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#### Private companies need to be able to develop all parts of space simultaneously – they build upon each other

Salazar 17 Juan A. Ortiz Salazar is a student at Cal Poly, SPACE PRIVATIZATION, COLONIZATION, AND MILITARIZATION: A NEW FRONTIER FOR INTERNATIONAL LAW, 2017, https://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1105&context=paideia. | MU

Space Privatization The US space industry is composed of four sectors: (1) defense, (2) intelligence, (3) commercial, and (4) civil space sectors.22 Space privatization is associated with the commercial space sector. In President Obama’s tenure private and public companies established themselves as necessary in space exploration. For the most part, the US national launch infrastructure has been privatized or leased to companies like SpaceX and Blue Origin.23 Asteroid mining may come next; it may be the most lucrative space endeavor in the near future and it does not violate international law nor the Moon Treaty. Asteroids can be composed of “nickel-iron metal, silicate minerals, semiconductor and platinum group metals, water,” and/or “bituminous hydrocarbons,” and at least 10% of near-Earth asteroids are more accessible than the moon.24 Energy collection is another mode of acquiring tremendous profit from space. Helium-3 reserves on the moon alone would generate ten times as much energy as coal, oil, and gas combined.25 Ezra J. Reinstein claims that the privatization of space for profit is at a standstill due mainly to the uncertainty of the legal regime: if exploitation of outer space resources is the goal, then a space property legal system with incentives and predictability is necessary. The moon is the best example on space privatization. It is within close-proximity and has valuable resources. It has promising sites for mining, energy-capturing projects, and spaceship refueling. Unfortunately, the resources are finite and usable land exits are limited.26 Space privatization also includes space itself. The Geo-Stationary Orbit (GSO) – a very well defined orbit above the Earth’s equatorial surface – is the most valuable space resource today. The GSO is related to all types of communication, weather monitoring, and military intelligence and surveillance. It is also the most satellite dense space around Earth. Due to its narrow band it is riddled with electromagnetic interference and “space-junk”.27 The most common private Space ventures remain competitions. Ansari X, Bigelow Aerospace, and NASA offer cash prizes in the millions for space ventures such as docking with an inflatable space station and collecting moon rocks.28 The objectives of those ventures are not to further research for the sake of science but for commercial research, tourism, and industrial production to generate profit. There are three arguments for the privatization of space systems: (1) ownership will reduce wasteful use, (2) alienability would create incentives to productively develop space, and (3) colonization.28 The first argument is founded on the bargain theory of economics – whoever can use the site for humanity’s greatest benefit will reap the greatest profit and is willing to spend the most to own it. Therefore, ownership may reduce wastefulness to increase profit margins by maximizing efficiency. An increase in overall efficiency of private ventures would in turn lead to space development to sustain such enterprises: routes, mines, colonies, and infrastructure. Privatization would create incentives to productively develop space because early developers would hold ownership rights allowing the company to internalize positive external effects. Colonization is special in that it is an argument for privatization as much as it may be an effect of it. Colonization cannot be maintained without property and private ownership, and enterprises such as mining may operate best with human supervision on site.

#### Without mass investment, all necessary space infrastructure is chilled – technology is all seen as linked to eventual deep space exploration

Sommariva 20 (Andrea, Italian Institute for International Political Studies, "The Evolution of Space Economy: The Role of the Private Sector and the Challenges for Europe," 12/11, <https://www.ispionline.it/en/pubblicazione/evolution-space-economy-role-private-sector-and-challenges-europe-28604> DD)

