# Framework

#### I value morality. My value criterion is preventing structural violence.

#### You should oppose everyday violence for two reasons- A) social bias underrepresents its effects B) its effects are exponential, not linear which means even if there is only a small amount of structural violence, its terminal impacts are huge

**Nixon ’11** (Rob, Rachel Carson Professor of English, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor, pgs. 2-3)

Three primary concerns animate this book, chief among them my conviction that we urgently need to rethink-politically, imaginatively, and theoretically-what I call "slow violence." By slow violence I mean a violence that occurs gradually and out of sight, a violence of delayed destruction that is dispersed across time and space, an attritional violence that is typically not viewed as violence at all. Violence is customarily conceived as an event or action that is immediate in time, explosive and spectacular in space, and as erupting into instant sensational visibility. We need, I believe, to engage a different kind of violence, a violence that is neither spectacular nor instantaneous, but rather incremental and accretive, its calamitous repercussions playing out across a range of temporal scales. In so doing, we also need to engage the representational, narrative, and strategic challenges posed by the relative invisibility of slow violence. Climate change, the thawing cryosphere, toxic drift, biomagnification, deforestation, the radioactive aftermaths of wars, acidifying oceans, and a host of other slowly unfolding environmental catastrophes present formidable representational obstacles that can hinder our efforts to mobilize and act decisively. The long dyings-the staggered and staggeringly discounted casualties, both human and ecological that result from war's toxic aftermaths or climate change-are underrepresented in strategic planning as well as in human memory. Had Summers advocated invading Africa with weapons of mass destruction, his proposal would have fallen under conventional definitions of violence and been perceived as a military or even an imperial invasion. Advocating invading countries with mass forms of slow-motion toxicity, however, requires rethinking our accepted assumptions of violence to include slow violence. Such a rethinking requires that we complicate conventional assumptions about violence as a highly visible act that is newsworthy because it is event focused, time bound, and body bound. We need to account for how the temporal dispersion of slow violence affects the way we perceive and respond to a variety of social afflictions-from domestic abuse to posttraumatic stress and, in particular, environmental calamities. A major challenge is representational: how to devise arresting stories, images, and symbols adequate to the pervasive but elusive violence of delayed effects. Crucially, slow violence is often not just attritional but also exponential, operating as a major threat multiplier; it can fuel long-term, proliferating conflicts in situations where the conditions for sustaining life become increasingly but gradually degraded.

#### Additionally prefer:

#### It’s a prerequisite. Morality must be applied equally to everyone, or else it wouldn’t be moral. Oppression excludes minorities from moral consideration.

# Contention 1: Safety Nets

#### Right now, billionaires are looking to space colonization to escape earth.

Journalist Reed Tucker writes in 2020:

Reed Tucker 20 (Reed Tucker, NY Based Journalist) Jeff Bezos and Elon Musk’s plans to colonize space are even crazier than we thought 8-8-2020 New York Post https://nypost.com/2020/08/08/billionaires-who-plan-to-colonize-space-live-in-a-dream-world/ //DebateDrills TJ

