## Must Open Source

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all constructive speech docs open source with highlighting on the NDCA LD wiki within an hour after debating.

#### Violation – they don’t

#### Debate resource inequities—disclosure is the only way to truly level the playing field for students such as novices in under-privileged programs.

Antonucci 5 [Michael (Debate coach for Georgetown; former coach for Lexington High School); “[eDebate] open source? resp to Morris”; December 8; http://cedadebate.org/pipermail/mailman/2005 December/060990.html]

a. Open source systems are preferable to the various punishment proposals in circulation. It's better to share the wealth than limit production or participation. Various flavors of argument communism appeal to different people, but banning interesting or useful research(ers) seems like the most destructive solution possible. Indeed, open systems may be the only structural, rule-based answer to resource inequities. Every other proposal I've seen obviously fails at the level of enforcement. Revenue sharing (illegal), salary caps (unenforceable and possibly illegal) and personnel restrictions (circumvented faster than you can say 'information is fungible') don't work. This would - for better or worse. b. With the help of a middling competent archivist, an open source system would reduce entry barriers. This is especially true on the novice or JV level. Young teams could plausibly subsist entirely on a diet of scavenged arguments. A novice team might not wish to do so, but the option can't hurt. c. An open source system would fundamentally change the evidence economy without targetting anyone or putting anyone out of a job. It seems much smarter (and less bilious) to change the value of a professional card-cutter's work than send the KGB after specific counter-revolutionary teams.

#### Evidence ethics – open source is the only way to verify before round that cards aren’t miscut – otherwise you could have highlighted unethically. That’s a voter – maintaining ethical ev practices is key to being good academics and we should be able to verify you didn’t cheat

#### Fairness is a voter – its constitutive of any competitive activity based on skills, wins, and losses – unfair practices skew the judge’s ability to determine the better debater

#### Drop the debater to set a norm – if they lose they’ll open source from now on

#### Competing interps – reasonability is arbitrary and begs the question of what’s reasonable requiring judge intervention

#### No neg rvi – otherwise the 6 minute 2nr can collapse to a short shell and get away with infinite 1nc abuse via sheer brute force and time spent on theory

**I negate: the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust**

# 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.

1. You should use probability weighing: any other form of risk calculus collapses in on itself

# Contention 1: Safety Nets

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

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.

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

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.

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

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.**

**Urgency continues to rise. Passing 2°C leads to extinction. Allowing private sector abuses will only worsen the situation and minorities will be hit the hardest**

**Worland, 20** (Justin Worland, Justin Worland is a Washington D.C.-based senior correspondent for TIME covering climate change and the intersection of policy, politics and society., 7-9-2020, accessed on 12-17-2021, Time, "2020 Is Our Last, Best Chance to Save the Planet", <https://time.com/5864692/climate-change-defining-moment/>) DD//SV

