## OFF

### 1

#### Interp – affirmatives must demonstrate how they engage efforts to advocate the plan BEYOND scenario planning or embody methods of solvency against violence discussed in the AFF.

**Reid-Brinkley 20** [Shanara Reid-Brinkley 2020, “The Future is Black: Afropessimism, Fugitivity, and Radical Hope in Education”, Edited by Carl Grant, Ashley Woodson, Michael Dumas, https://books.google.com/books?id=SMHyDwAAQBAJ&pg=PR5&source=gbs\_selected\_pages&cad=2#v=onepage&q&f=false//WY]

What lies in the wake" of competitive policy debate? How are Black debaters doing wake work? In the following section I take two examples from the National Debate Tournament Final Round to demonstrate wake work in competitive debate. Next, I ana-lyze the central argument in the final round characterizing the current clash of civilizations in debate and the ramifications of building community in debate. The final round of the 2017 National Debate Tournament was not just a com- petition, **it was a referendum on the notion of a universal community** and the **structural exclusions and fairness issues that characterize** the traditions and **norms of competitive practice**. Georgetown is affirmative in the debate and of fer a federal policy toward Alaska as an example of a specific proposal to combat catastrophic climate change. Based on the norms of competition, Georgetown presents a coherent affirmative argument providing an effective stasis point for fair deliberation of the climate change resolution. After the affirmative's speech Rutgers is allowed to cross-examine the speaker. Devane Murphy asks, “When is the first life saved as a result of the afffirmative]?” (2017). While Georgetown admits that a debate round cannot save lives directly, they argue that discuss- ing climate change policy is a valuable academic conversation. Rutgers then asks a series of questions about Georgetown's relationship as individuals to the people and places targeted by the federal policy they suggest: “Do you know any people in the arctic? Do you know any communities in the arctic? Can you name a family in the arctic?” (Murphy, 2017). While Georgetown answers no to these questions, they argue that a focus on debaters as individuals rather than the policy option they have presented is a distraction from the stasis point they have set for the debate. Using Afropessimism as a heuristic for engaging the resolution, debaters like Rutgers, reject any affirmation of the United States Federal Government. For these students, the federal government is always an unethical actor. In as much as the resolutional statement requires the affirmative to posit federal govern- ment action as an ethical response to public need, **the vast majority of Black debaters refuse to take such a position.** To combat this refusal to follow com- petitive norms, the Framework argument developed to confront the disruption of the normative form and content of policy debate competition. Framework debaters (mostly White and non-Black POCs) argue that if a team violates the norms of common practice they reject the normative stasis points for delibera-tion destroying the educational benefits of policy debate. Framework has operated as a strategic tool of capture and exclusion of Black thought in competitive debate. However, as "the holds multiply" so too does Black innovation. Rutgers' strategy in the final round took the form of the traditional Framework argument, but using Black thought **to revise the content and turn it against the norms of traditional debate**. Black Framework, Rutgers' strategy, argued that the affirmative **must embody their politics and demonstrate how they directly engage in** efforts to reduce climate change. Rutgers' argues that Georgetown is disconnected from their politics which is why they can advocate a policy that may affect the people of the Arctic while having little knowledge of those people or their lives. This kind of orientation toward policy action is dangerous, encouraging what Rutgers refers to as **“ascetic tourism"** by which debaters role-playing policy advocates “tour [the] trauma of various populations without ever acting to alleviate the harm” (Murphy, 2017). When Georgetown seeks further clarification of Black Framework, Rutgers' responds: "We provided an interpretation of what we think debate should look like, the same way in which when you're negative and you read my affirmative and you say we should not be able to do what we do. Very simple” (Murphy, 2017). Georgetown often runs the traditional Framework argument against Black Debate teams who fall outside their interpretation of a fair stasis point for debate about the resolution. Rutgers' turns the tables on Georgetown argu- ing that the traditional form of policy debate produces poor policy advocates and that Black Debate practice which centers embodied political practice is a superior method of training political advocates**.** Black Framework is an exam- ple of political theorizing from the hold. It operates from the perspective that anti-blackness is the stage upon which all political deliberation is played and then strategically identifies a tactic and an exigency for disruption.Rutgers capitalizes on the growing middle majority of judges who agree that Black Debate practice is an effective training tool for political advocacy. The use of Black Framework flips the script; it is a jarring (re)performance of the acts of exclusion that Black debaters have faced for decades. It took the form of Framework, paired with Black content, to argue that the neo-liberal norms of civil society would no longer get a free pass as the base frame for political negotiation. Rutgers turned a mirror on debate and offered a reflection of itself haunted by the specter of Black death. Arguing Black Framework was an act of bringing out the dead.

#### They violate.

#### First, ascetic tourism – reading the 1AC absent direct efforts to challenge communal violence posits them as tourists to violence. Benefits to scenario planning don’t disprove the violation.

#### Second, revitalization of stasis – our offense isn’t just “going beyond scenario planning” BUT specification of such since it revitalizes stasis and forces research beyond traditional norms.

#### Third, Effects T – words holding potential for action proves scenario planning could affect action, which still links since it still posits them as tourists over violence, and is infinitely regressive – anything could affect each other.

#### No RVIs – a) positions black individuals in a state of constant dispossession as violent rhetoric is imposed onto their bodies b) illogical – you don’t win for being fair c) chilling – good theory debaters bait theory and then win off the RVI every round. Encourages more abuse.

#### Competing interps –a) reasonability is arbitrary and bites judge intervention, b) competing interps is a race to the top where the best norm wins the debate.

### 2

#### Settler colonialism is not a one-off event but an ongoing structure of dispossession that requires the elimination of Indigenous life. This is marked by ontological violence reasserted each day of occupation.

Tuck and Yang 12 [Eve Tuck, Unangax, State University of New York at New Paltz K. Wayne Yang University of California, San Diego, Decolonization is not a metaphor, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 1, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1-40 JJ]