Now **the future of** space is largely **in** his and **the hands of** other free-spending, big-dreaming **billionaires** like him, including Amazon’s Jeff Bezos. But what will this future look like? Some answers can be found in the new book “[Star Settlers: The Billionaires, Geniuses, and Crazed Visionaries Out to Conquer the Universe](https://www.amazon.com/Star-Settlers-Billionaires-Geniuses-Visionaries/dp/1643134485/?tag=nypost-20&asc_refurl=https://nypost.com/2020/08/08/billionaires-who-plan-to-colonize-space-live-in-a-dream-world/&asc_source=web)” (Pegasus Books) by Fred Nadis, out now. “I see [guys like Musk] almost like medieval cathedral builders, with this multi-century project that they’re willing to take their time and their livelihood,” Nadis told The Post. That said, the author thinks these billionaires may be dreaming a bit too big. As Matt Damon found in “The Martian,” the red planet’s atmosphere is much thinner than Earth’s and the planet generates no electromagnetic field, meaning it gets pounded by cosmic rays and other harmful-to-humans energy.©20thCentFox/Courtesy Everett C Musk, the founder of Tesla, **has said** that all of his earthly business ventures are just a way to fund **his true passion: colonizing Mars.** His company, SpaceX, is planning to send humans to the red planet in 2024. Within a century, Musk envisions reusable rockets blasting off every two years and ferrying some 200 passengers at a time, ultimately establishing an outpost of a million people. It’s still unclear how they’ll survive. At its closest, Mars is some 35 million miles from Earth, and a trip would take around nine months. Once they get there, the problem explorers will face is that Mars’ atmosphere is much thinner than Earth’s and the planet generates no electromagnetic field, meaning it gets pounded by cosmic rays and other energy harmful to humans. “It’s really challenging,” Nadis says. “Not quite as simple as SpaceX might make it out to be.” Musk has offered sketchy details of what life off-world might look like. Any Mars colony would have to be self-sustaining and not rely on supplies from Earth. Musk has suggested food be grown on hydroponic farms, either underground or in an enclosed structure to protect the crops from radiation, but because Mars’ surface gets about half the sunlight Earth does, whatever plants that can be grown will likely have to be supplemented with artificial lights — and powering those lights will be no small challenge. Musk has said farms will be powered by solar panels, though he’s offered few details. “Really pretty straightforward,” he told Popular Mechanics last year. Princeton physicist Gerard O’Neill imagined space colonies consisting of giant counter-rotating cylinders, simulating gravity.Rick Guidice/NASA In the same interview, the billionaire suggested Mars’ inhabitants might live under a glass dome with an “outdoorsy, fun atmosphere” until the planet is terraformed — artificially transforming the planet to make it more Earth-like, with a livable atmosphere. But that plan also presents a problem: A 2018 NASA-sponsored study concluded that terraforming Mars is impossible, because there is not enough carbon dioxide locked in the soil to release into the air. Musk, however, isn’t daunted. He has suggested exploding 10,000 nuclear missiles over Mars’ surface in order to melt the planet’s ice reserves, thereby releasing the carbon dioxide locked within. His company has even produced “Nuke Mars” T-shirts. Scientists are divided on whether the idea would work. Penn State climate scientist Michael Mann, for example, told US News and World Report in 2015, “There are so many things that could go wrong here, it is difficult to know where to start.” Meanwhile, **Bezos and his company**, Blue Origin**, are also focused on moving off-world** — but **onto space colonies**. **Bezos is worried that the Earth’s resources will be gone in a few hundred years, spurring the need to leave.** Bezos draws much of his inspiration from the work of Gerard O’Neill, a Princeton physicist who in the 1970s laid out a grand design for space colonies.

#### Space colonization if only done by private entities will be primarily accessible to the extremely wealthy.

Journalist Kevin Maney writes in 2015:

Kevin Maney 15 (Kevin Maney, Contributor to the Atlantic, Fortune, best-selling author, award-winning columnist) 'Star Wars' Class Wars: Is Mars the Escape Hatch for the 1 Percent? 12-14-2015 Newsweek https://www.newsweek.com/2015/12/25/mars-colonies-rich-people-404681.html //DebateDrills TJ

This is the unspoken flip side of Musk's [SpaceX](http://dcinno.streetwise.co/2015/12/07/spacex-2016-elon-musks-internet-satellites-nasa-missions/) and Bezos's [Blue Origin](https://www.businessinsider.com/about-blue-origins-be-4-engine-2015-12). The space travel companies say they are creating a way for the human species to endure by populating other planets. But **the bottom line is that only the wealthy will have the means to move to Mars**. Musk's target ticket price is $500,000 a person in 2015 dollars, and that's just to get there. Imagine the new outfits you'll have to buy to go with that space helmet. So **you can picture a scenario that's something like the 1970s**[**white flight**](http://www.citylab.com/work/2013/11/mapping-60-years-white-flight-brain-drain-and-american-migration/7449/)**from inner cities, when the wealthier classes moved to freshly built suburbs, leaving the declining neighborhoods to the lower classes.** In fact, **the fleeing upper classes sped up the decrepitude of that era's older cities by relocating their money and clout with them**. Today, we're seeing a similar situation in Syria, as the wealthiest and most educated people [escape](https://www.ibtimes.com/europe-refugee-crisis-facts-wealthy-educated-syrians-risking-lives-leave-war-2089018) to the West, which will make the country even harder to stabilize and rebuild.

