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## 1

#### Interpretation: Debaters must have contact info on the wiki and disclose all constructive positions on open source with highlighting on the 2021-22 NDCA LD wiki after the round in which they read them.

#### Violation – they don’t. The screenshot proves:

Graphical user interface, text, application, email

Description automatically generated

#### 1] Debate resource inequities—you’ll say people will steal cards, but that’s good—it’s the only way to truly level the playing field for students such as novices in under-privileged programs who can’t bypass paywalled articles.

#### 2] Evidence ethics – open source is the only way to verify pre-round that cards aren’t miscut or highlighted or bracketed unethically. That’s a voter – maintaining ethical evidence practices is key to being good academics and we should be able to verify you didn’t cheat

#### 3] Depth of clash – it allows debaters to have nuanced researched objections to their opponents evidence before the round at a much faster rate, which leads to higher quality evidence comparison – outweighs cause thinking on your feet is NUQ but the best quality responses come from full access to a case.

#### Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

#### Drop the debater – a) they have a 7-6 rebuttal advantage and the 2ar to make args I can’t respond to, b) it deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

#### Use competing interps – a) reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter, b) collapses to competing interps – we justify 2 brightlines under an offense defense paradigm just like 2 interps.

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms, c) chilling effect – forces you to split your 2AR so you can’t collapse and misconstrue the 2NR, d) topic ed – prevents 1AR blipstorm scripts and allows us to get back to substance after resolving theory

## 2

#### The US commercial space industry is booming – private space companies are driving innovation

**Lindzon 2/23** [(Jared Lindzon, A FREELANCE JOURNALIST AND PUBLIC SPEAKER BORN, RAISED AND BASED IN TORONTO, CANADA. LINDZON'S WRITING FOCUSES ON THE FUTURE OF WORK AND TALENT AS IT RELATES TO TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION) "How Jeff Bezos and Elon Musk are ushering in a new era of space startups," Fast Company, 2/23/21, https://www.fastcompany.com/90606811/jeff-bezos-blue-origin-elon-musk-spaces-space] TDI

In early February, Jeff Bezos, the founder of Amazon and one of the planet’s wealthiest entrepreneurs, dropped the bombshell announcement that he would be stepping down as CEO to free up more time for his other passions. Though Bezos listed a few targets for his creativity and energy—The Washington Post and philanthropy through the Bezos Earth Fund and Bezos Day One Fund—one of the highest-potential areas is his renewed commitment and focus on his suborbital spaceflight project, Blue Origin. Before space became a frontier for innovation and development for privately held companies, opportunities were limited to nation states and the private defense contractors who supported them. In recent years, however, billionaires such as Bezos, Elon Musk, and Richard Branson have lowered the barrier to entry. Since the launch of its first rocket, Falcon 1, in September of 2008, Musk’s commercial space transportation company SpaceX has gradually but significantly reduced the cost and complexity of innovation beyond the Earth’s atmosphere. With Bezos’s announcement, many in the space sector are excited by the prospect of those barriers being lowered even further, creating a new wave of innovation in its wake. “What I want to achieve with Blue Origin is to build the heavy-lifting infrastructure that allows for the kind of dynamic, entrepreneurial explosion of thousands of companies in space that I have witnessed over the last 21 years on the internet,” Bezos said during the Vanity Fair New Establishment Summit in 2016. During the event, Bezos explained how the creation of Amazon was only possible thanks to the billions of dollars spent on critical infrastructure—such as the postal service, electronic payment systems, and the internet itself—in the decades prior. “On the internet today, two kids in their dorm room can reinvent an industry, because the heavy-lifting infrastructure is in place for that,” he continued. “Two kids in their dorm room can’t do anything interesting in space. . . . I’m using my Amazon winnings to do a new piece of heavy-lifting infrastructure, which is low-cost access to space.” In the less than 20 years since the launch of SpaceX’s first rocket, space has gone from a domain reserved for nation states and the world’s wealthiest individuals to everyday innovators and entrepreneurs. Today, building a space startup isn’t rocket science. THE NEXT FRONTIER FOR ENTREPRENEURSHIP According to the latest Space Investment Quarterly report published by Space Capital, the fourth quarter of 2020 saw a record $5.7 billion invested into 80 space-related companies, bringing the year’s total capital investments in space innovation to more than $25 billion. Overall, more than $177 billion of equity investments have been made in 1,343 individual companies in the space economy over the past 10 years. “It’s kind of crazy how quickly things have picked up; 10 years ago when SpaceX launched their first customer they removed the barriers to entry, and we’ve seen all this innovation and capital flood in,” says Chad Anderson, the managing partner of Space Capital. “We’re on an exponential curve here. Every week that goes by we’re picking up the pace.”

#### The plan creates a restriction that encourages companies to move their operations to states with lower standards

Albert 14 [(Caley Albert, J.D. Loyola Marymount University) “Liability in International Law and the Ramifications on Commercial Space Launches and Space Tourism,” Loyola of Los Angeles International and Comparative Law Review, 11/1/14, <https://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1708&context=ilr>] TDI

