## Case

### OV – Inequality

#### Private space appropriation guarantees massive inequality by extending capitalism to the universe – it’s a necessary spatial fix as we run out of resources. Traditional crisis impact calculus is privileged so prefer a FW of structural violence: 1) it’s the silent killer

### OV – Capitalism

Warming causes extinction and turns all conflicts. Capitalism is the root cause and is unsustainable because it requires a spatial fix –space billionaires are tricking the public into believing their utopian futurism

LBL

1] Double Bind:

- No double bind, they claim public drives colonialism but give no warrants or evidence, prefer our multiple cards of evidence that prove private are worse because they are primarily driven by capitalize accumulation and not saving the world

2] They indite Marx, it doesn’t matter if they aren’t the real Marx people are the same names. We provide author quals, they have multiple degrees so cross this out

3] Capitalism is not self correcting

#### Capitalism is unsustainable and strengthens any problems in a global crisis

Robinson 11-07

(William I. Robinson, distinguished professor of sociology, global studies and Latin American studies at the University of California at Santa Barbara. He worked in Managua with the Nicaragua News Agency and the Nicaragua Foreign Ministry in the 1980s, and was affiliated faculty with the Central American University in Managua until 2001. Robinson is editor of a special symposium on the Nicaraguan crisis that will be published by Latin American Perspectives in October; (11-07-21); <https://truthout.org/articles/the-covid-supply-chain-breakdown-can-be-traced-to-capitalist-globalization/>)

The global economy may be bouncing back from the depths of the pandemic-induced implosion. Notwithstanding fears of what The Economist called “[the shortage economy](https://www.economist.com/weeklyedition/2021-10-09),” and barring unforeseen circumstances, global supply will likely catch up to and again overtake global demand. However, given the underlying [structural crisis of global capitalism](https://truthout.org/articles/post-covid-economy-may-have-more-robots-fewer-jobs-and-intensified-surveillance/), worldwide economic turbulence is here to stay. On the eve of the pandemic, growth in the European Union countries had already shrunk to zero; much of Latin America and sub-Sahara Africa was in recession; growth rates in Asia were steadily declining; and North America faced a slowdown. Despite claims to the contrary by mainstream economists, crisis is endemic to capitalism, and instability rather than equilibrium is the natural state of the system. The history of capitalism is one of periodic crises of two types. One is cyclical, sometimes called the business cycle, and shows up as recessions. They typically occur about every ten years. There were recessions in the early 1980s, the early 1990s, and the early 2000s. The other is a more serious structural crisis. Cyclical crises may affect only certain countries or regions whereas structural crises generally affect the entire world economy. In the course of the 20th century the system experienced two great structural crises, the Great Depression of the 1930s and the crisis of stagnation and inflation (known as “stagflation”) of the 1970s. Both these crises had their origin in what political economists call overaccumulation. This refers to a situation in which enormous amounts of capital (profits) are built up, but this capital cannot find productive outlets for reinvestment. This capital then becomes stagnant, as capitalists hold on to their accumulated profits rather than reinvesting them, throwing the system into crisis. The 2008 global financial collapse marked the onset of a new structural crisis in world capitalism. Given the underlying structural crisis of global capitalism, worldwide economic turbulence is here to stay. Social polarization and inequality worldwide had already reached unprecedented levels prior to the pandemic, with just 1 percent of humanity [controlling over half the world’s wealth](https://policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/wealth-having-it-all-and-wanting-more-338125/) and the top 20 percent controlling 94.5 percent, while the remaining 80 percent had to make do with just 5.5 percent. Almost every country in the world has seen an [increase in inequality](https://www.nbcnews.com/news/world/world-s-richest-become-wealthier-during-covid-pandemic-inequality-grows-n1255506) during the pandemic. New digital technologies that are now at the very core of the global economy have greatly increased productivity and corporate profits even as the worldwide economic restructuring made possible by these technologies has resulted in a globally expanding mass of the under- and unemployed, those precariously employed, and the marginalized, or surplus humanity. Given extreme levels of inequality, the global market is unable to absorb the output of the global economy, leading to the chronic stagnation associated with structural crises.