#### This means that it allows for the extremely wealthy to have a safety net to turn to if things on earth go bad

Journalist Michael Moran writes in 2020:

Michael Moran 20 (Michael Moran, Journalist for the Daily Star, and The Times) Billionaires could leave Earth behind 'for space colony' as 'climate collapses' 2-8-2020 Dailystar.co.uk https://www.dailystar.co.uk/news/weird-news/billionaires-could-leave-earth-behind-21445413 //DebateDrills TJ

But noted American media theorist Douglas Rushkoff has written that **the overall direction of technological development was about creating an escape route for the super-rich**. He pointed out that combat robots would serve very well to guard the bolt-holes of billionaires remaining on Earth **once climate change reached its end-game** and described Elon Musk’s planned Mars colony as “less a continuation of the human diaspora than **a lifeboat for the elite.”** They can certainly afford a lifeboat. The world’s richest people have seen their share of the world’s total money supply increase from 42.5% at the height of the 2008 financial crisis to just over 50.% by the end of 2017. That adds up to about or $140trillion (£106tn), according to a report from Credit Suisse.

#### Look at the status quo, the wealthy are the ones exploiting earth right now.

Journalist Jess Zimmerman writes in 2015:

Jess Zimmerman 15 (Jess Zimmerman, Guardian US columnist) What if the mega-rich just want rocket ships to escape the Earth they destroy? 9-16-2015 Guardian https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/sep/16/mega-rich-rocket-ships-escape-earth //DebateDrills TJ

Of course, **uber-wealthy** tech entrepreneurs **aren’t just buying rockets for their personal amusement.** They’re founding or investing in space travel – they want to get you off-planet, too. Well, not you-you, but someone like you with much, much, much more money. And that’s where the vogue for billionaire space travel magnates gets a little weird –and maybe even sinister. It’s already very true that money expands your world; the person with the funds to have a car is less restricted in her movements than the person without one, and the person with a huge plane and the money to fly it is less restricted still. The expansion of rich people’s travel horizons comes at a price for everyone, both rich and poor. With the exception of America’s weirdly-expensive Amtrak system, cost and luxury scale with fossil fuel consumption; travel that costs more and feels more indulgent is also travel that has a cataclysmic effect on the environment. The faster and further you can afford to travel, the greater your environmental footprint. And often, the people less able to travel are the ones left holding the toxic-chemical and pollution-filled bag. **Companies** like Blue Origin **are using** money and **resources to push outwards**, to expand the worlds of their rich customers all the way into space. **But those same customers** – and some of the owners – **are** making their terrestrial money in the classic capitalist terrestrial way: by **working around any obstacle to profit, including environmental regulations and conservation efforts**. Almost all industry is environmentally disastrous, after all; truly prioritizing earth-friendliness would destroy most companies. Some people with a great deal of money care more about the fate of the world than others, but they’re all willing to cut corners if it affects the bottom line. You can tell because they have a great deal of money; you can also tell because they’re willing to spend it on a ride in a spaceship. Which raises the question: are they just gearing up to wash their hands of the planet and leave the rest of us to clean up? **By pushing outward while ignoring the problems it causes back on the home turf**, are **they effectively** **creat**ing **a galactic upper class that rests on the backs of the earthbound**? Even if that’s not literally the plan, it may be the ultimate outcome.

