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## 1

#### Strong commercial space catalyzes tech innovation – progress at the margins and spinoff tech change global information networks

Joshua Hampson 2017, Security Studies Fellow at the Niskanen Center, 1-25-2017, “The Future of Space Commercialization”, Niskanen Center, https://republicans-science.house.gov/sites/republicans.science.house.gov/files/documents/TheFutureofSpaceCommercializationFinal.pdf

Innovation is generally hard to predict; some new technologies seem to come out of nowhere and others only take off when paired with a new application. It is difficult to predict the future, but it is reasonable to expect that a growing space economy would open opportunities for technological and organizational innovation. In terms of technology, the difficult environment of outer space helps incentivize progress along the margins. Because each object launched into orbit costs a significant amount of money—at the moment between $27,000 and $43,000 per pound, though that will likely drop in the future —each 19 reduction in payload size saves money or means more can be launched. At the same time, the ability to fit more capability into a smaller satellite opens outer space to actors that previously were priced out of the market. This is one of the reasons why small, affordable satellites are increasingly pursued by companies or organizations that cannot afford to launch larger traditional satellites. These small 20 satellites also provide non-traditional launchers, such as engineering students or prototypers, the opportunity to learn about satellite production and test new technologies before working on a full-sized satellite. That expansion of developers, experimenters, and testers cannot but help increase innovation opportunities. Technological developments from outer space have been applied to terrestrial life since the earliest days of space exploration. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) maintains a website that lists technologies that have spun off from such research projects. Lightweight 21 nanotubes, useful in protecting astronauts during space exploration, are now being tested for applications in emergency response gear and electrical insulation. The need for certainty about the resiliency of materials used in space led to the development of an analytics tool useful across a range of industries. Temper foam, the material used in memory-foam pillows, was developed for NASA for seat covers. As more companies pursue their own space goals, more innovations will likely come from the commercial sector. Outer space is not just a catalyst for technological development. Satellite constellations and their unique line-of-sight vantage point can provide new perspectives to old industries. Deploying satellites into low-Earth orbit, as Facebook wants to do, can connect large, previously-unreached swathes of 22 humanity to the Internet. Remote sensing technology could change how whole industries operate, such as crop monitoring, herd management, crisis response, and land evaluation, among others. 23 While satellites cannot provide all essential information for some of these industries, they can fill in some useful gaps and work as part of a wider system of tools. Space infrastructure, in helping to change how people connect and perceive Earth, could help spark innovations on the ground as well. These innovations, changes to global networks, and new opportunities could lead to wider economic growth.

#### Tech innovation solves every existential threat – cumulative extinction events outweigh the aff

Dylan **Matthews 18**. Co-founder of Vox, citing Nick Beckstead @ Rutgers University. 10-26-2018. "How to help people millions of years from now." Vox. https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/26/18023366/far-future-effective-altruism-existential-risk-doing-good

If you care about improving human lives, you should overwhelmingly care about those quadrillions of lives rather than the comparatively small number of people alive today. The 7.6 billion people now living, after all, amount to less than 0.003 percent of the population that will live in the future. It’s reasonable to suggest that those quadrillions of future people have, accordingly, hundreds of thousands of times more moral weight than those of us living here today do. That’s the basic argument behind Nick Beckstead’s 2013 Rutgers philosophy dissertation, “On the overwhelming importance of shaping the far future.” It’s a glorious mindfuck of a thesis, not least because Beckstead shows very convincingly that this is a conclusion any plausible moral view would reach. It’s not just something that weird utilitarians have to deal with. And Beckstead, to his considerable credit, walks the walk on this. He works at the Open Philanthropy Project on grants relating to the far future and runs a charitable fund for donors who want to prioritize the far future. And arguments from him and others have turned “long-termism” into a very vibrant, important strand of the effective altruism community. But what does prioritizing the far future even mean? The most literal thing it could mean is preventing human extinction, to ensure that the species persists as long as possible. For the long-term-focused effective altruists I know, that typically means identifying concrete threats to humanity’s continued existence — like unfriendly artificial intelligence, or a pandemic, or global warming/out of control geoengineering — and engaging in activities to prevent that specific eventuality. But in a set of slides he made in 2013, Beckstead makes a compelling case that while that’s certainly part of what caring about the far future entails, approaches that address specific threats to humanity (which he calls “targeted” approaches to the far future) have to complement “broad” approaches, where instead of trying to predict what’s going to kill us all, you just generally try to keep civilization running as best it can, so that it is, as a whole, well-equipped to deal with potential extinction events in the future, not just in 2030 or 2040 but in 3500 or 95000 or even 37 million. In other words, caring about the far future doesn’t mean just paying attention to low-probability risks of total annihilation; it also means acting on pressing needs now. For example: We’re going to be better prepared to prevent extinction from AI or a supervirus or global warming if society as a whole makes a lot of scientific progress. And a significant bottleneck there is that the vast majority of humanity doesn’t get high-enough-quality education to engage in scientific research, if they want to, which reduces the odds that we have enough trained scientists to come up with the breakthroughs we need as a civilization to survive and thrive. So maybe one of the best things we can do for the far future is to improve school systems — here and now — to harness the group economist Raj Chetty calls “lost Einsteins” (potential innovators who are thwarted by poverty and inequality in rich countries) and, more importantly, the hundreds of millions of kids in developing countries dealing with even worse education systems than those in depressed communities in the rich world. What if living ethically for the far future means living ethically now? Beckstead mentions some other broad, or very broad, ideas (these are all his descriptions): Help make computers faster so that people everywhere can work more efficiently Change intellectual property law so that technological innovation can happen more quickly Advocate for open borders so that people from poorly governed countries can move to better-governed countries and be more productive Meta-research: improve incentives and norms in academic work to better advance human knowledge Improve education Advocate for political party X to make future people have values more like political party X ”If you look at these areas (economic growth and technological progress, access to information, individual capability, social coordination, motives) a lot of everyday good works contribute,” Beckstead writes. “An implication of this is that a lot of everyday good works are good from a broad perspective, even though hardly anyone thinks explicitly in terms of far future standards.” Look at those examples again: It’s just a list of what normal altruistically motivated people, not effective altruism folks, generally do. Charities in the US love talking about the lost opportunities for innovation that poverty creates. Lots of smart people who want to make a difference become scientists, or try to work as teachers or on improving education policy, and lord knows there are plenty of people who become political party operatives out of a conviction that the moral consequences of the party’s platform are good. All of which is to say: Maybe effective altruists aren’t that special, or at least maybe we don’t have access to that many specific and weird conclusions about how best to help the world. If the far future is what matters, and generally trying to make the world work better is among the best ways to help the far future, then effective altruism just becomes plain ol’ do-goodery.\*