4]

#### **2] On the adv on the marx 20 card – the card isnt even by the real marx its by a freelance writer with no author quals what so ever – err negative no the cap debate**

#### 3] Capitalism is self-correcting and sustainable – war and environmental destruction are not profitable and innovation solves their impacts

**Kaletsky ’11** (Anatole, editor-at-large of *The Times* of London, where he writes weekly columns on economics, politics, and international relationsand on the governing board of the New York-based Institute for New Economic Theory (INET), a nonprofit created after the 2007-2009 crisis to promote and finance academic research in economics, Capitalism 4.0: The Birth of a New Economy in the Aftermath of Crisis, p. 19-21)

Democratic **capitalism is a system built for survival. It has adapted successfully to shocks of every kind, to upheavals in technology and economics, to political revolutions and world wars. Capitalism** has been able to do this because, unlike communism or socialism or feudalism, it **has an inner dynamic akin to a living thing. It can adapt and refine itself in response to the changing environment.** And it will evolve into a new species of the same capitalist genus if that is what it takes to survive. In the panic of 2008—09, many politicians, businesses, and pundits forgot about the astonishing adaptability of the capitalist system. Predictions of global collapse were based on static views of the world that extrapolated a few months of admittedly terrifying financial chaos into the indefinite future. **The self-correcting mechanisms that market economies and democratic societies have evolved over several centuries were either forgotten or assumed defunct.** The language of biology has been applied to politics and economics, but rarely to the way they interact. **Democratic capitalism’s equivalent of the biological survival instinct is a built-in capacity for solving social problems and meeting material needs. This capacity stems from the principle of competition, which drives both democratic politics and capitalist markets. Because market forces generally reward the creation of wealth rather than its destruction, they direct the independent efforts and ambitions of millions of individuals toward satisfying material demands, even if these demands sometimes create unwelcome by-products.** Because voters generally reward politicians for making their lives better and safer, rather than worse and more dangerous, **democratic competition directs political institutions toward solving rather than aggravating society’s problems**, even if these solutions sometimes create new problems of their own**. Political competition is slower and less decisive than market competition, so its self-stabilizing qualities play out over decades or even generations, not months or years.** But regardless of the difference in timescale, **capitalism** and democracy have one crucial feature in common: Both are mechanisms that **encourage individuals to channel their creativity, efforts, and competitive spirit into finding solutions for material and social problems.** And in the long run, these mechanisms work very well. If we consider democratic capitalism as a successful problem-solving machine, the implications of this view are very relevant to the 2007-09 economic crisis, but diametrically opposed to the conventional wisdom that prevailed in its aftermath. Governments all over the world were ridiculed for trying to resolve a crisis caused by too much borrowing by borrowing even more. Alan Greenspan was accused of trying to delay an inevitable "day of reckoning” by creating ever-bigger financial bubbles. Regulators were attacked for letting half-dead, “zombie” banks stagger on instead of putting them to death. But these charges missed the point of what the democratic capitalist system is designed to achieve. In a capitalist democracy whose raison d’etre is to devise new solutions to long-standing social and material demands, a problem postponed is effectively a problem solved. To be more exact, a problem whose solution can be deferred long enough is a problem that is likely to be solved in ways that are hardly imaginable today. **Once the self-healing nature of the capitalist system is recognized,** the charge of “passing on our problems to our grand-children”—whether made about budget deficits by conservatives or about global warming by liberals—becomes morally unconvincing. Our grand-children will almost certainly be much richer than we are and will have more powerful technologies at their disposal. It is far from obvious, therefore, why we should make economic sacrifices on their behalf. Sounder morality, as well as economics, than the Victorians ever imagined is in the wistful refrain of the proverbially optimistic Mr. Micawber: "Something will turn up."

#### 4] Capitalism is allows for extreme centralization of power, which exacerbates inequality and doesn’t improve the world

Robinson 11-07

(William I. Robinson, distinguished professor of sociology, global studies and Latin American studies at the University of California at Santa Barbara. He worked in Managua with the Nicaragua News Agency and the Nicaragua Foreign Ministry in the 1980s, and was affiliated faculty with the Central American University in Managua until 2001. Robinson is editor of a special symposium on the Nicaraguan crisis that will be published by Latin American Perspectives in October; (11-07-21); <https://truthout.org/articles/the-covid-supply-chain-breakdown-can-be-traced-to-capitalist-globalization/>)