#### This leads to worse warming on earth. Billionaires are top cause of climate change and space means there are no consequences. Warming ultimately harms the most oppressed

Editor of the Guardian Laura Paddison writes in 2021:

Laura Paddison 21 (Laura Paddison, Editor of This New World, Editor of the Guardian) How the rich are driving climate change 10-27-2021 No Publication https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20211025-climate-how-to-make-the-rich-pay-for-their-carbon-emissions //DebateDrills TJ

In 2018, Stefan Gössling and his team spent months scouring the social media profiles of some of the richest celebrities, from Paris Hilton to Oprah Winfrey. The tourism professor from Linnaeus University in Sweden was looking for evidence of how much they were flying.  The answer was a lot. Bill Gates, one of the world's most high-profile environmental advocates, took 59 flights in 2017, according to Gössling's [calculations](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S016073831930132X?via%3Dihub), covering a distance of around 343,500km (213,000 miles) – more than eight times around the world – generating more than 1,600 tonnes of greenhouse gases (that's equivalent to the [average yearly emissions of 105 Americans](https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EN.ATM.CO2E.PC?locations=US)).  Gössling's aim was to try to uncover **the individual consumption levels of the mega rich**, whose lifestyles **are often shrouded in secrecy**. His research coincided with a growing environmental movement, spearheaded by Greta Thunberg, which put a spotlight on personal accountability. Flying, one of the most carbon-intensive forms of consumption, became a symbol of this new accountability.  "**The bigger your carbon footprint, the bigger your moral duty,**" Thunberg [wrote in the Guardian](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/jan/25/our-house-is-on-fire-greta-thunberg16-urges-leaders-to-act-on-climate) in 2019.  The last few decades have shone a spotlight on global inequality. From the 2008 financial crisis, to the pandemic and the [increasingly severe impacts of climate change](https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20200618-climate-change-who-is-to-blame-and-why-does-it-matter) – disruptive events tend to hit the poorest first and hardest.But in debates about how to solve inequality, over-consumption is often overlooked. "Each unit you overshoot means someone has to give [something] up," says Lewis Akenji, managing director of Hot or Cool Institute, a Berlin-based think tank. As a result, the outsized carbon footprints of society's richest entrench inequality and threaten the world's ability to stave off catastrophic climate change. The statistics are startling. **The world's wealthiest 10% were responsible for around half of global emissions in 2015, according to a 2020**[**report**](https://www.sei.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/research-report-carbon-inequality-era.pdf) from Oxfam and the Stockholm Environment Institute. **The top 1% were responsible for 15% of emissions**, **nearly twice as much as the world's poorest 50%,** **who** were responsible for just 7% and **will feel the brunt of climate impacts despite bearing the least responsibility for causing them.**

# Contention 2 is private government (sv)

#### In the status quo, only private entities can appropriate space

**Fukazawa 20**, James Fukazawa, 4-28-2020, "Does the U.S. Space Force Violate the Outer Space Treaty? – Denver Journal of International Law & Policy," No Publication, <http://djilp.org/does-the-u-s-space-force-violate-the-outer-space-treaty/> Livingston RB

Space-race sabre-rattling between the United States and Russia in the 1960s resulted in the creation of the dominant treaty governing space law, the 1966 United Nations Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, better known as the Outer Space Treaty (OST).[[10]](http://djilp.org/does-the-u-s-space-force-violate-the-outer-space-treaty/#post-9754-footnote-10) Guided by treaties governing the exploration and use of similarly harsh, terrestrial environments like the high seas and Antarctica, the OST declares outer space the province of all mankind and calls for cooperative use of outer space for peaceful purposes.[[11]](http://djilp.org/does-the-u-s-space-force-violate-the-outer-space-treaty/#post-9754-footnote-11) Like the Antarctica Treaty of 1959, which suspended claims of sovereignty in the Antarctic, **the OST** similarly **precludes claims of sovereignty in space.**[**[12]**](http://djilp.org/does-the-u-s-space-force-violate-the-outer-space-treaty/#post-9754-footnote-12) **The elimination of sovereignty precludes national appropriation of space objects, natural resources found in space, and celestial bodies**.[[13]](http://djilp.org/does-the-u-s-space-force-violate-the-outer-space-treaty/#post-9754-footnote-13) The restriction is meant to deter a space race motivated by national superiority, which would be inimical to the spirit of the OST.[[14]](http://djilp.org/does-the-u-s-space-force-violate-the-outer-space-treaty/#post-9754-footnote-14)