## 2

#### Reducing existential risks is the top priority in any coherent moral theory

**Pummer 15**

(Theron, Philosophy @St. Andrews http://blog.practicalethics.ox.ac.uk/2015/05/moral-agreement-on-saving-the-world/)

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, **whatever** general **moral view we adopt**: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous **catastrophe**, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try **to save the world.** According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), **it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists**. **But that is a huge mistake**. Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; **it is not the view that the latter don’t matter**. Even John **Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account** in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” **Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view**. They’d thus imply **very strong reasons** to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that **most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations** of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. **We should also take into account moral uncertainty.** What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) **who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken,** and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), **they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk**. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, **reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world**. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

#### These structural violence claims do not say to prioritize it – it just says structural violence is bad – extinction would okay.

#### They have not made any framing arguments for why cap should come first – err heavily neg on this question – no new 1ar frameworks, its too late breaking – err to extinction first offense.

## 3

#### Commercial companies will actively remove debris, they prevent geopolitical tensions via clear motivations

Bohumil Dobos and Jakub Prazak 2018, Institute of Political Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University, 12-27-2018, “To Clear or to Eliminate? Active Debris Removal Systems as Antisatellite Weapons”, Space Policy, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spacepol.2019.01.007

Given the complicated relationships among the actors like the United States, China, Europe, and Russia, commercialization of the process seems to be a better way forward. Following the development of NewSpace [3,21], it seems highly likely that the private entities will attempt to participate in the newly emerging debris mitigation market as well. This process can be conducted in cooperation with some of the less negatively perceived space agency like the ESA that develops some of the necessary technologies as a part of its Clean Space initiativednamely e.deorbit [5,51]. Commercial actors also do not face the issue of intent as they are profit-oriented unlike the complicated structure of the national interests. The commercialized and cooperative effort together with the presented technological limitations of the utility of the ADR systems as ASAT weapons should ensure that the process of the debris removal will take place without causing unnecessary conflict. The negative perception of the ADR systems can thus be limited by taking several steps: (a) do not develop capacity over the level suggested for an effective debris mitigation as to decrease the technological utility of the ADR systems as weapons, (b) operation of the ADR system should lay in hands of a commercial actor that would be contracted to clear the selected objects either by states or the UN, (c) any technological cooperation with the national space programs should primarily lay in technological development of the systems and not in their management and control dthis cooperation should be coordinated at the UN level, and (d) the ADR systems should not act unexpectedly as to increase the trust of all the spacefaring nations in the sincere intent of the operator.

#### If countries do debris removal, dual use tech causes space war or militarization

**Shakilyan 21** – Shakilyan, Astina T., International Trash Pick-Up: the Need for a Neutral Orbital Debris Removal Organization, <https://www.swlaw.edu/sites/default/files/2022-03/Shakilyan%20%2827%20SW.%20J.%20Int%27l%20L.%20410%29.pdf>, Astina Shakilyan is a J.D. Candidate at the Southwestern Law School [Harker KB]

The unique issue of orbital debris, its removal efforts, and the shortcomings of current space law aligned to create the perfect storm. Today, any space-faring nation would be able to place a dual-use weapon in space under the guise of minimizing the threat of orbital debris.65 Just last year, Chinese engineers at China’s Air Force Engineering University published a paper detailing the feasibility of a space-based laser that can be used to address the issue of orbital debris.66 They believe that the laser can blast large pieces of space debris into smaller pieces, making the pieces less harmful to humans and spacecraft in orbit.67 Moreover, China plans to accomplish this by equipping a satellite with the laser.68 This would effectively make the satellite a dual-use weapon. Although China was the first country to propose placing a laser in space to clean up debris, theoretically any country would be able to do so without violating the Treaty.69 This would give adversarial countries an advantage in space by allowing them to damage working satellites belonging to another country, potentially leading to a war in space. Additionally, China’s proposal to use a laser to blast orbital debris into smaller pieces puts the fear of the weaponization of space into the spotlight. Because orbital debris is a pressing issue for all space-faring nations, it gives every nation, not just China, a chance to hold itself out as attempting to solve the issue while simultaneously weaponizing space with dual-use technology.70 Similarly, under current international space law, any country would be able to place an ASAT dual-use weapon in space without violating the Treaty or other international agreements.71 The growing threat of orbital debris, the potential weaponization of space, and ambiguous language of the Treaty raise several concerns for the future of the final frontier, and existing space law does little to address those concerns.

**Either causes extinction**

**Gilliard 19**, Alexandra. (Alexandra Gilliard is a Senior Editor and interviewer of international relations experts for the International Affairs Forum. She holds an M.S. in Global Studies and International Relations from Northeastern University, and a B.A. in International Relations from Boston University, with expertise in conflict resolution, arms control, human rights issues, and the MENA region.) “What Are the Consequences of Militarizing Outer Space?” Global Security Review, 10 June 2019, https://globalsecurityreview.com/consequences-militarization-space/. //JQ

Consequences of Armament and Aggression in Space The consequences of weapons testing and aggression in space could span generations, and current technological advances only increase the urgency for policymakers to pursue a limitations treaty. As it stands, there are three major ramifications of a potential arms race in space: The destruction of satellites As both financial and technological barriers to the space services industry have decreased, the number of governmental and private investors with assets in space has inevitably increased. There is now an abundance of satellites in space owned by multiple states and corporations. These satellites are used to not only coordinate military actions, but to perform more mundane tasks, like obtaining weather reports, or managing on-ground communications, and navigation. Should states begin weapons testing in space, debris could cloud the orbit and make positioning new satellites impossible, disrupting our current way of life. More pressing, however, is that if a country’s satellites are successfully destroyed by an enemy state, military capabilities can be severely hindered or destroyed, leaving the country vulnerable to attack and unable to coordinate its military forces on the ground. Diminished future use of near space Whether caused by weapons testing or actual aggression, the subsequent proliferation of debris around the planet would damage our future ability to access space. Not only would debris act as shrapnel to preexisting assets in space, but it would also become much more difficult to launch satellites or rockets, hindering scientific research, space exploration, and commercial operations. From the past fifty-odd years of activity in space alone, the debris left behind in Earth’s orbital field has already become hazardous to spacecraft — a main reason why the U.S. and the Soviet Union did not continue with ASAT testing during the Cold War. If greater pollution were to occur, space itself could be become unusable, resulting in the collapse of the global economic system, air travel, and various communications. Power imbalances and proliferation on the ground Only so many states currently have access to space—which means any militarization be by the few, while other states would be left to fend for themselves. This would establish a clear power imbalance that could breed distrust among nations, resulting in a more insecure world and a veritable power keg primed for war. Additionally, deterrence measures taken by states with access to space would escalate, attempting to build up weapons caches not dissimilar to the nuclear weapons stockpiling activities of the Cold War. In any arms race, it is inevitable that more advanced weaponry is created. Yet, this does not only pose a risk to assets in space. Should a terrestrial war break out, this weaponry may eventually be deployed on the ground, and space-faring states would be able to capitalize on the power imbalance by using these new developments against states that have not yet broken into the space industry or developed equally-advanced weaponry.

