## AC

#### Our Value is Autonomy

#### Autonomy is self government via dignity of the rational creature- meaning, each being is an end in itself.

**Wood 99, Allen. “Autonomy as the Ground of Morality .” Autonomy as the Ground of Morality , Stanford, 1999, www1.cmc.edu/pages/faculty/jkreines/wood%20excerpt%20Autonomy%20as%20the%20ground%20of%20morality%20kant.pdf.**

**Those of us who are sympathetic to Kantian ethics usually are so because we regard it as an ethics of autonomy, based on rational self-esteem and respect for the human capacity to direct one’s own life according to rational principles. Kantian ethical theory is grounded on the idea that the moral law is binding on me only because it is a law proceeding from my own will. The ground of a law of autonomy lies in the very will which is to be subject to the law, and this leaves no room for any issue about why this will should obey the law. The idea of autonomy also identifies the authority of the law with the value constituting the content of the law, in that it bases the law on our esteem for the dignity of rational nature in ourselves, which makes every rational being an end in itself.**

#### Ethics must start from the noumenal world – it avoids bias and prevents unjust maxims -- the moral question "what should I do?" assumes an agent with a freedom to choose, and not an object subject to causal determination.

**Korsgaard 92:** Korsgaard, C. (1992). Creating the Kingdom of Ends: Reciprocity and Responsibility in Personal Relations. Philosophical Perspectives, 6, 305-332. doi:10.2307/2214250

Kant's response to this problem is to maintain that the question should not be asked. To ask how freedom and determinism are related is to inquire into the relation between the noumenal and phenomenal worlds, a relation about which it is in principle impossible to know anything. But our understanding of what this response amounts to will depend on how we understand the distinction between the noumenal and phenomenal worlds, and the related distinction between the two standpoints from which Kant says we may view ourselves and our actions. This is a large issue which I cannot treat here in a satisfactory way, I shall simply declare my allegiance. On a familiar but as I think misguided interpretation, the distinction between the two worlds is an ontological one; as if behind the beings of this world were another set of beings, which have an active and controlling relation to the beings of this world, but which are inaccessible to us because of the limits of experience. According to this view, we occupy both worlds, and viewing ourselves from the two standpoints we discover two different sets of laws which describe and explain our conduct in the two different worlds. We act on the moral law in the noumenal world, the law of self-love in the phenomenal world. This view gives rise to familiar paradoxes about how evil actions are even possible, and how we could ever be held responsible for them if they were. On what I take to be the correct interpretation, the distinction is not between two kinds of beings, but between the beings of this world insofar as they are authentically active and the same beings insofar as we are passively receptive to them. The "gap" in our knowledge exists not because of the limits of experience but because of its essential nature: to experience something is (in part) to be passively receptive to it, and therefore we cannot have experiences of activity as such. **As thinkers and choosers we must regard ourselves as active beings**, even though we cannot experience ourselves as active beings, **and so we place ourselves among the noumena**, necessarily, **whenever we think and act. According to this interpretation laws of the phenomenal world are laws that describe and explain our behavior. But the laws of the noumenal world are laws which are addressed to us as active beings; their business is not to describe and explain at all, but to govern what we do. Reason has two employments, theoretical and practical.** We view ourselves as phenomena when we take on the theoretical task of describing and explaining our behavior; we view ourselves as noumena when our practical task is one of deciding what **to do. The two standpoints cannot be mixed because these two enterprises-explanation and decision- are mutually exclusive. These** two ways of understanding the noumenal/phenomenal distinction yield very different interpretations of Kant's strictures against trying to picture the relation between the noumenal and phenomenal worlds. On the ontological view, the question how the two worlds are related is one which, frustratingly, cannot be answered. On the active/passive view, it is one which cannot coherently be asked. There is no question that is answered by my descriptions of how Marilyn's freedom interacts with the causal forces that determine her. Forfreedom is a concept with a practical employment, used in the choice and justification of action, not in explanation or prediction; while causality is a concept of theory, used to explain and predict actions but not to justify them. There is no standpoint from which we are doing both of these things at once, and so there is no place from which to ask a question that includes both concepts in its answer**. So, if I am myself Marilyn, and I am trying to decide whether to do something selfish, reflections on the disadvantages of my background are irrelevant. I must act under the idea of freedom, and so I must act on what I regard as reasons.** Being underprivileged may sometimes be a cause of selfish behavior, but it is not a reason that can be offered in support of it by a person engaged in it.So although we do not necessarily say of Marilyn: "her background gave her some tough incentives to deal with, but still it is up to her whether she treats them as reasons," that is what she must say to herself. I say that we do not necessarily say this, because, as I am about to argue, whether we say it depends on whether we have decided to enter into reciprocal relations with her and so to hold her responsible. But in that case, it is better regarded as something we say not about but to her.