A parallel can be drawn here between the commercial space industry and the maritime law concept of the Flag of Convenience. The term has evolved over time, but in this day and age, it is commonly used to mean the owner of a vessel does not want to create an obligation with a country with stricter standards for registry; hence, the owner will register strictly for economic reasons with a country that has a more convenient registry.133 By flying a Flag of Convenience, ship owners are able to avoid taxation on earnings of ships registered under these flags, and in some cases, they can also receive relief from stricter crew standards and corresponding operating costs.134 A Flag of Convenience is flown by a vessel that is registered in one state, which the vessel has little if any connection to, when in reality the vessel is owned and operated from another state.135 This way the vessel avoids any unfavorable economic requirements from its true home state.136 In this sense, “flag shopping” is similar to “launch forum shopping,” similar in that Flags of Convenience are utilized for economic reasons, such as to avoid high taxes and compliance with certain restrictive international conventions, commercial space companies will forum shop when choosing which country to launch from. As of today, there has yet to be a catastrophic commercial launch incident, so for now commercial space companies do not have an incentive to forum shop, but if there is, the indemnification policies described above may lead companies to seek out countries that provide more coverage so they pay less in the event something goes wrong. This comparison to Flags of Convenience brings up two separate yet equally important issues. First, launch companies may try to follow the Flags of Convenience model and soon catch on to the wisdom of their maritime predecessors by “registering” in countries with more favorable conditions. Of course, in this case the concern is not with registration so much as launching. If launch companies follow the Flags of Convenience model, they will seek out the most convenient state for launch, most likely the state that provides the most liability coverage and has the least safety precautions. Launching from states with low safety standards increases the potential for catastrophic launch events. This, in turn, will place states that are potentially incapable of paying for damages from launch disasters in a position they would not normally assume if these commercial companies had not been drawn to their shores with the promise of more favorable regulations. Second, launch customers may also seek out companies located in states with lower cost liability regimes (lower insurance policy limits) since those companies will presumably charge less to launch their payloads. In this scenario, instead of the launch companies seeking out states with lower liability caps and softer regulations, the launch customers themselves will seek companies located in states with lowcost liability regimes. Here, the effect will be the same as above. Under the Liability Convention, the launching state will be liable for any damage caused by a vehicle launched from within its borders; hence, if customers start engaging in “launch forum shopping,” states will be incentivized to put in place low-cost liability regimes, which in turn will increase the states’ potential payout in the event of a catastrophic launch incident. Looking at the indemnification program the United States has in place in comparison to other countries, it is possible to see how either launch companies or launch customers could engage in “launch forum shopping” when a catastrophic launch incident ever occur. It is also important to keep in mind that various factors go into where a company or customer decides to launch from. A state’s indemnification program is just one factor in this decision. With this in mind, it is clear that if a launch incident did occur in the United States, the commercial launch company would be liable for much more than it would in another country. For instance, why would a commercial space company launch in the United States, where it would be liable up to $500 million and the additional costs that the government would not cover? The argument can be made that a catastrophic space incident has yet to occur, and even if it did, it is unlikely to cost above the $2.7 billion covered by the United States government. Other states like Russia or France, which has the two-tier liability system, would simply cover all claims above the initial insurance, which is much lower than the $500 million mark required by the United States. In that case, the commercial company would never have to pay more than the initial liability insurance. If there ever is a catastrophic commercial space incident in the future, it is easy to see why commercial companies or launch customers might be drawn to “launch forum shop” outside the United States.

#### Maintaining US space dominance requires a homegrown commercial space industry – private companies offshoring gives China the advantage they need

**Cahan and Sadat 1/6** [(Bruce Cahan, J.D) (Dr. Mir Sadat, ) "US Space Policies for the New Space Age: Competing on the Final Economic Frontier," based on Proceedings from State of the Space Industrial Base 2020 Sponsored by United States Space Force, Defense Innovation Unit, United States Air Force Research Laboratory, 1/6/21, https://www.politico.com/f/?id=00000177-9349-d713-a777-d7cfce4b0000] TDI