## Case

#### Capitalism leads to successful space operations—4 reasons

Zimmerman 17 - Robert Zimmerman, award-winning independent science journalist and historian who has written four books and innumerable articles on science, engineering, and the history of space exploration and technology for Science, Air & Space, Sky & Telescope, Astronomy, The Wall Street Journal, USA Today, and a host of other publications. He also reports on space, science, and culture on his website, http://behindtheblack.com. He does not work for any aerospace company and has never received any money from NASA for his reporting. His books include Leaving Earth: Space Stations, Rival Superpowers, and the Quest for Interplanetary Travel (Joseph Henry Press), which won the American Astronautical Society’s Eugene M. Emme Astronautical Literature Award in 2003 as that year’s best space history for the general public. He also has written Genesis: The Story of Apollo 8 (Mountain Lake Press) and The Universe in a Mirror: The Saga of the Hubble Space Telescope and the Visionaries Who Built It (Princeton University Press). In 2000 he was co-winner of the David N. Schramm Award, given by the High Energy Astrophysics Division of the American Astronomical Society for Science Journalism, for his essay in The Sciences, “There She Blows,” on the 35-year-old astronomical mystery of gamma ray bursts, 17 ("Capitalism in Space," CNAS, 3-10-2017, Available Online at https://www.cnas.org/publications/reports/capitalism-in-space, Accessed on 7-9-2017 //JJ)

It is essential for any nation that wishes to thrive and compete on the world stage to have a successful and flourishing aerospace industry, centered on the capability of putting humans and payloads into space affordably and frequently. This is a bipartisan position held by elected officials from both American political parties since the Soviet launch of the Sputnik satellite in 1957.

The reasons for this are straightforward:

Military strength: For strategic reasons, the military must have the capability of launching satellites into orbit for the purpose of surveillance and reconnaissance. In addition, the country’s missile technology must be state-of-the-art to make this data gathering as effective as possible. A healthy aerospace industry is the only way to achieve both.

Natural resources: The resources in space – raw materials from asteroids and the planets as well as energy from the Sun – are there for the taking. Other nations are striving to obtain those resources and the wealth those assets will provide for their citizens. Without direct access to those resources, American society will have less opportunity for growth and prosperity, and the country will eventually fall behind as a major power.

Economic growth: A thriving aerospace industry helps fuel the U.S. economy. It develops cutting-edge technology in fields such as computer design, materials research, and miniaturization that drives innovation and invention in every other field.

National prestige: Even if the previous three reasons did not exist, the prestige of the United States requires that we remain competitive in the increasingly global race to explore and settle the solar system. If the United States doesn’t compete in this effort, future generations of Americans will be left behind as China, Russia, Europe, India, and an increasing number of other nations establish operations in space and permanent colonies on the Moon, Mars, and the asteroids.

#### Capitalism has made the world substantially better

Iacono 16 — Corey Iacono, 1-16-2016, "How Capitalism and Globalization have made the world a better place", Quillette, http://quillette.com/2016/01/16/how-capitalism-and-globalization-have-made-the-world-a-better-place/

Throughout this week, the hashtag #ResistCapitalism was trending on Twitter. Using this hashtag, activists have aired their grievances against an economic system which they deem to be destructive, unfair, and immoral. In their view, the growth of global capitalism experienced over the last few decades has been only detrimental to human well-being. Indeed, since the early 1990s, global capitalism has lapsed into “its most savage form,” according to progressive populist Naomi Klein.

In fact, the expansion of capitalism and freer international trade has coincided with an era of slow economic growth, high unemployment, increased child labor, skyrocketing inequality, and grinding poverty.

Just kidding, that’s not what happened at all. In fact, as the world has become more capitalist and more globalized, the quality of life for the average person, and especially for the average poor person, has increased substantially. In 1990, 37% of the global population lived on less than $1.90 per day. By 2012, that number had been reduced to 12.8%, and in 2015 it was under 10%. The source of this progress isn’t a massive wealth redistribution program; it’s massive wealth creation — that is, economic growth.

Economists David Dollar and Aart Kraay found that, in a global sample of over 100 countries, changes in the income growth of the bottom 40% of the world’s income earners are highly correlated with economic growth rates. On the other hand, changes in inequality contributed relatively little to changes in social welfare of the poor over the last few decades.

There is good reason to believe that the expansion of free trade, facilitated by international organizations like the World Trade Organization (WTO) and its predecessor, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), have had a considerable impact in accelerating the economic development of developing countries.

In the 1990s GATT facilitated reforms which moved 125 countries towards freer trade by reducing the burden of government imposed trade barriers like tariffs. This was the first serious attempt at trade reform for most developing countries at the time, and arguably presents a unique natural experiment on the economic effects of trade reform.

In fact, a paper published by the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER), specifically examined how trade reforms facilitated by GATT affected the economic development of the reforming countries. In the paper, the authors compared the trends in economic growth before and after trade reform in the reforming countries. Then they compared those results to trends in economic growth of a control group of countries which didn’t undergo trade reform.

What they found was very encouraging for proponents of free trade. Prior to reform, the economic development of reformers and non-reformers was practically identical, but after reform, the economic development of reforming countries accelerated while non-reforming countries saw their economies stagnate and decline. The results suggest that the reforms towards freer trade lead to an increase in income per capita of around 20% in the long-run, an effect so large that it almost certainly had a positive and non-trivial impact on poverty reduction.

Similarly, other research has shown that more free market trade policies result in lower rates of extreme poverty and child mortality in developing countries. There are other benefits as well. One study on trade reform in Indonesia found that reductions of import tariffs led to an increase in disposable income among poor households, which allowed them to pull their children out of the labor force, leading to “a strong decline” in the incidence of child labor.