The transnational capitalist class is too dependent on an open and integrated global economy for the continued accumulation of capital and power on a world scale to withdraw back into the confines of national economies. The corporate managers of the global economy, far from withdrawing from globalization, are expected to pursue diversification in supply chains and the nearshoring of production sequences that had previously been offshored. In particular, the transnational capitalist class and governments will set up new nodes in worldwide distribution networks in order to reduce dependence on a few key nodes and reduce the supply chain volatility that has become apparent in recent months, creating in the process denser webs and new geographic patterns of cross-border integration. Corporations have already begun to [nearshore,](https://prod.reuters.com/business/retail-consumer/how-global-supply-chains-are-falling-out-fashion-2021-09-30/) that is, to relocate production and distribution networks closer to the global markets that they service. According to one [industry report](https://www.lloydsloadinglist.com/freight-directory/news/Diversifying-sourcing-%E2%80%98critical-to-alleviate-supply-chain-volatility%E2%80%99/78673.htm#.YYAdKS2ZO-x) titled “The State of The Freight 2021,” almost 90 percent of shippers have set about to diversify their suppliers. The supply chain breakdown is fueling an acceleration of digitally driven global economic restructuring that had already begun before the coronavirus outbreak. The bottlenecks in global trade and supply chains are likely to be overcome in the coming months, especially after the holiday shopping season, as global consumption patterns normalize and national economies are reactivated. In the larger picture, however, the supply chain breakdown is fueling an acceleration of digitally driven global economic restructuring that had already begun before the coronavirus outbreak. Computer and information technology first introduced in the 1980s provided the original basis for globalization. It allowed the transnational capitalist class to coordinate and synchronize decentralized global production sequences and therefore to put into place the globally integrated production, financial and service system. Now, so-called fourth industrial revolution technologies — including artificial intelligence; big data; machine learning; and autonomously piloted land, air and sea vehicles — are driving a [new round of world capitalist restructuring](https://pmpress.org/index.php?l=product_detail&p=1264). According to “The State of The Freight 2021” report, this restructuring will include the digitalization of supply and logistics networks. These new digital technologies offer the technical means to build a people-centered global economy built from the bottom up through a very different political and economic system than the current global capitalism. But for the moment, the transnational capitalist class controls the production and deployment of the new digital technologies and is using them to further concentrate power and wealth in its own hands.

#### 6] Cap doesn’t solve climate. The climate crisis is getting worse and capitalists’ search for expansion can’t solve

Kate Aronoff 8-25-2021, “Capitalism Can’t Fix the Climate Crisis”, <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2021/08/capitalism-climate-crisis-global-green-new-deal-clean-energy-fossil-fuel-industry> //NL

It’s a reality. If the climate crisis were playing out over the course of two hundred, three hundred, or a thousand years, one could have an interesting theoretical debate about whether we should change the system we have and tweak it slightly in order to take on the crisis, or whether we should create an entirely new mode of production and build up a workaround alternative.

Unfortunately, we just don’t have that time. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change outlined in its 2018 report on 1.5 degrees Celsius that we had roughly twelve years. That is now nine years in which to rapidly decarbonize the global economy, which is an enormous challenge. In order to meet that ever-shrinking twelve-year window, we have to use the productive system in which we live — which is not my ideal situation, but then again, neither is global warming.

There are different ways of meeting that crisis; there are enormous political stakes in how we use those twelve years. There are different visions of climate action, which can put us on a path toward something like socialism or leave many of the extractive systems that define capitalism today in place. There’s nothing baked into capitalism that says it has to run on fossil fuels, and it’s an enormously resilient system. There’s no reason to think that it will be invulnerable to the climate crisis, or that it won’t figure out a way to extract profit off of renewables, solar, and wind.

These are the stakes we’re talking about when making the case — as programs like the Green New Deal do — that the road toward dealing with the climate crisis should be one of non-reformist reforms, to use [André Gorz’s framing](https://www.jacobinmag.com/2021/07/andre-gorz-non-reformist-reforms-revolution-political-theory). We want a better world as socialists. The ultimate goal is to transcend capitalism, but we have a really short-term problem that gets lost in the mainstream liberal thinking about the climate crisis and how to take it on, which is that capitalism as a logic is incompatible with dealing with the climate crisis because it has a constant thirst for expansion.

I spoke to a climate scientist named Kevin Anderson who does a lot of modeling on this question. He said, “If we deal with this problem, it entails a root-and-branch change to capitalism as we know it.” I don’t know whether that looks like any capitalism we would recognize today. I don’t know if that looks like socialism, but it looks very different than what we have now.

The big lie of mainstream liberal thinking about the climate crisis is that there’s an easy switch that can flick on the type of power that’s flowing through our lines, keeping basically everything we have today in place and just changing what powers it. And that will deliver us from the climate crisis. That’s not true. Any sort of reasonable solution to dealing with the problem looks like a really radical shift in our current economic order.

