## 1

#### Interp: The affirmative may only garner offense from the hypothetical implementation that the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust and may not garner offense external to that.

#### Resolved indicates a policy action.

**Parcher 1**. [Jeff. 2/26/01. “Re: Jeff P--Is the resolution a question?” [https://web.archive.org/web/20050122044927/http://www.ndtceda.com/archives/200102/0790.html](https://web.archive.org/web/20050122044927/http:/www.ndtceda.com/archives/200102/0790.html)] Justin

(1) Pardon me if I turn to a source besides Bill. American Heritage Dictionary: Resolve: 1. To make a firm decision about. 2. To decide or express by formal vote. 3. To separate something into constiutent parts See Syns at \*analyze\* (emphasis in orginal) 4. Find a solution to. See Syns at \*Solve\* (emphasis in original) 5. To dispel: resolve a doubt. - n 1. Frimness of purpose; resolution. 2. A determination or decision. (2) The very nature of the word "resolution" makes it a question. American Heritage: A course of action determined or decided on. A formal statemnt of a deciion, as by a legislature. (3) The resolution is obviously a question. Any other conclusion is utterly inconcievable. Why? Context. The debate community empowers a topic committee to write a topic for ALTERNATE side debating. The committee is not a random group of people coming together to "reserve" themselves about some issue. There is context - they are empowered by a community to do something. In their deliberations, the topic community attempts to craft a resolution which can be ANSWERED in either direction. They focus on issues like ground and fairness because they know the resolution will serve as the basis for debate which will be resolved by determining the policy desireablility of that resolution. That's not only what they do, but it's what we REQUIRE them to do. We don't just send the topic committtee somewhere to adopt their own group resolution. It's not the end point of a resolution adopted by a body - it's the prelimanary wording of a resolution sent to others to be answered or decided upon. (4) Further context: the word resolved is used to emphasis the fact that it's policy debate. Resolved comes from the adoption of resolutions by legislative bodies. A resolution is either adopted or it is not. It's a question before a legislative body. Should this statement be adopted or not.

#### The appropriation of outer space is permanent control.

TIMOTHY JUSTIN **TRAPP**, JD Candidate @ UIUC Law, **’13**, TAKING UP SPACE BY ANY OTHER MEANS: COMING TO TERMS WITH THE NONAPPROPRIATION ARTICLE OF THE OUTER SPACE TREATY UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LAW REVIEW [Vol. 2013 No. 4]

The issues presented in relation to the nonappropriation article of the Outer Space Treaty should be clear.214 The ITU has, quite blatantly, created something akin to “property interests in outer space.”215 It allows nations to exclude others from their orbital slots, even when the nation is not currently using that slot.216 This is directly in line with at least one definition of outer-space appropriation.217 [\*\*Start Footnote 217\*\*Id. at 236 (“**Appropriation of outer space**, **therefore, is ‘the exercise of exclusive control or exclusive use’ with a sense of permanence, which limits other nations’ access to i**t.”) (quoting Milton L. Smith, The Role of the ITU in the Development of Space Law, 17 ANNALS AIR & SPACE L. 157, 165 (1992)). \*\*End Footnote 217\*\*]The ITU even allows nations with unused slots to devise them to other entities, creating a market for the property rights set up by this regulation.218 In some aspects, this seems to effect exactly what those signatory nations of the Bogotá Declaration were trying to accomplish, albeit through different means.219

#### Violation: They don’t: At best they’re extra topical which is a voter for exploding limits and inflating aff solvency or effects topical which is worse, since any small aff can spill up to the resolution.

#### Vote neg for competitive equity and clash: changing the topic favors the aff because it destroys the only stasis point and makes prep impossible because any ground is self-serving, concessionary, and from distorted literature bases. Their model allows someone to specialize for 4 years giving them an edge over people who switch every 2 months. Filter this through debate’s nature of being a game where both teams want to win, which becomes meaningless without constraints.

