## Case

### The truth

#### Frame the 1AC through solvency – any attempt to filter offense through the iv is an arbitrary goalpost that insulates it from criticism and nuanced testing – they just read a bunch of cards about communism without having any material advocacy what does it mean to “affirm the communist party” – no warrant for how the aff spills over and changes debate – vote neg on presumption.

### Also the truth

#### Capitalism is sustainable – their environment scenarios are empirically denied and the transition crushes value to life.

Pinker ‘18

[Steven, Johnstone Family Professor in the Department of Psychology at Harvard University. February 2018. “Enlightment Now: The Case for Reason, Science, Humanism, and Progress.” Chapter 10: The Environment, Viking, Accessed through the Wake Forest Library] AMarb RC/JCH-PF

Ecomodernism begins with the realization that some degree of pollution is an inescapable consequence of the Second Law of Thermodynamics. When people use energy to create a zone of structure in their bodies and homes, they must increase entropy elsewhere in the environment in the form of waste, pollution, and other forms of disorder. The human species has always been ingenious at doing this—that’s what differentiates us from other mammals—and it has never lived in harmony with the environment. When native peoples first set foot in an ecosystem, they typically hunted large animals to extinction, and often burned and cleared vast swaths of forest.4 A dirty secret of the conservation movement is that wilderness preserves are set up only after indigenous peoples have been decimated or forcibly removed from them, including the national parks in the United States and the Serengeti in East Africa.5 As the environmental historian William Cronon writes, “wilderness” is not a pristine sanctuary; it is itself a product of civilization. When humans took up farming, they became more disruptive still. According to the paleoclimatologist William Ruddiman, the adoption of wet rice cultivation in Asia some five thousand years ago may have released so much methane into the atmosphere from rotting vegetation as to have changed the climate. “A good case can be made,” he suggests, that “the people in the Iron Age and even the late Stone Age had a much greater per-capita impact on the earth’s landscape than the average modern-day person.”6 And as Brand has pointed out (chapter 7), “natural farming” is a contradiction in terms. Whenever he hears the words natural food, he is tempted to rail: No product of agriculture is the slightest bit natural to an ecologist! You take a nice complex ecosystem, chop it into rectangles, clear it to the ground, and hammer it into perpetual early succession! You bust its sod, flatten it flat, and drench it with vast quantities of constant water! Then you populate it with uniform monocrops of profoundly damaged plants incapable of living on their own! Every food plant is a pathetic narrow specialist in one skill, inbred for thousands of years to a state of genetic idiocy! Those plants are so fragile, they had to domesticate humans just to take endless care of them!7 A second realization of the ecomodernist movement is that industrialization has been good for humanity. It has fed billions, doubled life spans, slashed extreme poverty, and, by replacing muscle with machinery, made it easier to end slavery, emancipate women, and educate children (chapters 7, 15, and 17). It has allowed people to read at night, live where they want, stay warm in winter, see the world, and multiply human contact. Any costs in pollution and habitat loss have to be weighed against these gifts. As the economist Robert Frank has put it, there is an optimal amount of pollution in the environment, just as there is an optimal amount of dirt in your house. Cleaner is better, but not at the expense of everything else in life. The third premise is that the tradeoff that pits human well-being against environmental damage can be renegotiated by technology. How to enjoy more calories, lumens, BTUs, bits, and miles with less pollution and land is itself a technological problem, and one that the world is increasingly solving. Economists speak of the environmental Kuznets curve, a counterpart to the Ushaped arc for inequality as a function of economic growth. As countries first develop, they prioritize growth over environmental purity. But as they get richer, their thoughts turn to the environment.9 If people can afford electricity only at the cost of some smog, they’ll live with the smog, but when they can afford both electricity and clean air, they’ll spring for the clean air. This can happen all the faster as technology makes cars and factories and power plants cleaner and thus makes clean air more affordable. Economic growth bends the environmental Kuznets curve by advances not just in technology but in values. Some environmental concerns are entirely practical: people complain about smog in their city, or green space getting paved over. But other concerns are more spiritual. The fate of the black rhinoceros and the well-being of our descendants in the year 2525 are significant moral concerns, but worrying about them now is something of a luxury. As societies get richer and people no longer think about putting food on the table or a roof over their heads, their values climb a hierarchy of needs, and the scope of their concern expands in space and time. Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel, using data from the World Values Survey, have found that people with stronger emancipative values—tolerance, equality, freedom of thought and speech— which tend to go with affluence and education, are also more likely to recycle and to pressure governments and businesses into protecting the environment. Ecopessimists commonly dismiss this entire way of thinking as the “faith that technology will save us.” In fact it is a skepticism that the status quo will doom us—that knowledge will be frozen in its current state and people will robotically persist in their current behavior regardless of circumstances. Indeed, a naïve faith in stasis has repeatedly led to prophecies of environmental doomsdays that never happened.

#### Capitalism creates good subjectivities – it ingrains socially conscious and progressive values – prefer statistics.

Haidt ‘15

[Jonathan, social psychologist and professor at NYU. “How Capitalism Changes Conscience.” <https://www.humansandnature.org/culture-how-capitalism-changes-conscience>] JCH-PF