Unfortunately, many activists have reflexively taken up the cause of opposing the expansion of global capitalism, for a number of reasons. Western anti-sweatshop activists, for example, will often argue in favor of government imposed barriers to trade with poor countries because their working conditions are terrible in comparison to those in developed Western nations. In their view, western consumers should not be promoting a cycle of capitalist exploitation by buying products made in Vietnamese sweat-shops.

But satisfactory working conditions aren’t the natural state of mankind; they are a consequence of decades of economic development. Erecting barriers to trade with poor countries is surely a large impediment to their development, in fact, research suggests that existing developed world tariffs depress economic growth rates in the developing world by 0.6 to 1.6 percent per person, a considerably large effect.

Moreover, the sweat-shops which produce clothing for Westerners are often much better than alternative forms of domestic employment. In poor countries like Bangladesh, China, and Vietnam, the apparel industry consistently pays more than most other domestic industries. According to research by economist Ben Powell, in poor countries “most sweatshop jobs provide an above average standard of living for their workers.”

Notably, a paper published in the Journal of Development Economics found that the expansion of the garments industry in Bangladesh lead to an increase in employment and income among young women, giving them the means to finance their own education. Remarkably the authors found that, “the demand for education generated through manufacturing growth appears to have a much larger effect on female educational attainment compared to a large-scale government conditional cash transfer program to encourage female schooling.”

Foreign investment is also more desirable than opponents of capitalism and globalization give it credit for. The conventional wisdom among activists in wealthy countries is that multinational corporations exploit poor workers in third world countries for cheap labor, profiting off people working in sweatshop conditions.

It should come as a surprise to the individuals who hold this view to learn that 85% of people in developing countries believe that foreign companies building factories in their countries is a good thing, according to Pew Research.

In fact, for all the talk of exploitative multinational corporations, research shows that, in general, these corporations provide higher wages and better working conditions than domestic employers in developing countries.

Additionally, when multinational corporations build factories in poor countries, it raises the demand for low-skilled workers, resulting in higher wages for local workers. Consistent with this fact, recent empirical evidence demonstrates that investment by foreign companies in developing countries reduces both poverty and income inequality by raising the incomes of low-skilled workers.

Foreign investment can also make people in relatively low-income countries better off by providing better or more inexpensive products. A recent analysis published by the NBER found that foreign retailers like Wal-Mart greatly reduce the cost of living for both the rich and poor in Mexico, making everyone along the income distribution better off.

Global capitalism is by no means a perfect phenomenon. Many businesses do have questionable labor practices that are worthy of contempt. And free market policies may in many instances lead to socially undesirable outcomes, sometimes on a large scale.

However, the one-dimensional, automatic denunciation of capitalism and the accompanying refusal to give it any credit for its successes — as social media activists have done — reflects an uncompromising, and quite frankly ignorant worldview. It is one in which capitalism is always bad, no matter what the evidence tells us.

#### Capitalism has made poverty better – has allowed for better living conditions, innovation, and health improvements

Steven Horwitz, 6-9-2016,( Steven Horwitz is the Charles A. Dana Professor of Economics at St. Lawrence University and the author of Hayek’s Modern Family: Classical Liberalism and the Evolution of Social Institutions. "Capitalism Is Good for the Poor," No Publication, <https://fee.org/articles/capitalism-is-good-for-the-poor/> , MRV)

Critics frequently accuse markets and capitalism of making life worse for the poor. This refrain is certainly common in the halls of left-leaning academia as well as in broader intellectual circles. But like so many other criticisms of capitalism, this one ignores the very real, and very available, facts of history. The biggest gains in the fight against poverty have occurred in countries that have opened up their markets. Nothing has done more to lift humanity out of poverty than the market economy. This claim is true whether we are looking at a time span of decades or of centuries. The number of people worldwide living on less than about two dollars per day today is less than half of what it was in 1990. The biggest gains in the fight against poverty have occurred in countries that have opened up their markets, such as China and India. If we look over the longer historical period, we can see that the trends today are just the continuation of capitalism’s victories in beating back poverty. For most of human history, we lived in a world of a few haves and lots of have-nots. That slowly began to change with the advent of capitalism and the Industrial Revolution. As economic growth took off and spread throughout the population, it created our own world in the West in which there are a whole bunch of haves and a few have-more-and-betters. For example, the percentage of American households below the poverty line who have basic appliances has grown steadily over the last few decades, with poor families in 2005 being more likely to own things like a clothes dryer, dishwasher, refrigerator, or air conditioner than the average household was in 1971. And consumer items that didn’t even exist back then, such as cell phones, were owned by half of poor households in 2005 and are owned by a substantial majority of them today. Capitalism has also made poor people’s lives far better by reducing infant and child mortality rates, not to mention maternal death rates during childbirth, and by extending life expectancies by decades. We spend a much smaller percentage of our lives working for pay, whether we’re rich or poor. Consider, too, the way capitalism’s engine of growth has enabled the planet to sustain almost 7 billion people, compared to 1 billion in 1800. As Deirdre McCloskey has noted, if you multiply the gains in consumption to the average human by the gain in life expectancy worldwide by 7 (for 7 billion as compared to 1 billion people), humanity as a whole is better off by a factor of around 120. That’s not 120 percent better off, but 120 times better off since 1800. The competitive market process has also made education, art, and culture available to more and more people. Even the poorest of Americans, not to mention many of the global poor, have access through the Internet and TV to concerts, books, and works of art that were exclusively the province of the wealthy for centuries. And in the wealthiest countries, the dynamics of capitalism have begun to change the very nature of work. Where once humans toiled for 14 hours per day at backbreaking outdoor labor, now an increasing number of us work inside in climate-controlled comfort. Our workday and workweek have shrunk thanks to the much higher value of labor that comes from working with productive capital. We spend a much smaller percentage of our lives working for pay, whether we’re rich or poor. And even with economic change, the incomes of the poor are much less variable, as they are not linked to the unpredictable changes in weather that are part and parcel of a predominantly agricultural economy long since disappeared. Think of it this way: the fabulously wealthy kings of old had servants attending to their every need, but an impacted tooth would likely kill them. The poor in largely capitalist countries have access to a quality of medical care and a variety and quality of food that the ancient kings could only dream of. Consider, too, that the working poor of London 100 years ago were, at best, able to split a pound of meat per week among all of their children, which were greater in number than the two or three of today. In addition, the whole family ate meat once a week on Sunday, the one day the man of the household was home for dinner. That was meat for a week. These changes are not about technology. Compare that to today, when we worry that poor Americans are too easily able to afford a meal with a quarter pound of meat in it every single day for less than an hour’s labor. Even if you think that capitalism has made poor people overweight, that’s a major accomplishment compared to the precapitalist norm of constant malnutrition and the struggle even 100 years ago for the working poor to get enough calories. The reality is that the rich have always lived well historically, as for centuries they could commandeer human labor to attend to their every need. In a precapitalist world, the poor had no hope of upward mobility or of relief from the endless physical drudgery that barely kept them alive. Today, the poor in capitalist countries live like kings, thanks mostly to the freeing of labor and the ability to accumulate capital that makes that labor more productive and enriches even the poorest. The falling cost of what were once luxuries and are now necessities, driven by the competitive market and its profit and loss signals, has brought labor-saving machines to the masses. When profit-seeking and innovation became acceptable behavior for the bourgeoisie, the horn of plenty brought forth its bounty, and even the poorest shared in that wealth. Once people no longer needed permission to innovate, and once the value of new inventions was judged by the improvements they made to the lives of the masses in the form of profit and loss, the poor began to live lives of comfort and dignity. These changes are not, as some would say, about technology. After all, the Soviets had great scientists but could not channel that knowledge into material comfort for their poor. And it’s not about natural resources, which is obvious today as resource-poor Hong Kong is among the richest countries in the world thanks to capitalism, while Venezuelan socialism has destroyed that resource-rich country. Wealth is not about natural resources. Inventions only become innovations when the right institutions exist to make them improve the lives of the masses. That is what capitalism did and continues to do every single day. And that’s why capitalism has been so good for the poor. Consider, finally, what happened when the Soviets decided to show the film version of The Grapes of Wrath as anticapitalist propaganda. In the novel and film, a poor American family is driven from their Depression-era home by the Dust Bowl. They get in their old car and make a horrifying journey in search of a better life in California. The Soviets had to stop showing the film after a short period because the Russian audiences were astonished that poor Americans were able to own a car. Even anticapitalist propaganda can’t help but provide evidence that contradicts its own argument. The historical truth is clear: nothing has done more for the poor than capitalism.