Our intention in this descriptive exercise is not be exhaustive, or even inarguable; instead, we wish to emphasize that (a) decolonization will take a different shape in each of these contexts - though they can overlap4 - and that (b) neither external nor internal colonialism adequately describe the form of colonialism which operates in the United States or other nation-states in which the colonizer comes to stay. Settler colonialism operates through internal/external colonial modes simultaneously because there is no spatial separation between metropole and colony. For example, in the United States, many Indigenous peoples have been forcibly removed from their homelands onto reservations, indentured, and abducted into state custody, signaling the form of colonization as simultaneously internal (via boarding schools and other biopolitical modes of control) and external (via uranium mining on Indigenous land in the US Southwest and oil extraction on Indigenous land in Alaska) with a frontier (the US military still nicknames all enemy territory “Indian Country”). The horizons of the settler colonial nation-state are total and require a mode of total appropriation of Indigenous life and land, rather than the selective expropriation of profit-producing fragments. Settler colonialism is different from other forms of colonialism in that settlers come with the intention of making a new home on the land, a homemaking that insists on settler sovereignty over all things in their new domain. Thus, relying solely on postcolonial literatures or theories of coloniality that ignore settler colonialism will not help to envision the shape that decolonization must take in settler colonial contexts. Within settler colonialism, the most important concern is land/water/air/subterranean earth (land, for shorthand, in this article.) Land is what is most valuable, contested, required. This is both because the settlers make Indigenous land their new home and source of capital, and also because the disruption of Indigenous relationships to land represents a profound epistemic, ontological, cosmological violence. This violence is not temporally contained in the arrival of the settler but is reasserted each day of occupation. This is why Patrick Wolfe (1999) emphasizes that settler colonialism is a structure and not an event. In the process of settler colonialism, land is remade into property and human relationships to land are restricted to the relationship of the owner to his property. Epistemological, ontological, and cosmological relationships to land are interred, indeed made pre-modern and backward. Made savage. 3 In using terms as “white” and “whiteness”, we are acknowledging that whiteness extends beyond phenotype. 4 We don’t treat internal/external as a taxonomy of colonialisms. They describe two operative modes of colonialism. The modes can overlap, reinforce, and contradict one another, and do so through particular legal, social, economic and political processes that are context specific. 6 E. Tuck & K.W. Yang In order for the settlers to make a place their home, they must destroy and disappear the Indigenous peoples that live there. Indigenous peoples are those who have creation stories, not colonization stories, about how we/they came to be in a particular place - indeed how we/they came to be a place. Our/their relationships to land comprise our/their epistemologies, ontologies, and cosmologies. For the settlers, Indigenous peoples are in the way and, in the destruction of Indigenous peoples, Indigenous communities, and over time and through law and policy, Indigenous peoples’ claims to land under settler regimes, land is recast as property and as a resource. Indigenous peoples must be erased, must be made into ghosts (Tuck and Ree, forthcoming). At the same time, settler colonialism involves the subjugation and forced labor of chattel slaves5 , whose bodies and lives become the property, and who are kept landless. Slavery in settler colonial contexts is distinct from other forms of indenture whereby excess labor is extracted from persons. First, chattels are commodities of labor and therefore it is the slave’s person that is the excess. Second, unlike workers who may aspire to own land, the slave’s very presence on the land is already an excess that must be dis-located. Thus, the slave is a desirable commodity but the person underneath is imprisonable, punishable, and murderable. The violence of keeping/killing the chattel slave makes them deathlike monsters in the settler imagination; they are reconfigured/disfigured as the threat, the razor’s edge of safety and terror. The settler, if known by his actions and how he justifies them, sees himself as holding dominion over the earth and its flora and fauna, as the anthropocentric normal, and as more developed, more human, more deserving than other groups or species. The settler is making a new "home" and that home is rooted in a homesteading worldview where the wild land and wild people were made for his benefit. He can only make his identity as a settler by making the land produce, and produce excessively, because "civilization" is defined as production in excess of the "natural" world (i.e. in excess of the sustainable production already present in the Indigenous world). In order for excess production, he needs excess labor, which he cannot provide himself. The chattel slave serves as that excess labor, labor that can never be paid because payment would have to be in the form of property (land). The settler's wealth is land, or a fungible version of it, and so payment for labor is impossible.6 The settler positions himself as both superior and normal; the settler is natural, whereas the Indigenous inhabitant and the chattel slave are unnatural, even supernatural. Settlers are not immigrants. Immigrants are beholden to the Indigenous laws and epistemologies of the lands they migrate to. Settlers become the law, supplanting Indigenous 5 As observed by Erica Neeganagwedgin (2012), these two groups are not always distinct. Neeganagwedgin presents a history of the enslavement of Indigenous peoples in Canada as chattel slaves. In California, Mexico, and the U.S. Southwest under the Spanish mission system, Indigenous people were removed from their land and also made into chattel slaves. Under U.S. colonization, California law stipulated that Indians could be murdered and/or indentured by any “person” (white, propertied, citizen). These laws remained in effect until 1937. 6 See Kate McCoy (forthcoming) on settler crises in early Jamestown, Virginia to pay indentured European labor with land. Decolonization is not a metaphor 7 laws and epistemologies. Therefore, settler nations are not immigrant nations (See also A.J. Barker, 2009). Not unique, the United States, as a settler colonial nation-state, also operates as an empire - utilizing external forms and internal forms of colonization simultaneous to the settler colonial project. This means, and this is perplexing to some, that dispossessed people are brought onto seized Indigenous land through other colonial projects. Other colonial projects include enslavement, as discussed, but also military recruitment, low-wage and high-wage labor recruitment (such as agricultural workers and overseas-trained engineers), and displacement/migration (such as the coerced immigration from nations torn by U.S. wars or devastated by U.S. economic policy). In this set of settler colonial relations, colonial subjects who are displaced by external colonialism, as well as racialized and minoritized by internal colonialism, still occupy and settle stolen Indigenous land. Settlers are diverse, not just of white European descent, and include people of color, even from other colonial contexts. This tightly wound set of conditions and racialized, globalized relations exponentially complicates what is meant by decolonization, and by solidarity, against settler colonial forces. Decolonization in exploitative colonial situations could involve the seizing of imperial wealth by the postcolonial subject. In settler colonial situations, seizing imperial wealth is inextricably tied to settlement and re-invasion. Likewise, the promise of integration and civil rights is predicated on securing a share of a settler-appropriated wealth (as well as expropriated ‘third-world’ wealth). Decolonization in a settler context is fraught because empire, settlement, and internal colony have no spatial separation. Each of these features of settler colonialism in the US context - empire, settlement, and internal colony - make it a site of contradictory decolonial desires7 . Decolonization as metaphor allows people to equivocate these contradictory decolonial desires because it turns decolonization into an empty signifier to be filled by any track towards liberation. In reality, the tracks walk all over land/people in settler contexts. Though the details are not fixed or agreed upon, in our view, decolonization in the settler colonial context must involve the repatriation of land simultaneous to the recognition of how land and relations to land have always already been differently understood and enacted; that is, all of the land, and not just symbolically. This is precisely why decolonization is necessarily unsettling, especially across lines of solidarity. “Decolonization never takes place unnoticed” (Fanon, 1963, p. 36). Settler colonialism and its decolonization implicates and unsettles everyone.”

#### Discourses of space exploration are inextricably tied to the colonial legacies that created them – space is rendered Terra Nullius; another empty wilderness open to the extension of colonial interests.

**Smiles 20** – Deondre Smiles is Ojibwe, Black, and settler, and he is a citizen of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, as well as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Geography at the University of Victoria, in B.C., Canada.

Deondre Smiles, “The Settler Logics of (Outer) Space,” Society and Space, October 26th, 2020, [https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/the-settler-logics-of-outer-space //](https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/the-settler-logics-of-outer-space%20//) sam dd

To most scholars, and certainly to the virtual majority of Indigenous peoples on Turtle Island, it is no secret that the country we call the United States of America was built upon the brutal subjugation of Indigenous people and Indigenous lands. Fueled by the American settler myths of terra nullius (no man’s land) and Manifest Destiny, the American settler state proceeded upon a project of cultural and physical genocide, with lasting effects that endure to the present day. The ‘settler myth’ permeates American culture. Words such as ‘pioneer’, the ‘West’, ‘Manifest Destiny’ grab the imagination as connected to the growth of the country in its early history. America sprang forth from a vast open ‘wilderness’. Of course, for Indigenous people, we know differently—these lands had complex cultural frameworks and political entities long before colonization. Words like ‘pioneer’ and ‘Manifest Destiny’, have deep meanings for us too, as they are indicative of the very real damage dealt against our cultures and nations, damage that we have had to work very hard to undo. Trump’s address raises key insights into the continuing logics of settler colonialism, as well as questions of its future trajectories. Trump’s invocation of ideas such as the ‘frontier’ and ‘taming the wilderness’ draws attention to the brutal violence that accompanied the building of the American state. Scholars such as Greg Grandin (2019) make the case that the frontier is part of what America is—whether it is the ‘Wild West’, or the U.S.-Mexican border, America is always contending with a frontier that must be defined. Language surrounding ‘frontier’ is troubling because it perpetuates the rationale of why the American settler state even exists—it could make better use of the land than Native people would, after all, they lived in wilderness. This myth tells us that what we know as the modern world was built through the hard work of European settlers; Indigenous people had nothing to offer or contribute. For someone like Mr. Trump, whose misgivings and hostility towards Native people have been historically documented, this myth fits well with his narrative as President—he is building a ‘new’ America, one that will return to its place of power and influence. The fact that similar language is being used around the potential of American power being extended to space could reasonably be expected, given the economic and military potential that comes from such a move. Space represents yet another ‘unknown’ to be conquered and bent to America’s will. However, such interplanetary conquest does not exist solely in outer space. I wish to situate the very real colonial legacies and violence associated with the desire to explore space, tracing the ways that they are perpetuated and reified through their destructive engagements with Indigenous peoples. I argue that a scientific venture such as space exploration does not exist in a vacuum, but instead draws from settler colonialism and feeds back into it through the prioritization of ‘science’ over Indigenous epistemologies. I begin by exploring the ways that space exploration by the American settler state is situated within questions of hegemony, imperialism, and terra nullius, including a brief synopsis of the controversy surrounding the planned construction of the Thirty Meter Telescope on Mauna Kea. I conclude by exploring Indigenous engagement with ‘space’ in both its Earthbound and beyond-earth forms as it relates to outer space, and what implications this might have for the ways we think about our engagement with space as the American settler state begins to turn its gaze skyward once again. I position this essay alongside a growing body of academic work, as well as journalistic endeavors (Haskins, 2020; Koren, 2020) that demands that the American settler colonial state exercise self-reflexivity as to why it engages with outer space, and who is advantaged and disadvantaged here on Earth as a result of this engagement.

#### The functionalist paradigm of debris removal that understands space debris as a barrier to future exploration relies on a hegemonic geography of space in which outer space is rendered empty and lifeless – it is critical to theorize space debris not through the lens of maximum utility but rather relationality.