#### Our Criterion is Categorical Imperative, defined as “the principle that people must always be treated as ends in themselves, never merely as means to the ends of others.”

#### You should prefer it- the Categorical imperative is the best ethical framework- it is the only universalizable ethic and the only binding ethic.

**Johnson & Cureton 16** Johnson, R., & Cureton, A. (2016). Robert Johnson is Professor of Philosophy and Chair of the Philosophy Department at the University of Missouri, Columbia. Johnson's PhD dissertation was written under the supervision Thomas E. Hill, Jr. at UNC Chapel Hill in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Adam Cureton is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of Tennessee. His main research interests are in ethics, Kant, and issues of disability. He is currently co-editing a volume with Thomas E. Hill titled Disability in Practice: Attitudes, Policies and Relationships. Kant’s Moral Philosophy (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy). Retrieved January 8, 2020, from Stanford.edu website: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-moral/#AutFor

**Although most of Kant’s readers understand the property of autonomy as being a property of rational wills, some, such as Thomas E. Hill, have held that Kant’s central idea is that of autonomy is a property, not primarily of wills, but of principles. The core idea is that Kant believed that all moral theories prior to his own went astray because they portrayed fundamental moral principles as appealing to the existing interests of those bound by them. By contrast, in Kant’s view moral principles must not appeal to such interests, for no interest is necessarily universal. Thus, in assuming at the outset that moral principles must embody some interest (or “heteronomous” principles), such theories rule out the very possibility that morality is universally binding. By contrast, the Categorical Imperative, because it does not enshrine existing interests, presumes that rational agents can conform to a principle that does not appeal to their interests (or an “autonomous” principle), and so can fully ground our conception, according to Kant, of what morality requires of us.**

#### Non-universalizability is the cause of all oppression since it is willing subjective maxims that serves to benefit a specific group of people – the categorical imperative solves and is the only way to avoid ethical egoism since it’s objective.

**Farr 02** [Arnold Farr (prof of phil @ UKentucky, focusing on German idealism, philosophy of race, postmodernism, psychoanalysis, and liberation philosophy). “Can a Philosophy of Race Afford to Abandon the Kantian Categorical Imperative?” JOURNAL of SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY, Vol. 33 No. 1, Spring 2002, 17–32.]