#### Capitalism is good for education—none of your arguments are supported by real evidence

Blanchard 15 - Kate Blanchard, has been teaching religious studies to undergraduates in central Michigan for over a decade. She is the author of 'The Protestant Ethic or the Spirit of Capitalism' (Cascade 2010), co-editor of 'Lady Parts: Biblical Women and the Vagina Monologues' (Wipf & Stock 2012), and co-author of 'An Introduction to Christian Environmentalism' (Baylor 2014). She has also written for Religion Dispatches, the Chronicle of Higher Education, and the Wabash Center, 15 ("Higher Ed and Capitalism: The Best of Frenemies," Huffington Post, 5-26-2015, Available Online at http://www.huffingtonpost.com/kate-blanchard/higher-ed-and-capitalism-\_b\_7437098.html, Accessed on 7-6-2017 //JJ)

One particular statement from a UNC board member, though, is especially jarring to those of us who are still naïve enough to believe in higher education as a good in and of itself. “We’re capitalists,” said Steven Long, “and we have to look at what the demand is, and we have to respond to the demand.”

As the beneficiary of both public high school and private institutions, I do not wish to dismiss the importance of markets to education. Excellent public education depends upon a healthy tax base, which in turn depends on a strong economy. Markets, when well regulated, on the whole do a better job of creating strong economies than the two alternative systems - theft or gift, both of which quash incentives to productivity. (I hasten to add, however, that taxation and theft are not necessarily the same thing, since citizens expect to get something for their taxes.) Well-funded education tends to be much better than under-funded education, so anything that produces funds for education is welcome. Thus, capitalism can be a friend to education in so far as it helps pay for it.

What the business-minded people who now populate most college and university boards fail to understand, however, is that not-for-profit education - while it may potentially thrive under a capitalist system - is not inherently “capitalist” in that it is not defined by the pursuit of profits. It is, rather, defined by the pursuit of human beings who are better than they would have been without education. Students, to speak capitalist language, could be called the products of a university rather than the customers; if there is any customer in the mix, it is society at large. But even to use the terms “product” and “customer” is already to have lost the argument. Capitalism is the enemy of education when it colonizes its logic, replacing the motivating values of genuine learning and personal growth with the values of radical individualism and material gain.

American higher education has been, indeed still is, globally admired for its excellence. That excellence was enabled both by healthy markets that provided a healthy tax base, and by civic-minded Americans who believed that their neighbors’ well-being (at least those neighbors who looked like them) would ultimately benefit their own. But somewhere along the way, a majority of American voters apparently decided, against all data to the contrary,

that taxation was essentially stealing from the deserving rich to help the undeserving poor.

#### Capitalism is the only way to incentivize the innovation necessary to solve the environment

Franz 4/25 (Caleb, podcast director for *Outset* magazine. “Markets Work: Capitalism and Innovation Heal the Earth”, 4/25/17. <http://outsetmagazine.com/2017/04/25/capitalism-and-innovation-heal-the-earth/>, 7/7/17)//JM