**Hunter and Nelson 21 –** Hannah Hunter is a PHD student in Philosophy at Queen’s University, where her research is centered on animal-human relationships and geographies. Elizabeth Nelson is also pretty cool, I can’t find her author info but it’s a peer reviewed journal

Hannah Hunter and Elizabeth Nelson, “Out of Place in Outer Space? Exploring Orbital Debris through Geographical Imaginations” Environment and Society, Volume 12 Issue 1, September 2021 // sam dd

Dominant preoccupations with the operational capacity of orbit and collision risk place their focus on functionalist paradigms of orbital space and debris objects. The narratives created here—oft en both produced by and reproducing hegemonic geographical imaginations of orbital space—limit how debris are engaged with. We now highlight a selection of more capacious geographical imaginations of orbital space to off er inspiration for how scholars and stakeholders might (and do) engage with orbital debris diff erently. We hope that such expanded and creative engagements may better refl ect the diversity of relationships between the terrestrial and extraterrestrial, as well as the unfathomable time scales of orbital objects. Space archeologist Alice Gorman suggests an alternative imagination by arguing for a more heterogeneous view of orbital debris wherein outer space is considered a cultural landscape (Gorman 2005, 2009, 2019, 2020). This approach goes beyond human–nature dichotomies, recognizing places as co-created through human–environment interaction (Gorman 2005). Gorman embraces the cultural signifi cance and complexity of near-Earth space, and she argues that terms like “wilderness” and “fi nal frontier” are outdated given the now-multifaceted interactions between “the space environment and human material culture” (2005: 86). Th rough this, Gorman liberates space objects from risk and mitigation frameworks that regard all debris as out of place, assessing orbital matter instead through its “social, historical, aesthetic, and scientifi c signifi cance” (Gorman 2009: 382). Considering the still-orbiting 1958 Vanguard 1 satellite, Gorman (2009) questions how attempts to “solve the space junk problem” could inadvertently destroy the cultural heritage of outer space, as defunct historic satellites are technically debris. She suggests that “the natural setting for these artefacts is the orbital landscape, and where they do not constitute a collision risk, there is no reason to remove them” (2020: 244). Gorman (2009) does not disregard the serious consequences that may result from debris-based collision events, but rather argues that the cultural heritage value of debris objects should also be considered and perhaps protected in the management of orbital space. Th is cultural landscape approach provides one possible alternative to narrowly functionalist paradigms of orbital space. We might also consider how an environmentalist geographical imagination of orbital space could off er alternative understandings of orbital debris. Outer space as “environment” or “ecology” has been well established by a number of critical space scholars (e.g., Beery 2016; Klinger 2019; Olson 2013; Olson and Messeri 2015; Rand 2016). As noted above, scholars have been concerned with the negative, oft en unjust, environmental impact of space activities on Earth. However, the environmental impact of debris on orbital space is much trickier to articulate. Rand observes that outer space is oft en portrayed as “the opposite of verdant green-and-blue nature” (2016: 8). Th e lack of charismatic megafauna makes it challenging to argue the grounds for environmental protection of outer space outside of the risk that debris pose to human endeavors (Rand 2016). Even so, ideas of “space environmentalism” and “astroenvironmentalism” have been proposed. Ryder W. Miller (2001) suggests that the environmentalist project be extended upward to regard “space and the celestial bodies [as] pristine wildernesses that need to be protected rather than frontiers to conquer.” Th is includes calls for the creation of guidelines, ethics, and legal power that would safeguard space from unilateral control based around nation or corporation, and which is concerned with the environmental future of outer-spaces (Miller 2001). Others question what it would mean for the collective good to extend the concept of sustainable development beyond terrestrial boundaries (Wallacher et al. 2019). In these arguments, however, much attention is still given to current and future human entanglements with this environment, including the impact of orbital debris on satellites, rather than more-than-human environmental considerations. How, then, can we think of the environmental protection of outer space beyond anthropocentrism? Critical geography now widely recognizes more-than-humans as social actors and place-making agents (Haraway 2008; Whatmore 2006). However, this scholarship rarely recognizes its debt to Indigenous ontologies and thinkers who, as noted by Kim TallBear, “have never forgotten that nonhumans are agential beings engaged in social relations that profoundly shape human lives” (in Muñoz et al. 2015: 234; see also Belcourt 2015; and Todd 2016). Environmental geographical imaginations of orbital space must consider what is more-than-human and morethan-machine, and how these beings and entanglements might off er new perspectives on orbital debris beyond functionalist paradigms. As mentioned above, many scientists do not understand space as empty, but rather as a complex fi eldsite full of energy, matter, and forces (Olson 2013; Rand 2016). Many embrace the probability of life beyond Earth (Messeri 2016), pointing to the fact that lively places like hydrothermal vents in the deep ocean were similarly once thought to be barren (Helmreich 2012). Here, outer space is not an “empty vessel” (Kearnes and Van Dooren 2017: 182) or purely a space for knowledge production and capitalist endeavor, but a natural ecosystem potentially containing “other sensitive biological systems with the prerogative to exist” (Klinger 2019: 22). Th is point raises the question of whether this “nature” should be protected against human-machinic “contamination,” whether by debris or functional objects. Th is issue of safeguarding is partially addressed by the planetary protection protocols of the Outer Space Treaty (UNOOSA 1967). Th ese were designed in part to prevent the “contamination” of outer space by terrestrial microbes brought along by spacecraft (European Space Agency 2014), which might harm the existence or emergence of extraterrestrial life forms (Klinger 2019) as well as the ability of scientists to “discover” them (Cheney et al. 2020). However, Klinger (2019) notes that spacefaring powers, particularly private enterprises, have either disregarded these protocols altogether or have shift ed from protection to preservation due to the inhibiting nature of the protection protocols to their endeavors. “Preservation” here follows the “logic of Earthly conservation regimes” (2019: 22), where outer space could become segmented “into spaces of acceptable and unacceptable contamination” (2019: 22). Th is could create interstellar preserves shielded from the apparent imperatives of colonial capital destruction (Klinger 2019). In terrestrial nature preserves, places become protected for their ecological or cultural importance (Dudley et al. 2010). If these preservationist practices were applied upward, orbital space could be framed as a protected wilderness area—a pure “nature” that must be shielded from the polluting interventions of humans (Cockell and Horneck 2006; Miller 2001). However, orbital space seems to lack the speculative and charismatic biodiversity that planetary protection protocols seek to protect (Rand 2016). To evoke the protection of orbital space as nature, the cultural-ecological signifi cance and uniqueness of certain processes, exchanges, forces, and orbital objects would need to be identifi ed by heterogeneous interest groups (Tavares et al. 2020). Whole orbital trajectories could be designated as extraterrestrial parks with strict rules about satellite traffi c and orbital littering, or human-made objects could be banned from certain locations altogether (Cockell and Horneck 2006). In this vision, any orbital matter could be considered polluting, regardless of its functionality or collision potential with other human-made materials. However, this parks model could give free rein for the degradation of non-protected areas (Klinger 2019), or project problematic human–nature divides into outer space (Gorman 2005; Klinger 2019). To draw attention to less dominant framings of orbital space, we are compelled to consider alternative ethics to those evident in hegemonic geographic imaginations of orbital space. Matthew Kearnes and Th om van Dooren off er the “ethics of interstellar fl ourishing” (2017: 180) as an alternative to frontier logics that frame space as empty and thus limit ethical demands. Th ey explain that the concept of “‘worlding,’ ask[s]: What kind of worlds are we helping to produce and with what consequences for whom?” (2017: 186). Th is question allows a consideration of ethics in relation to both human and nonhuman actors in outer space. It asks whether abiotic asteroids, future Martians, and seemingly empty spaces might also be of ethical importance (Kearnes and Van Dooren 2017: 186). Critically, this ethic discards imaginations of outer space as an empty void waiting to either be occupied or protected. Instead, if “space is already full of meaning and value; the very stuff of ethics” (2017: 186), then our ethics must be attentive to the entangled and unknowable nature of outer space. By “holding ‘the good’ open, under question” (2017: 188) a living, inclusive ethic of extraterrestrial extension might better account for the diversity of outer space actors, objects, and unknowable futures (Kearnes and Van Dooren 2017). By demanding attention to the “diversity within categories like humanity, the nonhuman, the abiotic, and ‘space’” (Kearnes and Van Dooren 2017: 186), interstellar fl ourishing pushes beyond imaginations of extraterrestrial extension as a “biological imperative” (Gorman 2005: 103) of a homogeneous human race, who all benefi t or are harmed equally by these endeavors (Kearnes and Van Dooren 2017). Th is connects with a call by Frank Tavares and colleagues (2020) for a reevaluation of planetary protection measures to reject the expansion of colonial practices onto other planets. Th ey argue, for instance, that “agency and moral consideration” (Tavares et al. 2020: 2) needs to be extended to existing and potential microbial life and that potential lifeforms matter beyond their relative “intelligence” (2020: 4). Th us, a “multiplicity of epistemologies” (2020: 1) must be considered to decenter colonial logics in discussions of extraterrestrial expansion.

