966, “is democratic in form and plutocratic in content.”²⁶ In the Trump administration, following a long-established tradition, 72 percent of those appointed to the cabinet have come from the higher corporate echelons, while others have been drawn from the military.²⁷ War, engineered by the United States and other major powers at the apex of the system, has

become perpetual in strategic oil regions such as the Middle East, and threatens to escalate into a global thermonuclear exchange. During the Obama administration, the United States was engaged in wars/bombings in seven different countries—Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Yemen, Somalia, and Pakistan.²⁸ Torture and assassinations have been reinstituted by Washington as acceptable instruments of war against those now innumerable individuals, group networks, and whole societies that are branded as terrorist. A new Cold War and nuclear arms race is in the making between the United States and Russia, while Washington is seeking to place road blocks to the continued rise of

China. The Trump administration has created a new space force as a separate branch of the military in an attempt to ensure U.S. dominance in the militarization of space. Sounding the alarm on the increasing dangers of a nuclear war and of climate destabilization, the distinguished Bulletin of Atomic Scientists moved its doomsday clock in 2018 to two minutes to midnight, the closest since 1953, when it marked the advent of thermonuclear weapons.²⁹ Increasingly severe economic sanctions are being imposed by the United States on countries like Venezuela and Nicaragua, despite their democratic elections—or because of them. Trade and currency wars are being actively promoted by core states, while racist barriers against immigration continue to be erected in Europe and the United States as some 60 million refugees and internally displaced peoples flee devastated environments. Migrant populations worldwide have risen to 250 million, with those

residing in high-income countries constituting more than 14 percent of the populations of those countries, up from less than 10 percent in 2000. Meanwhile, ruling circles and wealthy countries seek to wall off islands of power and privilege from the mass of humanity, who are to be left to their fate.³⁰ More than three-quarters of a billion people, over 10 percent of the world population, are chronically malnourished.³¹ Food stress in the United States keeps climbing, leading to the rapid growth of cheap dollar stores selling poor quality and toxic food. Around forty million Americans, representing one out of eight households, including nearly thirteen million children, are food insecure.³² Subsistence farmers are being pushed off their lands by agribusiness, private capital, and sovereign wealth funds in a global depeasantization process that constitutes the greatest movement of people in history.³³ Urban overcrowding and poverty across much of the globe is so severe that one can now reasonably refer to a “planet of slums.”³⁴ Meanwhile, the world housing market is estimated to be worth up to \$163 trillion (as compared to the value of gold mined over all recorded history, estimated at \$7.5 trillion).³⁵ The Anthropocene epoch, first ushered in by the Great Acceleration of the world economy immediately after the Second World War, has generated enormous rifts in planetary boundaries, extending from climate change to ocean acidification, to the sixth extinction, to disruption of the global nitrogen and phosphorus cycles, to the loss of freshwater, to the disappearance of forests, to widespread toxic-chemical and radioactive pollution.³⁶ It is now estimated that 60 percent of the world’s wildlife vertebrate population (including mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, and fish) have been wiped out since 1970, while the worldwide abundance of invertebrates has declined by 45 percent in recent decades.³⁷ What climatologist James Hansen calls the “species exterminations” resulting from accelerating climate change and rapidly shifting climate zones are only compounding this general process of biodiversity loss. Biologists expect that half of all species will be facing extinction by the end of the century.³⁸ If present climate-change trends continue, the “global carbon budget” associated with a 2°C increase in average global temperature will be broken in sixteen years (while a 1.5°C increase in global

average temperature—staying beneath which is the key to long-term stabilization of the climate—will be reached in a decade). Earth System scientists warn that the world is now perilously close to a Hothouse Earth, in which catastrophic climate change will be locked in and irreversible.³⁹ The ecological, social, and economic costs to humanity of continuing to increase carbon emissions by 2.0 percent a year as in recent decades (rising in 2018 by 2.7 percent—3.4 percent in the United States), and failing to meet the minimal 3.0 percent annual reductions in emissions currently needed to avoid a catastrophic destabilization of the earth’s energy balance, are simply

incalculable.⁴⁰ Nevertheless, major energy corporations continue to lie about climate change, promoting and bankrolling climate denialism—while admitting the truth in their internal documents. These corporations are working to accelerate the extraction and production of fossil fuels, including the dirtiest, most greenhouse gas-generating varieties, reaping enormous profits in the process. The melting of the Arctic ice from global warming is seen by capital as a new El Dorado, opening up massive additional oil and gas reserves to be exploited without regard to the consequences for the earth’s climate. In response to scientific reports on climate change, Exxon Mobil declared that it intends to extract and sell all of the fossil-fuel reserves at its disposal.⁴¹ Energy corporations continue to intervene in climate negotiations to ensure that any

agreements to limit carbon emissions are defanged. Capitalist countries across the board are putting the accumulation of wealth for a few above combatting climate destabilization, threatening the very future

of humanity. Capitalism is best understood as a competitive class-based mode of production and exchange geared to the accumulation of capital through the exploitation of workers' labor power and the private appropriation of surplus value (value generated beyond the costs of the workers' own reproduction). The mode of economic accounting intrinsic to capitalism designates as a value-generating good or service anything that passes through the market and therefore produces income. It follows that the greater part of the social and environmental costs of production outside the market are excluded in this form of valuation and are treated as mere negative "externalities," unrelated to the capitalist economy

itself—whether in terms of the shortening and degradation of human life or the destruction of the natural environment. As environmental economist K. William Kapp stated,

"capitalism must be regarded as an economy of unpaid costs."⁴² We have now reached a point in the twenty-first century in which the externalities of this irrational system, such as the costs of war, the depletion of natural resources, the waste of human lives, and the disruption of the planetary environment, now far exceed any future economic benefits that capitalism offers to society as a whole.