I agree that the planet can’t support ten billion people consuming at the level of today’s Americans. But I’d like to point out how capitalist development tends to change values and lifestyles in ways that might be reassuring to those who identify as left-leaning, politically, on social and environmental issues. The best research on how rising prosperity changes people comes from the World Values Survey (WVS), led by Ron Inglehart and Christian Welzel. The WVS has collected data on representative samples of people in many countries every six years or so since the early 1980s. They started with twenty countries and are now up to ninety-five countries in the sixth wave of research. They ask more than a hundred questions on topics such as religion, democracy, women’s rights, capitalism, and national priorities. After each wave, the authors compute the average scores within each country on each value question, and then they do a procedure called “multi-dimensional scaling” to create a two-dimensional map within which countries can be placed. The computer has no idea what the two dimensions mean—it simply aligns countries with similar value profiles, as you can see in the figure below. World Values Survey Graph Figure 2. The Inglehart-Welzel culture map. Based on wave 6 data, 2015. For more information see: www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSContents.jsp The authors of the WVS interpret the two dimensions, as follows: The vertical dimension runs from “traditional values” at the bottom (in which people report a high valuation on religion, ritual, hierarchy, and deference to authorities such as God and parents) to “secular rational” values, at the top (which are the opposite). The Horizontal dimension runs from “survival values” on the left (where people emphasize economic and physical security above all else) to “self-expression” values on the right (where people begin to value things beyond money—in particular they value autonomy and rights; they want the freedom to chart their own course in life, and get more out of life than financial wealth). The best way to understand the graph is to consider that nearly all societies used to be agricultural societies. Pre-industrial farming cultures generally have traditional and survival values (they cluster in the bottom left quadrant of the map). Life is hard and unpredictable, so you should do your duty, pray to the gods, and cling to your extended family for protection. But as countries industrialize and people leave the land and enter factories, wealth rises and values shift. Interestingly, countries don’t just move diagonally, from the poor quadrant (currently occupied by the Islamic and African nations) to the rich quadrant (anchored by Scandinavia, in the upper right). Rather, there is a two-step process. First, countries move upward, from traditional/survival values to secular/survival values. When money comes from fitting yourself into the routines of factory production, there’s little time or room for religious ritual. People express materialistic values in this quadrant—they want money, not just for security, but for the social prestige it can buy. This, I believe, is the step that gives capitalism a bad name in so many countries, particularly among intellectuals and artists. It sure looks like the capitalists are exploiting the workers (for the capitalists keep almost all of the surplus economic value created), and the workers are buying into it, going crazy for consumer goods, seemingly fueling the cycle of their own exploitation. But if you just wait a few generations, you usually get to the second step. Societies transition to more service-based jobs, which require (and foster) very different skills and values compared to factory jobs. Also, as societies get wealthier, life generally gets safer, not just due to reductions in disease, starvation, and vulnerability to natural disasters, but also due to reductions in political brutalization. People get rights. The net effect of rising security is to transform people’s values in ways that the modern political left should love. Welzel explains what happens when countries move to the right in Figure 2: Fading existential pressures open people’s minds, making them prioritize freedom over security, autonomy over authority, diversity over uniformity, and creativity over discipline. The generation raised with these “open minds” and “expressive values” starts caring about women’s rights, animal rights, gay rights, human rights, and environmental degradation. They start expecting more out of life than their parents did. When women have education and career prospects, they start having fewer children—so few, in fact, that if we set aside sub-Saharan Africa (which will be the last region to undergo this “demographic transition”), the population in the rest of the world will begin declining in just a few decades and will plummet in the twenty-second century. Shanghai City lights at night I recently returned from a three-month trip across Asia, and Welzel’s words were like the Rosetta stone for understanding the vast generation gap opening up in rapidly rising Asian nations. Most Asians under thirty-five have not experienced famine, war, or the fear of being abducted during the night. But most of their grandparents (or parents in some countries) grew up with such existential threats, and their values—the so called “Asian values” that prioritize authority over freedom—don’t sit well in the minds of today’s young people, who have moved to the right along the WVS spectrum. As people become richer and safer, their values change just as Welzel describes. Young people begin to demand more socially and environmentally responsible behavior from each other and from their governments. People and countries move in a direction that can only be described as progressive, or left leaning. That doesn’t mean that left-leaning political parties have an advantage—they often get out too far ahead, or too far leftward, of the average voter. And this process works only for social issues—not for economic issues such as taxation and the size of government. But the general consensus on social and environmental issues shifts leftward (politically), and this is my central point: Capitalism and the wealth it creates changes nature and humanity simultaneously. Any discussion of a “sustainable” or “resilient” future should acknowledge not only the devastation wrought by the industrial revolution and the consumer society but also the progressive environmental values, environmentally-friendly technologies, and shrinking populations that are the inevitable result of economic development. Capitalism changes conscience. Capitalism got us into this ecological mess, back when most people had materialist values and cared little for the environment. But as values and cultures shift toward post materialism all over the world, capitalism might just get us out.

#### Capitalism reforms with technologies and innovations that benefit the whole of society – any alternative is a system of oppression.

Ashworth ‘10

[Stephen, academic publishing at Oxford. 12/18/2010. “Towards the Sociology of the Universe, Part 2.” <http://www.astronist.demon.co.uk/space-age/essays/Sociology2.html>] JCH-PF

Under capitalism, social benefit is primarily expressed in monetary terms, and society is stratified economically, with richer classes nearer the top of the social scale and poorer classes nearer the bottom. Under the socialist mode of society, the central function of capital – deciding the allocation of resources – is performed by political ideology. Social benefit is now primarily expressed in terms of ideological capital, being the level of influence, official or unofficial, which an individual enjoys within the institutions, such as in the Soviet Union the Communist Party, which express, teach and propagate that ideology. The rich in such a system are therefore the ideologically rich: those who rise to prominence in the political process and occupy official posts in the Party apparatus; while the poor are those who merely dutifully consume the Party propaganda. The poorest are those who disagree with or actively resist the ruling ideology, and who end up marginalised or criminalised as a result. In view of historical precedents such as the Soviet Union, it is highly unlikely that any realistic socialist society represents an advance over capitalist society in terms of the well-being of the majority of its members (as judged by those members). It is not known whether any third option exists that is compatible with industrialism; however, it is highly plausible that new options will appear in due course, given continued technological development and corresponding social change. Recent history suggests that politically driven attempts at creating a socially just society put all its members, except those at the very top of the Party hierarchy, at a considerable material disadvantage to corresponding members of capitalist societies. One reason for this is that democratic capitalist institutions tend to be flexible and thus capable of responding to changing circumstances, while ideology tends to resist change even in changing circumstances. It must also be clear that any beneficial changes to the modern global liberal democratic market capitalist order can only come about in an incremental fashion, as argued in the social philosophy of Karl Popper (in his book The Open Society and its Enemies). Violent political revolution would, judging by historical precedents, be so destructive that it cannot be contemplated except with extreme horror. Incremental changes in technology, for example the recent introduction of the internet, allow the institutions of democratic capitalism to evolve in ways which are unpredictable but generally beneficial to most groups in society. As civilisation continues to change under the influence of new technologies of computing, medicine and transport, particularly space transport, the democratic capitalist system will naturally also change. Considering the freedoms and privileges enjoyed by the peoples of developed countries compared with their forebears of a few generations ago, it is reasonable to look forward to continued incremental social evolution with optimism concerning the nature of future society, while setting impractical utopian dreams aside

#### Capitalism solves war on a massive scale – it creates lock-in mechanisms that bind countries together and dampen conflict – best studies.