#### This means that these private entities gain the power to act as functional governments- Elon Musk is already planning this

**Cuthbertson 20**, Anthony Cuthbertson, [Anthony Cuthbertson](https://anthonycuthbertson.com/) is a staff writer at Newsweek, based in London. Anthony's awards include Digital Writer of the Year (Online Media Awards) and Journalist of the Year (Association of Online Publishers), 10-28-2020, "Elon Musk’s SpaceX says it will ‘make its own laws on Mars'," Independent, <https://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/gadgets-and-tech/elon-musk-spacex-mars-laws-starlink-b1396023.html> Livingston RB

[**SpaceX**](https://www.independent.co.uk/topic/spacex)**will not recognise international law on**[**Mars**](https://www.independent.co.uk/topic/mars), according to the Terms of Service of its Starlink internet project. Elon Musk’s space company **will instead reportedly adhere to a set of “self-governing principles"** that will be defined at the time of Martian settlement. Musk revealed [plans to create a self-sustaining city on Mars](https://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/gadgets-and-tech/elon-musk-mars-spacex-starship-colony-b1179088.html) last week, though no timeframe is yet to be put in place for its development. Any future colony created by SpaceX would likely use constellations of Starlink satellites orbiting the planet to provide internet connection to people and machines on the surface. More than 800 of the internet satellites have already been launched into orbit around Earth, with tens of thousands more planned in the coming years. A Starlink app launched in certain regions this week, following a successful beta test of the network’s capabilities in parts of the US and Canada. Users noted that the terms of service within the app state that Starlink services provided to Earth or Moon will be governed in accordance with the laws of the State of California. Beyond our planet and its satellite, however, the laws and regulations by which it will abide are less clear. “For services provided on Mars, or in transit to Mars via [Starship](https://www.independent.co.uk/topic/starship) or other colonisation spacecraft, the parties recognise **Mars as a free planet and that no Earth-based government has authority or sovereignty over Martian activities**,” the governing law section states. “Accordingly, **disputes will be settled through self-governing principles, established in good faith, at the time of Martian settlement**.” Space systems engineer Erwan Beauvois said SpaceX’s position was reminiscent of a declaration put forward by the Earthlight Foundation, a non-profit organisation committed to preparing for the expansion of humanity beyond Earth. **The**[**Declaration of the Rights and Responsibilities of Humanity in the Universe**](https://earthlightfoundation.org/declaration/)**states that space should be “considered free, by all, for all and to all.”**

#### This is bad because Companies are already planning arrangements similar to indentured servitude on mars

**Levin 21**, Tim Levin, 2-19-2021, "Elon Musk, once again the world's richest person, is selling all his possessions so people know he's serious about colonizing Mars," Business Insider, <https://www.businessinsider.com/worlds-richest-person-elon-musk-dedicate-wealth-mars-colony-2021-1> Livingston RB

The SpaceX founder has said he [plans to send 1 million people](https://www.businessinsider.com/elon-musk-plans-1-million-people-to-mars-by-2050-2020-1) to Mars by 2050 and build a fleet of 1,000 Starships to ferry them there. Musk aims to launch three of the 387-foot rockets SpaceX is developing for deep-space travel each day. And lest you think **a trip to Mars is too expensive for most people**, **Musk** has said he **intends for there to be "loans available for those who don't have money"** **and jobs** on the red planet **for colonists to pay off their debts**. Some [**critics**](https://twitter.com/elonmusk/status/1217991853615677440/retweets/with_comments) **say Musk's plans resemble an interplanetary form of indentured servitude.**