#### Topicality must be a voting issue evaluated through competing interps– the role of the ballot is to vote for whoever does the better debating over the resolutional question. Any 1AR role for debate must explain why we switch sides and why there has to be a winner and a loser – switching sides within the competitive yet limited bounds of the topic performs the labor of the negative which avoids group polarization and untested advocacy

Ralf Poscher 16, director of the Institute for Staatswissenschaft & Philosophy of Law, Professor of Public Law and Legal Philosophy, “Why We Argue About the Law: An Agonistic Account of Legal Disagreement,” in *Metaphilosophy of Law*, ed. Gizbert-Studnicki, Dyrda, Banas, 2/19/16, SSRN//Recut Aanya

Hegel’s dialectical thinking powerfully exploits the idea of negation. It is a central feature of spirit and consciousness that they have the power to negate. The spirit “is this power only by looking the negative in the face and tarrying with it. This […] is the magical power that converts it into being.”102 The tarrying with the negative is part of what Hegel calls the “labour of the negative”103. In a loose reference to this Hegelian notion Gerald Postema points to yet another feature of disagreements as a necessary ingredient of the process of practical reasoning. Only if our reasoning is exposed to contrary arguments can we test its merits. We must go through the “labor of the negative” to have trust in our deliberative processes.104 This also holds where we seem to be in agreement. Agreement without exposure to disagreement can be deceptive in various ways. The first phenomenon Postema draws attention to is the group polarization effect. When a group of like‐minded people deliberates an issue, informational and reputational cascades produce more extreme views in the process of their deliberations.105 The polarization and biases that are well documented for such groups 106 can be countered at least in some settings by the inclusion of dissenting voices. In these scenarios, disagreement can be a cure for dysfunctional deliberative polarization and biases.107 A second deliberative dysfunction mitigated by disagreement is superficial agreement, which can even be manipulatively used in the sense of a “presumptuous ‘We’”108. Disagreement can help to police such distortions of deliberative processes by challenging superficial agreements. Disagreements may thus signal that a deliberative process is not contaminated with dysfunctional agreements stemming from polarization or superficiality. Protecting our discourse against such contaminations is valuable even if we do not come to terms. Each of the opposing positions will profit from the catharsis it received “by looking the negative in the face and tarrying with it”. These advantages of disagreement in collective deliberations are mirrored on the individual level. Even if the probability of reaching a consensus with our opponents is very low from the beginning, as might be the case in deeply entrenched conflicts, entering into an exchange of arguments can still serve to test and improve our position. We have to do the “labor of the negative” for ourselves. Even if we cannot come up with a line of argument that coheres well with everybody else’s beliefs, attitudes and dispositions, we can still come up with a line of argument that achieves this goal for our own personal beliefs, attitudes and dispositions. To provide ourselves with the most coherent system of our own beliefs, attitudes and dispositions is – at least in important issues – an aspect of personal integrity – to borrow one of Dworkin’s favorite expressions for a less aspirational idea. In hard cases we must – in some way – lay out the argument for ourselves to figure out what we believe to be the right answer. We might not know what we believe ourselves in questions of abortion, the death penalty, torture, and stem cell research, until we have developed a line of argument against the background of our subjective beliefs, attitudes and dispositions. In these cases it might be rational to discuss the issue with someone unlikely to share some of our more fundamental convictions or who opposes the view towards which we lean. This might even be the most helpful way of corroborating a view, because we know that our adversary is much more motivated to find a potential flaw in our argument than someone with whom we know we are in agreement. It might be more helpful to discuss a liberal position with Scalia than with Breyer if we want to make sure that we have not overlooked some counter‐argument to our case. It would be too narrow an understanding of our practice of legal disagreement and argumentation if we restricted its purpose to persuading an adversary in the case at hand and inferred from this narrow understanding the irrationality of argumentation in hard cases, in which we know beforehand that we will not be able to persuade. Rational argumentation is a much more complex practice in a more complex social framework. Argumentation with an adversary can have purposes beyond persuading him: to test one’s own convictions, to engage our opponent in inferential commitments and to persuade third parties are only some of these; to rally our troops or express our convictions might be others. To make our peace with Kant we could say that “there must be a hope of coming to terms” with someone though not necessarily with our