**One of the most popular criticisms of Kant’s moral philosophy is that it is too formalistic.13 That is, the universal nature of the categorical imperative leaves it devoid of content. Such a principle is useless since moral decisions are made by concrete individuals in a concrete, historical, and social situation. This type of criticism lies behind Lewis Gordon’s rejection of any attempt to ground an antiracist position on Kantian principles. The rejection of universal principles for the sake of emphasizing the historical embeddedness of the human agent is widespread in recent philosophy and social theory. I will argue here on Kantian grounds that although a distinction between the universal and the concrete is a valid distinction, the unity of the two is required for an understanding of human agency. The attack on Kantian formalism began with Hegel’s criticism of the Kantian philosophy.14 The list of contemporary theorists who follow Hegel’s line of criticism is far too long to deal with in the scope of this paper. Although these theorists may approach the problem of Kantian formalism from a variety of angles, the spirit of their criticism is basically the same: The universality of the categorical imperative is an abstraction from one’s empirical conditions. Kant is often accused of making the moral agent an abstract, empty, noumenal subject. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Kantian subject is an embodied, empirical, concrete subject. However, this concrete subject has a dual nature. Kant claims in the Critique of Pure Reason as well as in the Grounding that human beings have an intelligible and empirical character.15 It is impossible to understand and do justice to Kant’s moral theory without taking seriously the relation between these two characters. The very concept of morality is impossible without the tension between the two. By “empirical character” Kant simply means that we have a sensual nature. We are physical creatures with physical drives or desires. The very fact that I cannot simply satisfy my desires without considering the rightness or wrongness of my actions suggests that my empirical character must be held in check by something, or else I behave like a Freudian id. My empiri- cal character must be held in check by my intelligible character, which is the legislative activity of practical reason. It is through our intelligible character that we formulate principles that keep our empirical impulses in check. The categorical imperative is the supreme principle of morality that is constructed by the moral agent in his/her moment of self-transcendence. What I have called self-transcendence may be best explained in the following passage by Onora O’Neill: In restricting our maxims to those that meet the test of the categorical imperative we refuse to base our lives on maxims that necessarily make our own case an exception. The reason why a universilizability criterion is morally signiﬁcant is that it makes our own case no special exception (G, IV, 404). In accepting the Categorical Imperative we accept the moral reality of other selves, and hence the possibility (not, note, the reality) of a moral community. The Formula of Universal Law enjoins no more than that we act only on maxims that are open to others also.16 O’Neill’s description of the universalizability criterion includes the notion of self-transcendence that I am working to explicate here to the extent that like self-transcendence, universalizable moral principles require that the individ- ual think beyond his or her own particular desires. The individual is not allowed to exclude others as rational moral agents who have the right to act as he acts in a given situation. For example, if I decide to use another person merely as a means for my own end I must recognize the other person’s right to do the same to me. I cannot consistently will that I use another as a means only and will that I not be used in the same manner by another. Hence, the universalizability criterion is a principle of consistency and a principle of inclusion. That is, in choosing my maxims I attempt to include the perspective of other moral agents. … Whereas most criticisms are aimed at the formulation of universal law and the formula of autonomy, our analysis here will focus on the formula of an end in itself and the formula of the kingdom of ends, since we have already addressed the problem of universality. The latter will be discussed ﬁrst. At issue here is what Kant means by “kingdom of ends.” Kant writes: “By ‘kingdom’ I understand a systematic union of different rational beings through common laws.”32 The above passage indicates that Kant recognizes different, perhaps different kinds, of rational beings; however, the problem for most critics of Kant lies in the assumption that Kant suggests that the “kingdom of ends” requires that we abstract from personal differences and content of private ends. The Kantian conception of rational beings requires such an abstraction. Some feminists and philosophers of race have found this abstract notion of rational beings problematic because they take it to mean that rationality is necessarily white, male, and European.33 Hence, the systematic union of rational beings can mean only the systematic union of white, European males. I ﬁnd this interpretation of Kant’s moral theory quite puzzling. Surely another interpretation is available. That is, the implication that in Kant’s philosophy, rationality can only apply to white, European males does not seem to be the only alternative. The problem seems to lie in the requirement of abstraction. There are two ways of looking at the abstraction requirement that I think are faithful to Kant’s text and that overcome the criticisms of this requirement. First, the abstraction requirement may be best understood as a demand for intersubjectivity or recognition. Second, it may be understood as an attempt to avoid ethical egoism in determining maxims for our actions. It is unfortunate that Kant never worked out a theory of intersubjectivity, as did his successors Fichte and Hegel. However, this is not to say that there is not in Kant’s philosophy a tacit theory of intersubjectivity or recognition. The abstraction requirement simply demands that in the midst of our concrete differences we recognize ourselves in the other and the other in ourselves. That is, we recognize in others the humanity that we have in common. Recognition of our common humanity is at the same time recognition of rationality in the other. We recognize in the other the capacity for selfdetermination and the capacity to legislate for a kingdom of ends. This brings us to the second interpretation of the abstraction requirement. To avoid ethical egoism one must abstract from (think beyond) one’s own personal interest and subjective maxims. That is, the categorical imperative requires that I recognize that I am a member of the realm of rational beings. Hence, I organize my maxims in consideration of other rational beings. Under such a principle other people cannot be treated merely as a means for my end but must be treated as ends in themselves. The merit of the categorical imperative for a philosophy of race is that it contravenes racist ideology to the extent that racist ideology is based on the use of persons of a different race as a means to an end rather than as ends in themselves. Embedded in the formulation of an end in itself and the formula of the kingdom of ends is the recognition of the common hope for humanity. That is, maxims ought to be chosen on the basis of an ideal, a hope for the amelioration of humanity. This ideal or ethical commonwealth (as Kant calls it in the Religion) is the kingdom of ends.34 Although the merits of Kant’s moral theory may be recognizable at this point, we are still in a bit of a bind. It still seems problematic that the moral theory of a racist is essentially an antiracist theory. Further, what shall we do with Henry Louis Gates’s suggestion that we use the Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime to deconstruct the Grounding? What I have tried to suggest is that instead of abandoning the categorical imperative we should attempt to deepen our understanding of it and its place in Kant’s critical philosophy. A deeper reading of the Grounding and Kant’s philosophy in general may produce the deconstruction35 suggested by Gates. However, a text is not necessarily deconstructed by reading it against another. Texts often deconstruct themselves if read properly. To be sure, the best way to understand a text is to read it in context. Hence, if the Grounding is read within the context of the critical philosophy, the tools for a deconstruction of the text are provided by its context and the tensions within the text. Gates is right to suggest that the Grounding must be deconstructed. However, this deconstruction requires much more than reading the Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime against the Grounding. It requires a complete engagement with the critical philosophy. Such an engagement discloses some of Kant’s very signiﬁcant claims about humanity and the practical role of reason. With this disclosure, deconstruction of the Grounding can begin. What deconstruction will reveal is not necessarily the inconsistency of Kant’s moral philosophy or the racist or sexist nature of the categorical imperative, but rather, it will disclose the disunity between Kant’s theory and his own feelings about blacks and women. Although the theory is consistent and emancipatory and should apply to all persons, Kant the man has his own personal and moral problems. Although Kant’s attitude toward people of African descent was deplorable, it would be equally deplorable to reject the categorical imperative without ﬁrst exploring its emancipatory potential.**