#### The alternative is to refuse the research project of the affirmative – this is a generative event that creates space for alternative modalities of knowing around outer space and insists upon the interrogation of the epistemological underpinnings of the 1ac.

**Tuck and Yang 14** – associate professor of critical race and indigenous studies at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto and director of ethnic studies at UC San Diego

Eve Tuck and Wayne C Yang, “R-Words: Refusing Research,” Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry with youth and communities, vol 223 pp 239 – 243 [https://townsendgroups.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/tuckandyangrwords\_refusingresearch.pdf //](https://townsendgroups.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/tuckandyangrwords_refusingresearch.pdf%20//) sam

For the purposes of our discussion, the most important insight to draw from Simpson’s article is her emphasis that refusals are not subtractive, but are theoretically generative (p. 78), expansive. Refusal is not just a “no,” but a redirection to ideas otherwise unacknowledged or unquestioned. Unlike a settler colonial configuration of knowledge that is petulantly exasperated and resentful of limits, a methodology of refusal regards limits on knowledge as productive, as indeed a good thing. To explore how refusal and the installation of limits on settler colonial knowledge might be productive, we make a brief detour to the Erased Lynching series (2002–2011) by Los Angeles–based artist Ken Gonzales-Day (see Figure 12.1). Gonzales-Day researched lynching in California and the Southwest and found that the majority of lynch victims were Latinos, American Indians, and Asians. Like lynchings in the South, lynchings in California were events of public spectacle, often attended by hundreds, sometimes thousands of festive onlookers. At the lynchings, professional photographers took hours to set up portable studios similar to those used at carnivals; they sold their images frequently as postcards, mementos of public torture and execution to be circulated by U.S. post through- out the nation and the world. Lynching, we must be reminded, was extralegal, yet nearly always required the complicity of law enforcement—either by marshals or sheriffs in the act itself, or by judges and courts in not bothering to prosecute the lynch mob afterward. The photographs immortalize the murder beyond the time and place of the lynching, and in their proliferation, expand a single murder to the general murderability of the non-White body. In this respect, the image of the hanged, mutilated body itself serves a critical function in the maintenance of White supremacy and the spread of racial terror beyond the lynching. The spectacle of the lynching is the medium of terror. Gonzales-Day’s Erased Lynching series reintroduces the photographs of lynching to a contemporary audience, with one critical intervention: The ropes and the lynch victim have been removed from the images. Per Gonzales-Day’s website (n.d.), the series enacted a conceptual gesture intended to direct the viewer’s attention, not upon the lifeless body of the lynch victim, but upon the mechanisms of lynching themselves: the crowd, the spectacle, the photographer, and even consider the impact of flash photography upon this dismal past. The perpetrators, if present, remain fully visible, jeering, laughing, or pulling at the air in a deadly pantomime. As such, this series strives to make the invisible visible. The Erased Lynching series yields another context in which we might consider what a social scientist’s refusal stance might comprise. Though indeed centering on the erasure of the former object, refusal need not be thought of as a subtractive methodology. Refusal prompts analysis of the festive spectators regularly backgrounded in favor of wounded bodies, strange fruit, interesting scars. Refusal shifts the gaze from the violated body to the violating instruments—in this case, the lynch mob, which does not disappear when the lynching is over, but continues to live, accumulating land and wealth through the extermination and subordination of the Other. Thus, refusal helps move us from thinking of violence as an event and toward an analysis of it as a structure. Gonzales-Day might have decided to reproduce and redistribute the images as postcards, which, by way of showing up in mundane spaces, might have effectively inspired reflection on the spectacle of violence and media of terror. However, in removing the body and the ropes, he installed limits on what the audience can access, and redirected our gaze to the bodies of those who were there to see a murder take place, and to the empty space beneath the branches. Gonzales-Day introduced a new representational territory, one that refuses to play by the rules of the settler colonial gaze, and one that refuses to satisfy the morbid curiosity derived from settler colonialism’s preoccupation with pain. Refusals are needed for narratives and images arising in social science research that rehumiliate when circulated, but also when, in Simpson’s words, “the representation would bite all of us and compromise the representational territory that we have gained for ourselves in the past 100 years” (p. 78). As researcher-narrator, Simpson tells us, “I reached my own limit when the data would not contribute to our sovereignty or complicate the deeply simplified, atrophied representations of Iroquois and other Indigenous peoples that they have been mired within anthropologically” (p. 78). Here Simpson makes clear the ways in which research is not the intervention that is needed—that is, the interventions of furthering sovereignty or countering misrepresentations of Native people as anthropological objects. Considering Erased Lynchings dialogically with On Ethnographic Refusal, we can see how refusal is not a prohibition but a generative form. First, refusal turns the gaze back upon power, specifically the colonial modalities of knowing persons as bodies to be differentially counted, violated, saved, and put to work. It makes transparent the metanarrative of knowledge production—its spectatorship for pain and its preoccupation for documenting and ruling over racial difference. Thus, refusal to be made meaningful first and foremost is grounded in a critique of settler colonialism, its construction of Whiteness, and its regimes of representation. Second, refusal generates, expands, champions representational territories that colonial knowledge endeavors to settle, enclose, domesticate. Simpson complicates the portrayals of Iroquois, without resorting to portrayals of anthropo- logical Indians. Gonzales-Day portrays the violations without reportraying the victimizations. Third, refusal is a critical intervention into research and its circular self-defining ethics. The ethical justification for research is defensive and self-encircling—its apparent self-criticism serves to expand its own rights to know, and to defend its violations in the name of “good science.” Refusal challenges the individualizing discourse of IRB consent and “good science” by high- lighting the problems of collective harm, of representational harm, and of knowledge colonization. Fourth, refusal itself could be developed into both method and theory. Simpson presents refusal on the part of the researcher as a type of calculus ethnography. Gonzales-Day deploys refusal as a mode of representation. Simpson theorizes refusal by the Kahnawake Nation as anticolonial, and rooted in the desire for possibilities outside of colonial logics, not as a reactive stance. This final point about refusal connects our conversation back to desire as a counterlogic to settler colonial knowledge.

## Case

### 1NC – AT: Debris

#### 1] Debris risk is overstated – objects are small compared to the size of space and even when collisions happen, damage is minimal

Paradise 15 (Lee A., writer for Science Clarified encyclopedia. 2001, accessed July 29 2015 "Does the accumulation of "space debris" in Earth's orbit pose a significant threat to humans, in space and on the ground?" [www.scienceclarified.com/dispute/Vol-1/Does-the-accumulation-of-space-debris-in-Earth-s-orbit-pose-a-significant-threat-to-humans-in-space-and-on-the-ground.html](http://www.scienceclarified.com/dispute/Vol-1/Does-the-accumulation-of-space-debris-in-Earth-s-orbit-pose-a-significant-threat-to-humans-in-space-and-on-the-ground.html) DD)

Considering the small size of objects like satellites or the shuttle placed against an environment as vast as space, the risk of severe collisions is minimal. Even when an object in space is hit by space debris, the damage is typically negligible even considering the high rate of speed at which the debris travels. Thanks to precautions such as debris shielding, the damage caused by space debris has been kept to a minimum. Before it was brought back to Earth via remote control, the MIR space station received numerous impacts from space debris. None of this minor damage presented any significant problems to the operation of the station or its various missions. The International Space Station (ISS) is designed to withstand direct hits from space debris as large as 0.4 in (1 cm) in size.¶ Most scientists believe that the number of satellites actually destroyed or severely damaged by space debris is extremely low. The Russian Kosmos 1275 is possibly one of these rare instances. The chance of the Hubble Space Telescope suffering the same fate as the Russian satellite is approximately 1% according to Phillis Engelbert and Diane L. Dupuis, authors of The Handy Space Answer Book . Considering the number of satellites and other man-made objects launched into space in the last 40 years, the serious risk posed to satellites is astronomically low.¶ In fact, monitoring systems such as the Space Surveillance Network (SSN) maintain constant track of space debris and Near Earth Orbits. Thanks to ground-based radar and computer extrapolation, this provides an early warning system to determine if even the possibility of a collision with space debris is imminent. With this information, the Space Shuttle can easily maneuver out of the way. The Space Science Branch at the Johnson Space Center predicts the chance of such a collision occurring to be about 1 in 100,000, which is certainly not a significant enough risk to cause panic. Soon the ISS will also have the capability to maneuver in this way as well.