opponent, but maybe only a third party or even just ourselves and not necessarily only on the issue at hand, but maybe through inferential commitments in a different arena. f) The Advantage Over Non‐Argumentative Alternatives It goes without saying that in real world legal disagreements, all of the reasons listed above usually play in concert and will typically hold true to different degrees relative to different participants in the debate: There will be some participants for whom our hope of coming to terms might still be justified and others for whom only some of the other reasons hold and some for whom it is a mixture of all of the reasons in shifting degrees as our disagreements evolve. It is also apparent that, with the exception of the first reason, the rationality of our disagreements is of a secondary nature. The rational does not lie in the discovery of a single right answer to the topic of debate, since in hard cases there are no single right answers. Instead, our disagreements are instrumental to rationales which lie beyond the topic at hand, like the exploration of our communalities or of our inferential commitments. Since these reasons are of this secondary nature, they must stand up to alternative ways of settling irreconcilable disagreements that have other secondary reasons in their favor – like swiftness of decision making or using fewer resources. Why does our legal practice require lengthy arguments and discursive efforts even in appellate or supreme court cases of irreconcilable legal disagreements? The closure has to come by some non‐argumentative mean and courts have always relied on them. For the medieval courts of the Germanic tradition it is bequeathed that judges had to fight it out literally if they disagreed on a question of law – though the king allowed them to pick surrogate fighters.109 It is understandable that the process of civilization has led us to non‐violent non‐ argumentative means to determine the law. But what was wrong with District Judge Currin of Umatilla County in Oregon, who – in his late days – decided inconclusive traffic violations by publicly flipping a coin?110 If we are counting heads at the end of our lengthy argumentative proceedings anyway, why not decide hard cases by gut voting at the outset and spare everybody the cost of developing elaborate arguments on questions, where there is not fact of the matter to be discovered? One reason lies in the mixed nature of our reasons in actual legal disagreements. The different second order reasons can be held apart analytically, but not in real life cases. The hope of coming to terms will often play a role at least for some time relative to some participants in the debate. A second reason is that the objectives listed above could not be achieved by a non‐argumentative procedure. Flipping a coin, throwing dice or taking a gut vote would not help us to explore our communalities or our inferential commitments nor help to scrutinize the positions in play. A third reason is the overall rational aspiration of the law that Dworkin relates to in his integrity account111. In a justificatory sense112 the law aspires to give a coherent account of itself – even if it is not the only right one – required by equal respect under conditions of normative disagreement.113 Combining legal argumentation with the non‐argumentative decision‐ making procedure of counting reasoned opinions serves the coherence aspiration of the law in at least two ways: First, the labor of the negative reduces the chances that constructions of the law that have major flaws or inconsistencies built into the arguments supporting them will prevail. Second, since every position must be a reasoned one within the given framework of the law, it must be one that somehow fits into the overall structure of the law along coherent lines. It thus protects against incoherent “checkerboard” treatments114 of hard cases. It is the combination of reasoned disagreement and the non‐rational decision‐making mechanism of counting reasoned opinions that provides for both in hard cases: a decision and one – of multiple possible – coherent constructions of the law. Pure non‐rational procedures – like flipping a coin – would only provide for the decision part. Pure argumentative procedures – which are not geared towards a decision procedure – would undercut the incentive structure of our agonistic disagreements.115 In the face of unresolvable disagreements endless debates would seem an idle enterprise. That the debates are about winning or losing helps to keep the participants engaged. That the decision depends on counting reasoned opinions guarantees that the engagement focuses on rational argumentation. No plain non‐argumentative procedure would achieve this result. If the judges were to flip a coin at the end of the trial in hard cases, there would be little incentive to engage in an exchange of arguments. It is specifically the count of reasoned opinions which provides for rational scrutiny in our legal disagreements and thus contributes to the rationales discussed above. 