#### Also Consequentialism fails for 4 reasons-

#### 1) Infinite regression- Each consequence creates a new set of consequences so there’s no start or end point

#### 2) Sequencing- Intents chronologically come first so they’re a prerequisite to consequences and we can only be morally culpable for what we will for, or else there is no reason to be moral if I’m being punished for something I can’t control.

#### 3) Value- Consequentialism justifies killing people arbitrarily- it is the basis of all oppressive systems like slavery and capitalism. This means even if they win that deontological frameworks aren’t perfect, they are still a prerequisite to establishing ethical systems that prevent oppression which should be your tie breaker.

**4)There IS an act omission distinction or else you would be held morally culpable for everyone else dying in the status quo: ie you didn’t donate to my dying grandpa’s go fundme so you’re responsible for his death. That doesn’t make sense**

### C1 Violence

#### First, private appropriation of outer space recreates the violence of inequality and colonialism capitalism necessitates while violating the commons established by the outer space treaty of 1967

Taylor R **Genovese**, **2017** (Master of Arts in Anthropology Northern Arizona University. “THE NEW RIGHT STUFF: SOCIAL IMAGINARIES OF OUTER SPACE AND THE CAPITALIST ACCUMULATION OF THE COSMOS” MA Dissertation, May 2017, https://www.proquest.com/openview/ff0b7851cf17e6d7fc4805b03d9d4dff/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750 Accessed 1-11-2021; Wally)