#### 2] Cleanup is working – multiple countries actively co-operate, treaties solve, and new tech is more careful

Paradise 15 (Lee A., writer for Science Clarified encyclopedia. 2001, accessed July 29 "Does the accumulation of "space debris" in Earth's orbit pose a significant threat to humans, in space and on the ground?" [www.scienceclarified.com/dispute/Vol-1/Does-the-accumulation-of-space-debris-in-Earth-s-orbit-pose-a-significant-threat-to-humans-in-space-and-on-the-ground.html](http://www.scienceclarified.com/dispute/Vol-1/Does-the-accumulation-of-space-debris-in-Earth-s-orbit-pose-a-significant-threat-to-humans-in-space-and-on-the-ground.html) DD)

In addition, space agencies around the world have taken steps to reduce space clutter. The United States, for example, has taken an official stand that is outlined in the 1996 National Space Policy that clearly states: "The United States will seek to minimize the creation of new orbital debris." For example, space mechanics are far more careful with regard to their tools. In the past, space mechanics sometimes let go of their tools and were unable to recover them. Strident efforts are now made to retain all objects used to repair satellites and conduct other missions. The Russians have also agreed to do their part. They used to purposely destroy their equipment in space to prevent it from falling into the wrong hands, but now refrain from that practice. Newly designed crafts and operating procedures also play a part in helping to keep space clean, while researchers continue to investigate safe ways to clean up the debris that currently exists. Everything from forcing the debris to reenter the atmosphere in a controlled manner to nudging it away from the Earth's orbit has been discussed. An activity such as collecting garbage from inside the space station and sending it back to Earth to burn up at reentry is one tangible way space explorers are helping to ensure the reduction of space clutter.¶ At this time there is no international treaty on how to deal with space debris; however, several nations have joined together to form the Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Committee (IADC). The IADC assesses the subject of space debris and how it should be handled in the future. Japan, like the United States, has developed a list of safety policies regarding space debris. Because this is ultimately a global issue, other countries such as France, The Netherlands, and Germany have jumped on the bandwagon with regard to addressing this issue.

#### 3] Space lasers solve – explode the debris so it doesn’t damage space craft.

Venton 15 (Danielle Venton, science writer for Wired 5/12/15 "The Mad Plan to Clean Up Space Junk With a Laser Cannon" [www.wired.com/2015/05/laser-cannon-space-debris/](http://www.wired.com/2015/05/laser-cannon-space-debris/) DD)

IF A TEAM of astronomers has its way, the International Space Station will be outfitted with a spiffy laser-wielding telescope. No, no, hold on—it’s not to kill aliens or rebel civilizations. It’s to clean up a huge mess.¶ If anything rivals the human drive for exploration, it is the apparent need to leave a spectacular plume of trash in our wake. In space, the problem is becoming acute. Decades of discarded satellites and unchecked collisions have left some 3,000 tons of debris in orbit. That’s roughly 15 blue whales, 600 elephants, or 1,500 cars.¶ Mankind’s slovenly ways threaten our continued use of space-based satellites, which have become a core component of modern technological infrastructure. You’ve probably used those satellites dozens of ways so far today. Have you sent a text? Watched TV? Used GPS? Checked the weather? If you’d like to keep doing these things, astronomers will soon need to find a way of tidying up low Earth orbit. In that region, between 100 and 1,250 miles above the planet, mere flecks of paint (of which there are many) travel with sufficient force to sever electrical wires, dent spacecraft, and kill astronauts.¶ Lasers could be the saviors in operation Orbital Clean House. A team of astronomers at Japan’s RIKEN, a network of basic-research laboratories, have proposed adding debris-zapping capabilities to a telescope they are already developing for the ISS. They plan to start on a small scale, with a laser no more powerful than the pointer you use to play with your cat. In time, the power could be increased to become a proper laser cannon. (Yes, dear reader, a laser cannon.)¶ If the notion of lasers in space sounds slightly terrifying, you’re not alone. “The problem with it is mostly political,” says Don Kessler, who spent more than 30 years at NASA’s Johnson Space Center. “Everyone is afraid you are going to weaponize space.” Kessler began the field of studying orbital debris and lends his name to “Kessler syndrome,” a scenario in which colliding debris begins a cascade of increasing debris and destruction.¶ If you can take out a derelict satellite or rocket body, you also have the ability to kill a working satellite. And given how important satellites are to militaries, an attack could prompt a war. But if astronomers are going to put a laser cannon anywhere above Earth, the ISS would be the place to do it. Bolting the proposed laser to the ostensibly neutral space station—which already must make frequent maneuvers to avoid larger, tracked pieces of debris—might be a way to make a scientifically sound idea politically sound as well.¶ For the team at RIKEN, the proposed laser cannon is a way to not only clean up their beloved orbits but also make their telescope, the Extreme Universe Space Observatory, more practically relevant, says project scientist Marco Casolino. With its wide field of view and the ability to register even the quickest flashes of light, the scope would be well suited for spotting debris as it whizzes past the ISS.¶ Now, the RIKEN team isn’t the first to suggest lasers as debris-fighting tools: Scientists have for at least 30 years kicked around the idea of laser-vaporizing an object’s surface and knocking it into the atmosphere to burn up. Nor is it the only plan currently in development.¶ The European Union is supporting a project called Stardust which is analyzing how to handle space debris and threatening asteroids (items they call “non-cooperative targets”)—and may settle on lasers as the best plan. Stardust is led by Massimiliano Vasile, of the University of Strathclyde’s Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. Vasile and his team previously came up with a proposal to use a swarm of navigable laser-equipped satellites to launch coordinated attacks against non-cooperative targets. The project was known, appropriately, as Laser Bees.¶ In the United States, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—which publishes Orbital Debris Quarterly News, a must read for space junk enthusiasts—proposes fighting space debris with a ground-based laser. (No NASA official could be reached before deadline for comment.) Non-lasery ideas are abundant too, coming in the form of reusable spacecraft launched off modified jumbo jets or electrodynamic space tethers to slow orbiting junk by accosting it with electricity.

#### 4] Space debris creates existential deterrence and a taboo

Bowen 18 [(Bleddyn, lecturer in International Relations at the University of Leicester) “The Art of Space Deterrence,” European Leadership Network, February 20, 2018, https://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/commentary/the-art-of-space-deterrence/] TDI

Fourth, the ubiquity of space infrastructure and the fragility of the space environment may create a degree of existential deterrence. As space is so useful to modern economies and military forces, a large-scale disruption of space infrastructure may be so intuitively escalatory to decision-makers that there may be a natural caution against a wholesale assault on a state’s entire space capabilities because the consequences of doing so approach the mentalities of total war, or nuclear responses if a society begins tearing itself apart because of the collapse of optimised energy grids and just-in-time supply chains. In addition, the problem of space debris and the political-legal hurdles to conducting debris clean-up operations mean that even a handful of explosive events in space can render a region of Earth orbit unusable for everyone. This could caution a country like China from excessive kinetic intercept missions because its own military and economy is increasingly reliant on outer space, but perhaps not a country like North Korea which does not rely on space. The usefulness, sensitivity, and fragility of space may have some existential deterrent effect. China’s catastrophic anti-satellite weapons test in 2007 is a valuable lesson for all on the potentially devastating effect of kinetic warfare in orbit.

#### 5] No impact to debris – it hits stations all the time.

Cain ’15 (Fraser; 12/23/15; writer for Universe Today; “How Do Astronauts Avoid Debris”; http://www.universetoday.com/121067/how-do-astronauts-avoid-debris)

So, just how do we keep our space stations, ships and astronauts from being riddled with holes from all of the space junk in orbit around Earth? We revel in the terror grab bag of all the magical ways to get snuffed in space. Almost as much as we celebrate the giant brass backbones of the people who travel there. We’ve already talked about all the scary ways that astronauts can die in space. My personal recurring “Hail Mary full of grace, please don’t let me die in space” nightmare is orbital debris. We’re talking about a vast collection of spent rockets, dead satellites, flotsam, jetsam, lagan and derelict. It’s not a short list. NASA figures there are **21,000 bits of junk** bigger than 10 cm, **500,000 particles** between 1 and 10 cm, and more than **100 million** smaller than 1 cm. Sound familiar, humans? This is our high tech, sci fi great Pacific garbage patch. Sure, a tiny rivet or piece of scrap foil doesn’t sound very dangerous, but consider the fact that astronauts are orbiting the Earth at a velocity of about 28,000 km/h. And the Tang packets, uneaten dehydrated ice cream, and astronaut poops are also traveling at 28,000 km/h. Then think about what happens when they collide. Yikes… or yuck. Here’s the International Space Station’s solar array. See that tiny hole? Embiggen and clarinosticate! That’s a tiny puncture hole made in the array by a piece of orbital crap. The whole station is **pummeled by tiny pieces of space program junk drawer contents**. Back when the Space Shuttle was flying, NASA had to **constantly replace their windows because of the damage they were experiencing** from the orbital equivalent of Dennis the Menace hurling paint chips, fingernail clippings, and frozen scabs.