2. The Semantics of Agonistic Disagreements The agonistic account does not presuppose a fact of the matter, it is not accompanied by an ontological commitment, and the question of how the fact of the matter could be known to us is not even raised. Thus the agonistic account of legal disagreement is not confronted with the metaphysical or epistemological questions that plague one‐right‐answer theories in particular. However, it must still come up with a semantics that explains in what sense we disagree about the same issue and are not just talking at cross purposes. In a series of articles David Plunkett and Tim Sundell have reconstructed legal disagreements in semantic terms as metalinguistic negotiations on the usage of a term that at the center of a hard case like “cruel and unusual punishment” in a death‐penalty case.116 Even though the different sides in the debate define the term differently, they are not talking past each other, since they are engaged in a metalinguistic negotiation on the use of the same term. The metalinguistic negotiation on the use of the term serves as a semantic anchor for a disagreement on the substantive issues connected with the term because of its functional role in the law. The “cruel and unusual punishment”‐clause thus serves to argue about the permissibility of the death penalty. This account, however only provides a very superficial semantic commonality. But the commonality between the participants of a legal disagreement go deeper than a discussion whether the term “bank” should in future only to be used for financial institutions, which fulfills every criteria for semantic negotiations that Plunkett and Sundell propose. Unlike in mere semantic negotiations, like the on the disambiguation of the term “bank”, there is also some kind of identity of the substantive issues at stake in legal disagreements. A promising route to capture this aspect of legal disagreements might be offered by recent semantic approaches that try to accommodate the externalist challenges of realist semantics,117 which inspire one‐right‐answer theorists like Moore or David Brink. Neo‐ descriptivist and two‐valued semantics provide for the theoretical or interpretive element of realist semantics without having to commit to the ontological positions of traditional externalism. In a sense they offer externalist semantics with no ontological strings attached. The less controversial aspect of the externalist picture of meaning developed in neo‐ descriptivist and two‐valued semantics can be found in the deferential structure that our meaning‐providing intentions often encompass.118 In the case of natural kinds, speakers defer to the expertise of chemists when they employ natural kind terms like gold or water. If a speaker orders someone to buy $ 10,000 worth of gold as a safe investment, he might not know the exact atomic structure of the chemical element 79. In cases of doubt, though, he would insist that he meant to buy only stuff that chemical experts – or the markets for that matter – qualify as gold. The deferential element in the speaker’s intentions provides for the specific externalist element of the semantics. In the case of the law, the meaning‐providing intentions connected to the provisions of the law can be understood to defer in a similar manner to the best overall theory or interpretation of the legal materials. Against the background of such a semantic framework the conceptual unity of a linguistic practice is not ratified by the existence of a single best answer, but by the unity of the interpretive effort that extends to legal materials and legal practices that have sufficient overlap119 – be it only in a historical perspective120. The fulcrum of disagreement that Dworkin sees in the existence of a single right answer121 does not lie in its existence, but in the communality of the effort – if only on the basis of an overlapping common ground of legal materials, accepted practices, experiences and dispositions. As two athletes are engaged in the same contest when they follow the same rules, share the same concept of winning and losing and act in the same context, but follow very different styles of e.g. wrestling, boxing, swimming etc. They are in the same contest, even if there is no single best style in which to wrestle, box or swim. Each, however, is engaged in developing the best style to win against their opponent, just as two lawyers try to develop the best argument to convince a bench of judges.122 Within such a semantic framework even people with radically opposing views about the application of an expression can still share a concept, in that they are engaged in the same process of theorizing over roughly the same legal materials and practices. Semantic frameworks along these lines allow for adamant disagreements without abandoning the idea that people are talking about the same concept. An agonistic account of legal disagreement can build on such a semantic framework, which can explain in what sense lawyers, judges and scholars engaged in agonistic disagreements are not talking past each other. They are engaged in developing the best interpretation of roughly the same legal materials, albeit against the background of diverging beliefs, attitudes and dispositions that lead them to divergent conclusions in hard cases. Despite the divergent conclusions, semantic unity is provided by the largely overlapping legal materials that form the basis for their disagreement. Such a semantic collapses only when we lack a sufficient overlap in the materials. To use an example of Michael Moore’s: If we wanted to debate whether a certain work of art was “just”, we share neither paradigms nor a tradition of applying the concept of justice to art such as to engage in an intelligible controversy.