At the same time, Elon Musk —the CEO of NewSpace corporation SpaceX—has proposed that we should be 3 “nuking Mars” in order to prepare it for future terraforming and human habitation (Leopold 2016). Others, such as Lowell Wood—an architect of the Reagan-era “Star Wars” program that hoped to weaponize outer space—has said unironically that terraforming Mars is “the manifest destiny of the human race” (Grinspoon 2004, para. 7). He furthers the colonialist rhetoric by saying that “in this country we are the builders of new worlds. In this country we took a raw wilderness and turned it into the shining city on the hill of our world” (Grinspoon 2004, para. 7). As Grinspoon (2004) comments in his article, **this seems less like terraforming and more like “Ameriforming” Mars**. This likening of outer space to a frontier-space—like the American West—is troubling. **Not only is it historically inaccurate and culturally insensitive, it also fails to capture the most compelling aspect of venturing into the cosmos—a new beginning for all people**. **Humans have never lived untethered from Earth and yet, we cannot wait to export our globalized capitalist system of oppression and inequality into the cosmos; the only thing more frightening than globalized capitalism is interplanetary capitalism**. Yet, **we** are **already** beginning to **see** this **capitalist expansion**, as **evidenced by** the passing of the U.S. Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act (2015), **which facilitates commercial exploration and commercial recovery of space resources**. It also “discourage[s] government barriers” and according to §51303 of the law, any “United States citizen engaged in commercial recovery of an asteroid resource or a space resource under this chapter shall be entitled to any . . . resource obtained, including to possess, own, transport, use, and sell” (U.S. Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act 2015). **This seems to be in direct violation of The Outer Space Treaty of 1967—of which the United States is a signatory—which states that “the exploration and use of outer space shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries and shall be the province of all mankind** [sic]” and **that “outer space is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means or use of occupation, or by any other means**” (Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, 1966). **The foundation of the capitalist expansion into the cosmos is happening right now.** Other than the objections from a small group of space scientists—including anthropologists interested in space—it **is proceeding unchecked**. The field of anthropology is uniquely poised to engage in research about human futures in outer space. Anthropologists are able to confront and answer questions about colonialism, imperialism, the danger of unrestrained capitalism, human-machine interaction, fictive kinship among those living in close quarters, and discussions about the Other— including the ultimate Other, possible extraterrestrial life (Dick 2006). Much like science fiction writers, anthropologists studying space are thinking about life here on Earth while imagining possible futures here and off our planet (Oman-Reagan 2016c). Furthermore, **the way that we talk and think about our imagined futures influences what happens in our reality** (Polak 1973). **As** **the NewSpace industry continues to grow**, national space agency/military budgets expand, and more countries on Earth begin to enter space—such as recent spacefarers China and North Korea—**the question is no longer whether humans will migrate into space, but when** (Oman-Reagan 2016c**)? And who will have access**? Anthropology, as a field and discipline, has a choice to make: **do we become a complacent tool of capitalist and colonial expansion** as we did in the past **or do we** learn from our bygone follies and **affect positive change** in a future that is beginning to look eerily similar to the time of anthropology’s genesis? I hope to argue for the latter within this thesis. In order to do this, I have broken this thesis into four sections. The first section contains my literature review and my theoretical perspective; these sections were written prior to my conducting research in order to situate myself within the milieu of outer space anthropology. The second section is entitled “The Past” and will take readers through a crash course on science fiction’s influence in outer space realties, the effects and consequences of the coterminous development of nuclear weapons and crewed spacecraft during the Cold War, and NASA’s neoliberal turn starting in the 1970s. The third section—titled “The Present”—is a presentation of my fieldwork data by presenting three ethnographic vignettes, written in an experimental, imaginative style (Elliott and Culhane 2017) followed by an anthropological analysis of coded themes that I have extracted postfieldwork. The last section is labeled “The Future” and utilizes anthropological and phenomenological speculation and theorizing about an outer space future that is dominated by NewSpace and how resistance to the neoliberalization of outer space could form.

#### Additionally, the intents behind Space Privatization create poor material conditions on earth and violate our obligations to democratic organization

**Jackson 21**

Tim Jackson, Professor of Sustainable Development and Director of the Centre for the Understanding of Sustainable Prosperity (CUSP), University of Surrey, Billionaire space race: the ultimate symbol of capitalism’s flawed obsession with growth, July 20, 2021, <https://theconversation.com/billionaire-space-race-the-ultimate-symbol-of-capitalisms-flawed-obsession-with-growth-164511>, accessed 1-7-21