# Contention 3 is developing countries

#### Outer space houses tons of valuable resources, it’s about who can get there first

**Blair 15**, Brad Blair, Expert in commercial space law, Winter 2015, "Space Mineral Resources," National Space Society - Working to Create a Spacefaring Civilization, <https://space.nss.org/space-mineral-resources/> Livingston RB

**A recently released study** by the International Academy of Astronautics (IAA) **found that space mineral resources** (SMR) **can serve as an economic gamechang**er, **opening a vast new source of wealth to benefit humanity**. The study examined technical, economic, legal, and policy-related requirements to enable SMR, and offered specific recommendations to international space agencies and commercial enterprise for moving humanity forward into a new era of space settlement and commercial resource development. The study was assembled by two prominent space lawyers. Art Dula is a professor of law at the Houston Law School, trustee of the Heinlein Prize Trust, and founder of Excalibur Exploration Limited. Zhang Zhenjun is secretary general of the China Institute of Space Law, a resident director of the Chinese Society of Astronautics, and holds an MBA from George Washington University. The work solicited and included extensive input by entrepreneurial startup companies including Deep Space Industries, Shackleton Energy Company, Planetary Resources, Excalibur Exploration, Moon Express, and Tethers Unlimited. Study findings on SMR technology and engineering design are that **mining asteroids and lunar regolith is within reach of the current state of the technical art.** The extrapolation of Earth-based mining appears to be a one-for-one trade with alterations due to vacuum, low gravity, and temperature, with bench and lab-scale testing to date in private and government labs on Earth affirming this conclusion. Indeed, the primary roadblocks to SMR today are more intimately related to reducing market, legal, and financial risk. A focus on customers, demographics, and increasing market certainty is needed to create a solid foundation for the future of space enterprise. The study found that the cost to develop Moon or asteroid water sources could become significantly lower than the delivery price from Earth, especially as distance increases, making space water a potential basis for future currency. Indeed, establishing spaceports and selling water mined in space is a key to unlocking a robust and sustainable space economy, enabling human expansion into the Solar System.

#### The ability to appropriate space keeps developing nations out of these valuable resources- it’s already happened with satellites

**Giacomin 19**, Nicolas Giacomin, author on space, 12-4-2019, "The Bogotá Declaration and space law," Space Legal Issues, <https://www.spacelegalissues.com/the-bogota-declaration-and-space-law/> Livingston RB

The practice of developed states **is based** **on free access** and priority given to the first **satellites** placed in the geostationary orbit. The placing into orbit of satellites is in accordance with the 1967 Outer Space Treaty. These satellites have the right to pursue a trajectory without interference from satellites later placed in orbit. In addition, the international regulation of the radio spectrum has favored the development of satellite telecommunications systems. Increasing congestion of the orbit and frequencies may **limit the access and opportunities of developing countries in the future**. **It will become more and more difficult** to use frequencies from the geostationary orbit under satisfactory conditions (without creating or suffering radio interference, or without incurring additional costs). Common law regime for the use of frequencies traditionally protects the first users against such interference. In this situation, new entrants must design their space telecommunication systems taking into account both the trajectory and the frequencies used by the satellites in place. Unlike the regime of orbit and outer space in general, for more than half a century, there has already been an institutionalized mechanism for access to radio frequencies. This mechanism makes it possible to coordinate the use of frequencies and thereby, prevents harmful interference between radio stations under the jurisdiction of different states. In order to avoid anarchy in this area, ITU distributes radio waves between recognized radio services. Thus, the frequencies used by the various services at the international level are determined in advance before the establishment of telecommunications stations. Any state wishing to establish a station and allocate a frequency band, must comply with the service allocation deriving from international regulations. While inter-service distribution is pre-established, the distribution among states within a given service is traditionally done according to their order of arrival: the first to notify the use of a frequency band by a station under its jurisdiction acquires a right of priority at the international level. Frequency assignments by states must be registered with the ITU. Within the latter, the International Frequency Registration Board examines the compliance of these assignments with the regulations in force and the possibility of interference with other stations already in operation. In case of conflict between an existing user registered before the International Frequency Registration Board and a newcomer, preference is given to the first one; this is sometimes described as **“first come, first served”**. Some **developing countries have argued that** the utilization of geostationary **orbit by developed countries is contrary to the 1967 Outer Space Treaty** and, in particular, to the principle of non-appropriation. For a variety of reasons, **this challenge to current practice does not really addresses the problem** of orbital saturation. First, the 1967 Outer Space Treaty and the prohibition of appropriation do not limit the use of orbital space. In addition, this instrument appears unable to provide a solution to the problem of saturation of the orbit, because it is primarily due to exogenous constraints related to the use of radio frequencies. Access to the frequency spectrum depends on International Telecommunications Law and not on space law.