### 1NC – AT: Cap

#### 1] 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.

#### 2] Capitalism is comparatively the most ethical system - greed is innate - capitalism prevents it from getting out of hand because all exchanges are inevitable

Bast and Walberg 3 (Joseph, Fellow @ The American Association for the Advancement of Science and Founder @ The International Academy of Education, Herbert, Distinguished Visiting Fellow @ Hoover, “Education and Capitalism,” Chapter 6, <http://media.hoover.org/sites/default/files/documents/0817939717_137.pdf>)

Recognizing the challenge capitalism presents to some of our traditional notions of morality does not mean that capitalism is an immoral way to organize an economy. The most common error made by critics of capitalism is failing to recognize that greed or ambition (the desire to gain power or distinction without regard to its effects on others) long predates capitalism. Greed, Max Weber wrote in 1904, “exists and has existed among waiters, physicians, coachmen, artists, prostitutes, dishonest officials, soldiers, nobles, crusaders, gamblers, and beggars. One may say that it has been common to all sorts and conditions of men at all times and in all countries of the earth, wherever the objective possibility of it is or has been given.” 6 All political and economic systems must cope with greed. Societies that rely on tradition to shape their economies allow some people—usually those with inherited status or willingness to use force against others—to express their greed by imposing their will on others. Sociologist Orlando Patterson calls this sovereignal freedom, or the freedom to rule others. 7 Nietzsche termed it “Will to Power.” Although it may fulfill the material and psychological needs of those who exercise it, this is the freedom that led to the slave societies of ancient Rome, the nationalism of Nazism, and the tribal societies of much of impoverished Africa today. Socialism, as it was formulated by Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, and the British Fabians, assumed greed to be a social phenomenon conjured by man’s alienation from his work and the rest of society, allegedly caused by the institutions of capitalism. Greed could be extinguished, they thought, if social institutions were organized along collectivist lines, such as those described in the 1962 Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union: Joint planned labor by the members of society, their daily participation in the management of state and public affairs, and the development of communist relations of comradely cooperation and mutual support, recast the minds of people in a spirit of collectivism, industry, and humanism. Increased communist consciousness of the people furthers the ideological and political unity of the workers, collective farmers, and intellectuals and promotes their gradual fusion in the single collective of the working people of communist society. 8 The New Soviet Man, as he was called, never emerged. Repression of the most severe type was justified in the spirit of collectivism, and the result was a criminal society. Socialists are quick to deny that the collapse of the Soviet Union reflects in any way on the tenets of their faith. But the passage of time has revealed that the rot that destroyed the footings of the Soviet Union began in the denial of individual liberty, especially the denial of property rights that stands at the core of socialist thinking. 9 Unlike its alternatives, capitalism does a remarkably good job of constraining greed and ambition. The most basic rule of capitalism—that all exchanges are voluntary—is a formidable check on the pursuit of selfish interest at the expense of others. In a capitalist society, attaining wealth, respect, and status requires appealing to the self-interest of others, specifically by discovering, creating, and delivering goods and services that others are willing to buy. Getting around this requirement— attempting to live at other people’s expense by using force or fraud to take things from them or enslave them—violates the laws of property, exchange, and voluntary contract. Assuming government is performing its proper role, those who would break the rules are stopped and punished. Capitalism goes beyond simply checking greed and ambition by yoking the pursuit of self-interest to the advancement of the public good. Once we learn the use of force is forbidden, we discover that the more effectively we serve others the greater the rewards we receive. As explained in Chapter 4, markets tend to place control over goods and property in the hands of those who value them most and who make decisions that produce the most benefit to others. Competition makes the ban on the use of coercion self-enforcing because others will refuse to trade or contract with us if we violate the rules.

#### 3] Capitalism is key to growth – and also reductions in poverty.

Skarbek, 10 – Research Fellow at the Independent Institute, founding Director of the Institute's Center on Entrepreneurial Innovation (COEI) and the COEI Government Cost Calculator, and Lecturer in the Department of Political Economy at King's College in London, England. She received her Ph.D. in economics from George Mason University, and she has been Assistant Professor of Economics at San Jose State University and an F.A. Hayek Scholar, and she is the recipient of the Don Lavoie Memorial Award.

Emily C. Skarbek, “Capitalism and Economic Growth,” Independent Institute. April 15, 2010. <https://www.independent.org/issues/article.asp?id=2769>

When the current administration talks of entrepreneurship, they speak of politically favored businesses and privileged recipients of the taxpayers’ dollars. To be clear, that is not entrepreneurship. It has become conventional to say that those who openly embrace capitalism, free markets and free trade are dogmatic, ideologues, idealistic, or market fundamentalists. And if you look to the media and our leaders, you get the impression that being in favor of free markets is somehow an unreasonable position.

Unless one is ashamed of unprecedented increases in income, rising life expectancy, greater education, and more political freedom, there is no reason to be a fair-weather fan of capitalism. Sprawling free markets in countries that became more capitalist over the last 25 years have meant many more people enjoy improvements in well being and opportunities to advance human capabilities.

There is no evidence that countries that eschewed freer markets and embraced substantially greater state control performed better on any of these major indicators. On the contrary, those countries that adopt increased taxation, increased regulation, fiscal mismanagement and enormous public debt have performed demonstrably worse.

From a global perspective, we have witnessed remarkable progress of mankind through the increased acceptance of free market policies in both rich and poor countries. Before the industrial revolution, 80% of the world’s population lived in abject poverty. By 1980, that number has fallen to 34.8% and by 2000, less than 20% of the population lives on less than $1 a day. In five years, the number is expected to fall to 10% if free trade is allowed to flourish.

In just the past 25 years increased private ownership, increased free trade, and lower taxes all came at the hands of politicians like Deng Xiaoping in China, Margaret Thatcher in England, and Ronald Reagan in United States. In the years following the adoption of these policies by these global leaders, per capita income nearly doubled from 1980 to 2005; Tariffs fell and trade increased; Schooling and life expectancy grew rapidly, while infant mortality and poverty fell just as fast.

In the average country that became more capitalist over the last 25 years, the average citizen gained a 43% increase in income, nearly half a decade in life expectancy, and a 2-year increase in the average years of schooling. In my lifetime alone, freer markets have improved the lives of billions of people from all walks of life.

When we look back at our own history, the tremendous economic growth that Americans experienced from the time of the original Tea Party up to 1914 was the result of economic freedom from government regulation, open boarders for free immigration, and very few trade restrictions on the global flow of goods, services, and capital. Anyone could get on a boat, land on Ellis Island and become an immigrant and this benefited both domestic Americans and the immigrant alike. Business and labor were free to be entrepreneurial—and entrepreneurship created wealth. But we don’t want wealth for wealth’s sake. Wealth allows for the improvement of the human condition.

For example, in 1905, our average life expectancy in the U.S. was 47. Today it is 78. A hundred years ago only 14% of homes had a bathtub; 8% had a phone; 95% of all births took place at home; most women washed their hair once a month; and the average worker made about $300 per year.

As recent as 1984, it took the average American wage earner 456 hours of labor to earn enough to purchase a cellphone. Today, it takes the average American 4 hours. A computer has fallen from costing 435 hours of labor to less than 20. None of this accounts for the tremendous improvements in technological capacity. There are several reasons that the costs of goods have dropped so drastically, but perhaps the biggest is increased international trade.

Simply put, the free market means the poor are less poor. Globalization extends and deepens a capitalist system that has for generations been lifting American living standards—for high-income households, of course, but for low-income ones as well. When the world embraces free market reforms, the world economy expanded greatly, the quality of life improves sharply for billions of people, and dire poverty was substantially scaled back. This is not a coincidence.