Today, China’s commercial space sector is in its infancy but is set to grow with continued national and provincial support, which have been rapidly increasing over the past three years.64 Since 2004, the United States and China accounted for 74% of the $135.2 billion venture capital (VC) invested in commercial space. 65 The early 2020s are pivotal, as it would be far cheaper for China and Chinese commercial space firms to acquire space technologies from the United States or allied nation companies seeking revenues or facing cashflow constraints, than to build the companies and their teams and technologies from scratch in China. The tight coupling of Chinese military goals and an economy organized to achieve those goals magnifies the economic threats and market disruptions that the United States must immediately address, in order for DoD and national security operations to rely on US commercial space capabilities. 3. ISSUES AND CHALLENGES Peaceful Uses of Space and Space Exploration Space has been primarily a shared, not a warfighting, domain.67 With each passing second of Planck time,68 space enables a modern way of life, provides instantaneous global imagery, assures telecommunications, and captures humanity’s imagination for civil space exploration. As a result, space is a burgeoning marketplace and territory for commercial ventures and investors. Strengthening the US commercial space industrial base is vital to and beyond US national security. Civil space activities are a source of US “soft power” in global commerce, cooperation, and investment. 69 The civil space sector, led by NASA, is fundamental to America’s national security. 70 NASA is on an ambitious critical path to return to the Moon by 2024,71 along with developing the capabilities and infrastructure for a sustained lunar presence. NASA’s lunar plans provide a lunar staging area for missions to Mars and beyond. They offer a strategic and economic presence for the United States on the Moon. Congress, the White House, DoD, and NASA must recognize that economic and strategic dominance in service of national security requires catalyzing and accelerating growth of a vibrant, private US industrial and cultural expansion into the Solar System. Human visitation and eventual settlement beyond the Earth require sustaining visionary leaders, aided by, and aiding, US national security. A recurring theme in US policy is “maintaining and advancing United States dominance and strategic leadership in space” because US global competitors and adversaries are competent and capable of outpacing American space capabilities. 72 The stakes are high: At this historic moment, there is a real race for dominance over cislunar access and resources. Regulations Should Foster US Commercial Space as a National Asset Leveraging the reimagination and disruption of terrestrial industries, the US commercial space industry is pushing the frontiers of the United States and global space economics and capabilities. A pre-COVID19 assessment by the US Chamber of Commerce projected that the US space market will increase from approximately $385 billion in 2020, to at least $1.5 trillion by 2040. 73 This projection represents a seven percent (7%) annual compound average growth rate (CAGR), driven largely by expanded business opportunities in Low Earth Orbit (LEO). Total addressable market (TAM) for US commercial space companies could be far larger were they to have federal and financial support for initiating cislunar space operations and opportunities. Recent advancements in commercial space technologies and business models have driven down costs and unlocked new areas of economic growth and space capabilities that outpace and de-risk acquiring capabilities through traditional US government economic development, research and development (R&D), procurement and regulatory policies and processes. US regulations must ensure that US companies lead in commercial space. In specific, technological advances that lower access costs and expand space mission capabilities, content, continuity, and redundancies must be fully supported by or incorporated into US government programs, budgets, requirements, and acquisition processes. Until commercial space offerings are fully incorporated, and federal acquisition policies and personnel commit to innovation, US government fiscal buying power, intelligence and program support will lag and remain inadequate in comparison to US private sector companies and the nation’s global competitors and adversaries in space. Addressing COVID-19’s Impact on US Commercial Space The COVID-19 pandemic damaged and still challenges the US space industrial base. US domestic investors’ funding of space R&D remains inconsistent across the lifecycle of New Space companies and the spectrum of technologies necessary to grow the space economy. To date, public R&D, government procurements and visionary space entrepreneurs have played a major role in establishing and funding the New Space industrial base. In the last five years, $11 billion of private capital has been invested.74 Traditional private investors may become reluctant to fund space technologies due to perceptions of higher risk over longer time horizons before receiving profitable returns on their capital. Institutional and long-horizon investors who manage patient capital have an appetite for illiquid, but higher yielding, terrestrial alternative asset investments such as commodities, private equity limited partnerships and real estate.75 The COVID-19 pandemic has created economic uncertainties making the New Space’s funding model unreliable. COVID-19 significantly impacted venture capital (VC)-backed companies: the pace of VC space investments fell 85% between April - June, as compared to January – March, in 2020. 76 Pre-COVID-19, the New Space industrial base confronted multiple challenges in raising later stages of venture capital such as (1) the lag between having an early-stage startup with an idea and commercializing a viable revenue-generating product, (2) the lack of market liquidity for founder and private equity space investments to attract and retain talented teams, and (3) the lack of a market to re-sell contracts for space goods and services when customers buy more capacity than needed. Even prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, federal financing of US R&D was at a historically minor level, as compared to businesses and universities.77 US government support for basic research has steadily declined as a percent of GDP. The federal government will experience near- to medium-term budget constraints.78 The vibrant venture community in the United States has taken up a portion of this slack by increasing R&D investment in later-stage and applied research. However, founding teams and VC financing rely on government to fund earlier R&D for basic science and engineering. Therefore, government must resume the sustainable and impactful past levels of support for basic research, an essential role in the space economy’s public-private partnership that ensures US leadership in space. Space as Existential Terrain for National Security In this Digital Era, space integrates and drives all elements of US national security. The Cold War may be over, but since the early 2010s, a renewed era of great power competition has emerged across terrestrial land, air, sea, and cyber domains. This competition extends into space, where a great game ensues.79 Space is no longer an uncontested or sanctuary domain. Competent and capable global competitors and peer adversaries are challenging US military, commercial, and civil space interests. The United States, along with its allies and partners, has had to accept and anticipate that space may be a warfighting domain, as suggested primarily by Russian and Chinese counter-space capabilities, military operations, and declarative statements. On December 20, 2019, the bipartisan National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 202080 authorized the creation of the US Space Force, under the Department of the Air Force, to secure US national interests in an increasingly contested domain.81 Back in October 1775, the Continental Congress established the US Navy to ensure that commercial and government fleets could freely navigate the Atlantic coastline - today, that includes the South China Sea. Likewise, the USSF’s mission is to ensure unfettered access to and the freedom to operate in space. The 2017 National Security Strategy considers space to be a “priority domain.”82 Freedom of navigation is a sovereign right that nations have fought to achieve and defend. 83 The USSF’s main role is to organize, train and equip, as well as to protecting US space interests and supporting terrestrial and joint warfighters (e.g., US Space Command). Thus, USSF must secure US national interests in space, whether military, commercial, scientific, civil, or enhancing US competitiveness for cislunar leadership.

#### US space dominance prevents global war

**Zubrin 15** [(Robert Zubrin, president of Pioneer Energy, a senior fellow with the Center for Security Policy) “US Space Supremacy is Now Critical,” Space News, 1/22/15, <https://spacenews.com/op-ed-u-s-space-supremacy-now-critical/>] TDI