Dafoe and Kelsey ‘14

(Allan & Nina; assistant professor in political science at Yale & research associate in international economics at Berkeley; Journal of Peace Research, “Observing the capitalist peace: Examining market-mediated signaling and other mechanisms,” http://jpr.sagepub.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/content/51/5/619.full)

Countries with liberal political and economic systems rarely use military force against each other. This anomalous peace has been most prominently attributed to the ‘democratic peace’ – the apparent tendency for democratic countries to avoid militarized conflict with each other (Maoz & Russett, 1993; Ray, 1995; Dafoe, Oneal & Russett, 2013). More recently, however, scholars have proposed that the liberal peace could be partly (Russett & Oneal, 2001) or primarily (Gartzke, 2007; but see Dafoe, 2011) attributed to liberal economic factors, such as commercial and financial interdependence. In particular, Erik Gartzke, Quan Li & Charles Boehmer (2001), henceforth referred to as GLB, have demonstrated that measures of capital openness have a substantial and statistically significant association with peaceful dyadic relations. Gartzke (2007) confirms that this association is robust to a large variety of model specifications. To explain this correlation, GLB propose that countries with open capital markets are more able to credibly signal their resolve through the bearing of greater economic costs prior to the outbreak of militarized conflict. This explanation is novel and plausible, and resonates with the rationalist view of asymmetric information as a cause of conflict (Fearon, 1995). Moreover, it implies clear testable predictions on evidential domains different from those examined by GLB. In this article we exploit this opportunity by constructing a confirmatory test of GLB’s theory of market-mediated signaling. We first develop an innovative quantitative case selection technique to identify crucial cases where the mechanism of market-mediated signaling should be most easily observed. Specifically, we employ quantitative data and the statistical models used to support the theory we are probing to create an impartial and transparentmeans of selecting cases in which the theory – as specified by the theory’s creators –makes its most confident predictions.We implement three different case selection rules to select cases that optimize on two criteria: (1) maximizing the inferential leverage of our cases, and (2) minimizing selection bias. We examine these cases for a necessary implication of market-mediated signaling: that key participants drew a connection between conflictual events and adverse market movements. Such an inference is a necessary step in the process by which market-mediated costs can signal resolve. For evidence of this we examine news media, government documents, memoirs, historical works, and other sources. We additionally examine other sources, such as market data, for evidence that economic costs were caused by escalatory events. Based on this analysis, we assess the evidence for GLB’s theory of market mediated costly signaling. Our article then considers a more complex heterogeneous effects version of market-mediated signaling in which unspecified scope conditions are required for the mechanism to operate. Our design has the feature of selecting cases in which scope conditions are most likely to be absent. This allows us to perform an exploratory analysis of these cases, looking for possible scope conditions. We also consider alternative potential mechanisms. Our cases are reviewed in more detail in the online appendix.1 To summarize our results, our confirmatory test finds that while market-mediated signaling may be operative in the most serious disputes, it was largely absent in the less serious disputes that characterize most of the sample of militarized interstate disputes (MIDs). This suggests either that other mechanisms account for the correlation between capital openness and peace, or that the scope conditions for market-mediated signaling are restrictive. Of the signals that we observed, strategic market-mediated signals were relatively more important than automatic market-mediated signals in the most serious conflicts. We identify a number of potential scope conditions, such as that (1) the conflict must be driven by bargaining failure arising from uncertainty and (2) the economic costs need to escalate gradually and need to be substantial, but less than the expected military costs of conflict. Finally, there were a number of other explanations that seemed present in the cases we examined and could account for the capitalist peace: capital openness is associated with greater anticipated economic costs of conflict; capital openness leads third parties to have a greater stake in the conflict and therefore be more willing to intervene; a dyadic acceptance of the status quo could promote both peace and capital openness; and countries seeking to institutionalize a regional peace might instrumentally harness the pacifying effects of liberal markets. The correlation: Open capital markets and peace The empirical puzzle at the core of this article is the significant and robust correlation noted by GLB between high levels of capital openness in both members of a dyad and the infrequent incidence of militarized interstate disputes (MIDs) and wars between the members of this dyad (Gartzke, Li & Boehmer, 2001). The index of capital openness (CAPOPEN) is intended to capture the ‘difficulty states face in seeking to impose restrictions on capital flows (the degree of lost policy autonomy due to globalization)’ (Gartzke & Li, 2003: 575). CAPOPEN is constructed from data drawn from the widely used IMF’s Annual Reports on Exchange Arrangements and Exchange Controls; it is a combination of eight binary variables that measure different types of government restrictions