The second factor focuses on spacecraft and space-access costs. NASA has moved from a government-run International Space Station access system to one where the transportation of goods and people relies on private companies, obviously under contract and control of NASA, thus eliminating the monopoly of Lockheed Martin and Boeing. As a result, significant progress has been made in the design and development of cost-effective launch vehicles. Currently, SpaceX has developed a system to reuse the first stage of rockets, which serves to give the initial thrust necessary to overcome Earth's atmosphere. Normally, after doing its job, the first stage came off and fell into the ocean as waste. SpaceX has successfully developed the recovery and reuse of the first stages of rockets, reducing the cost per kilogram of payload by more than 50 percent. These developments provide access to space for many small and medium-sized companies, as well as educational and research institutions. In the near future, the development of the satellite Internet will allow people and companies to connect wherever they are - an effective alternative when terrestrial networks are absent or of poor quality. In addition, satellite technology gives rise to a growing stream of uses, including transportation and logistics efficiency, natural resource management, precision agriculture, environment and climate change monitoring, and makes it a potential source of economic growth, social well-being, and sustainable development. As for the exploration programs, the return to the Moon is now days on the agendas of the major space agencies, such as NASA and ESA. Over the next ten to fifteen years, the use of space resources will be crucial for the success of expeditions to the Moon and other planets. The Moon's resources provide propellant for the in-orbit refueling of spacecraft, reducing their costs[1], and oxygen and water for support systems of the future space station around the Moon (the Gateway project). A new form of public-private partnership is rising, a partnership in which governments will provide initial support in the exploration and the advancement of critical technologies (telecommunications and Moon-Earth navigation), and in the construction of space infrastructure. NASA plans a first exploration mission at the South Pole of the Moon in 2024. The private sector would then take the lead in creating new markets and expanding the presence of humanity in space. SpaceX is developing a vehicle, Starship, for missions to the Moon and beyond. The Starship is a fully reusable launch vehicle. It consists of two stages, the booster and the spacecraft, which in November 2018 Elon Musk renamed Super Heavy and Starship respectively. The overall vehicle architecture includes both the launcher and the vehicle, as well as the infrastructure for the first and subsequent launches, and zero-gravity propellant transfer’s technology. The spacecraft alone is designed to be used, in a first phase, without a booster for both freight and passenger transport. In April 2020, NASA selected a modified version of the Starship as one of three landing systems for the Artemis Program. Moon mining will present also an opportunity to make space based solar power (SBSP) economically feasible. SBSP has been studied for decades. However, the costs of launching such large infrastructure from Earth to geosynchronous orbit (GEO) make these projects economically not feasible. At the SEE Lab-SDA Bocconi, we have initiated a study where the basic idea is to build the SBSP satellite with material from the Moon and to transfer the components to GEO where they would be assembled. Its costs are comparable to a large-scale nuclear power plant. If preliminary results are confirmed by the completion of the study, space based solar power can transform the energy markets of Earth[2], and can give an important contribution to the climate change’s mitigation.

#### Strong commercial space industry catalyzes tech innovation – progress at the margins and spinoff tech change global information networks.

**Hampson 17** [Joshua Hampson, 1-27-2017, "The Future of Space Commercialization," Niskanen Center, <https://www.niskanencenter.org/wp-content/uploads/old_uploads/2017/01/TheFutureofSpaceCommercializationFinal.pdf>]//DDPT

Innovation is generally hard to predict; some new technologies seem to come out of nowhere and others only take off when paired with a new application. It is difficult to predict the future, but it is reasonable to expect that a growing space economy would open opportunities for technological and organizational innovation.

In terms of technology, the difficult environment of outer space helps incentivize progress along the margins. Because each object launched into orbit costs a significant amount of money—at the moment between $27,000 and $43,000 per pound, though that will likely drop in the future —each 19 reduction in payload size saves money or means more can be launched. At the same time, the ability to fit more capability into a smaller satellite opens outer space to actors that previously were priced out of the market. This is one of the reasons why small, affordable satellites are increasingly pursued by companies or organizations that cannot afford to launch larger traditional satellites. These small 20 satellites also provide non-traditional launchers, such as engineering students or prototypers, the opportunity to learn about satellite production and test new technologies before working on a full-sized satellite. That expansion of developers, experimenters, and testers cannot but help increase innovation opportunities.

Technological developments from outer space have been applied to terrestrial life since the earliest days of space exploration. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) maintains a website that lists technologies that have spun off from such research projects. Lightweight 21 nanotubes, useful in protecting astronauts during space exploration, are now being tested for applications in emergency response gear and electrical insulation. The need for certainty about the resiliency of materials used in space led to the development of an analytics tool useful across a range of industries. Temper foam, the material used in memory-foam pillows, was developed for NASA for seat covers. As more companies pursue their own space goals, more innovations will likely come from the commercial sector.

Outer space is not just a catalyst for technological development. Satellite constellations and their unique line-of-sight vantage point can provide new perspectives to old industries. Deploying satellites into low-Earth orbit, as Facebook wants to do, can connect large, previously-unreached swathes of 22 humanity to the Internet. Remote sensing technology could change how whole industries operate, such as crop monitoring, herd management, crisis response, and land evaluation, among others. 23 While satellites cannot provide all essential information for some of these industries, they can fill in some useful gaps and work as part of a wider system of tools. Space infrastructure, in helping to change how people connect and perceive Earth, could help spark innovations on the ground as well. These innovations, changes to global networks, and new opportunities could lead to wider economic growth.