When it comes to opposing factions, it seems as though no two factions could be more averse to each other than environmentalists and capitalists. We are taught to believe that those who care about economic growth cannot possibly care about environmental protection and vice versa. While this rhetoric is a good way to polarize those with opposing priorities, the truth is that they can co-exist. In fact, not only can capitalism and environmentalism co-exist, but only with free market capitalism can the environment ever hope to be clean. Even though critics of capitalism accuse the system of placing profits above people or the environment, the reality sets a different tone. The market demand for clean and renewable energy is growing every day. Companies and businesses are finding it profitable to keep the environment that their costumers live in clean. There is also an opportunity for those who care about the cause to take action like never before and to do so within the market. Technology and innovation are evolving at such a rate that dirty fuels and pollution will soon become a thing of the past. Elon Musk is the perfect example of this concept. Musk has created an entire empire based on clean and affordable energy; not because of government decree or regulation, but from private incentives to innovate and compete, which drives product quality up. Because Musk is allowed to profit and gain from the demand of the marketplace, his companies are on the cutting edge of innovation changing the world and the environment. Musk recently announced that he could produce roof solar panels at a cheaper rate than even conventional roofs. He is using Tesla Motors to revolutionize the automobile and clean energy industries. While Tesla cars are currently not as quite as profitable as I’m sure he would like, these innovations are setting the essential groundwork for years to come. On a smaller scale, new industries are finding innovative ways to help fight pollution and restore clean water to the planet. The only reason any company is even able to do this is capitalism. Competition is a powerful force, and people often forget that the market is what we make it. Going to government is not just a lazy way of trying to achieve sustainability, but it is also ineffective and does more harm than good. The market, so long as it is free and without crony assistance from the government, always hold businesses accountable. Sure, in a genuinely free market, a business might pollute, but the decision to pollute in excess will eventually prove counter to business interests. First, a company’s pollution would significantly affect the water that their employees drink or the air that they breathe, which would raise employment costs. Second, and more importantly, the company would also be polluting the water or air of their customers, who will be far less likely to continue doing business with the company after they have damaged the ecosystem of the community. Pollution would leave the company vulnerable to outside competition that recognizes these environmental concerns as well as the economic concerns. The business that pollutes the air and waters of the community it serves will quickly lose customers and suffer significant losses because the community, and not the government, will punish the business. Not only should we explore innovation with the market to protect the environment, but we must also act to curtail the world’s largest polluter: the U.S. Government. While environmentalist protest and rally against large corporations who pollute the air and water, the government remains the world’s largest overall polluter. Calls for government reform are silent. Not only are they the largest overall, but the federal government is also the fourth largest contributor to greenhouse gas pollution alone. Of course, we also cannot forget about the terrible EPA mine spill polluting the Colorado River in 2015. If environmentalists want to be serious about reducing pollution, they must focus on cutting the size of government. We should all strive for sustainability. Therefore, we should not view capitalism at odds with a clean Earth. Only through capitalism can we have a realistic expectation of a cleaner Earth. Government intervention only hinders economic progress and does little to protecting the environment. The path to a clean and sustainable planet cannot and should not go through the government but through competition and innovation. The government cannot mandate economic growth. The only thing it can and should do is get out of the way and remove all restrictions that slow innovation. Fossil fuels are already on their way out, and clean energy is the way of the future. But that fact does not, by itself make clean energy affordable. Only with the creative destruction that the market provides can we have a clean and sustainable future that coincides with our economic growth and prosperity. Capitalism leading the way to heal the planet is just one excellent example of how well markets work.

#### Improving capitalism is key to solve warming

Kellner 4-11 (Peter, founder and managing partner of Richmond Global Ventures L.L.C. and chairman and C.E.O. of the Richmond Global Compass Fund L.P., 4-11-2017, "To fight climate change, we need to improve capitalism, not get rid of it," America Magazine, <https://www.americamagazine.org/politics-society/2017/04/11/fight-climate-change-we-need-improve-capitalism-not-get-rid-it>) kb

Pope Francis correctly points out the evil fruits of capitalism, including inequality. However, no other system has lifted billions of people out of poverty. It is an imperfect system, with many flavors, but it is our best form of imperfection. Now, more than ever, we must rely on—and change—its dynamics. We live in the Anthropocene, a period defined by the emergence of humans and our impact on the climate and environment. Before this period, there were five major mass extinctions: Ordovician, Devonian, Permian, Triassic and Cretaceous. Each time, a catastrophic event, or series of events, wiped out between 76 percent and 86 percent of all species. Should we be concerned about another mass extinction? The Industrial Revolution has dramatically affected the climate, causing the melting of the Arctic, rising sea levels and unbearable pollution in cities such as Beijing and Mumbai (and, at one time, Los Angeles). Yet the idea of climate change is still controversial. Is it hyperbole or undeniable reality? I contend it is the latter. We cannot ignore the signals from nature itself, akin to red alerts if one pays close attention. Scientists estimate that we are now losing species at 1,000 to 10,000 times the natural long-term rate. That means dozens of species are going extinct daily. In her book The Sixth Extinction: An Unnatural History, Elizabeth Kolbert reports that a third of all reef-building corals, a third of all freshwater mollusks, a third of sharks and rays, a quarter of all mammals, a fifth of all reptiles and a sixth of all birds are headed toward extinction. The answer to this scourge is capitalism, but in a new form and magnitude. For decades, there has been a largely philanthropy-driven effort to promote socially conscious investing and grant-making. There has also been a substantial growth in socially responsible for-profit businesses of various kinds. But only recently has a focus on social and environmental responsibility started to gain traction among for-profit investors and financial markets. It takes the form of a new approach called E.S.G. (for “environmental, social and governance”) investing, and it is increasingly being used by endowments, pensions and family-controlled investment groups. E.S.G. investing has been mainstreamed through “impact investment” firms that seek both financial and social returns, as well as through philanthropy. In total, these efforts account for the hundreds of.billions of dollars invested in private markets annually. Evidence from leading business schools and experts suggest that E.S.G. investing can increase financial and social returns by lowering the cost of capital, reducing volatility, increasing returns (or the risk premium), improving governance (a proxy for management) and mitigating a variety of regulatory and other risks. Once an outlier, E.S.G. is now seen by the U.S. Department of Labor as valid in helping to determine the value of an investment. Here is the challenge, and it is enormous: The hundreds of billions invested annually from impact investing and philanthropy is critical but only a first step in addressing worldwide environmental change. Compared with the scale of global capital markets overall, it is a drop in the bucket. We must focus on the approximately $180 trillion invested annually in public global financial assets. E.S.G. investing barely touches this sector, but it is only this quantum of capital that is truly capable of shifting our global trajectory, through investments in a cleaner environment, improved governance and healthy communities. We have not yet seized the opportunity to drive powerful change through the allocation of global public capital. Reasons for this include the short-termism of financial reporting, managerial priorities and differences between investors in different geographic areas (for example, Europe is much more E.S.G.-focused than the United States is). We are nearly out of time. Most environmental scientists warn that if temperatures rise another two to four degrees Celsius (as I am sure they will without action), we will face irreversible change, including crop failure, flooding, diseases, wildfires, rising waters, extreme heat, and social and economic instability at a global level. An alternate course is possible if our greatest investors, and the trillions in assets behind them, recognize the gold mine waiting to be prospected: $180 trillion annually! The time is now for a course correction in capitalism, and its rewards are abundant. Everyone should preach this gospel.