The United States needs a new national security policy. For the first time in more than 60 years, we face the real possibility of a large-scale conventional war, and we are woefully unprepared. Eastern and Central Europe is now so weakly defended as to virtually invite invasion. The United States is not about to go to nuclear war to defend any foreign country. So deterrence is dead, and, with the German army cut from 12 divisions to three, the British gone from the continent, and American forces down to a 30,000-troop tankless remnant, the only serious and committed ground force that stands between Russia and the Rhine is the Polish army. It’s not enough. Meanwhile, in Asia, the powerful growth of the Chinese economy promises that nation eventual overwhelming numerical force superiority in the region. How can we restore the balance, creating a sufficiently powerful conventional force to deter aggression? It won’t be by matching potential adversaries tank for tank, division for division, replacement for replacement. Rather, the United States must seek to totally outgun them by obtaining a radical technological advantage. This can be done by achieving space supremacy.To grasp the importance of space power, some historical perspective is required. Wars are fought for control of territory. Yet for thousands of years, victory on land has frequently been determined by dominance at sea. In the 20th century, victory on both land and sea almost invariably went to the power that controlled the air. In the 21st century, victory on land, sea or in the air will go to the power that controls space. The critical military importance of space has been obscured by the fact that in the period since the United States has had space assets, all of our wars have been fought against minor powers that we could have defeated without them. Desert Storm has been called the first space war, because the allied forces made extensive use of GPS navigation satellites. However, if they had no such technology at their disposal, the end result would have been just the same. This has given some the impression that space forces are just a frill to real military power — a useful and convenient frill perhaps, but a frill nevertheless. But consider how history might have changed had the Axis of World War II possessed reconnaissance satellites — merely one of many of today’s space-based assets — without the Allies having a matching capability. In that case, the Battle of the Atlantic would have gone to the U-boats, as they would have had infallible intelligence on the location of every convoy. Cut off from oil and other supplies, Britain would have fallen. On the Eastern front, every Soviet tank concentration would have been spotted in advance and wiped out by German air power, as would any surviving British ships or tanks in the Mediterranean and North Africa. In the Pacific, the battle of Midway would have gone very much the other way, as the Japanese would not have wasted their first deadly airstrike on the unsinkable island, but sunk the American carriers instead. With these gone, the remaining cruisers and destroyers in Adm. Frank Jack Fletcher’s fleet would have lacked air cover, and every one of them would have been hunted down and sunk by unopposed and omniscient Japanese air power. With the same certain fate awaiting any American ships that dared venture forth from the West Coast, Hawaii, Australia and New Zealand would then have fallen, and eventually China and India as well. With a monopoly of just one element of space power, the Axis would have won the war. But modern space power involves far more than just reconnaissance satellites. The use of space-based GPS can endow munitions with 100 times greater accuracy, while space-based communications provide an unmatched capability of command and control of forces. Knock out the enemy’s reconnaissance satellites and he is effectively blind. Knock out his comsats and he is deaf. Knock out his navsats and he loses his aim. In any serious future conventional conflict, even between opponents as mismatched as Japan was against the United States — or Poland (with 1,000 tanks) is currently against Russia (with 12,000) — it is space power that will prove decisive. Not only Europe, but the defense of the entire free world hangs upon this matter. For the past 70 years, U.S. Navy carrier task forces have controlled the world’s oceans, first making and then keeping the Pax Americana, which has done so much to secure and advance the human condition over the postwar period. But should there ever be another major conflict, an adversary possessing the ability to locate and target those carriers from space would be able to wipe them out with the push of a button. For this reason, it is imperative that the United States possess space capabilities that are so robust as to not only assure our own ability to operate in and through space, but also be able to comprehensively deny it to others. Space superiority means having better space assets than an opponent. Space supremacy means being able to assert a complete monopoly of such capabilities. The latter is what we must have. If the United States can gain space supremacy, then the capability of any American ally can be multiplied by orders of magnitude, and with the support of the similarly multiplied striking power of our own land- and sea-based air and missile forces be made so formidable as to render any conventional attack unthinkable. On the other hand, should we fail to do so, we will remain so vulnerable as to increasingly invite aggression by ever-more-emboldened revanchist powers. This battle for space supremacy is one we can win. Neither Russia nor China, nor any other potential adversary, can match us in this area if we put our minds to it. We can and must develop ever-more-advanced satellite systems, anti-satellite systems and truly robust space launch and logistics capabilities. Then the next time an aggressor commits an act of war against the United States or a country we are pledged to defend, instead of impotently threatening to limit his tourist visas, we can respond by taking out his satellites, effectively informing him in advance the certainty of defeat should he persist. If we desire peace on Earth, we need to prepare for war in space.

## 3

**The standard is maximizing expected well-being.**

**1] Only pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable – all other frameworks collapse.**

**Moen 16** [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] TDI

Let us start by observing, empirically, that a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that **pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable**. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues. This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for **there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels**, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. “Pleasure” and “pain” are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative.2 **The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values.** If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, I might ask: “What for?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable. You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the **pleasure is not good for anything further**; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good.3 As Aristotle observes: “We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that **pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value.**

**2] Extinction first --- moral uncertainty.**

**Bostrom 12** [(Nick Bostrom, Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford) “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy, 2012] TDI

These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate. **Our** present **understanding** of axiology **might** well **be confused**. We may not now know — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. **If we are** indeed profoundly **uncertain about our** ultimate aims, **then we should** recognize that there is a great option **value** in preserving — and ideally improving — **our ability to** recognize value and to **steer the future accordingly. Ensuring** that there will be **a future** version **of humanity** with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value. To do this, **we must prevent any existential catastrophe**.

## Case

Cap good -

#### Growth is sustainable – yes absolute decoupling

Hausfather 4/6 [(Zeke, climate scientist and energy systems analyst whose research focuses on observational temperature records, climate models, and mitigation technologies, PhD in climate science from the University of California, Berkeley, former research scientist with Berkeley Earth, senior climate analyst at Project Drawdown, and US analyst for Carbon Brief) “Absolute Decoupling of Economic Growth and Emissions in 32 Countries,” Breakthrough Institute, 4/6/2021] JL

The past 30 years have seen immense progress in improving the quality of life for much of humanity. Extreme poverty — the number of people living on less than $1.90 per day — has fallen by nearly two-thirds, from 1.9 billion to around 650 million. Life expectancy has risen in most of the world, along with literacy and access to education, while infant mortality has fallen. Despite perceptions to the contrary, the average person born today is likely to have access to more opportunities and have a better quality of life than at any other point in human history. Much of this increase in human wellbeing has been propelled by rapid economic growth driven largely by state-led industrial policy, particularly in poor-to-middle income countries.