on capital and currency flow (Gartzke, Li & Boehmer, 2001: 407). The measure of CAPOPEN starts in 1966 and is defined for many countries (increasingly more over time). Most of the countries that do not have a measure of CAPOPEN are communist.2 GLB implement this variable in a dyadic framework by creating a new variable, CAPOPENL, which is the smaller of the two dyadic values of CAPOPEN. This operationalization is sometimes referred to as the ‘weak-link’ specification since the functional form is consonant with a model of war in which the ‘weakest link’ in a dyad determines the probability of war. CAPOPENL has a negative monotonic association with the incidence of MIDs, fatal MIDs, and wars (see Figure 1).3 The strength of the estimated empirical association between peace and CAPOPENL, using a modified version of the dataset and model from Gartzke (2007), is comparable to that between peace and, respectively, joint democracy, log of distance, or the GDP of a contiguous dyad (Gartzke, 2007: 179; Gartzke, Li & Boehmer, 2001: 412). In summary, CAPOPENL seems to be an important and robust correlate of peace. The question of why specifically this correlation exists, however, remains to be answered. The mechanism: Market-mediated signaling? Gartzke, Li & Boehmer (2001) argue that the classic liberal account for the pacific effect of economic interdependence – that interdependence increases the expected costs of war – is not consistent with the bargaining theory of war (see also Morrow, 1999). GLB argue that ‘conventional descriptions of interdependence see war as less likely because states face additional opportunity costs for fighting. The problem with such an account is that it ignores incentives to capitalize on an opponent’s reticence to fight’ (Gartzke, Li & Boehmer, 2001: 400.)4 Instead, GLB (see also Gartzke, 2003; Gartzke & Li, 2003) argue that financial interdependence could promote peace by facilitating the sending of costly signals. As the probability of militarized conflict increases, states incur a variety of automatic and strategically imposed economic costs as a consequence of escalation toward conflict. Those states that persist in a dispute despite these costs will reveal their willingness to tolerate them, and hence signal resolve. The greater the degree of economic interdependence, the more a resolved country could demonstrate its willingness to suffer costs ex ante to militarized conflict. Gartzke, Li & Boehmer’s mechanism implies a commonly perceived costly signal before militarized conflict breaks out or escalates: if market-mediated signaling is to account for the correlation between CAPOPENL and the absence of MIDs, then visible market-mediated costs should occur prior to or during periods of real or potential conflict (Gartzke, Li & Boehmer, 2001). Thus, the proposed mechanism should leave many visible footprints in the historical record. This theory predicts that these visible signals must arise in any escalating conflict, involving countries with high capital openness, in which this mechanism is operative Clarifying the signaling mechanism Gartzke, Li & Boehmer’s signaling mechanism is mostly conceptualized on an abstract, game-theoretic level (Gartzke, Li & Boehmer, 2001). In order to elucidate the types of observations that could inform this theory’s validity, we discuss with greater specificity the possible ways in which such signaling might occur. A conceptual classification of costly signals The term signaling connotes an intentional communicative act by one party directed towards another. Because the term signaling thus suggests a willful act, and a signal of resolve is only credible if it is costly, scholars have sometimes concluded that states involved in bargaining under incomplete information could advance their interests by imposing costs on themselves and thereby signaling their resolve (e.g. Lektzian & Sprecher, 2007). However, the game-theoretic concept of signaling refers more generally to any situation in which an actor’s behavior reveals information about her private information. In fact, states frequently adopt sanctions with low costs to themselves and high costs to their rivals because doing so is often a rational bargaining tactic on other grounds: they are trying to coerce their rival to concede the issue. Bargaining encounters of this type can be conceptualized as a type of war-of-attrition game in which each actor attempts to coerce the other through the imposition of escalating costs. Such encounters also provide the opportunity for signaling: when states resist the costs imposed by their rivals, they ‘signal’ their resolve. If at some point one party perceives the conflict to have become too costly and steps back, that party ‘signals’ a lack of resolve. Thus, this kind of signaling arises as a by-product of another’s coercive attempts. In other words, costly signals come in two forms: self-inflicted (information about a leader arising from a leader’s intentional or incidental infliction of costs on himself) or imposed (information about a leader that arises from a leader’s response to a rival’s imposition of costs). Additionally, costs may arise as an automatic byproduct of escalation towards military conflict or may be a tool of statecraft that is strategically employed during a conflict. The automatic mechanism stipulates that as the probability of conflict increases, various economic assets will lose value due to the risk of conflict and investor flight. However, the occurrence of these costs may also be intentional outcomes of specific escalatory decisions of the states, as in the case of deliberate sanctions; in this case they are strategic. Finally, at a practical level, we identify three different potential kinds of economic costs of militarized conflict that may be mediated by open capital markets: capital costs from political risk, monetary coercion, and business sanctions.