#### Capitalism is key to resolve climate change, alternatives take too long, the belief that squo governments can solve only feeds into right wing criticisms of climate change

Chait 15 (Jonathan, an American liberal commentator and writer for New York magazine, previously a senior editor at The New Republic and an assistant editor of The American Prospect, 10-23-2015, "Is Naomi Klein Right That We Must Choose Between Capitalism and the Climate?," Daily Intelligencer, <http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2015/10/must-we-choose-between-capitalism-and-climate.html>) kb

It is not the right but the center-left that provides the main target of Klein’s polemic. Mainstream liberalism, in keeping with classic economic analysis, has always seen pollution as a straightforward market failure. If an individual or a business is dumping a harmful by-product into the commons, economic logic dictates they be forced to internalize the cost. Creating a price for carbon emissions, so that greenhouse gasses cannot be emitted for free, will give the marketplace the correct financial incentive to reduce its emissions to the necessary level. Klein insists, on the contrary, that liberal remedies that leave in place the underlying structure of the market economy do not, and cannot, work. Klein portrays the 2010 failure of a cap-and-trade bill as a victory for true environmentalism against the corporate neoliberal sellouts that promoted it. “The fact that the U.S. Senate failed to pass climate legislation in 2009 should not be seen, as it often is, as the climate movement’s greatest defeat,” she writes, “but as a narrowly-dodged bullet.” Klein attacks the cap-and-trade bill for compromising with energy producers in order to neutralize their opposition. At one point, she mocks the bill as a giveaway to Big Energy (“a huge amount of wealth being transferred to their companies”). Two pages later, she mocks the bill for being opposed and defeated by those energy companies (who “made it abundantly clear that they had never stopped being its enemies”). Cap-and-trade is damned by evidence of energy companies supporting it, and it is also damned by evidence of energy companies opposing it. If her logic does not make sense to you, that is because you fail to grasp Klein’s moral code, which considered corporations an irredeemably evil force tainting anything with which they come into contact. Consider a passage in which she dismisses the Environmental Defense Fund, a moderate green outfit. EDF, she writes, “prided itself as putting ‘results’ above ideology, but Krupp’s EDF was highly ideological.” Its neoliberal ideology led it to advocate a cap-and-trade system in the 1980s to reduce emissions of sulfur dioxide, which caused acid rain. “The new approach worked and it was popular among foundations and private donors, particularly on Wall Street,” she reports. If you’re a neoliberal sellout, you probably think the important part of that sentence is the beginning, where Klein concedes that the cap-and-trade system proposed by EDF “worked.” The successful results would seem to disprove Klein’s accusation that EDF is hyperideological and merely pretends to be results-driven. Indeed, she might even pause to consider the possibility that this program’s success demonstrates that it is possible to reduce pollution through market mechanisms. (Numerous other examples can be found.) Instead, Klein just blows right past the fact that EDF’s program worked right into associating it with Wall Street, a fact that tells her everything she needs to know. This is not the only time Klein comes face-to-face with evidence that falsifies her thesis and ignores it. In one passage, she castigates the World Trade Organization, an old bête noire, for blocking a Canadian law designed to protect a domestic solar manufacturer. This episode, she tells her readers, shows how free trade prevents the transition to a clean economy. Yet, in a footnote, she complains that China “flooded the market with cheap panels in recent years, contributing to a global oversupply that has outpaced demand.” Klein presents this as more evidence of the WTO’s nefarious impact. But, from the standpoint of the climate, aren’t cheap solar panels good? \*\*\* The most fascinating thing about This Changes Everything is how much factual refutation of Klein’s thesis is contained within the book itself. She faithfully reports huge amounts of damning facts, but confines them to subordinate clauses and footnotes. Klein’s major thesis, remember, is that the triumph of anti-corporate economics is the only way to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions. In another brief but damning passage, she concedes that a number of governments with sufficiently progressive economic character have taken power in recent years, citing Ecuador, Bolivia, Argentina, Venezuela, and Greece. Alas, she admits, “have so far been unable to come up with economic models that do not require extremely high levels of extraction of finite resources, often at tremendous ecological and human cost.” In other words, Klein’s proposed remedy of addressing climate change by electing a left-wing government has been tried repeatedly, and it has failed every single time. Even left-wing governments turn out to not be keen on shutting down their fossil-fuel industries and jacking up energy prices on their voters. Once again, though, Klein moves quickly past this deep record of unbroken failure. Her book and the documentary linger extensively on positive anecdotes she gathers from activists. “Large and growing social movements in all these countries,” she reports, “are pushing back against the idea that extraction-and-redistribution is the only route out of poverty and economic crisis.” Klein backs this up with lots of inspiring drum-circle footage. If Klein’s arguments do not pass any plausible evidentiary standard, it may be a result of her lack of interest in traditional standards of evidence. Klein’s narrative rests heavily on moral disgust with market-based mechanisms and the cold reasoning associated with them. She dismisses the “language of risk assessment,” a traditional economist way of measuring the dangers of climate change, and approvingly quotes a spiritual leader who tells her, “Water is holy.” Klein deems this analytic method superior to economic modelling of how to restrict pollution. “These truths,” she writes, “emerge not out of an abstract theory about ‘the commons’ but out of lived experience.” Klein’s fervently ideological, anti-empiricist style, and her deep skepticism of the mainstream liberals who believe emissions can be controlled without destroying capitalism, places her in odd agreement with the far right. Visiting a conference of climate-science deniers, Klein discovers the kind of absolutist ideological reasoning and suspicion of mushy technocracy to which she can relate. Climate-science deniers see the fight to restrain emissions as a pretext to expand government power over the economy. Since that is exactly how Klein sees climate change, she thinks they are on to something: “I think these hard-core ideologues understand the real significance of climate change better than most of the ‘warmists’ in the political center … ” she writes, “when it comes to the scope and depth of change required to avert catastrophe, they are right on the money.” Finally, somebody else who understands that the real choice is capitalism versus the climate. In the actual world outside this jointly inhabited ideological bubble, capitalism and climate science are discovering ways to co-exist. Klein dismisses the “past quarter century of international negotiations,” which she characterizes as “struggling, sputtering, failing utterly to achieve its goals.” In reality, American greenhouse-gas emissions peaked several years ago. European Union emissions peaked several decades ago. Chinese coal use has peaked, and its energy intensity has fallen. The world may not be decarbonizing as rapidly as it should, but it is moving rapidly. It may be slow by the standards of atmospheric conditions, but it is fast by the standards of global political cooperation. U.N. efforts to fight climate change have only been under way since 1988. Compare this with the notion of replacing capitalism with a radical egalitarian alternative, which has been around for a century and a half. The project does not seem to be moving forward. Waiting to limit the damage of greenhouse-gas emissions until the people can overthrow the yoke of unfettered capitalism may represent the most dangerous advice the left has come up with in a very long time.