#### Impacts:

#### 1] Procedural fairness outweighs—a) intrinsicness—debate is a game and equity is necessary to sustain the activity b) probability—debate can’t alter subjectivity, but it can rectify skews c) metaconstraint—all your arguments concede fairness since you assume they will be evaluated fairly d) application—your model only indicts how fairness has been appliednot that it’s intrinsically bad—their model would justify exclusion.

#### 2] Switch Side Debate—they can read it as a K against affirmatives—forces debaters to consider issues from multiple perspectives. Non-topical affs allow individuals to establish their own metrics for what they want to debate leading to dogmatism.

**3] TVA – defend an affirmative that defends the topic – their whole aff is about how private entities exploration of space is bad\**

#### Drop the debater – Changing your advocacy kills NC strat because the 1ac advocacy is the only stasis point for NC offense, anything else moots all clash and fairness. No cross apps from the aff since framework proves that that layer was skewed to begin with so we can’t actually test the truth of cross applications to the affirmative.

#### New 2nr answers to AC preempts because they are hidden, and implications are unknown until the 1ar.

No impact turns or rvis - A] Perfcon – if T’s bad and you vote for them on that arg, you’re voting on T. B] Substance – if T’s bad then we should try debating on substance – impact turns force me to go for T since I need to defend my position

### Cap Good

**Capitalism is inevitable. Economic theory means it’s bound to stay – empirics prove**

Scheper 5 Patrick Q. Scheper “Capitalism: An Inevitable Conclusion” Rebirth of Reason February 8th 2005 <http://rebirthofreason.com/Articles/Scheper/Capitalism_An_Inevitable_Conclusion.shtml> JW 3/15