It is a well-established fact that when people are free to buy from, sell to, and invest with one another as they choose, they can achieve far more than when governments attempt to control economic decisions. Widening the circle of people with whom we transact—including across political borders—brings benefits to consumers in the form of lower prices, greater variety, and better quality, and it allows companies to reap the benefits of innovation, specialization, and economies of scale that larger markets bring. Free markets are essential to prosperity, and expanding free markets as much as possible enhances that prosperity.

Voluntary economic exchange is inherently fair and does not justify government intervention. When two free people come together on terms they have agreed upon to exchange peacefully, both benefit. Government intervention in voluntary economic exchange on behalf of some citizens at the expense of others is inherently unfair. One person is coerced in order to privilege another. It really is that simple.

When goods, services, labor and capital flow freely across U.S. borders, Americans can take full advantage of the opportunities of the international marketplace. They can buy the best or least expensive goods and services the world has to offer; they can sell to the most promising markets; they can choose among the best investment opportunities; and they can tap into the worldwide pool of capital. Study after study has shown that countries that are more open to the global economy grow faster and achieve higher incomes than those that are relatively closed. This is capitalism.

Growth is not guaranteed. It seems obvious that the central challenges facing America have to do with the with predatory regulatory and tax policies conducted by governments domestic and abroad. From an economic perspective, then, the case for unilateral trade liberalization—that is reducing our own trade barriers and subsidies without preconditions or reciprocal commitments from other countries—is the best policy to promote peace and prosperity globally.

Politically, however, the concentrated and organized beneficiaries of protectionism are powerful relative to the much larger, disorganized, beneficiaries of free trade. Politicians tend to be most responsive to the loudest interest groups and are therefore inclined to view free trade unfavorably. But we as Americans must be clear—capitalism is not evil. It has done more good for more people than any acts of state, any stimulus spending, any health program or welfare initiative. Americans can no longer afford to fear freedom.

Finally, acknowledging the relationship between free markets and economic prosperity does not make someone “dogmatic”. It is unreasonable to continue to ignore these facts. Capitalism’s superiority for economic growth and development deserves the unqualified support of everyone who believe that wealth is better than poverty, life is better than death, and liberty is better than oppression.

#### That outweighs---and turns sustainability.

Smith ’18 – assistant professor of finance at Stony Brook University

Noah. September 19. “Saving the Planet Doesn’t Mean Killing Economic Growth” <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2018-09-19/saving-the-planet-doesn-t-mean-killing-economic-growth>

In the 19th and 20th centuries, a few countries got fabulously rich. These included most of Europe, parts of East Asia, some small oil producing states and parts of the former British Empire. In recent decades, more of the world — large parts of China, portions of India, Southeast Asia and part of Latin America — have joined the rich world, thanks to an unprecedented explosion of global growth. But for large swathes of the world, life remains a grinding daily struggle. Women in poor countries spend hours every day carrying water. Hundreds of millions of people contract malaria every year. Almost a billion people still defecate outdoors.

The obvious solution to lifting these people out of poverty — without inflicting poverty on some of those who have already escaped it — is economic growth. But there is a small but vocal group of environmentalists telling us that growth is no longer possible — that unless growth ends, climate change and other environmental impacts will destroy civilization. Writing in Foreign Policy, anthropologist Jason Hickel declares:

Once we reach the limits of efficiency, pursuing any degree of economic growth drives resource use back up … Ultimately, bringing our civilization back within planetary boundaries is going to require that we liberate ourselves from our dependence on economic growth—starting with rich nations.

Hickel cites analyses by the United Nations Environment Program and others showing that even big improvements in resource efficiency, encouraged by very high carbon taxes, will be unable to halt overall resource use or global carbon emissions. But this evidence doesn’t support Hickel’s conclusions, which rely on several misconceptions about the nature and the importance of growth.

First, Hickel doesn’t seem to grapple with the fact that most economic growth now happens in countries that are relatively poor. The International Monetary Fund estimates that from 2010 to 2015, emerging markets and developing countries were responsible for about 70 percent of global output and consumption growth, while advanced economies were responsible for the rest. The World Bank’s forecasts for 2017-2019 are similar:

China’s contribution to global growth will be double that of the U.S., and India’s will be larger than that of the entire euro zone.

The same is true of greenhouse gas emissions. Since about 1990, emissions from the U.S. and EU have fallen, while emissions from developing countries, especially China and India, have exploded:

In 2017, the International Energy Agency estimated that the growth in energy-related carbon emissions in China and the rest of developing Asia was more than five times the growth in the European Union, while U.S. emissions declined.

In other words, if Hickel and others stop economic growth, it won’t be rich countries that bear the brunt of the change. It will be poor and middle-income countries like India and China. African countries that are still desperately poor will not even get their chance.

Hickel tries to avoid this outcome by declaring that “We can improve people’s lives right now simply by sharing what we already have more fairly,” but even total global redistribution — which is, of course, far outside of the realm of political and logistical possibility — would afford the average person a standard of living only slightly better than that now enjoyed in China. A realistic amount of redistribution would do far less for the global poor — meaning they’d be the ones on the hook in a zero-growth world.

The second thing that Hickel leaves out is the connection between growth and fertility. Once countries pass per-capita gross domestic product of $10,000, fertility rates rapidly drop to or below the replacement rate of 2.1 children per woman. Halting growth now would leave most African countries trapped well below that magic level, meaning their population growth — and thus, the world’s population growth — would continue without limit. That in turn would eventually overwhelm the world’s resources — if not in terms of the climate, then certainly in terms of fresh water and food.

Fortunately, Hickel and the zero-growth environmentalists ignore a third crucial factor — technology. In rich countries, growth has shifted somewhat from physical things to digital services, which require much less energy consumption. Even more importantly, green energy, especially solar power, has progressed by leaps and bounds:

In many regions, wind and solar are already cheaper than coal power, and electric vehicles are rapidly becoming more common. This incredible technological progress means that rich countries could see a renewable-powered electrical grid and fully electrified transportation before the century is out. More importantly, cheap renewable energy means that poor countries in Africa and South Asia will be able to follow a different, cleaner path to industrialization without sacrificing living standards. Ultimately, technological progress will be much more important for limiting global resource use than the energy-efficiency measures Hickel considers.

In the movie “Avengers: Infinity War,” the supervillain Thanos kills off half the universe in a misguided attempt to prevent resource overuse. The zero-growth environmentalists are embracing a solution only slightly less destructive. Thanos’s better course would have been to use his vast powers to provide the universe with renewable energy technology that would let them get rich — and lower their fertility rates — without destroying the environment. Environmentalists in the real world should take that approach as well.

#### 4] And solves interstate conflicts which outweighs, while also net-reducing intrastate conflicts

Griswold 07

Daniel Griswold directs the Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute, Cato Institute, April 20, 2007, “Trade, Democracy and Peace: The Virtuous Cycle”, http://www.cato.org/publications/speeches/trade-democracy-peace-virtuous-cycle

The Peace Dividend of Globalization

The good news does not stop there. Buried beneath the daily stories about suicide bombings and insurgency movements is an underappreciated but encouraging fact: **The world has** somehow **become** a **more peaceful** place.

A little-noticed headline on an Associated Press story a while back reported, “War declining worldwide, studies say.” In 2006, a survey by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute found that **the number of** armed **conflicts around the world has been in decline for the past half-century**. Since the early 1990s, ongoing conflicts have dropped from 33 to 17, with all of them now civil conflicts within countries. The Institute’s latest report found that 2005 marked the second year in a row that no two nations were at war with one another. What a remarkable and wonderful fact.

**The death toll** from war **has also been falling**. According to the Associated Press report, “The number killed in battle has fallen to its lowest point in the post-World War II period, dipping below 20,000 a year by one measure. Peacemaking missions, meanwhile, are growing in number.” Current estimates of people killed by war are down sharply from annual tolls ranging from 40,000 to 100,000 in the 1990s, and from a peak of 700,000 in 1951 during the Korean War.

Many causes lie behind the good news—the end of the Cold War and the spread of democracy, among them—but **expanding trade** and globalization **appear to be playing a major role in promoting world peace.** Far from stoking a “World on Fire,” as one misguided American author argued in a forgettable book, growing commercial ties between nations have had **a dampening effect on armed conflict and war**. I would argue that free trade and globalization have promoted peace in **three main ways**.

First, as I argued a moment ago, **trade** and globalization have **reinforced the trend toward democracy**, and **democracies tend not to pick fights with each other**. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world’s countries today are democracies—a record high. Some studies have cast doubt on the idea that democracies are less likely to fight wars. While it’s true that democracies rarely if ever war with each other, it is not such a rare occurrence for democracies to engage in wars with non-democracies. We can still hope that **has more countries turn to democracy, there will be fewer provocations for war** by non-democracies.