#### Tech innovation solves every existential threat – cumulative extinction events outweigh the aff

**Matthews 18** [Dylan Matthews, 10-26-2018, "How to help people millions of years from now," Vox, <https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/26/18023366/far-future-effective-altruism-existential-risk-doing-good>]

If you care about improving human lives, you should overwhelmingly care about those quadrillions of lives rather than the comparatively small number of people alive today. The 7.6 billion people now living, after all, amount to less than 0.003 percent of the population that will live in the future. It’s reasonable to suggest that those quadrillions of future people have, accordingly, hundreds of thousands of times more moral weight than those of us living here today do.

That’s the basic argument behind Nick Beckstead’s 2013 Rutgers philosophy dissertation, “[On the overwhelming importance of shaping the far future](https://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&pid=sites&srcid=ZGVmYXVsdGRvbWFpbnxuYmVja3N0ZWFkfGd4OjExNDBjZTcwNjMxMzRmZGE).” It’s a glorious mindfuck of a thesis, not least because Beckstead shows very convincingly that this is a conclusion any plausible moral view would reach. It’s not just something that [weird utilitarians](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/consequentialism/) have to deal with.

And Beckstead, to his considerable credit, walks the walk on this. He works at the Open Philanthropy Project on grants relating to the far future and runs a [charitable fund](https://app.effectivealtruism.org/funds/far-future) for donors who want to prioritize the far future. And arguments from him and others have turned “long-termism” into a very vibrant, important strand of the effective altruism community.

But what does prioritizing the far future even mean?

The most literal thing it could mean is preventing human extinction, to ensure that the species persists as long as possible. For the long-term-focused effective altruists I know, that typically means identifying concrete threats to humanity’s continued existence — like unfriendly artificial intelligence, or a [pandemic](https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/15/17948062/pandemic-flu-ebola-h1n1-outbreak-infectious-disease), or global warming/out of control geoengineering — and engaging in activities to prevent that specific eventuality.

But in a [set of slides](https://intelligence.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Beckstead-Evaluating-Options-Using-Far-Future-Standards.pdf) he made in 2013, Beckstead makes a compelling case that while that’s certainly part of what caring about the far future entails, approaches that address specific threats to humanity (which he calls “targeted” approaches to the far future) have to complement “broad” approaches, where instead of trying to predict what’s going to kill us all, you just generally try to keep civilization running as best it can, so that it is, as a whole, well-equipped to deal with potential extinction events in the future, not just in 2030 or 2040 but in 3500 or 95000 or even 37 million.

In other words, caring about the far future doesn’t mean just paying attention to low-probability risks of total annihilation; it also means acting on pressing needs now.

For example: We’re going to be better prepared to prevent extinction from AI or a supervirus or global warming if society as a whole makes a lot of scientific progress. And a significant bottleneck there is that the vast majority of humanity doesn’t get high-enough-quality education to engage in scientific research, if they want to, which reduces the odds that we have enough trained scientists to come up with the breakthroughs we need as a civilization to survive and thrive.

So maybe one of the best things we can do for the far future is to improve school systems — here and now — to harness the group economist Raj Chetty calls [“lost Einsteins”](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/03/opinion/lost-einsteins-innovation-inequality.html) (potential innovators who are thwarted by poverty and inequality in rich countries) and, more importantly, the hundreds of millions of kids in developing countries dealing with even worse education systems than those in depressed communities in the rich world.

What if living ethically for the far future means living ethically now?

Beckstead mentions some other broad, or very broad, ideas (these are all his descriptions):

Help make computers faster so that people everywhere can work more efficiently

Change intellectual property law so that technological innovation can happen more quickly

Advocate for open borders so that people from poorly governed countries can move to better-governed countries and be more productive

Meta-research: improve incentives and norms in academic work to better advance human knowledge

Improve education

Advocate for political party X to make future people have values more like political party X

”If you look at these areas (economic growth and technological progress, access to information, individual capability, social coordination, motives) a lot of everyday good works contribute,” Beckstead writes. “An implication of this is that a lot of everyday good works are good from a broad perspective, even though hardly anyone thinks explicitly in terms of far future standards.”

Look at those examples again: It’s just a list of what normal altruistically motivated people, not effective altruism folks, generally do. Charities in the US love talking about the lost opportunities for innovation that poverty creates. Lots of smart people who want to make a difference become scientists, or try to work as teachers or on improving education policy, and lord knows there are plenty of people who become political party operatives out of a conviction that the moral consequences of the party’s platform are good.