The next question that needs to be asked is "What is capitalism? Is it an art or a science?" The question is better asked, "Is economics an art or a science", as capitalism is an economic theory. However, as we will see, it is really the only correct economic theory that can prevail. Economics is the study of how people relate to each other when it comes to trade and production. As this is the case, economics is really part of political science, or the study of how people relate to each other in an organized society. Political science is a science (as the name implies) and is part of the broader science, philosophy. Philosophy is a science in that it is grounded in certain absolutes (which, ironically, some of the most well-regarded philosophers have ignored.) This essay is not intended to defend these absolutes, as there are plenty of other works which adequately do so. This essay accepts the fact that there are absolutes. Existence, the primacy of existence, the primacy of the individual over society, and identity are the most notable. From these absolutes, natural laws can be found and universally validated. The most important of these, for the purposes of this essay, are the "natural rights": life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. From these come other laws and rights, like the right to free speech and property rights. If philosophy is a science based in absolutes, than its resulting branches must also be sciences and grounded by the absolutes and laws derived from them. Therefore, economics is a science and all economic systems must be consistent with natural laws. The only truly consistent economic system is a capitalist one as it is in its most basic of definitions a system whereby everyone is allowed to act according to natural law and pursue his own interests so long as his actions do not prohibit another’s ability to do so. Economics is a science, and capitalism is a valid and universally true scientific process. In fact it is the only true scientific process that can be used in the field of economics.Correct Science Always Prevails Because capitalism is scientifically correct, it will always prevail. Any attempts to build an economic system or process that ignores the basic laws derived from the absolutes of philosophy and ignores natural rights and laws, will inevitably come to destroy itself, just as the [person] man who jumped off the cliff and ignored gravity met [their] his demise. Economics is a process, in that it studies the means by which people interact and exchange and create resources. Capitalism is a specific process that defines how an economy should work via individual freedoms. Capitalism, as it adheres to the basic absolutes of philosophy, is scientifically correct. Other economic systems have been proposed and put into place throughout history, either voluntarily or through coercion. These systems have failed, are failing, or will fail if they are inconsistent with reality and its absolutes. Socialism and communism ignore the primacy of the individual and as a result disregard property rights and a person’s right to his life and its products. As we have seen in the Soviet Union and other communist countries, these economic systems will destroy themselves. A society where the factors and outputs of productive efforts are completely or partially controlled by the states cannot exist in perpetuity, as natural laws will eventually come to topple the system. The basic human nature to protect one’s property from being forcibly taken against one’s will and an individual’s primacy over society will always (though sometimes very gradually) overcome even the most ruthless coercive efforts. Just as natural rights prevailed over communism and are beginning to open up former communist economies to free market processes, so too will natural law prevail[s] over "active governments" and economic regulations set up in quasi-free market countries like the United States. Government regulations, agencies, and laws that inhibit the free market will never work in the long run. Examples can be seen in the fact that private industries always correct government errors (i.e. FedEx, private schooling) and even those seemingly uncorrectable errors will simply be outdone by more efficient market forces. 401(k) plans are eliminating dependency on social security for many and private charities always seem to pop up to correct poor planning and misuse of funds by the welfare state. FedEx was set up and marketed on its ability to outdo the inefficient United States Postal Service. The internet, information technology, and Silicon Valley have rendered many government regulations useless if not downright impossible to enforce. When a proponent of the free market gets discouraged by government regulations and coercive authority, he need only to look around to see that capitalism always prevails, even in the face of extreme regulations and anti-competitive laws. Communism, socialism, regulations, and all other free market hindrances are akin to the man who jumps off the cliff. Capitalism is the gravity that will cause his fall.

#### Only cap can solve warming

**Fedrizzi 15:** Rick Fedrizzi (CEO and founding chair of US Green Building Council). “Capitalism is the solution to climate change.” CNBC. November 30th, 2015. <https://www.cnbc.com/2015/11/30/capitalism-is-the-solution-to-climate-change-commentary.html>