#### Growth is a prerequisite to getting off the rock

Ashworth ‘10

Stephen Ashworth is a long-standing Fellow of the British Interplanetary Society. He works in academic publishing in the Voltaire Foundation, part of Oxford University – Towards the Sociology of the Universe, part 1 – “A Review of Dickens and Ormrod, Cosmic Society – 18 December 2010 – http://www.astronist.demon.co.uk/space-age/essays/Sociology1.html

There are thus two plausible end-points to our current phase of growth: collapse back to a pre-industrial level (the supernova burns out), or continued growth taking us onto a sustainable level of technological maturity (the baby grows up). The difference between these two future courses is immense. In terms of population, the carrying capacity of Earth for human populations is greater than the current 6 or 7 billion, but not very much so, perhaps a few tens of billions (depending on the technologies available). Any retreat to medieval levels of technology would cut this figure by a factor of ten, probably down to less than a billion. But the carrying capacity of the Solar System is at least a million times greater than that of a high-tech Earth, and that of the Galaxy at least a billion times greater again than that of the Solar System. The present-day situation of human society is therefore that it finds itself at a cross-roads of unparalleled significance. If growth is not maintained, then, unless they can reignite that growth phase, our descendants are forever restricted to planet Earth. But must they necessarily fall back to a medieval or even more primitive level? Could industrial civilisation survive for a while in a zero-growth phase at around its present-day level of development, and if so, for how long? In any discussion of mankind and space, this is a key question which must be addressed. Certainly, pre-industrial civilisations have survived with little change over millennial timespans, but to what extent does industrial technology change this picture? And what about million-year timespans? The only types of industrial civilisation we have observed so far have been that based on capitalist economics, and that based on socialism, in which a political ideology takes over the role of capital. Capitalist societies would seem to be expansionary in their very nature: they are defined by the self-multiplying power of capital. But could a socialist society, one with a suitable ideology which was sufficiently severely imposed, preserve zero growth indefinitely? I think not, because societies evolve in an unpredictable manner. Governments which have tried to maintain control in, say, Tokugawa Japan (1603-1868) or Soviet Russia (1917-1989) have failed in their goals of stability (Japan) or planned growth (Russia), and modern liberal democracy works by limiting its ambitions and ceding much power to the economy at large. Even a global dictatorship, which unlike those two historical examples would by definition not face competition from abroad, would, I think, be unable to control all the disruptive political, technological and economic forces emerging unpredictably worldwide over centuries and millennia. The result would then be either the breakout of a new phase of growth, or decline and collapse. In view of the likelihood of long-term adverse climate change (whether triggered by industrial pollution, or asteroid impact, or an outbreak of super-vulcanism, or the return of ice-age conditions, or solar variations), and in addition the persistent threat of global high-tech conflict (whether spreading destruction by nuclear weapons, or computer viruses, or genetically engineered organisms, or microscopic or macroscopic robots), decline would be the more plausible outcome. Nevertheless, the question as to how long a global zero-growth industrial civilisation could survive in a stable state on one planet is an interesting one, though not one that is likely to attract unbiased analysis by modern sociology. What, however, if growth is maintained? Surely Earth will become overburdened and that growth will lead to environmental and social collapse? The point here is that, while the resources of Earth are limited, those of the Solar System are very much greater. Growth in population sizes and in the usage of energy and raw materials may therefore continue for a number of centuries into the future, provided that two conditions are met: \* Material growth on Earth levels off; \* Material growth in space and on other planets takes over the upward trend. Is this not equivalent to saying that Earth must settle down with a zero-growth society before space development begins? No, so long as the terrestrial and extraterrestrial economies are linked. While this remains true, it will be possible for investors on Earth to invest capital in extraterrestrial development, and receive dividends back from that development. While most Earth-dwelling people will remain on the mother planet, there will also be flows of people, goods and ideas between Earth and her colonies, which must also have a profound economic effect. A net inflow of value to Earth is in any case necessary in order that terrestrial investment in outer space does not merely produce inflation in the home economy. But that inflow need not be of material goods, and is more likely to consist of energy (solar power delivered on microwaves or lasers) and information (software and product development). But surely ultimately the limits of the Solar System will be reached, and the interplanetary civilisation have to settle down as a zero-growth society? Yes, granted. But this differs from a zero-growth planet Earth due to the immense size of the Solar System, which is larger than Earth by between four and six orders of magnitude, depending how far out one wants to go – to the distance of Mars, say, or to the Oort comet cloud far beyond Pluto. An interplanetary industrial civilisation is secure for the long term in a way that a monoplanetary one is not, because it is too large to form a unity, either politically or environmentally, and because it is forced to adapt to a wide range of hostile environmental conditions. It will therefore be secure against any conceivable environmental or military disaster, because such a disaster can only affect a single planet, or at most a limited region of the system. Climate change or world war on Earth has no effect on Mars, and vice versa. And with the majority of the population in orbiting artificial space colonies, even a major change in solar luminosity could be tolerated (though such a change is not expected to have a noticeable effect for hundreds of millions of years yet). With interplanetary civilisation, the social system as a whole can tolerate decline and collapse in particular locations, because they can then be recolonised from outside. Once humanity achieves interstellar status, this security factor is clearly vastly enhanced. However, in order for interplanetary growth to occur in the first place, an economic mechanism must be in place to drive it. The most suitable economic mechanism that has been demonstrated so far is capitalism. Its need for continuous expansion makes it highly appropriate as an economic system for a society colonising its local planetary system.

#### Capitalism avoids planetary extinction through Mars colonization.

Spring 16 (Todd, Writer, "A Case for Capitalism, In Regards to Space Travel – The Policy", Policy, 6-3-2016, https://thepolicy.us/a-case-for-capitalism-in-regards-to-space-travel-d77e50f8116e, DOA: 7-28-2017) //Snowball //strikethrough on gendered language

As of now, N.A.S.A. does not plan on sending a ~~manned~~ mission to Mars until the 2030s — assuming, of course, they get the government funding they need to undertake such a massive project. Considering the recent cuts to deep space exploration, down nearly $300 million from 2016, I am not certain what the condition of the program will look like in another two years…much less the gap between now and the 2030s. Where, then — if the government and its agencies will not provide us with the money for exploration — will we turn to slake our thirst for cosmic space travel? SpaceX. Private corporations. Capitalism. Seeing this article in the news, reading day after day the story of budget cuts to N.A.S.A. in regards to deep-space exploration and other related programs, got me thinking about just how important it will be for private companies and corporations to undertake these projects…such as Elon Musk’s SpaceX, and countless others (read the full list here). The problem is that we have gotten it into our heads that Capitalism is the root cause of our economic woes in the United States, perhaps failing to understand that such policies are something like a double-edged sword: they could also be our salvation. This article provides a great list of the pro’s and con’s of Capitalism. I would recommend you take the short passing of time it requires to read it through-and-through before continuing. Now then. I have never been for for fully-unhindered Capitalism. I do not believe that the government should stay out of economic affairs entirely, for as provided in the article many of the con’s relate to improper regulation (monopolization) as opposed to something fundamentally wrong, but I do not believe that any government should be going about shoving their claws into every economic affair either. There must be a healthy balance, especially if Capitalism is to work as it is supposed to work. The same goes for any policy. The government should be there to bolster competition between businesses…not favor one or bail-out the other. The more regulation, the more interference or amendment, the less it works…but this mix of regulation and free market must fall in the “goldilocks zone” if the citizens of said society are to reap its full benefit. If not, like planets about a star, the society shall either burn or freeze. One of those benefits is highlighted by Elon Musk’s SpaceX: the intervention of privately-funded companies to do things that a traditional government agency cannot. Namely, the exploration and eventual colonization of Mars in a reasonable, step-by-step timeframe…unlike the “we will get to it eventually” mindset plaguing the bowels of the United States government. Were not the policies in place to foster the growth of private companies, our best chance at getting people out of Earth-orbit — the Bush-approved, now-cancelled, insanely-expensive Constellation program — would have gone the way of promises and well-wishes. It is my hope that Elon Musk and space entrepreneurs like him are not simply blowing steam, and that one day — perhaps even within my lifetime — I could be on my way to a space hotel on the Moon, flying aboard a space airliner with the name of a private company plastered across the side. Regardless, if we humans are to truly become a multi-planet species we must not hinder economic growth with narrow thoughts. We must not become confused that the “problems down here” and the “problem of getting out there” must be in conflict; they do not need to, and we must not suppose they should. They are two separate issues with two unique sets of problems, and thus this policy of taking resources from one to give to the other will only ensure that neither issue is given that which it needs, or enough to fix what must be solved.