**We’re standing at a climate crossroads: the world has already warmed 1.1°C since the Industrial Revolution. If we pass 2°C, we risk hitting one or more major tipping points, where the effects of climate change go from advancing gradually to changing dramatically overnight, reshaping the planet**. To ensure that we don’t pass that threshold, we need to cut emissions in half by 2030. Climate change has understandably fallen out of the public eye this year as the coronavirus pandemic rages. Nevertheless, this year, or perhaps this year and next, is likely to be the most pivotal yet in the fight against climate change. “We’ve run out of time to build new things in old ways,” says Rob Jackson, an earth system science professor at Stanford University and the chair of the Global Carbon Project. **What we do now will define the fate of the planet–and human life on it–for decades.** The time frame for effective climate action was always going to be tight, but the coronavirus pandemic has shrunk it further. Scientists and policymakers expected the green transition to occur over the next decade, but the pandemic has pushed 10 years of anticipated investment in everything from power plants to roads into a monthslong time frame. Countries have already spent $11 trillion to help stem the economic damage from COVID-19. They could spend trillions more. “It’s in this next six months that recovery strategies are likely to be formulated and the path is set,” says Nicholas Stern, a former World Bank chief economist known for his landmark 2006 report warning that **climate change could devastate the global economy**. We don’t know where the chips will fall: Will a newfound respect for science and a fear of future shocks lead us to finally wake up, or will the desire to return to normal overshadow the threats lurking just around the corner? One of Los Angeles’ most crowded highway interchanges was nearly empty during rush hour on April 24. Stuart Palley We find ourselves on the brink of climate catastrophe in large part because of the decisions made during a past crisis. As the world came out of the Great Depression and World War II, the U.S. launched a rapid bid to remake the global economy–running on fossil fuels. In the first postwar years, Americans moved to suburbs and began driving gas-guzzling cars to work, while the federal government built a highway system to connect the country for those vehicles. The single biggest line item in the Marshall Plan, the U.S. government program that funded the European recovery, went to support oil, which ensured that the continent’s economy would also run on that fossil fuel. Meanwhile, plastic, an oil derivative, became the go-to building block for consumer goods after the U.S. had developed production capacity for use in World War II. The underlying philosophy of economic development in this time period was a focus on gross national product, a term developed by U.S. government economists during the Depression, which included consumption as a proxy for prosperity: the more we consume, the better off we are, according to this model, which, in the postwar era, the U.S. assiduously spread abroad. The promise of endless growth also required an endless supply of oil to power factories, automobiles and jet planes. In 1945, President Franklin D. Roosevelt sealed a deal with Ibn Saud, the first King of Saudi Arabia, trading security for access to the country’s vast oil reserves. Every U.S. President since, implicitly or explicitly, has continued that exchange. The coronavirus pandemic is the most significant disruption yet to the postwar fossil-fuel order. The global economy is expected to contract more than 5% this year, according to the International Monetary Fund (IMF). This is a challenge so big that it has also created a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to change direction. This moment comes just in time. In 2018, a landmark report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the U.N.’s climate-science body, warned that **allowing the planet to warm any more than 2°C above preindustrial levels would drive hundreds of millions of people into poverty**, destroy coral reefs **and leave some countries unable to adapt.** **A 2019 analysis in the journal Nature identified nine tipping points**–from the collapse of the West Antarctic ice sheet to the thawing of Arctic permafrost–that the planet appears close to reaching, any one of which might very well be triggered if warming exceeds 1.5°C. “**Going beyond 2°C is a very critical step**,” says Johan Rockstrom, director of the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, “not only in terms of economic and human impact but also **in terms of the stability of the earth**.” To keep temperatures from rising past the 1.5°C goal, we would need to cut global greenhouse-gas emissions 7.6% every year for the next decade, according to a report from the U.N. Environment Programme (UNEP). That’s about the level the COVID-19 pandemic will reduce emissions this year, but virtually no one thinks a deadly pandemic and accompanying unemployment is a sustainable way to halt climate change–and recessions are typically followed by sharp rebounds in emissions. To achieve the 1.5°C goal without creating mass disruption has always meant thoughtfully restructuring the global economy, moving it away from fossil-fuel extraction slowly but surely. Scientists and economists agree this is the last opportunity we have to do so. “If we delay further than 2020,” says Rockstrom, “there’s absolutely no empirical evidence that it can be done in an orderly way.” As of late June, countries had spent some $11 trillion on measures to halt the pandemic and stem its economic impact, according to the IMF. Economists say that’s not enough, and countries and central banks plan to keep doling out money to help the global economy stay afloat. There are lots of things we could be buying with that money that would make our lives better and protect us from climate disaster. In recent months, leading institutions across the spectrum have offered approaches that are varied in their specifics but generally similar in philosophy: invest in greener infrastructure. The International Energy Agency (IEA), for example, calls for an annual $1 trillion investment in clean energy for the next three years. At a cost of about 0.7% of global GDP, this would represent a small portion of the funds spent to combat COVID-19 but could be transformative. Expansion and modernization of electric grids would allow for easier flow of renewable energy. Governments could buy out gas-guzzling vehicles, pushing consumers to go electric. Homes and buildings could be retrofitted to consume less energy. This spending would also help solve the immediate problem of lost jobs and economic stagnation by creating nearly 10 million