## T- Must implement, define unjust

**1AR – implementation**

**C/I – Affirmatives must identify private appropriation of outer space as unjust.**

**Unjust means unfair or immoral**

**OED no date** ["unjust, adj. and n." Oxford English Dictionary, https://www-oed-com.proxy.hw.com/viewdictionaryentry/Entry/214856] HWIC

A. adj.

1. Not fair or equitable.

**Definitions of "resolved" don't matter – yes congress can pass a bill that says "X is unjust" but that doesn't entail a prohibition of X**

**-- Even if unjust means unlawful that is incoherent if the law doesn't exist in the first place**

**1] Predictability – the topic is intuitively a moral statement, not a policy action – turns ground bc interpretations of the resolution guide pre-tournament prep**

**2] No ground loss – topic disads (ie not politics) are still reasons to negate because they're reasons that appropriation is more just than the alternative**

**3] Clash – a model where offense mainly consists of case turns (ie space col good / capitalism good) ensures the debate stays focused on the aff and promotes deep topic research**

**4] Topic ed – aff model encourages research into concepts like the non-appropriation principle and the philosophical aspect of the topic**

**5] Use reasonability – if we win sufficient defense to their standards, default to substance – key to deter friv theory and preserve substance which o/w on urgency – intervention is inevitable so intervene for substance**

## AT: Asteroid mining DA

### 2AC Cap K of DA

#### The DA is *literally* enclosure

Corbyn 18

(Zoe, <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2018/jun/09/asteroid-mining-space-prospectors-precious-resources-fuelling-future-among-stars>, 6-9)

But while it may be technically possible to mine asteroids a generation from now, the question is should we? One set of issues is around justice, according to Tony Milligan and Robert Sparrow, who study space ethics at King’s College London and Monash University, Australia, respectively. If asteroids belong to anyone, it is to everyone, says Sparrow. Should private companies be permitted to profit from resources that are part of our extraterrestrial commons? While the companies can be taxed, it is hard to see it being equitably distributed across humanity, says Milligan. There are also issues around safety and liability. What if mining an asteroid somehow changes its trajectory, putting it on a collision course with Earth? When it comes to the environment, mining lifeless asteroids is not expected to disrupt any ecosystems but there are still some that may be worth protecting, just like the Grand Canyon or Uluru. Ceres and Vesta, the largest asteroids in the asteroid belt, could be considered unique and distinctive, says Milligan. And do we want to live in the middle of a “giant celestial quarry”, or feel a sense that we “belong” to a place? He draws an analogy to the development of the American frontier. It was so quick and got so out of control that a lot was destroyed in the process. “It became very difficult to get people to think in the long term when there were such short-term advantages to be had,” he says. “We have done so badly at looking after our home that the desire to mine asteroids can’t help but appear profoundly arrogant,” says Sparrow. However, Bonin flips that argument on its head. “I actually think of it as an ultimate act of environmental stewardship for Earth,” he says. People need resources, he argues, and mining asteroids could ensure they were obtained without hurting the planet.

#### Private space is spectacle not innovation

Marx 21

(Paris Marx is a socialist writer and host of the Tech Won't Save Us podcast. <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2021/07/billionaires-space-richard-branson-jeff-bezos-elon-musk> , 7-13)

For all the lauding of private space companies and the space billionaires that champion them, they remain heavily reliant on government money. This is the real face of the private space industry: billions of dollars in contracts from NASA, the military, and increasingly for telecommunications that are helping companies like SpaceX and Blue Origin control the infrastructure of space — and it’s all justified to the public under the promise that it’s in service of grand visions that are nothing more than marketing ploys. Part of the reason SpaceX has been so successful at winning these contracts is because Musk is not an inventor but a marketer. He knows how to use PR stunts to get people to pay attention, and that helps him win lucrative contracts. He also knows what things not to emphasize, like the potentially controversial military contracts that don’t get tweets or flashy announcement videos. Bezos’s trip to space is all about embracing spectacle, because he realizes it’s essential to compete for the attention of the public and the bureaucrats deciding who gets public contracts.

#### Xt Aronoff— public funding is the basis of most innovation and the reason why private companies succeed in the first place; rhetoric that private can do what governments and public can’t do generates a dangerous series of myths that billionaires use to manipulate the global view of progress.