#### Governments cause capitalist countries to be unsustainable, Alt’s approach fails and more capitalism is key to a sustainable society

Adler 96 Jonathan H. Adler (born November 3, 1969) is an American legal commentator and law professor at the Case Western Reserve University School of Law. He contributes to the widely read weblog "The Volokh Conspiracy", is frequently cited in the American media, and has been recognized as one of the most cited professors in the field of environmental law. (“CAPITALISM AND SUSTAINABILITY”, <http://home.earthlink.net/~jhadler/pegs.html>, accessed 7/11/17, EVH)

About socialism, Alperovitz is absolutely correct that state control of all relevant resources produces "disastrous" ecological results. He explains that "The governing authorities of the socialist states lacked the will (and probably the capacity) to hold economic operations accountable to true social costs." Yet this failing is not unique to socialist systems. Indeed, political actors evidence the same failure of will in the American system of a mixed economy. Many environmental problems that are clearly identified remain unaddressed because the "governing authorities" in "capitalist" countries also "lack the will" to impose restraint upon economic actors and/or the government itself. Witness the failure of both Congress and the current administration to restrain environmentally destructive government spending. Despite protestations that "the era of big government is over" and environmental protection must not be compromised, numerous environmentally destructive federal programs -- from farm subsidies to below-cost use of federal lands to federally-provided flood insurance -- persist because political actors are unwilling to impose the costs on particular interests that ending those programs would entail. Similarly, the legacy of government-led ecological ruin in this country is different only in scale to that of the former-Soviet countries. Both here and abroad, political institutions have shown themselves to be unresponsive to all but the most pressing environmental concerns, just as they are typically unresponsive to economic concerns. A sustainability problem, therefore, can be found in politics itself and the instinct to centralize decisions about resource use in political entities. Alperovitz comes close to recognizing this fact when he notes that corporations have a disproportionate ability to "manipulate regulatory agencies, . . . and impact both electoral politics and legislation," for what he has identified is that corporations wield significant power over non-market institutions. It is the political nature of these institutions, and not the market system, that should be blamed. From this standpoint, how curious is it that most environmental policies seek to centralize decisions in political entities? Economic central-planning, inevitably, was a dismal failure. Ecological central planning is a far more difficult task, and will fare no better. The knowledge and public choice problems faced by political actors only increase as the issues under consideration become ever more complex. Eco-socialism -- that is any effort that seeks to centralize environmental decision making within a state apparatus -- will prove the most unsustainable system of all. What then about the marketplace? For the existence of unsustainable tendencies in the political system does not inoculate the free market from similar complaints. Indeed, there is certainly a legacy of privately-sponsored environmental harm. However to blame the system of private ownership and market exchange (i.e. capitalism), and the attendant drive to maximize personal utility -- as Alperovitz does -- is a mistake. Capitalism -- the free market -- is a socio-economic system that relies upon certain basic institutions, among them private property, contract, rule of law, and voluntary exchange. It is this system that enables individuals and communities to pursue their own perceived self-interest without resorting to coercion. The capitalist system also allows for the creation of corporations and other entities that seek to maximize profit as a means of meeting the needs and wants of individuals and communities. One means of maximizing profit is to provide greater utility to customers at a lower cost. This means finding ways of producing more, using less, or both. Therefore, market institutions do not fundamentally encourage greater resource use, as Alperovitz suggests, so much as they encourage greater output. The two are not the same. Indeed, as a direct result of market institutions, humans have learned to do more with less; to meet human needs while using fewer, and less scarce natural resource inputs, and recovering materials for recycling or reuse where appropriate. This can be seen in the replacement of copper with fiber optics (made from silica -- i.e., sand), the downsizing of computer circuitry, the light weighting of packaging, the explosion of agricultural productivity, and so on. The environmental benefits of such pressure are enormous. Consider that to feed the current world's population using 1950s agricultural technology would require putting an additional 10 million square miles under plow -- acres that are now forest or wildlife habitat; or that a microchip made from a few grains of sand is capable of retaining and reprocessing all of the information contained in a local library; or that proven reserves of oil and gas have increased seven-fold since 1950. Alperovitz also accuses capitalism of generating "pressure to externalize costs," but again he has identified the secondary pressure of a mixed system, and not something inherent in capitalism itself; such pressure is not inevitable. As above, the fundamental institutional pressure is to reduce the differential between benefits and costs, leading to profits in corporations or greater personal utility in individuals. This "generates pressures to externalize costs and pollute" only when such options are available due to the existence of common resources or a failure to extend market institutions to cover the full range of ecological resources. This has been known for quite some time -- it was pointed out in Garrett Hardin's seminal essays on the commons -- but rarely informs the environmental debate. That corporations (or self-interested individuals for that matter) seek out unpriced goods is not surprising, nor is it behavior that is to be condemned. It is the existence of goods that are unpriced that is the source of the problem. A company that opts to dispose of chemical wastes as effluent into a nearby river over seeking to recycle such wastes or send them to a disposal facility clearly does so because it is the least cost option; acting in that manner is a rational action motivated by a desire to maximize profits. The question that needs to be asked is why is pollution the least-cost action? The answer: because so long as the river is an unowned resource, the company will bear no cost by using it. The problem is not the company's profit-driven incentive. The problem is the failure to incorporate the river into market institutions. Were the river owned, the company would have to negotiate with the river's owner(s), or those who own rights to the river's use downstream, before dumping its wastes. If the ecological impact of such dumping is negligible, the company could probably continue as before. If not, the company would have to find a means of reducing the damage, compensating the owner, or developing an alternative means of waste disposal. There would be no "pressure to externalize" if there were no place to which one could. Even were the river owned by the company itself, it would not simply dump its wastes with abandon, as that would destroy the value of its resource. The company would have to weigh the river's value as a disposal site with that as a potential source of drinking water, recreation site, fishery, and so on. The fact that others in a market system place value on alternative uses of the river would force the company to consider these uses, and seek to reconcile them with its own priorities, in order to fulfill the profit-maximizing mandate placed upon it by its shareholders. Those resources that are market orphans, left out of the capitalist system, are those that are the most misused.
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#### Top level – if we win that extinction outweighs – we in the debate because we are the only ones with extinction level threats that outweigh – we are going for the innovation DA – it turns the case since if we are not actively alive to work against capatalism then there is no chance in progressing and actively working towards a better world ie if we prevent an extinction level threat then work towards solving cap that is possible – so even if they win all their offense on case it doesn’t matter because extinction is a prior question.