However, this growth has come at a cost: between 1990 and 2019, global emissions of CO2 increased by 56%. Historically, economic growth has been closely linked to increased energy consumption — and increased CO2 emissions in particular — leading some to argue that a more prosperous world is one that necessarily has more impacts on our natural environment and climate. There is a lively academic debate about our ability to “absolutely decouple” emissions and growth — that is, the extent to which the adoption of clean energy technology can allow emissions to decline while economic growth continues.

Over the past 15 years, however, something has begun to change. Rather than a 21st century dominated by coal that energy modelers foresaw, global coal use peaked in 2013 and is now in structural decline. We have succeeded in making clean energy cheap, with solar power and battery storage costs falling 10-fold since 2009. The world produced more electricity from clean energy — solar, wind, hydro, and nuclear — than from coal over the past two years. And, according to some major oil companies, peak oil is upon us — not because we have run out of cheap oil to produce, but because demand is falling and companies expect further decline as consumers increasingly shift to electric vehicles.

The world has long been experiencing a relative decoupling between economic growth and CO2 emissions, with the emissions per unit of GDP falling for the past 60 years. This is the case even in countries like India and China that have been undergoing rapid economic growth. But relative decoupling alone is inadequate in a world where global CO2emissions need to peak and decline in the next decade to give us any chance at limiting warming to well below 2℃, in line with Paris Agreement targets.

Thankfully, there is increasing evidence that the world is on track to absolutely decouple CO2 emissions and economic growth — with global CO2 emissions potentially having peaked in 2019 and unlikely to increase substantially in the coming decade. While an emissions peak is just the first and easiest step towards eventually reaching the net-zero emissions required to stop the world from continuing to warm, it demonstrates that linkages between emissions and economic activity are not an immutable law, but rather simply a result of our current means of energy production.

In recent years we have seen more and more examples of absolute decoupling — economic growth accompanied by falling CO2 emissions. Since 2005, 32 countries with a population of at least one million people have absolutely decoupled emissions from economic growth, both for terrestrial emissions (those within national borders) and consumption emissions (emissions embodied in the goods consumed in a country). This includes the United States, Japan, Mexico, Germany, United Kingdom, France, Spain, Poland, Romania, Netherlands, Belgium, Portugal, Sweden, Hungary, Belarus, Austria, Bulgaria, El Salvador, Singapore, Denmark, Finland, Slovakia, Norway, Ireland, New Zealand, Croatia, Jamaica, Lithuania, Slovenia, Latvia, Estonia, and Cyprus. Figure 1, below, shows the declines in territorial emissions (blue) and increases in GDP (red).  
To qualify as having experienced absolute decoupling, we require countries included in this analysis to pass four separate filters: a population of at least one million (to focus the analysis on more representative cases), declining territorial emissions over the 2005-2019 period (based on a linear regression), declining consumption emissions, and increasing real GDP (on a purchasing power parity basis, using constant 2017 international $USD). We chose not to include 2020 in this analysis because it is not particularly representative of longer-term trends, and consumption and territorial emissions estimates are not yet available for many countries.

There is a wide range of rates of economic growth between 2005-2019 among countries experiencing absolute decoupling. Somewhat counterintuitively, there is no significant relationship between the rate of economic growth and the magnitude of emissions reductions within the group. While it is unlikely that there is not at least some linkage between the two factors, there are plenty of examples of countries (e.g., Singapore, Romania, and Ireland) experiencing both extremely rapid economic growth and large reductions in CO2 emissions.

One of the primary criticisms of some prior analyses of absolute decoupling is that they ignore leakage. Specifically, the offshoring of manufacturing from high-income countries over the past three decades to countries like China has led to “illusory” drops in emissions, where the emissions associated with high-income country consumption are simply shipped overseas and no longer show up in territorial emissions accounting. There is some truth in this critique, as there was a large increase in emissions embodied in imports from developing countries between 1990 and 2005. After 2005, however, structural changes in China and a growing domestic market led to a reversal of these trends; the amount of emissions “exported” from developed countries to developing countries has actually declined over the past 15 years.

This means that, for many countries, both territorial emissions and consumption emissions (which include any emissions “exported” to other countries) have jointly declined. In fact, on average, consumption emissions have been declining slightly faster than territorial emissions since 2005 in the 32 countries we identify as experiencing absolute decoupling. Figure 2, below, shows the change in consumption emissions (teal) and GDP (red) between 2005 and 2019.  
There is a pretty wide variation in the extent to which these countries have reduced their territorial and consumption emissions since 2005. Some countries — such as the UK, Denmark, Finland, and Singapore – have seen territorial emissions fall faster than consumption emissions, while the US, Japan, Germany, and Spain (among others) have seen consumption emissions fall faster. Figure 3 shows reductions in consumption and territorial emissions for each country, with the size of the dot representing the size of the population in 2019.  
Absolute decoupling is possible. There is no physical law requiring economic growth — and broader increases in human wellbeing — to necessarily be linked to CO2 emissions. All of the services that we rely on today that emit fossil fuels — electricity, transportation, heating, food — can in principle be replaced by near-zero carbon alternatives, though these are more mature in some sectors (electricity, transportation, buildings) than in others (industrial processes, agriculture).

This is not to say that infinite economic growth is desirable (or even possible), particularly given that the global population is expected to start to shrink by the end of the 21st century (and well before that in most currently wealthy countries). There will be some tradeoffs between economic growth and climate mitigation — particularly if the world is to meet ambitious mitigation targets. But it is possible to envision a world that is prosperous, equal, and at net-zero emissions; indeed, all of the future emissions scenarios used by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) do just that.