jobs worldwide and increasing global GDP by 1.1%, meaning it would add more to the economy than it costs. Importantly, green investment would result in a slew of “co-benefits.” For example, some rural communities would receive access to electricity for the first time. For another, air pollution would decline all over the world. “**If governments do not make use of this opportunity, they may miss a very important tool for the economic recovery**,” says Fatih Birol, head of the IEA. But this moment is not just about opportunity; even **maintaining the status quo is dangerous**. **Research from the UNEP released last year shows that if nations stick with current plans to reduce emissions, global temperatures will rise more than 3°C by the end of this century**. For the past five years, climate advocates had positioned 2020 as critical in the fight against climate change. Under the Paris Agreement, countries are required to submit new plans to reduce emissions in 2020, and climate diplomats had planned a series of meetings around the world this year to build momentum, culminating with the U.N. climate conference in Glasgow, in November. The Glasgow event was postponed a year, but the coronavirus pandemic has created a new sort of momentum. Empty city streets have been transformed into pedestrian space with cars banished, and many cities say they’re not going back. The oil industry has faced a reckoning, with the U.S. benchmark price at one point in mid-April dropping into negative territory and investors fleeing the industry; smaller firms filing for bankruptcy; and some of its biggest players writing down assets they say have lost their value. With the writing beginning to appear on the wall, many countries are starting to build a different world. In South Korea, the newly re-elected government has promised a $10 billion Green New Deal to invest in renewable energy and make public buildings energy efficient. In Costa Rica, one of a few developing countries to commit to eliminating their carbon footprint by 2050, leaders have created a new fee on gasoline to fund social-welfare programs and are planning to issue new green bonds to fund the next stage of climate adaptation programs. Rwanda, which has a GDP of roughly $9 billion, has adopted an $11 billion plan to reduce emissions and adapt to climate change, which includes a push for buses, cars and motorcycles to go electric. “We cannot afford to have the same mode of recovery, the same mode of doing business, the same mode of economic activity,” says Juliet Kabera, director general of the Rwanda Environment Management Authority. International institutions are playing a critical role nudging these countries. The IMF, which has said it “stands ready” to use its $1 trillion lending capacity to stave off the effects of the coronavirus pandemic, has made climate resilience a key criterion for its lending. This has already paid dividends: some 50 nations, including dozens of developing countries, committed in late June to address climate change in their coronavirus recovery plans. “It’s a great catalyst to think about building a new world,” says Costa Rican President Carlos Alvarado Quesada. “Whatever we decide as a country or as a global community in the next six or 10 or 12 months is going to determine what happens on the earth for the next decade.” Nowhere will such an approach have as large an impact as in the E.U. When compared with countries, the bloc is the world’s second largest economy and third largest emitter. Its pandemic recovery will help achieve the proposed target of halving its emissions in 10 years by spending $100 billion annually to make homes energy-efficient, $28 billion to build renewable energy capacity and up to $67 billion for zero-emissions trains. The European investment in going green will hurt coal-mining jobs in places like Poland and the Czech Republic, but the European recovery program will pay billions to retrain the workers and transition them to other industries. The measure awaits approval by the member countries, and the details are subject to negotiation, but observers do not expect the direction of the policy to change. Other major players in the global economy, most notably the U.S. and China, have not made as clear commitments to a green-tinged recovery. Upcoming decisions in both of those countries, which combined are responsible for nearly half of global emissions, are urgent. China is being pulled in two directions as it develops a plan that will set the course of its development–and, by extension, its emissions–for the next half decade. In March, as China’s coronavirus epidemic began to subside, the nation’s powerful Politburo Standing Committee, which is made up of senior leaders of the Communist Party, including President Xi Jinping, endorsed a proposal to expedite $1.4 trillion in spending on so-called “new infrastructure” that includes electric-vehicle charging stations and high-speed rail, as well as 5G technology, which wouldn’t cut emissions per se but would help advance the country’s tech sector rather than its heavy industry, stimulating economic growth with lower emissions.But the degree of commitment to those green recovery measures remains unclear. The Politburo Standing Committee’s push is unfunded, leaving provincial governments to follow through. So far, the evidence on the ground has not been encouraging. Local Chinese governments have approved new coal-fired power plants this year at the fastest clip since 2015–a surefire way to stimulate economic growth and emissions. And the country is reportedly planning to ramp up production of oil and natural gas. Demand has fallen, but cheaper oil and gas typically stimulate the economy. Abroad, China continues to fund emissions-intensive projects through its Belt and Road Initiative. In Africa, for instance, China is financing new coal-fired power plants, even as many international financial institutions have walked away from the energy source. External pressure is likely to force the issue, and the E.U. is trying to offer just that. To push China and others along, the bloc is crafting a new tax on imports from countries that aren’t reducing emissions. Climate and trade are both currently being discussed by officials behind the scenes and were planned to be on the top of the agenda at a now postponed September summit between the E.U. and China. “Europe is a very important market for the Chinese,” says Laurence Tubiana, the CEO of the European Climate Foundation and a key architect of the Paris Agreement. “China can be secured in its potential exports to Europe by understanding that it can secure positive trade relations by increasing its climate ambition.

# Contention 2 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 due to perception

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).