All of which is to say: Maybe effective altruists aren’t that special, or at least maybe we don’t have access to that many specific and weird conclusions about how best to help the world. If the far future is what matters, and generally trying to make the world work better is among the best ways to help the far future, then effective altruism just becomes plain ol’ do-goodery.\*

### 2 – cap good and framing

#### Extinction isn’t white paranoia and apocalyptic reps are good

**Thompson 18** [Nicole Akoukou. Chicago-based creative writer. 4-6-2018. "Why I will not allow the fear of a nuclear attack to be white-washed." RaceBaitR. http://racebaitr.com/2018/04/06/2087/#]

**I couldn’t spare empathy for a white** woman **whose biggest fear was something that hadn’t happened yet and might not. Meanwhile, my most significant fears were in motion**: **women and men dying in cells** after being wrongly imprisoned, **choked out for peddling cigarettes, or shot to death** during ‘routine’ traffic stops. I twitch when my partner is late, worried that a cantankerous cop has brutalized or shot him because he wouldn’t prostrate himself. **As a woman of color, I am aware of** the **multiple types of violence that threaten me currently—not theoretically. Street harassment**, excessively affecting me as a Black woman, has blindsided me since I was eleven. A premature body meant **being** **catcalled** before I’d discussed the birds and the bees. It meant being **followed, whistled at, or groped**. As an adult, while navigating through neighborhoods with extinguished street lights, I noticed the correlation between women’s safety and street lighting—as well as the fact that Black and brown neighborhoods were never as brightly lit as those with a more significant white population. I move quickly through those unlit spaces, never comforted by the inevitable whirl of red and blue sirens. In fact, it’s always been the contrary. Ever so often, cops approach me in their vehicle’s encouraging me to “Hurry along,” “Stay on the sidewalk,” or “Have a good night.” My spine stiffening, I never believed they endorsed my safety. Instead, I worried that I’d be accused of an unnamed accusation, corned by a cop who preys on Black women, or worse. A majority of my 50-minute bus ride from the southside of Chicago to the north to join these women for the birthday celebration was spent reading articles about citywide shootings. I began with a Chicago Tribute piece titled “33 people shot, seven fatally, in 13 hours,” then toppled into a barrage of RIP posts on Facebook and ended with angry posts about police brutality on Tumblr. You might guess, by the time I arrived to dinner I wasn’t in the mood for the “I can’t believe we’re all going to die because Trump is an idiot” shit. I shook my head, willing the meal to be over, and was grateful when the check arrived just as someone was asking me about my hair. My thinking wasn’t all too different from Michael Harriot’s ‘Why Black America Isn’t Worried About the Upcoming Nuclear Holocaust.” While the meal was partly pleasant, **I departed thinking, “fear of nuclear demolition is just some white shit**.” Sadly, that thought would not last long. **I still vibe with Harriot’s statement, “Black people have lived under the specter of having our existence erased on a white man’s whim since we stepped on**to the **shore** at Jamestown Landing.” **However**, a friend—a Black friend—ignited my nuclear paranoia by sharing theories about when it might happen and who faced the greatest threat. In an attempt to ease my friend’s fear, I leaned in to listen but accidentally toppled down the rabbit hole too. I forked through curated news feeds. I sifted through “fake news,” “actual news,” and foreign news sources. Suddenly, an idea took root: **nuclear strike would disproportionately impact Black people, brown people, and low-income individuals. North Korea won’t target the plain sight racists of Portland**, Oregon, **the violently microaggressive liberals of the rural Northwest, or the white-hooded klansmen** **of** Diamondhead, **Mississippi. No, under the instruction of the supreme leader Kim Jong-un, North Korea will likely strike densely populated urban areas**, such as Los Angeles, Chicago, Washington D.C., and New York City. **These locations stand-out as targets for a nuclear strike because they are densely populated** U.S. population centers. **Attacking the heart of the nation or populous cities would translate to more casualties**. With that in mind, it’s not lost on me that **the most populous cities in the United States boast sizeable diverse populations, or more plainly put: Black populations.** This shit stresses me out! There’s a creeping chill that follows me, a silent alarm that rings each time my Google alert chimes letting me know that Donald Trump has yet again provoked Kim Jong-Un, a man who allegedly killed his very own uncle. I’ve grown so pressed by the idea of nuclear holocaust that my partner and I started gathering non-perishables, candlesticks, a hand-crank radio, and other must-buy items that can be banked in a shopping cart. **The practice of preparing for a nuclear holocaust sometimes feels comical, particularly when acknowledging that there has long been a war on Black people in this country**. Blackness is bittersweet in flavor. We are blessed with the melanized skin, the MacGyver-like inventiveness of our foremothers, and our blinding brightness—but the anti-blackness that we experience is also blinding as well as stifling. We are stuck by rigged systems, punished with the prison industrial complex, housing discrimination, pay discrimination, and worse. We get side-eyes from strangers when we’re “loitering,” and the police will pull us over for driving “too fast” in a residential neighborhood. We get murdered for holding cell phones while standing in our grandmother’s backyard. The racism that strung up our ancestors, kept them sequestered to the back of the bus and kept them in separate and unequal schools still lives. It lives, and it’s more palpable than dormant. To me, this means one thing: Trump’s America isn’t an unfortunate circumstance, it’s a homecoming event that’s hundreds of years in the making, no matter how many times my white friends’ say, “He’s not my president.” **In light of this homecoming, we now flirt with a new, larger fear of a Black genocide**. **America has always worked towards Black eradication through a steady stream of life-threatening inequality, but nuclear war on American soil would be swift**. And **for this reason I’ve grown tired of whiteness** **being at the center of the nuclear conversation. The race-neutral approach to the dialogue, and a tendency to continue to promote the idea that missiles will land in suburban and rural backyards, instead of inner-city playgrounds, is false.** “The Day After,” the iconic, highest-rated television film in history, aired November 20, 1983. More than 100 million people tuned in to watch a film postulating a war between the Soviet Union and the United States. The film, which would go on to affect President Ronald Reagan and policymakers’ nuclear intentions, shows the “true effects of nuclear war on average American citizens.” The Soviet-targeted areas featured in the film include Higginsville, Kansas City, Sedalia, Missouri, as well as El Dorado Springs, Missouri. They depict the destruction of the central United States, and viewers watch as full-scale nuclear war transforms middle America into a burned wasteland. Yet unsurprisingly, the **devastation from the attack is completely white-washed, leaving out the more likely victims which are the more densely populated (Black) areas**. **Death tolls would be high for white populations, yes, but large-scale losses of Black and brown folks would outpace that number, due to placement and poverty. That number would be pushed higher by limited access to premium health care, wealth, and resources. The effects of radiation sickness, burns, compounded injuries, and malnutrition would throttle Black and brown communities and would mark us for generations. It’s for that reason that we have to do more to foster** disaster **preparedness among Black people where we can. Black people deserve the space to explore nuclear unease, even if we have competing threats, anxieties**, and worries. Jacqui Patterson, Director of the Environmental and Climate Justice Initiative, once stated: African American communities are disproportionately vulnerable to and impacted by natural (and unnatural) catastrophes. Our socio-economic vulnerability is based on multiple factors including our lack of wealth to cushion us, our disproportionate representation in lower quality housing stock, and our relative lack of mobility, etc.