#### Capitalism is *objectively good* in space – it’s key to internet access, and warming. This ev assumes *ALL* of their warrants – every empirical example concludes negative and independently our ev postdates theirs.

Rinehart & Thierer ’21 [William Rinehart and Adam Thierer, “Why Capitalists in Space Are Good for Americans’ Future”, 08-05-2021, https://regproject.org/blog/why-capitalists-in-space-are-good-for-americans-future/]//pranav

Nothing quite exposes differing views on innovation than billionaires launching their own rockets into space. As Blue Origin ascended, carrying Amazon founder Jeff Bezos, critics rose up against private space tourism efforts. They repeated all the same slogans as the week before when Virgin Galactic CEO Richard Branson took a trip.

But the harshest critics have the story backwards. We are on the precipice of an epochal shift that will help make space travel cheaper, safer, and more accessible. Thanks to nearly two decades of reform at NASA, American entrepreneurialism and ingenuity are flourishing in space. The story is told as a failure, but it is actually a sign of success.

While many praised Bezos, Branson, and Elon Musk of SpaceX for using their fortunes to advance private space travel and exploration, with the goal of even getting to Mars, a vocal group of detractors blasted these capitalists for having the audacity to look toward the stars at all.

Discouraging private space exploration would be a step backwards and undo positive reforms that have made space more accessible and affordable. The way that NASA did things changed dramatically in 2005 when Mike Griffin took over as Administrator. In early 2006, the Commercial Orbital Transportation Services (COTS) program was announced, which aimed to spend $500 million to develop and demonstrate commercial space launches. It was unlike anything NASA had tried before. Instead of detailed requirements which were typical at the time, COTS spent only three pages to lay out broad cargo and crew transportation capabilities. Private industry was left to innovate on their own to meet those requirements.

These contractual tweaks seem minor, but they’ve been revolutionary for NASA and for the space industry. COTS pushed SpaceX and Blue Origin to begin developing reusable rockets. SpaceX’s Falcon 9 rocket has since become a workhorse, supplying the International Space Station (ISS) and launching satellites into orbit. Another milestone was reached last year when Americans were launched to the ISS on a reused Falcon 9, the first time a U.S.-built space vehicle accomplished this feat since the shuttering of the Shuttle program.

COTS and its follow-on programs demonstrate what innovation can accomplish when coupled with policy reforms. About a decade ago, NASA ran the numbers on Falcon 9 and estimated its traditional system of contracting would have cost taxpayers $4 billion. SpaceX did it for $443 million, a tenth of the cost. NASA estimated that COTS’ successor, the Commercial Crew program, saved the agency some $20 billion to $30 billion over its lifetime, ultimately reducing the cost of launching hardware into space.

Cheap launches mean Starlink broadband internet is potentially feasible for rural regions. Cheap launches mean satellites like Sentinel 6 which track climate change are easier to deploy. They mean more experiments in space and a better understanding of our world. But yes, cheap launches also mean billionaires can hitch a ride to space, even if some mistakenly claim it’s just the rich living out their fantasies.

We have heard similar stories before. When the Wright Brothers proved flight was possible, some predicted it would never be anything more than a toy for the rich. Astronomer William H. Pickering argued that the vision of “gigantic flying machines speeding across the Atlantic carrying innumerable passengers… would be prohibitive to any but the capitalist who could use his own yacht.”

Technologies of all stripes go through this process. The automobile was a novelty of the rich until it wasn’t. Cell phones were the plaything of the wealthy until they weren’t. Space travel seems poised to travel this same arc, and it was pushed along because NASA changed course and did things better.

Instead of dunking on billionaires, critics should take it as a chance to learn what has gone right and apply those lessons broadly. Smarter policy combined with American ingenuity is a recipe for success, both here on Earth and out in space.

#### \Internet solves extinction

**Eagleman 10** [David Eagleman is a neuroscientist at Baylor College of Medicine, where he directs the Laboratory for Perception and Action and the Initiative on Neuroscience and Law and author of Sum (Canongate). Nov. 9, 2010, “ Six ways the internet will save civilization,”  
 http://www.wired.co.uk/magazine/archive/2010/12/start/apocalypse-no]