#### Extinction

Pelton ‘17

former Dean and Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the International Space University, Founder of the Arthur C. Clarke Foundation and the founding President of the Society of Satellite Professionals International, serves on the Executive Board of the International Association for the Advancement of Space Safety, Director Emeritus of the Space and Advanced Communications Research Institute (SACRI) at George Washington University [Joseph N. Pelton, 2017, Chapter 1: Why This Gold Rush Is Different in *The New Gold Rush The Riches of Space Beckon!*, pgs 1-2, Springer, DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-39273-8] AMarb

What will we do when Earth’s resources are used up by humanity? The world is now hugely over populated, with billions and billions crammed into our overcrowded cities. By 2050, we may be 9 billion strong, and by 2100 well over 11 billion people on Planet Earth. Some at the United Nations say we might even be an amazing 12 billion crawling around this small globe. And over 80 % of us will be living in congested cities. These cities will be ever more vulnerable to terrorist attack, natural disaster, and other plights that come with overcrowding and a dearth of jobs that will be fueled by rapid automation and the rise of artificial intelligence across the global economy. We are already rapidly running out of water and minerals. Climate change is threatening our very existence. Political leaders and even the Pope have cautioned us against inaction. Perhaps the naysayers are right. All humanity is at tremendous risk. Is there no hope for the future? This book is about hope. We think that there is literally heavenly hope for humanity. But we are not talking here about divine intervention. We are envisioning a new space economy that recognizes that there is more water in the skies that all our oceans. There is a new wealth of natural resources and clean energy in the reaches of outer space—more than most of us could ever dream possible. There are those that say why waste money on outer space when we have severe problems here at home? Going into space is not a waste of money. It is our future. It is our hope for new jobs and resources. The great challenge of our times is to reverse public thinking to see space not as a resource drain but as the doorway to opportunity. The new space frontier can literally open up a “gold rush in the skies.” In brief, we think there is new hope for humanity. We see a new a pathway to the future via new ventures in space. For too long, space programs have been seen as a money pit. In the process, we have overlooked the great abundance available to us in the skies above. It is important to recognize there is already the beginning of a new gold rush in space—a pathway to astral abundance. “New Space” is a term increasingly used to describe radical new commercial space initiatives—many of which have come from Silicon Valley and often with backing from the group of entrepreneurs known popularly as the “space billionaires.” New space is revolutionizing the space industry with lower cost space transportation and space systems that represent significant cost savings and new technological breakthroughs. “New Commercial Space” and the “New Space Economy” represent more than a new way of looking at outer space. These new pathways to the stars could prove vital to human survival.

#### Transition wars – RIP

Mead ‘9

(Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, Walter Russell, The New Republic, “Only Makes You Stronger”, 2-4, http://www.tnr.com/politics/story.html?id=571cbbb9-2887-4d81-8542-92e83915f5f8&p=2)

But, in many other countries where capitalism rubs people the wrong way, this is not the case. On either side of the Atlantic, for example, the Latin world is often drawn to anti-capitalist movements and rulers on both the right and the left. Russia, too, has never really taken to capitalism and liberal society--whether during the time of the czars, the commissars, or the post-cold war leaders who so signally failed to build a stable, open system of liberal democratic capitalism even as many former Warsaw Pact nations were making rapid transitions. Partly as a result of these internal cultural pressures, and partly because, in much of the world, capitalism has appeared as an unwelcome interloper, imposed by foreign forces and shaped to fit foreign rather than domestic interests and preferences, many countries are only half-heartedly capitalist. When crisis strikes, they are quick to decide that capitalism is a failure and look for alternatives. So far, such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position, farther behind the frontrunners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. **Crisis** can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies. As a result, developing countries and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, financial crises often reinforce rather than challenge the global distribution of power and wealth. This may be happening yet again. None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises.

#### Markets drive innovation which resolves sustainability and ecological damage – uniqueness is shifting.

Fitzmaurice ‘15

[Matthew, CEO of EcoAlpha Asset Management LLC, an asset management firm that invests in companies that provide solutions to global burdened resources with a specific emphasis on water, agriculture and energy efficiency. EcoAlpha focuses on public securities and seeks to generate superior risk-adjusted returns for investors. 03/23/2015. “Only Capitalism Can Save the Planet.” <https://ensia.com/voices/only-capitalism-can-save-the-planet/>] JCH-PF

To say the world has changed a lot in the last century is a huge understatement. Industrial, medical and social progress has resulted in unprecedented growth in the world’s population and economy, and that growth has placed tremendous burdens on the planet’s resources. These burdens create problems — perhaps the most substantive problems we have faced as a species: from water scarcity and pollution to climate change, reliable access to nourishing food, and affordable energy. Here’s the thing, though: where there are problems to be solved, there’s money to be made. And where there’s money to be made, we awaken one of the world’s most powerful forces for change: capitalism. Of course capitalism has played a starring role in distressing the planet’s resources. Historically, the combination of unchecked industry, a readiness to externalize costs and a relentless thirst for growth have plundered and polluted the earth. It’s not a debate, but simple fact that our population size and economies cannot continue on their present trajectories without exhausting the world’s resources. Yet, a rapidly expanding global middle class — increasingly urbanized and hungry for protein — threatens further and accelerating distress. The hopeful news is that businesses, with their almost singular focus on economic self-interest, and governments, motivated by a variety of interests, are beginning to recognize and address in earnest these inevitable problems. Today, the businesses that develop practical and affordable solutions to burdened resource problems will end up being the world’s most profitable companies. No longer can they be considered “sustainability” businesses. They are everyday businesses with a long view, targeting problems that are not going away. That’s smart business. Burdened resources have become a strong economic driver for businesses of all sizes, in all industries everywhere to spend and change — and one that will only grow in scope and intensity over time. The companies that provide effective solutions to burdened resources will provide superior risk-adjusted returns to their investors as business and governments accelerate their solutions spending out of their own economic self-interest. And because the products, technologies and services these companies provide are common solutions to global problems — and are therefore exponentially repeatable — these investments will have amplified positive impact on global resource scarcity issues. Too often people have a narrow view of these solutions, thinking only of solar panels and windmills. But solutions are enormously diverse: They include, among many others, agricultural drones that monitor soil conditions, smart irrigation technology that delivers water only where and when it’s really needed, more efficient distributed energy generation and component suppliers that make cars use less gas. As a whole, the ~~human~~ [humxn] race has a poor track record when it comes to altruism. Although there are a great many saints among us who spend — and even sacrifice — their lives to help others, most of us are hard pressed to take care of ourselves and our families. We have a much better track record when it comes to investing money in our own self-interest, which has fueled the unprecedented innovation, economic and life-expectancy growth of the past century. In the past, many people who invested in sustainable solutions were motivated principally by conscience, willing to accept reduced returns in order to invest their money in a way that was consistent with their beliefs and convictions — be they religious, social or environmental. Now, however, we face a new reality in which our economic self-interest and the long-term well-being of the planet are coming into alignment. Because we have to face the reality of burdened resources, there’s money in it.