Environmentalists around the world are pinning their hopes on the international climate talks happening now. But conference rooms in Paris are not where the action on climate change really is. Rather, it's in boardrooms around the world. Companies large and small are taking steps to protect the environment, while increasing their profits. They're motivated not by consensus or conservation, but by cold hard cash. It's true that industry has contributed enormously to climate change and environmental degradation. Business interests have long opposed sustainable practices they believed would negatively impact profits. And the environmental community has held fast to this dynamic, holding up industry and capitalism as the enemy for decades. But the truth is that capitalism is the only force strong enough and capable of acting quickly enough to address climate change before the damage becomes irreversible. I've seen the kind of positive effect business can have on our environment when driven by profit and economic growth — and in one of the world's largest, dirtiest industries no less: real estate. In 1993, I co-founded the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC), a non-profit organization dedicated to sustainability in our built environment. USGBC created a voluntary rating system — Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, or LEED — which allows buildings to earn credits for their sustainable features, including energy and water efficiency, indoor environmental quality, and recycled materials. LEED has had a dramatic impact on profits and the planet. In just 15 short years, 14 billion square feet of real estate have been LEED registered and certified in more than 150 countries, including some of the most iconic buildings in the world, from the Chrysler Building in Manhattan, which reduced energy use by 21 percent, to Lincoln Financial Field, home of the Philadelphia Eagles, which has reduced its energy consumption by the equivalent of removing 41,000 cars per year from the road. Thanks to LEED, as legendary environmentalist Paul Hawken put it, "USGBC may have had a greater impact than any other single organization in the world on materials saved, toxins eliminated, greenhouse gases avoided, and human health enhanced." But the benefits are more than just environmental — they're economic. From hospitals to schools to skyscrapers to factories, communities and companies that have invested in LEED see energy savings, cost savings, and a significant return on their investment. And green buildings haven't only been profitable for building owners, but also for the American economy at large. Green construction added $167.4 billion to the U.S. GDP from 2011 to 2014, according to a new 2015 Green Building Economic Impact Study. This year, the green building sector will employ more than 2.3 million Americans, and by 2018, it is expected to nearly double in size. Of course, real estate isn't the only industry where economic and environmental benefits align. Today, the power of sustainability to drive profits is being quietly embraced throughout the global economy, and major companies are reaping the benefits. Take United Technologies, the manufacturing powerhouse that ranks 45th on the Fortune 500 list. Between 2006 and 2014, UTC reduced its greenhouse gas emissions by 30 percent, and water use by 33 percent. Over those same eight years, its stock price more than doubled. Unilever, one of the world's largest consumer-goods companies, has reduced emissions by 37 percent since 2008, and its efforts have saved the company more than 400 million euros (US$422 million). GE's Ecomagination program has boosted its top line by $200 billion over the past decade, growing at four times the rate of the company at large. Last year, Siemens' Environmental Portfolio not only eliminated 428 million tons of CO2 emissions for its customers, but also brought in €33 billion. The list goes on and on. As Patagonia's CEO Yvon Chouinard says: "Every time we've made a decision that's right for the planet, it's made us more money." The private sector has long been seen as the enemy of environmentalism, and for good reason. But times have changed. Today, a select number of enlightened corporations are wasting less, earning more, and proving just how profitable sustainability can be. There's no reason to keep waiting for an elusive climate agreement. Instead, let's take action to advance market-driven solutions that have the potential — and the ability — to save the planet. It's time for environmentalists and business leaders to leverage the profit motive to achieve our common goal: a sustainable, profitable future.

#### Studies prove markets and income are key to the environment – It’s more likely to create a mindset shift than other systems

**Taylor 3:** Director of Natural Resource Studies 0at Cato Institute, Jerry Taylor, “Happy Earth Day? Thank Capitalism,” New York Sun, April 2 20032, http://www.cato.org/dailys/04-23-03-2.html

Earth Day is traditionally a day for the Left -- a celebration of government's ability to deliver the environmental goods and for threats about the parade of horribles that will descend upon us lest we rededicate ourselves to federal regulators and public land managers. This is unfortunate because it's businessmen -- not bureaucrats or environmental activists -- who deserve most of the credit for the environmental gains over the past century and who represent the best hope for a Greener tomorrow. Indeed, we wouldn't even have environmentalists in our midst were it not for capitalism. Environmental amenities, after all, are luxury goods. America -- like much of the Third World today -- had no environmental movement to speak of until living standards rose sufficiently so that we could turn our attention from simply providing for food, shelter, and a reasonable education to higher "quality of life" issues. The richer you are, the more likely you are to be an environmentalist. And people wouldn't be rich without capitalism. Wealth not only breeds environmentalists, it begets environmental quality. There are dozens of studies showing that, as per capita income initially rises from subsistence levels, air and water pollution increases correspondingly. But once per capita income hits between $3,500 and $15,000 (dependent upon the pollutant), the ambient concentration of pollutants begins to decline just as rapidly as it had previously increased. This relationship is found for virtually every significant pollutant in every single region of the planet. It is an iron law. Given that wealthier societies use more resources than poorer societies, such findings are indeed counterintuitive. But the data don't lie. How do we explain this? The obvious answer -- that wealthier societies are willing to trade-off the economic costs of government regulation for environmental improvements and that poorer societies are not -- is only partially correct. In the [US] United States, pollution declines generally predated the passage of laws mandating pollution controls. In fact, for most pollutants, declines were greater before the federal government passed its panoply of environmental regulations than after the EPA came upon the scene. Much of this had to do with individual demands for environmental quality. People who could afford cleaner-burning furnaces, for instance, bought them. People who wanted recreational services spent their money accordingly, creating profit opportunities for the provision of untrammeled nature. Property values rose in cleaner areas and declined in more polluted areas, shifting capital from Brown to Green investments. Market agents will supply whatever it is that people are willing to spend money on. And when people are willing to spend money on environmental quality, the market will provide it.