#### Capitalism is self-correcting and sustainable – war and environmental destruction are not profitable and innovation solves their impacts

Kaletsky ’11 (Anatole, editor-at-large of *The Times* of London, where he writes weekly columns on economics, politics, and international relationsand on the governing board of the New York-based Institute for New Economic Theory (INET), a nonprofit created after the 2007-2009 crisis to promote and finance academic research in economics, Capitalism 4.0: The Birth of a New Economy in the Aftermath of Crisis, p. 19-21)

Democratic capitalism is a system built for survival. It has adapted successfully to shocks of every kind, to upheavals in technology and economics, to political revolutions and world wars. Capitalism has been able to do this because, unlike communism or socialism or feudalism, it has an inner dynamic akin to a living thing. It can adapt and refine itself in response to the changing environment. And it will evolve into a new species of the same capitalist genus if that is what it takes to survive. In the panic of 2008—09, many politicians, businesses, and pundits forgot about the astonishing adaptability of the capitalist system. Predictions of global collapse were based on static views of the world that extrapolated a few months of admittedly terrifying financial chaos into the indefinite future. The self-correcting mechanisms that market economies and democratic societies have evolved over several centuries were either forgotten or assumed defunct. The language of biology has been applied to politics and economics, but rarely to the way they interact. Democratic capitalism’s equivalent of the biological survival instinct is a built-in capacity for solving social problems and meeting material needs. This capacity stems from the principle of competition, which drives both democratic politics and capitalist markets. Because market forces generally reward the creation of wealth rather than its destruction, they direct the independent efforts and ambitions of millions of individuals toward satisfying material demands, even if these demands sometimes create unwelcome by-products. Because voters generally reward politicians for making their lives better and safer, rather than worse and more dangerous, democratic competition directs political institutions toward solving rather than aggravating society’s problems, even if these solutions sometimes create new problems of their own. Political competition is slower and less decisive than market competition, so its self-stabilizing qualities play out over decades or even generations, not months or years. But regardless of the difference in timescale, capitalism and democracy have one crucial feature in common: Both are mechanisms that encourage individuals to channel their creativity, efforts, and competitive spirit into finding solutions for material and social problems. And in the long run, these mechanisms work very well. If we consider democratic capitalism as a successful problem-solving machine, the implications of this view are very relevant to the 2007-09 economic crisis, but diametrically opposed to the conventional wisdom that prevailed in its aftermath. Governments all over the world were ridiculed for trying to resolve a crisis caused by too much borrowing by borrowing even more. Alan Greenspan was accused of trying to delay an inevitable "day of reckoning” by creating ever-bigger financial bubbles. Regulators were attacked for letting half-dead, “zombie” banks stagger on instead of putting them to death. But these charges missed the point of what the democratic capitalist system is designed to achieve. In a capitalist democracy whose raison d’etre is to devise new solutions to long-standing social and material demands, a problem postponed is effectively a problem solved. To be more exact, a problem whose solution can be deferred long enough is a problem that is likely to be solved in ways that are hardly imaginable today. Once the self-healing nature of the capitalist system is recognized, the charge of “passing on our problems to our grand-children”—whether made about budget deficits by conservatives or about global warming by liberals—becomes morally unconvincing. Our grand-children will almost certainly be much richer than we are and will have more powerful technologies at their disposal. It is far from obvious, therefore, why we should make economic sacrifices on their behalf. Sounder morality, as well as economics, than the Victorians ever imagined is in the wistful refrain of the proverbially optimistic Mr. Micawber: "Something will turn up."