#### Cap solves environmental destruction and bioD

**Veer 12**   
Pierre-Guy, Independent journalist writing for the Von Mises Institute, 5/2, “Cheer for the Environment, Cheer for Capitalism,” http://www.mises.ca/posts/blog/cheer-for-the-environment-cheer-for-capitalism/

No Ownership, No Responsibility How can such a negligence have happened? It’s simple: **no one was the legitimate owner of the resources** (water, air, ground). When a property is state-owned – as was the case under communism – **government has generally little incentive to sustainably exploit it**. In communist Europe, governments wanted to industrialize their country in order, they hoped, to catch up with capitalist economies. Objectives were set, and they had to be met no matter what. This included the use of brown coal, high in sulfur and that creates heavy smoke when burned[4], and questionable farming methods, which depleted the soil. This lack of vision can also be seen in the public sector of capitalist countries. In the US, the Department of Defense creates more dangerous waste than the top five chemical product companies put together. In fact, pollution is such that cleanup costs are estimated at $20 billion. The same goes for agriculture, where Washington encourages overfarming or even farming not adapted for the environment it’s in[5]. Capitalism, the Green Solution In order to solve most of the pollution problems, there exists a simple solution: **laissez-faire capitalism, i.e.** **make sure property rights and profitability can be applied**. The latter helped Eastern Europe; when communism fell, capitalism made the countries seek profitable – and not just cheap – ways to produce, which greatly reduced pollution[6]. As for the former, it proved its effectiveness, notably with the Love Canal[7]. Property rights are also thought of in order to protect some resources, be it fish[8] or **endangered species**[9]. Why such efficiency? Because an owner’s self-interest is directed towards the maximum profitability of his piece of land. By containing pollution – as Hooker Chemicals did with its canal – he keeps away from costly lawsuit for property violation. At the same time, badly managed pollution can diminish the value of the land, and therefore profits. Any entrepreneur with a long-term vision – and whose property is safe from arbitrary government decisions – thinks about all that in order to protect his investment. One isn’t foolish enough to sack one’s property! In conclusion, I have to mention that I agree with environmentalists that it is importance to preserve the environment in order to protect mother nature and humans. However, I strongly disagree with their means, i.e. government intervention. Considering it very seldom has a long-term vision, it is the worst thing that can happen. In fact, one could says that most **environmental disasters** are, directly or indirectly, caused by the State, mainly by a lack of clear property rights. Were they clearer, they would let each and everyone of us, out of self-interest, protect the environment in a better manner. That way, everyone’s a winner.

#### Even if all their rhetoric about revolutionary commitment is persuasive its not an accurate description of how people act – the status quo proves that the world is far from the conditions for revolt, violent or otherwise.

Eror 17 [Aleks Eror’s work has been published by The Guardian, Vice, Slate, and The Daily Telegraph, amongst others, 2-6-2017, "The West Isn’t Ready for a Revolution," New Republic, https://newrepublic.com/article/140429/west-isnt-ready-revolution]

As bad as things are, they’re evidently not bad enough for a broad enough base of people—yet—because mass discontent hasn’t translated into mass action. The Occupy protesters may have shouted and rallied, but they ultimately failed to attract enough popular support to evolve from protest to movement. It could be argued that their vision wasn’t compelling or clear enough, which is probably true, but this only tells part of the story. Most people, it seems, simply aren’t prepared to commit themselves completely to political activism. Instead, they want the system changed for them. Although Trump and the Brexiters like to eulogize their achievements in revolutionary terms, their slim victories still came via the voting booth rather than through popular uprisings. The electorate may have rubber-stamped those victories, but they played no part in formulating them. After all, then–Prime Minister David Cameron wasn’t pressured by the British public into holding a referendum on E.U. membership; it was mutinous Conservative backbenchers who forced his hand. Trump is not a product of the Tea Party. His supporters might loathe the Washington establishment, but they never threatened to organize and shake the pillars of power themselves. Unlike the Syrians who risked life and limb to rise up against Bashar al-Assad, most westerners are quite clearly still content to wait it out for a messiah—or a snake-oil salesman, whichever one comes first—to fix the world on their behalf, rather than muster up a solution on their own. We do this because most of us fail to comprehend the sheer scale of sacrifice that wholesale political change demands. We fixate on street protest, as if it’s the political atom bomb, rather than a singular tool with questionable efficacy. We delude ourselves that protests’ power lies in scale rather than frequency, but the Iraq war protests wouldn’t have been any less impotent had they been bigger; they failed because they weren’t sustained. And even if we did comprehend this, would it change anything? Are people prepared to make the necessary sacrifices? Otpor!’s victory over Milosevic came after nine years of struggle. In the meantime, lives and careers were suspended. Last weekend’s U.S. airport protests petered out as Monday approached because most people had jobs and routines to return to, so some donated pizza instead. In Britain, protests against Trump’s proposed state visit were scheduled outside of office hours. It’s quite telling that the general strike is an utterly alien tactic to western protesters. Political dissatisfaction may be widespread, but that seemingly isn’t enough: The status quo needs to be so intolerable that people are prepared to prioritize change, and the collective effort that it demands, over their own self-interests. Most people, regardless of their political leanings, want reform rather than revolution. We are nowhere near that tipping point—especially not in the U.S., where the unemployment rate is just 4.8 percent. Prevailing rhetoric reveals that most people, regardless of their political leanings, want reform rather than revolution. The closure of corporate tax loopholes or greater protectionism are discussed within the context of the existing system, rather than a new one. Most Trump voters simply dream of a return to an era of more job security and greater purchasing power, not a fundamentally different society built on a radically new set of values. Californian secessionists aim to insulate themselves from the Trumpian agenda rather than forge an alternative. This is what separates them from Occupy or Otpor! or the Baader-Meinhof Gang, and although it can be disheartening, it also presents an opportunity. A complete and total demolition job is nothing more than a self-serving escapist fantasy; the majority are too invested in the system to dispense with it completely, but recent events prove that there’s an appetite for change that outsiders can exploit from within. Let’s not forget that Brexit wasn’t pioneered by a grassroots movement of disaffected Britons, but a 25-year-long ideological crusade by tory Europhobes like Daniel Hannan and Nigel Farage, who devoted their entire lives and careers to a cause many dismissed as futile. In Spain and Italy, respectively, Podemos and the Five Star Movement have risen from the electorate, through the political apparatus, and are making tangible gains in government. The Tea Party proved to be an effective pressure group of citizen lobbyists, and their tactics have been co-opted by the authors of the Indivisible Guide for use in the Trump era. This is what uniquely western revolutions look like. Maybe they don’t fit the the simplistic, news-optimized narrative that we’re used to, but the common thread that ties them to the headline-grabbing popular uprisings of recent years is an absolute, total, and undivided commitment to change. Aspiring revolutionaries just have to ask themselves if they want change desperately enough to commit to that.