#### Free markets solve poverty – global trends go neg

MacKenzie ‘14: (The Data Is Clear: Free Markets Reduce Poverty. June 16, 2014. D.W. MacKenzie, Assistant Professor of Economics At Carroll College)

I have no doubt that Pope Francis has seen many poor people with his own eyes. But, our comprehension of the root causes of poverty requires both data on economic conditions and theoretical knowledge of economic systems. What does rational analysis of evidence tell us about global poverty? It is an obvious fact that severe poverty has disappeared in the most industrialized countries. Nations like the US, UK, Switzerland, and Japan industrialized within what were predominantly laissez-faire free-market conditions. Even the so-called social democracies, like Sweden and Germany, developed in free-market conditions, and adopted extensive state welfare and regulatory programs only after achieving high levels of economic development and industrialization. World Bank data shows that there is inequality, but this inequality is between the free-market nations and the crony-capitalist and socialistic nations.[1] The idea that domestic laissez-faire causes poverty is unfounded. It is a historical fact that India, China, and Kenya never tried capitalism, so this system was never given a chance to work. Furthermore, China and India have realized some progress in abating poverty since they moved in the direction of capitalism. Of course, China and India adopted regulated crony capitalism, but this is still better than their old socialist systems. One could argue that global capitalism allows a few people in some nations to exploit the masses of other nations. Marxists have attempted to make this case since Lenin. Lenin revised Marx because even in his day it had become obvious that Marx’s prediction that capitalists would exploit domestic workers was refuted by evidence. We now know that Lenin’s attempt to blame poverty on global markets is wrong. As previously mentioned, economic conditions in China and India improved after switching from socialism to crony capitalism. China and India have also expanded trade in global markets. There have been significant improvements in living conditions around the world over the past thirty years. The largest improvements in the poorest nations took place during the wave of globalization that took place twenty years ago, after the fall of the USSR. The collapse of the Soviet Union opened the door to unprecedented globalization of industry. What does real data tell us about poverty during this period? Per Capita GDP rose dramatically: Thirty years ago half (50 percent) the people in the poorer nations of the world lived [in extreme poverty](http://data.worldbank.org/news/extreme-poverty-rates-continue-to-fall). In 2012, 21 percent of people in the poorer nations of the world live in extreme poverty. Development of global markets has greatly lessened poverty around the world. This is a very important fact. Movement from being in the lowest global income bracket, to lower middle income to middle income means moving from average life expectancy in the low forties to life expectancy of fifty or sixty, respectively. Cardinal Maradiaga is wrong: this economy does not kill; it has extended the lives of the poorest people in the world. A superficial examination of the world today reveals that there is poverty, that this poverty has real consequences for living-standards and life-expectancies, and that we do have global markets and capitalism in most of the world. Careful analysis shows that capitalism has truly lessened the severity of poverty over time, and that the main problem with capitalism in most nations is that it has too many elements of government regulation and cronyism. Pope Francis and Cardinal Maradiaga have good intentions, but their anti-capitalistic beliefs are unfounded. Their campaign against global capitalism endangers the poorest people of the world.