#### This perpetuates inequality into space

**Reinstein 99**, Ezra J. Reinstein, Owning Outer Space, 20 Nw. J. Int'l L. & Bus. 59 (1999-2000) <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1500&context=njilb> Livingston RB

The rights of less-developed nations create a concern that is both political and moral in character. As a matter of political reality, the less developed nations wield considerable power, due in no small part to majority voting systems in the major international regulatory bodies. Some feel, and developing nations argue, that **it is morally imperative to take the interests of the non-space-capable nations into account when designing a system of space property law.** A regime based on **the "right of grab,"** the first-come, first-served theory of property acquisition**, should be feared**. **By the time space-incapable nations develop the** technological **prowess and capital** reserves **to fund** meaningful **development of** outer **space, the earlier** space-faring **nations,** left unchecked, might already **have locked up the** most accessible and valuable **resources. Present inequities of global wealth distribution** thus **would be carried forward into** the **space** age. 38

#### Global Inequality has severe impacts for all

**Doucouliagos 17** Chris Doucouliagos, Professor of Economics, Department of Economics, Deakin Business School and Alfred Deakin Institute for Citizenship and Globalisation, Deakin University 8-6-2017, "Don't listen to the rich: inequality is bad for everyone," Conversation, <https://theconversation.com/dont-listen-to-the-rich-inequality-is-bad-for-everyone-81952> Livingston RB

A world where a few people have most of the wealth [motivates others](https://www.economist.com/blogs/economist-explains/2015/06/economist-explains-11) who are poor to strive to earn more. And when they do, they’ll [invest](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2296292?origin=JSTOR-pdf&seq=1#fndtn-page_scan_tab_contents) in businesses and other areas of the economy. That’s the argument for inequality. But it’s wrong. [**Our study**](http://business.monash.edu/__data/assets/pdf_file/0017/455111/1816inequalitymadsenislamdoucouliagos-002.pdf)**of 21 OECD countries over more than a 100 years shows income inequality actually** **restricts** people from **earning** more, **educating** themselves **and** becoming **entrepreneurs**. That flows on to businesses who in turn invest less in things like plant and equipment**. Inequality makes it harder for economies to benefit from innovation.** However, if people have access to credit or the money to move up, it can offset this effect. We measured the impact of this by looking at the number of patents for new inventions and then also looking at the Gini coefficient and the income share of the top 10%. The Gini coefficient is a measure of the distribution of income or wealth within a nation. Don’t let yourself be misled. Understand issues with help from experts. How inequality reduces innovation From 1870 to 1977, inequality measured by the Gini coefficient fell by about 40%. During this time people actually got more innovative and productivity increased, incomes also increased. **But inequality has increased in recent decades and it’s** having the opposite effect Inequality is **preventing people** [with less income and wealth](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2297811?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents) **from reaching their potential in terms of education and invention**. There’s also less [entrepreneurship](http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/261876). Inequality also means **the market for new goods shrinks.**

#### Inequality is bad because it leads to dehumanization and animalization, strengthens structural violence

Sainz **et al 20** (All authors are from the University of Edinburgh focusing in the School of Philosophy, Psychology, and Language Sciences) Sainz, M., Loughnan, S., Martinez, R., Moya , M., & Rodriguez-Bailon, R. (2020). Dehumanization of socioeconomically disadvantaged groups decreases support for welfare policies via perceived wastefulness. *International Review of Social Psychology*, *33*(1), 1-13. [12]. https://doi.org/10.5334/IRSP.414