#### None of their impact evidence is unique – they need to prove that a better system will replace cap to access their impacts. Cap is better than any other system – it prevents war and reduces poverty.

Weede 2008 [Erich, professor at the Institute for Political Science and Sociology, “Globalization and Inequality” Comparative Sociology 7, p. 415-433]

Globalization refers to an increasing international division of labor and more trade between economies, to cross-border investment and rapid transfers of technology between nations, to global capital ﬂows and, to a lesser degree, to increasing labor mobility. Th ere is as yet no global labor market. Globalization also implies better opportunities to learn from foreigners or strangers. Th e more similar you are to others, the less likely it is that you can learn from them.1 Unfortunately, many people prefer to rely on established routines and resent the challenge of having to learn from others. Globalization is another word for a worldwide expansion of capitalism. It results in international tax competition (Edwards and de Rugy 2002; Mitchell 2005). Globalization is based on some technological and political prerequisites. These include ever cheaper and faster means of communication and transportation as well as an adequate political environment. The global expansion of capitalism requires political fragmentation: markets should be larger than political units.2 This provides an exit option from oppressive government for capital and, to a lesser degree, for qualiﬁed labor. Such an exit option protects economic freedom from ever-increasing state interference and tax burdens. If one state should be much more powerful than all others, as the US currently is, then globalization requires a deeper commitment to capitalism and economic freedom by the hegemon than by other states. Th ese political requirements of globalization are fulﬁlled. Globalization maximizes the size of the market. Since Adam Smith (1776/1976) we know that the size of the market determines the degree of division of labor which promotes productivity. Thus, globalization is beneﬁcial because it increases productivity. This is not only a theoretical claim, but also an empirical statement. For instance, based on data from the US Bureau of Labor Statistics, yearly economic gains from globalization have been estimated to be somewhere between $1,650 and $3,300 per capita for Americans (Scheve and Slaughter 2007:36–37). Real compensation per hour (including beneﬁts and wages) has also gone up in the past decade, by 22 percent (Griswold 2007:1).3 Since Deng Xiaoping opened China in the late 1970s by introducing reforms which imply creeping capitalism, Chinese agricultural production grew rapidly. Later, China attracted a lot of foreign direct investment. Today China is a major base for manufacturing. By 2005 it was already the third largest exporter, still behind Germany and the US but already ahead of Japan (Th e Economist 2005). By 2008 China is likely to become the biggest exporter in the world. In the early 1980s (but no longer thereafter) even the disparity between urban and rural incomes in China decreased (Lin, Cai, and Li 2003:145). Hundreds of millions of Chinese were taken out of abject poverty. In the ﬁrst two decades of reform, per capita incomes grew fourfold (Bhalla 2002:218). Later, less radical reforms in India led to nearly doubling per capita incomes in a similar period of time and pulled about two hundred million Indians out of abject poverty (Das 2002:360). Since China and India together account for nearly forty percent of mankind and about half of the population living in less developed countries, economic growth in China and India and other Asian countries contributes to the equalization of the global distributions of income between individuals and households. If we are interested in individuals rather than states, then the empirical indicators are clear. Globalization or the global expansion of capitalism has contributed to, or at least been compatible with, an equalization of the size distribution of income between human beings. Since cross-national differences between average incomes are still a more important component of inequality between human beings than intra-national differences in income, it is possible – and currently true – to have the following two trajectories at the same time: growing inequality within many or even most countries amidst some movement towards equality among individuals worldwide (Bhalla 2002; Firebaugh 1999; Goesling 2001; Sala-i-Martin 2007; World Bank 2005). Admittedly, many economies, including the US and China, suffered some deterioration in their domestic income distributions. This is why the legitimacy of capitalism and globalization comes under attack, even in the American citadel of capitalism. This is also why calls for protectionism