The accumulation of capital and the amassing of wealth are increasingly occurring at the expense of an irrevocable rift in the social and environmental conditions governing human life on earth.⁴³ Some would argue that China stands as an exception to much of the above, characterized as it is by a seemingly unstoppable rate of economic advance (though carrying with it deep social and ecological contradictions). Yet Chinese development has its roots in the 1949 Chinese Revolution, carried out by the Chinese Communist Party headed by Mao Zedong, whereby it liberated itself from the imperialist system. This allowed it to develop for decades under a planned economy largely free of constraints from outside forces, establishing a strong agricultural and industrial economic base. This was followed by a shift in the post-Maoist reform period to a hybrid system of more limited state planning along with a much greater reliance on market relations (and a vast expansion of debt and speculation) under conditions—the globalization of the world market—that were particularly fortuitous to its "catching up." Through trade wars and other pressures aimed at destabilizing China's position in the world market, the United States is already seeking to challenge the bases of China's growth in world trade. China, therefore, stands not so much for the successes of late capitalism but rather for its inherent limitations. The current Chinese model, moreover, carries within it many of the destructive tendencies of the system of capital accumulation.

Ultimately, China's future too depends on a return to the process of revolutionary transition, spurred by its own population.⁴⁴ How did these disastrous conditions characterizing capitalism worldwide develop? An understanding of the failure of capitalism, beginning in the twentieth century, requires a historical examination of the rise of neoliberalism, and how this has only served to increase the destructiveness of the system. Only then can we address the future of humanity in the twenty-first century.

We affirm outer space as the 'commons' in opposition to 'capital' - only by affirming the commons can we build social relations past cap -

Hardt & Negri 19

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. "Michael Hardt & Antonio Negri, Empire, Twenty Years on, NLR 120, November–December 2019." New Left Review, 2019, <https://newleftreview.org/issues/ii120/articles/empire-twenty-years-on>.

A second set of analyses highlights the role of the common in biopolitical relations, covering cognitive forms of production and the generation of affects and care, which spans the productive and reproductive realms. Studies of cognitive capitalism generally analyse the role of knowledge, intelligence and science in contemporary production, emphasizing the extent to which the 'general intellect'—that is, the knowledges accumulated in society that have become in some sense common—has become directly productive of value. Others focus on digital labour and

the production of value through digital networks and platforms, which in some cases rely on the value generated by the attention of users. Along with intelligence and attention, affects are also increasingly put to work in capitalist society, most often according to established gender hierarchies. Jobs that involve a large portion of affect production—nurses, home-care workers, administrative-support staff, waged domestic workers, primary-school teachers, food servers—are low paid, highly precarious and, accordingly, predominantly filled by women. The production of affects is also central to the unpaid realm of social reproduction, including domestic labour, which continues to be defined by a gender division of labour.

In these analyses, we recognize new and intensified forms of exploitation and domination, along with new forms of biopolitical control, and the colonization and commodification of further realms of human existence. Today, as the studies show, biopolitical productive forces are enclosed within private-property relations, labouring for a wage, or subordinated and discounted while the value they produce is still expropriated and accumulated. But here too we recognize the social nature of the common, since intelligence, knowledge, attention, affect and care are all immediately social capacities, defined by collective actions and interdependence. Great biopolitical reservoirs of the common are constructed in these resources of shared knowledge, collective intelligence, decommodified relations of affect and care, and, ultimately, the circuits of social cooperation; these have the potential to become autonomous from capitalist control.

A third terrain of analysis addresses the common even more directly, by investigating the myriad ways in which the development of capital destroys the earth and its ecosystems. Analyses of climate change, in particular, demonstrate how intimately the history of capitalist development is tied to the extraction of fossil fuels. Many authors point out that saying human actions cause climate change or that we have entered an Anthropocene age, as if the species as a whole was equally responsible for the decisions that

created our present predicament, masks the fact that a relatively small class of capitalists in the dominant countries are really responsible. As these studies make clear, a necessary precondition for any project to preserve the long-term health of the planet is challenging and overcoming the primacy of capitalist rule.^{footnote29} That the common is at stake in this domain is immediately recognizable, as vital realms of life that were once shared—the earth, the seas, the atmosphere—are closed off or degraded. The poor will suffer most and first from the effects of climate change, but eventually all will succumb. The common is central not only to what we have lost, however, but also to the alternatives we might construct. Indigenous protests against capitalist destruction pose most clearly the need for humans to establish a new relationship with the earth, characterized by relations of interdependence and care—to make the earth common.^{footnote30} What stands out in all these analyses of contemporary capital is the power of the common in all its forms, from earth and water to the metropolitan circuits of social cooperation, from shared knowledges and intelligence to affective relations and social reproduction. Capital has increasingly become an apparatus of capture that preys on the common, extracting the values produced there, and creating myriad forms of suffering and destruction in the process. But all these realms of the common, especially when mobilized and brought together in relations of interdependence, have the potential for autonomy—the potential to create social relations beyond capitalist rule.