A second and even more potent way that trade has promoted peace is by **promoting** more **economic integration**. **As national economies become** **more intertwined** with each other, those **nations have more to lose should war break out.** War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also **ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage** on the economy. In short, **globalization** has **dramatically raised the economic cost of war.**

The 2005 Economic Freedom of the World Report contains an insightful chapter on “Economic Freedom and Peace” by Dr. Erik Gartzke, a professor of political science at Columbia University. Dr. Gartzke compares the propensity of countries to engage in wars and their level of economic freedom and concludes that **economic freedom**, including the freedom to trade, **significantly decreases the probability** that **a country will experience a military dispute with another** country. Through econometric analysis, he found that, “Making economies freer translates into making countries more peaceful. At the extremes, **the least free states are about 14 times as conflict prone as the most free.**”

By the way, Dr. Gartzke’s analysis found that economic freedom was a far more important variable in determining a countries propensity to go to war than democracy.

A third reason why **free trade** promotes peace is because it **allows nations to acquire wealth through production and exchange rather than conquest** of territory and resources. As economies develop, wealth is increasingly measured in terms of **i**ntellectual **p**roperty, financial assets, and human capital. Such **assets cannot be easily seized by armies**. In contrast, hard assets such as minerals and farmland are becoming relatively less important in a high-tech, service economy. **If people need resources outside their national borders, say oil or timber or farm products, they** can **acquire them peacefully by trading away what they** can **produce** best **at home**. In short, globalization and the development it has spurred have **rendered** the **spoils of war less valuable.**

Of course, free trade and globalization do not guarantee peace. Hot-blooded nationalism and ideological fervor can overwhelm cold economic calculations. Any relationship involving human beings will be messy and non-linier. There will always be exceptions and outliers in such complex relationships involving economies and governments. But **deep trade** and investment **ties among nations make war less attractive.**

A Virtuous Cycle of Democracy, Peace and Trade

The global trends we’ve witnessed in the spread of trade, democracy and peace tend to **reinforce each** other in a grand and virtuous cycle. As trade and development encourage more representative government, those governments provide more predictability and incremental reform, creating a better climate for trade and investment to flourish. And as the spread of trade and democracy foster peace, the decline of war creates a more hospitable environment for trade and economic growth and political stability.

We can see this virtuous cycle at work in the world today. The European Union just celebrated its 50th birthday. For many of the same non-economic reasons that motivated the founders of the GATT, the original members of the European community hoped to build a more sturdy foundation for peace. Out of the ashes of World War II, the United States urged Germany, France and other Western European nations to form a common market that has become the European Union. In large part because of their intertwined economies, a general **war in Europe is now unthinkable.**

**In East Asia**, the **extensive** and growing **economic ties among** Mainland **China, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan is helping** to **keep the peace**. China’s communist rulers may yet decide to go to war over its “renegade province,” but **the economic cost** to their economy **would be staggering and** could **provoke** a **backlash among its citizens**. In contrast, poor and isolated North Korea is all the more dangerous because it has nothing to lose economically should it provoke a war.

In Central America, countries that were racked by guerrilla wars and death squads two decades ago have turned not only to democracy but to expanding trade, culminating in the Central American Free Trade Agreement with the United States. As the Stockholm Institute reported in its 2005 Yearbook, “Since the 1980s, **the introduction of a more open economic model in** most states of the **Latin American** and Caribbean region **has been accompanied by** the **growth of** new **regional structures, the dying out of interstate conflicts and** a **reduction in intra-state conflicts.”**

#### 5] Capitalism solves environmental crisis - industrial development, technological advances, and any alternative fails

Zitelmann 20 [(Dr. Rainer, a historian and sociologist. He is also a world-renowned author, successful businessman and real estate investor. Zitelmann has written a total of 24 books and has a doctorate in political science and sociology) “‘System Change Not Climate Change’: Capitalism And Environmental Destruction” Forbes, 7/13/2020] BC

The Price Of Growth—Destruction Of The Environment?

But isn’t there a price for this growth: environment devastation? Of course, nobody would deny that industrialization causes environmental problems. But the assertion that growth automatically leads to ever accelerating environmental degradation is simply false. Yale University’s Environmental Performance Index (EPI) uses 16 indicators to rank countries on environmental health, air quality, water, biodiversity, natural resources and pollution. These indicators have been selected to reflect both the current baseline and the dynamics of national ecosystems. One of the Index’s most striking findings is that there is a strong correlation between a state’s wealth and its environmental performance. Most developed capitalist countries achieve high environmental standards. Those countries with the worst EPI scores, such as Ethiopia, Mali, Mauritania, Chad and Niger, are all poor. They have both low investment capacity for infrastructure, including water and sanitation, and tend to have weak environmental regulatory authorities.

Contrary to prevailing perceptions, industrial development and technological advances have contributed significantly to relieving the burden on the environment. Both Indur Goklany in his book The Improving State of the World and Steven Pinker in chapter ten (“The Environment”) of his book Enlightenment Now demonstrate that we are not only living longer, healthier lives in unprecedented prosperity, but we are also doing so on a comparatively clean planet.

Researchers have confirmed that economic freedom—in other words, more capitalism—leads to higher, not lower, environmental quality.

Every year, the Heritage Foundation compiles its Index of Economic Freedom, which analyzes individual levels of economic freedom, and thus capitalism, in countries around the world. The Heritage Foundation’s researchers also measure the correlation between each country’s environmental performance and its economic freedom. The results couldn’t be clearer: the world’s most economically free countries achieve the highest environmental performance rankings with an average score of 76.1, followed by the countries that are “mostly free,” which score an average of 69.5. In stark contrast, the economically “repressed” and “mostly unfree” countries all score less than 50 for environmental performance.

Is Government The Best Solution To Environmental Problems?

Anti-capitalists frequently claim that central government is the best solution to environmental problems. And there is no doubt that state regulations to safeguard the environment are important. But state regulations, cited by anti-capitalists as a panacea for environmental issues, often achieve the opposite of what they were intended to do. Hardly any other country in the world touts its green credentials as much as Germany. According to even the most conservative estimates, Germany’s so-called “energy transition” is set to cost a total of almost €500 billion by 2025.

But the results of this massive investment is sobering, as an analysis by McKinsey reveals, “Germany is set to miss several key energy transition targets for the year 2020, and the country’s high power supply security is at risk unless new generation capacity and grid infrastructure are built in time for the coal and nuclear exit and electrification of transportation networks is accelerated.”

For decades, environmentalists in Germany focused on shutting down nuclear power plants. However, the phasing out of nuclear power has left Germany in a poor position in terms of CO2 emissions compared to other countries. It is not without good reason that Germany’s energy policy has been described as the dumbest in the world.

The latest generation of nuclear power plants are much safer than their predecessors. Despite what environmentalists might claim, impartial calculations have confirmed that it is impossible to meet the world’s energy needs from solar and wind power alone. Enlightened environmentalists are therefore now calling for nuclear power to be rightfully included in the fight against climate change. And yet, this is precisely what is being prevented in Germany by politicians—not capitalism. This example, just one of many, shows that government environmental policy is often ineffective. In some instances, it even achieves the opposite of what it was originally intended to, i.e. it exacerbates existing environmental problems.

It is also wrong to think that capitalism necessarily leads to ever greater waste of limited natural resources. Just take the smartphone for example, one of the most environmentally friendly of capitalism’s many achievements. With just one small device, a whole plethora of devices that used to consume resources in the past, such as the telephone, camera, calculator, navigation system, dictation machine, alarm clock, flashlight and many others, have been replaced. Smartphones also help to reduce the consumption of paper as many people choose not to take notes on paper and, for example, use their iPhone instead of a calendar to enter appointments.

Those who call for “system change” instead of “climate change” do not usually say which system they would prefer. All they are really sure of is that any new system should not be based on free market economics and that the state should play the decisive role. The simple fact is that socialism has failed in every country every time it has been tried—and socialism has damaged the environment more than any capitalist system. Murray Feshbach documents examples of the environmental destruction wrought by socialism in his book Ecological Disaster. Cleaning Up the Hidden Legacy of the Soviet Regime. As the book progresses through chapters such as “A Nuclear Plague,” “Dying Lakes, Rivers, and Inland Seas” and “Pollution of the Air and Land,” it becomes clear that this non-capitalist system was responsible for the greatest environmental destruction in history. Anti-capitalists may well reply that they do not want a system like the Soviet Union. And yet, they cannot name a single real-world system—at any time in the history of mankind—that provides better environmental solutions than capitalism.