Many **great civilisations have fallen**, leaving nothing but cracked ruins and scattered genetics. Usually this results **from: natural disasters, resource depletion, economic meltdown, disease, poor information flow and corruption**. But we’re luckier than our predecessors because **we command a technology that no one else possessed: a rapid communication network that finds its highest expression in the internet**. I propose that there are six ways in which **the net has vastly reduced the threat of societal collapse. Epidemics can be deflected by telepresence** One of our more dire prospects for collapse is an infectious-disease epidemic**. Viral and bacterial epidemics precipitated the fall of** the Golden Age of Athens**,** the Roman Empire and most of the empires of the Native Americans. **The internet can be our key to survival because the ability to work telepresently can inhibit microbial transmission by reducing human-to-human contact**. In the face of an otherwise devastating epidemic, businesses can keep supply chains running with the maximum number of employees working from home. This can reduce host density below the tipping point required for an epidemic. **If we are well prepared when an epidemic arrives, we can fluidly shift into a self-quarantined society** in which microbes fail due to host scarcity. Whatever the social ills of isolation, they are worse for the microbes than for us. **The internet will predict natural disasters We are witnessing the downfall of slow central control in the media**: news stories are increasingly becoming user-generated nets of up-to-the-minute information. **During the recent California wildfires,** locals went to the TV stations to learn whether their neighbourhoods were in danger. But the news stations appeared most concerned with the fate of celebrity mansions, so Californians changed their tack: they uploaded geotagged mobile-phone pictures, updated Facebook statuses and tweeted. The balance tipped: **the internet carried news about the fire more quickly and accurately than any news station could.** In this grass-roots, decentralised scheme, there were embedded reporters on every block, and the news shockwave kept ahead of the fire. This head start could provide the extra hours that save us. If the Pompeiians had had the internet in 79AD, they could have easily marched 10km to safety, well ahead of the pyroclastic flow from Mount Vesuvius. **If the Indian Ocean had the Pacific’s networked tsunami-warning system, South-East Asia would look quite different today. Discoveries are retained and shared** Historically, **critical information has required constant rediscovery**. Collections of learning -- from the library at Alexandria to the entire Minoan civilisation -- have fallen to the bonfires of invaders or the wrecking ball of natural disaster. Knowledge is hard won but easily lost. And information that survives often does not spread. **Consider smallpox inoculation**: this was under way in India, China and Africa centuries before it made its way to Europe**. By the time the idea reached North America, native civilisations who needed it had already collapsed. The net solved the problem. New discoveries catch on immediately;** information spreads widely. In this way, societies can optimally ratchet up, using the latest bricks of knowledge in their fortification against risk. **Tyranny is mitigated Censorship of ideas** was a familiar spectre in the last century, with state-approved news outlets ruling the press, airwaves and copying machines **in the USSR**, Romania, Cuba, China, Iraq **and elsewhere**. In many cases, such as Lysenko’s agricultural despotism in the USSR, it **directly contributed to the collapse of the nation**. Historically**, a more successful strategy has been to confront free speech with free speech -- and the internet allows this in a natural way.** It democratises the flow of information by offering access to the newspapers of the world, the photographers of every nation, the bloggers of every political stripe. Some posts are full of doctoring and dishonesty whereas others strive for independence and impartiality -- but all are available to us to sift through. Given the attempts by some governments to build firewalls, it’s clear that this benefit of the net requires constant vigilance. **Human capital is vastly increased**

**Crowdsourcing brings people together to solve problems.** Yet far fewer than one per cent of the world’s population is involved. We need expand human capital. Most of the world not have access to the education afforded a small minority. For every Albert Einstein, Yo-Yo Ma or Barack Obama who has educational opportunities, uncountable others do not. This squandering of talent translates into reduced economic output and a smaller pool of problem solvers. **The net opens the gates education to anyone with a computer**. A motivated teen anywhere on the planet can walk through the world’s knowledge -- from the webs of Wikipedia to the curriculum of MIT’s OpenCourseWare**. The new human capital will serve us well when we confront existential threats we’ve never imagined before. Energy expenditure is reduced** Societal collapse can often be understood in terms of an energy budget: **when energy spend outweighs energy return, collapse ensues**. This has taken the form of deforestation or soil erosion; **currently, the worry involves fossil-fuel depletion. The internet addresses the energy problem with a natural ease**. Consider the massive energy savings inherent in the shift from paper to electrons -- as seen in the transition from the post to email. **Ecommerce reduces the need to drive long distances to purchase products. Delivery trucks are more eco-friendly** than individuals driving around, not least because of tight packaging and optimisation algorithms for driving routes. Of course, there are energy costs to the banks of computers that underpin the internet -- but these costs are less than the wood, coal and oil that would be expended for the same quantity of information flow. **The tangle of events that triggers societal collapse can be complex,** and there are several threats the net does not address. **But vast, networked communication can be an antidote to several of the most deadly diseases threatening civilisation.** The next time your coworker laments internet addiction, the banality of tweeting or the decline of face-to-face conversation, you may want to suggest that the net may just be the technology that saves us.

**Tech solves resources**

Alex **Epstein 14**, Director of the Center for Industrial Progress, "Alex Epstein: The sustainability myth," 12/24/14, news.nationalpost.com/2014/12/24/alex-epstein-the-sustainability-myth/

Modified for gendered language – insertions bracketed

But nature gives us very few directly usable machine energy resources. **Resources are not taken from nature, but created**; from nature. What applies to the raw materials of coal, oil, and gas also applies to every raw material in nature — they are all potential resources, with **unlimited potential** to be rendered valuable by the human mind.

Ultimately, a resource is just matter and energy transformed via human ingenuity to meet human needs. Well, the planet we live on is 100% matter and energy, 100% potential resource for energy and anything else we would want. To say we’ve only scratched the surface is to **significantly understate** how little of this planet’s potential we’ve unlocked. We already know that we have enough of a combination of fossil fuels and nuclear power to last **thousands and thousands of years**, and by then, hopefully, we’ll have fusion (a potential, far superior form of nuclear power) or even some hyper-efficient form of solar power.

**The amount of raw matter and energy on this planet is so incomprehensibly vast that it is nonsensical to speculate about running out of it**. Telling us that there is only so much matter and energy to create resources from is like telling us that there is only so much galaxy to visit for the first time. True, but irrelevant.

Sustainability is not a clearly defined term. According to the United Nations, it has over a thousand interpretations, but the basic idea is “indefinitely repeatable.” For example, the idea of renewability, which is usually synonymous with sustainability in the realm of energy, is that the fuel source keeps replenishing itself over and over without the need to do anything different.

But why is this an ideal? In most realms, we accept and desire constant change. For example, you want the best phone with the best materials, regardless of whether those materials will be there in 200 years and regardless of whether it would be more “renewable” to use two cups and a string.

Why should we want to use solar panels or windmills over and over (leaving aside the fact that they quickly deteriorate and thus require a continuous series of mass-mining projects) if they keep giving us expensive, unreliable energy? Why not use the best, the most progressive form of energy at any given time, recognizing that this will change as we advance and the best becomes better?