Growingeconomic **inequality** especially **affects** the well-being of those who have a **disadvantaged** position (Buttrick & Oishi, 2017). Nowadays, many people rely on government support for food, heat, and accommodations (e.g., 6.8 million working-age British citizens receive benefits; National Statistics, 2017). However, despite the devastating effects that a deprived position has on people’s lives (Mood & Jonsson, 2016), many citizens oppose social welfare policies that seek to alleviate the consequences of living in poverty (Ashok et al., 2015). Even though this opposition likely has multiple causes, **one** potentially important explanatory **factor is the social perceptions that individuals form about low-socioeconomic status (low-SES) groups**. In addition to being disliked (Cozzarelli et al., 2001) or stereotyped as less competent especially in higher economic inequality contexts (Durante, Tablante & Fiske, 2017), **low-SES groups are also often considered as less human than high-SES groups** (Loughnan et al., 2014; Sainz, Martínez, Moya, & Rodríguez-Bailón, 2019). Moreover, low-SES people sometimes are depicted as having wasteful consumption practices that supposedly stem from irrational economic decisions or a dysfunctional lifestyle (Jones, 2011); put simply, one can readily have an understanding that low-SES people spend their money on electronics or expensive clothes instead of on essential goods such as food or accommodations (Bullock et al., 2001; Hayward & Yar, 2006). In the present work, we aimed to extend previous work on the consequences of animalizing low-SES groups (Sainz, Martínez, Sutton, Rodríguez-Bailón, & Moya, 2019): We predict that dehumanizing low-SES groups may reduce support for social welfare policies, by portraying the recipients of such programs as economically irresponsible. The denial of people’s humanity is an important feature in intergroup relations (for reviews, see Haslam & Loughnan, 2014; Haslam & Stratemeyer, 2016; or Vaes et al., 2012). **Haslam** (2006) **proposed** two **dimensions of humanity**: human nature (HN) and **human uniqueness (HU).** The former includes traits such as emotionality, cognitive openness, and depth; the denial of these traits leads to perception of others as unemotional objects (i.e., mechanistic dehumanization). The latter **involves traits such as rationality and civility that serve to differentiate humans from animals; denial in this case leads to animalization**. Based on the previous literature, **HU is the dimension traditionally denied to groups that occupy a subordinate position in society, such as immigrants, refugees, and minority ethnic groups** (DeLuca-McLean & Castano, 2009; Esses et al., 2008; Goff et al., 2008). Furthermore, prior work has identified HU as the dimension, above and beyond HN, associated with the justification of hierarchical inequalities (Haslam, 2006) and its consequences such, for instance, the discrimination of ethnic minorities (Haslam & Loughnan, 2014). Although there has been limited work directly pairing SES and dehumanization, there is **evidence that low-SES groups are viewed as not fully human**; for instance, Loughnan et al. (2014) showed that **people in different countries associated low-SES groups with animals such as apes, rats, and dogs**, and Sainz, Martínez, Moya, and Rodríguez-Bailón (2019) demonstrated that low-SES groups were considered lacking more HU than high-SES groups. This previous research highlights that groups that have a low socioeconomic position are prone to be considered as less evolved than other groups. In addition, prior work identified that the denial of HU, even more than of HN, seems to drive negative attitudes about redistribution policies aimed to reduce the income gap between low- and high-SES groups (Sainz, Martínez, Sutton, et al., 2019). Further, authors explore how the willingness to accept that poverty is caused by external (e.g., economic system) or by internal (e.g., lack of intelligence) factors mediates the relationship between animalizing low-SES and attitudes about income redistribution. These findings are a key starting point for the current research because it highlights how **animalizing groups could influence the justification of** income **inequality** (Sainz, Martínez, Rodríguez-Bailón, et al., 2019; Sainz, Martínez, Sutton, et al., 2019).