#### Causality of all their impact and link stuff is wrong because world is getting better – reject their progress pessimism

Horgan, ‘16 (John Horgan, Writer for Scientific American, two Science Journalism Awards from the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the National Association of Science Writers Science-in-Society Award, “Yes, Trump Is Scary, but Don't Lose Faith in Progress,” The Scientific American, <https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/cross-check/yes-trump-is-scary-but-don-t-lose-faith-in-progress/>) cg

Is progress a pipe dream? Or are things getting better? I debated this question last month at Stevens Institute of Technology with my pal Garry Dobbins, a philosopher who’s even more of a curmudgeon than I am. In a blurb for the debate, Garry asserted that “we tend to deceive ourselves about having made progress." In the wake of Trump's victory, Garry's pessimism looks all too apt. I'm nonetheless re-posting my pro-progress arguments below. Now, more than ever, we need to remember how far we've come, so we don't lose faith in ourselves. –John Horgan Ours is a glum age. Pessimism is rampant not only among old people, like my colleague, Prof. Dobbins, but also among people just starting out in life, like students here at Stevens. When I ask if they think things are getting better, my students usually shake their heads. They think progress is a pipe dream. I know progressives who doubt progress. Progress-deniers seem to believe in conservation of misery. If things get better today, they must get worse tomorrow. Progress here means regress there. I understand why many people think things are bad and getting worse. We face serious problems: war, terrorism, nuclear weapons, racism, religious extremism, inequality, climate change, AIDS, the Zika virus, political corruption. Trump. But progress-pessimism is wrong-headed, for two reasons. First of all, it can be self-fulfilling if it foments apathy or despair, which undercut efforts to solve problems. Progress-denial also flies in the face of the enormous progress we’ve achieved over the past couple of centuries. Humanity is healthier, wealthier, more peaceful and more free than ever. Denial of this progress is delusional. Here are statistics on progress, many of which come from “Our World in Data,” a terrific website created by Oxford economist Max Roser. WE ARE HEALTHIER THAN EVER. Average life expectancy for almost all of human history and pre-history was about 30 years, in part because maternal and child mortality were so high. Since 1900 global life expectancy has more than doubled--from just over 30 to almost 70--as a result of improved water and sewage treatment, medical hygiene, vaccines, antibiotics and other health-measures. Maternal and child mortality have plummeted. In the U.S., life expectancy is almost 80 years. Pessimists might think, Yeah, but longer life spans mean overpopulation. There’s some truth to that, but take heart. The rate of population growth has fallen by almost 50 percent since peaking in 1962, because women are choosing to have fewer children. WE ARE WEALTHIER THAN EVER. For most of human history, the vast majority of humans were extremely poor, living a hand to mouth existence. Then the industrial revolution brought about what economist Deirdre McCloskey calls “the great enrichment." Beginning in the late 18th century, average global income has surged by a factor of more than 10. Some people have gotten much richer than others, but this is not a zero-sum trend. Humanity as a whole has become less poor. The percentage of people who live in extreme poverty, defined as $1.25 a day or less, dropped in the last few decades from over 50 percent to less than 20 percent. WE ARE MORE PEACEFUL. Many of my students were toddlers on September 11, 2001, so they cannot remember a time when your country was not at war. Nevertheless, we are living in a relatively peaceful era, especially compared to the previous century. Estimates of war deaths should vary widely and hence should be taken with a grain of salt, but a clear trend emerges from data presented by Roser and other groups (see here and here). According to my estimate, global war-related deaths have averaged about 200,000 people a year since 2000. That includes casualties of the war in Syria, which has killed an average of 80,000 people a year since 2011. In the first half of the 20th century, about 4 million people a year on average were killed by war and genocide. Almost 1 million people a year were killed between 1950 and 2000. (These latter figures come from my book The End of War.) As a percentage of population, war casualties have fallen by roughly two orders of magnitude over the past century. More good news: The threat of global nuclear war has receded since the Cold War ended in the early 1990s. There are about 15,000 nuclear warheads in the world, down from a high of almost 70,000 in the 1980s. Terror attacks, like the recent bombing in New York City, have us all spooked. But your annual risk of being killed by in a terror attack in the United States since 2000 is less than your risk of drowning in a bathtub.