At the beginning of this book, we observed that human beings survive by using ingenuity to transform nature to meet their needs — i.e., to produce and consume resources. And we observed that the motive power of transformation, the amplifier of human ability, the resource behind every other resource, is energy — which, for the foreseeable future, means largely fossil fuel energy. **There is no inherent limit to energy resources** — we just

need human ingenuity to be free to discover ways to turn unusable energy into usable energy. This opens up a thrilling possibility: the **endless potential for improving life** through ever-growing energy resources helping create ever-growing resources of every kind. This is the principle that explains the strong correlation between fossil fuel use and life expectancy, fossil fuel use and income, fossil fuel use and pretty much anything good: human ingenuity transforming potential resources into actual resources — including the most fundamental resource, energy.

**Growth is not unsustainable**. With freedom, including the freedom to produce energy, it is practically **inevitable**. We are not

### AT: Resource Wars

**No resource wars**

**Bayramov 17** Agha Bayramov, international relations PhD candidate at the University of Groningen. [Review: Dubious nexus between natural resources and conflict. Journal of Eurasian Studies, 9(1), p. 72-81, https://www.rug.nl/research/portal/files/63407252/1\_s2.0\_S187936651730026X\_main.pdf]//BPS

Second, **less research has scrutinized political and economic costs of resources wars, namely occupation cost, international cost and investment costs** (e.g. Meierding, 2016). **The existing works give a misleading impression that resource incomes can cover easily** invasion, investment and international **costs** of wars. Third, **the existing works consider** approximately **most resource states to be more or less equal entities**. Although such states may have equal rights from juridical perspective, **they share too many diverse features** to be considered equal entities **in** other **empirical terms**. For example, while Azerbaijan and Saudi Arabia have rich natural resources, they are **dissimilar in a number of other important ways**. However, **both qualitative and quantitative analyses neglect this factor while explaining the resource-conflict nexus**. Therefore, **it is unwise to lump different case studies together in the same category without considering the particular characteristics** of the region or country in question. Moreover, **wide part of the existing works adopts a national**-level **approach** by portraying abundancy, scarcity and conflict at the unitary state-level. Nevertheless, **natural resources are distributed inconsistently over a nation’s territory**. In other words, **only** particular places, namely **cities** or urban areas are **affected by** the **abundancy or scarcity** of resources. Hence, conflict more likely develops in areas which are excluded from resource wealth and development. However, **the present works neglect the distinctive characteristics between resource rich cities and nonresource cities by putting them into country level analysis**.

### AT: War

**Multilateral economic ties forged through capitalism are key to interdependence which sets a cap on conflict – Robust models prove**

**Jackson and Nei 15** – Matthew O. Jackson, William D. Eberle Professor of Economics at Stanford, and PhD in economics from Stanford Graduate School of Business, Stephen Nei, Economics PhD candidate at Stanford University (“Networks of military alliances, wars, and international trade,” *Proceedings of the National Academies of Science of the United States*, December 15th, 112(50), pp. 15277–15284, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4687585/)

**We provided a model of networks of military alliances and the interactions of those with international trade**. We showed that **regardless of military technologies and asymmetries** among countries, **nonempty stable networks fail to exist unless trade considerations are substantial**. Moreover, the network perspective gives us an understanding of how **trade might prevent conflict**, **by discouraging countries from turning against their allies and encouraging countries to defend their trade partners**. Although **this points to trade as a necessary condition for stability**, whether it is sufficient for stability depends on size of the costs and benefits of war. In closing, **we comment on several other features of international relations that are part of the larger picture of interstate war**. A notable change in alliances during the Cold-War period was from a “multipolar” to a “bipolar” structure, something which has been extensively discussed in the Cold-War literature (e.g., see ref. 12 for references). Although this lasted for part of the postwar period, and was characterized by a stalemate between the Eastern and Western blocs, such **a system of** two **competing cliques of alliances is only war-stable if there are sufficient trade benefits between members of a clique, as shown in our second theorem**. Moreover, it is more of a historical observation than a theory, and it does not account at all for the continued peace that has ensued over the last several decades. Thus, this fits well within the scope of the model and does not account for the overall trend in peace. Another institutional observation regarding the post-WWII calm is that **institutions have allowed for coordination of countries onto a peaceful “collective security” equilibrium where any country disrupting international peace is punished by all other countries**, so that war against one is war against all. However, as shown by ref. 34, this equilibrium is in some sense “weak”: **It relies heavily upon the assurance that a country tempted to join an attacking coalition will refuse and that all countries will follow through on their punishment commitments, so that far-sighted expectations of off-equilibrium behavior are correct**. Given that various small conflicts since WWII did not precipitate a global response, such doubts of some countries’ commitment to follow through on punishments seem reasonable.§§§§ Although collective security does not seem to explain the lasting peace, it nonetheless does suggest an interesting avenue for extension of our model: taking a repeated games approach to networked conflict and trade. One more relevant observation regarding changes in patterns of conflict is the so-called democratic peace: Democracies rarely go to war with each other. This coupled with a large growth of democracies might be thought to explain the increase in peace. However, once one brings trade back into the picture, it seems that **much of the democratic peace may be due to the fact that well-established democracies tend to be better-developed and trade more**. Indeed, studies (38, 39) indicate that poor democracies are actually significantly more likely to fight each other than other countries, and that paired **democracy is only significantly correlated with peace when the countries involved have high levels of economic development, which is consistent with trade’s playing the major role rather than the government structure**. Our model abstracts from political considerations, which still could be significant, and so this suggests another avenue for further extension.