become louder and louder (Scheve and Slaughter 2007). But critics of globalization tend to forget a basic truth about free trade (Griswold 2007:3): “If workers, capital, and resources can shift within the domestic economy, jobs eliminated by import competition will quickly be replaced by jobs created elsewhere.”4 One should not blame the consequences of institutional sclerosis, or of an unwillingness to adjust, on globalization. Globalization has led to a significant reduction in mass poverty. Although the Chinese distribution of income has become much less equal since the reform process began in the late 1970s, the strong growth performance of China has pulled hundreds of millions out of abject poverty. In India growth has been less spectacular than in China such that the distribution of income has changed less, and yet again hundreds of millions have been pulled out of abject poverty. Although Latin America and Africa have benefitted much less from globalization than Asia has, these continents also cannot match the demographic weight of Asia. Therefore, their comparative lack of success cannot neutralize Asian progress in global perspective. Moreover, one has to keep in mind that winning in the process of globalization presupposes participating in it, not abstaining from it. One may illustrate global change with data provided by Indian economist Surjit Bhalla (2002:187). He deﬁnes people with a daily income between $10–$40 USD as members of the global middle class. In 1960 this class consisted largely of whites; only six percent were Asians. By 2000, however, 52 percent was Asian. Th e era of globalization is one in which Asia is now recovering, after falling for about two centuries further behind the West. Except for Africa abject poverty worldwide is likely to become signiﬁcantly reduced within one or two decades. Th e African share of abject poverty in the world is expected to rise until 2015 from 36 percent to about 90 percent (Bhalla 2002:S. 172).5 Why did so many people in Asia beneﬁt from globalization, whereas Africans did not? A plausible explanation has been oﬀered by Collier (2007:79).6 He points out that about three quarters of the bottom billion7 live in countries which have suﬀered from civil war or long periods of bad governance and poor economic policies. According to Collier (2007:27), “civil war is development in reverse. It damages both the country itself and its neighbors.” Bad governance and poor economic policies distort incentives and misallocate the meager resources of poor countries. Africa has suﬀered from these development traps to a greater degree than other continents. Moreover, one may argue that a focus on income and income distributions is biased towards understating the beneﬁts of globalization. As Goklany (2007:chaps. 2–3) has pointed out, the same income per capita today (in terms of purchasing power) implies higher life expectancies, lower infant mortalities, less malnutrition, healthier lives, and less child labor than it did decades or centuries earlier. Less developed, still poor countries do benefit from the technological progress achieved by developed and rich countries. Thus, even if one disputes the widely held and well-supported view regarding some equalization of individual or house-hold incomes worldwide in recent decades, one should still accept Goklany’s contention (2007:72): “In the aspects of human well-being that are truly critical – life expectancy, infant mortality, hunger, literacy, and child labor – the world is far more equal today than it was a century ago, in large part because of globalization.”8 Another advantage of globalization is that it contributes to preventing war (Russett and Oneal 2001; Weede 2005). Quantitative research demonstrates that the risk of war between nations is reduced if they trade a lot with each other. There is something like a commercial peace or peace by trade. Moreover, economic freedom reduces involvement in military conﬂict and ﬁnancial market openness also reduces the risk of war (Gartzke 2005, 2007). In particular, I want to underline that economic cooperation paciﬁes the geopolitical relationship between rising China and the West.9 Moreover, there is also something like a democratic peace. The risk of war between democracies is extremely small. In my view, one should conceptualize this as a component of a capitalist peace because democracies prosper best in wealthy countries10 and because capitalism or economic freedom and thereby globalization contribute to prosperity (Weede 2005, 2006). Since rising powers tend to challenge the political status quo, it is fortunate that the two demographic giants of this world seem to prosper under global capitalism.

#### Debates about pro-social state action in educational spaces combat depoliticization and prevent government actors from controlling politics.

Giroux 6 [(Henry, sociologist) “The abandoned generation: The urban debate league and the politics of possibility” from America on the Edge]

￼The decline of democratic values and informed citizenship can be seen in research studies done by The Justice Project in 2001 in which a substantial number of teenagers and young people were asked what they thought democracy meant. The answers testified to a growing depoliticization of American life and largely consisted of statements along the following lines: "Nothing," "I don't know," or "My rights, just like, pride, I guess, to some extent, and paying taxes," or "I just think, like, what does it really mean? I know its our, like, our government, but I don't know what it 6 technically is." The transition from being ignorant about democracy to actually sup- porting antidemocratic Tendencies can be seen in a number of youth surveys that have been taken since 2000. For instance, a survey released by the University of California, Berkeley, revealed that 69 percent of students support school prayer and 44 percent of young people aged fifteen to twenty-two support government restric- tions on abortions. A 2004 survey of 112,003 high school students on First Amendment rights showed that one third of students surveyed believed that the First Amendment went too far in the rights it guarantees and 36 percent believed that the press enjoyed too much freedom. This suggests not just a failing of education, but a crisis of citizenship and democracy. ￼One consequence of the decline in democratic values and citizenship literacy is that all levels of government are being hollowed our, their role reduced to dismantling the gains of the welfare state as they increasingly construct policies that ￼criminalize social problems and prioritize penal methods over social investments. When citizenship is reduced to consumerism, it should come as no surprise that people develop an indifference to civic engagement and participation in democratic public life. Unlike some theorists who suggest that politics as critical exchange and social engagement is either dead or in a state of terminal arrest, I believe that the current depressing state of politics points to an urgent challenge: reformulating the crisis of democracy as a fundamental crisis of vision, meaning, education, and political agency. Central to my argument is the assumption that politics is not simply about power, but also, as Cornelius Castoriadis points out, "has to do with political judgments and value choices," meaning that questions of civic education—learning how 8 to become a skilled citizen—afe central to democracy itself. ￼Educators at all levels need to challenge the assumption that politics is dead, or the nature of politics will be determined exclusively by government leaders and experts m the heat of moral frenzy. Educators need to take a more critical position, arguing that knowledge, debate, and dialogue about pressing social problems offer individuals and groups some hope in shaping the conditions that bear down on their lives. Public civic engagement is essential if the concepts of social life and the public sphere are to be used to revitalize the language of civic education and democratization as part of a broader discourse of political agency and critical citizenship in a global world. Linking the social to democratic public values represents an attempt, however incom- plete, to link democracy to public action, as part of a comprehensive attempt to revitalize civic activism and citizen access to decision-making while simultaneously addressing basic problems of social justice and global democracy. ￼Educators within public schools need to find ways to engage political issues by making social problems visible and by debating them in the political sphere. They also need to be at the forefront of the defense of the most progressive historical advances and gains of the state. 1-rcnch sociologist Pierre Bourdieu is right when he calls for collective work by educators to prevent those who arc mobilized against the welfare state from destroying the most precious democratic conquests in labor legis- lation, health, social protection, and education.'' At the very least, this would suggest that educators should defend schools as democratic public spheres, struggle against the de-skilling of teachers and students that has accompanied the emphasis on teach- ing for test-taking, and argue for pedagogy grounded in democratic values rather than testing schemes that severely limit the creative, ethical, and liberatory potential of education.

#### Free market capitalism is vital to preventing extinction and ensuring equality, value to life including individual rights– also solves disease and poverty

Rockwell 02

(Llewellyn H., President of the Mises Institute, The Free Market, “Why They Attack Capitalism”, Volume 20, Number 10, October, http://www.mises.org/freemarket\_detail.asp?control=418&sortorder-articledate)

If you think about it, this hysteria is astonishing, even terrifying. The market economy has created unfathomable prosperity and, decade by decade, for centuries and centuries, miraculous feats of innovation, production, distribution, and social coordination. To the free market, we owe all material prosperity, all our leisure time, our health and longevity, our huge and growing population, nearly everything we call life itself. Capitalism and capitalism alone has rescued the human race from degrading poverty, rampant sickness, and early death. In the absence of the capitalist economy, and all its underlying institutions, the world’s population would, over time, shrink to a fraction of its current size, in a holocaust of unimaginable scale, and whatever remained of the human race would be systematically reduced to subsistence, eating only what can be hunted or gathered. And this is only to mention its economic benefits. Capitalism is also an expression of freedom. It is not so much a social system but the de facto result in a society where individual rights are respected, where businesses, families, and every form of association are permitted to flourish in the absence of coercion, theft, war, and aggression. Capitalism protects the weak against the strong, granting choice and opportunity to the masses who once had no choice but to live in a state of dependency on the politically connected and their enforcers. The high value placed on women, children, the disabled, and the aged— unknown in the ancient world—owes so much to capitalism’s productivity and distribution of power. Must we compare the record of capitalism with that of the state, which, looking at the sweep of this past century alone, has killed hundreds of millions of people in wars, famines, camps, and deliberate starvation campaigns? And the record of central planning of the type now being urged on American enterprise is perfectly abysmal.

### Case