Mars ain’t the kind of place to raise your kids, laments the Rocket Man in Elton John’s timeless classic. In fact, it’s cold as hell. But that doesn’t seem to worry a new generation of space entrepreneurs intent on colonising the “final frontier” as fast as possible. Don’t get me wrong. I’m no sullen technophobe. As lockdown projects go, Nasa’s landing of the Perseverance rover on the surface of the red planet earlier this year was a hell of a blast. Watching it reminded me that I once led a high school debate defending the motion: this house believes that humanity should reach for the stars. It must have been around the time that Caspar Weinberger was trying to persuade President Nixon not to cancel the Apollo space programme. My brothers and I had watched the monochrome triumph of the Apollo 11 landing avidly in 1969. We’d witnessed the near disaster of Apollo 13 – immortalised in a 1995 Hollywood film – when Jim Lovell (played by Tom Hanks) and two rookie astronauts narrowly escaped with their lives by using the Lunar Module as an emergency life raft. We knew it was exciting up there. I remember later going to see Apollo 13 (the film) with a friend who wasn’t born when the mission itself took place. “What did you think?” I asked as we came out of the cinema. “It was OK,” said my friend. “Just not very believable.” But we kids were glued to our black-and-white TV sets the entire week of the original mission. We watched in horror as CO₂ levels rose in the Lunar Module. We endured the endless blackout as the returning astronauts plunged perilously back to Earth. We held our breath with the rest of the world as the expected four minutes stretched to five and hope began to fade. It was a full six minutes before the camera finally came into focus on the command module’s parachutes – safely deployed above the Pacific Ocean. We felt the endorphin rush. We knew it was believable. That was 1970. This is now. And here I am again on the edge of another sofa, in the lingering uncertainty of the time of COVID-19, waiting for signs of arrival from another re-entry blackout on another barren rock, devoid of breathable atmosphere, 200 million miles away. And when the Perseverance Rover finally touches down on the surface of Mars: that same exhilaration. That same endorphin rush. Quite difficult to witness the jubilation behind the masks at Nasa’s mission control without feeling a glimmer of vicarious joy. Hope, even. But Nasa’s clever science experiment is just the tip of an expansionary iceberg. A teaser, if you will, for an ambitious dream that is being driven faster and faster by huge commercial interests. A curious twist in a debate that has been raging now for almost half a century. Growth wars Ever since 1972, when a team of MIT scientists published a massively influential report on the Limits to Growth, economists have been fighting about whether it’s possible for the economy to expand forever. Those who believe it can, appeal to the power of technology to “decouple” economic activity from its effects on the planet. Those (like me) who believe it can’t point to the limited evidence for decoupling at anything like the pace that’s needed to avoid a climate emergency or prevent a catastrophic decline in biodiversity. The growth debate often hangs on the power you attribute to technology to save us. Usually it’s the technophiles arguing for infinite growth on a finite planet – sometimes putting their hopes in speculative technologies such as direct air capture or dangerous ones like nuclear power. And usually it’s the sceptics arguing for a post-growth economy. But the simple division between technophiles and technophobes has never been particularly helpful. Very few growth sceptics reject technology completely. No one at all is asking humanity to return to the cave. My own research teams at the University of Surrey have been exploring the vital role of sustainable technology in transforming the economy for almost three decades now. But we’ve also shown how the dynamics of capitalism – in particular its relentless pursuit of productivity growth – continually push society towards materialistic goals, and undermine those parts of the economy such as care, craft and creativity, which are essential to our quality of life. And now suddenly, along comes a group of self-confessed technology lovers finally admitting that the planet is too small for us. Yes, you were right, they imply: the Earth cannot sustain infinite growth. That’s why we have to expand into space. Wait. What just happened? Did somebody move the goalposts? Something is wrong. Maybe it’s me. One thing I know for sure. I’m no longer the same kid I was – the one from the debating society. This house believes that humanity should grow the fuck up. Before it spends trillions of dollars littering its techno-junk around the solar system, this house believes that **humanity should pay** a little **more attention to what’s happening** right here and now. **On this planet**. The human condition Perhaps ironically, it was from space that we saw it first. In October 1957, the Soviets sent an unmanned orbital satellite called Sputnik into space. It was one of those odd moments in history (like the coronavirus) that dramatically reshapes our social world. Sputnik kicked off the space race, intensified the arms race and heightened the cold war. It was a huge blow to US self-esteem not to be the first nation to reach space and it was the jolt it used to kickstart the Apollo Moon shot. No one likes coming second. Least of all the most powerful people on the planet. But Sputnik also signalled the beginning of a new relationship between humanity and its earthly home. As the political philosopher Hannah Arendt remarked in the prologue to her 1958 masterpiece, The Human Condition, going into space allowed us to grasp our planetary predicament for the first time in history. It was a reminder that “the Earth is the quintessence of the human condition”. And nature itself, “for all we know, may be unique in providing human beings with a habitat in which they can move and breathe without effort and without artifice”. Fair point. And nothing we’ve learned in the intervening years has changed that prognosis. Mars may be the most habitable planet in the solar system, outside our own. But it’s still a very far cry from the beauty of home – whose fragility we only truly learned to appreciate fully from the images sent back to us from space. Nature photographer Galen Rowell once called William Anders’ iconic photo Earthrise – taken from the Apollo 8 module in lunar orbit – “the most influential environmental photograph ever taken”. Earthrise brought home to us, in one astonishing image, the stark reality that this shining orb was – and still is – humanity’s best chance for anything that might meaningfully be called the “good life”. Its beauty is our beauty. Its fragility is our fragility. And its peril is our peril. In the very same year that Arendt published The Human Condition, a Shell executive named Charles Jones presented a paper to the fossil fuel industry’s trade group, the American Petroleum Institute, warning of the impact of carbon emissions from fossil fuel combustion on the atmosphere. It was early evidence of climate change. It was also evidence, according to lawsuits now being filed by cities and states in the US, that companies like Shell knew it was happening more than 60 years ago – three decades before James Hansen’s scientific testimony to Congress in 1988 brought global warming to public attention. And they did nothing about it. Worse, argue plaintiffs like the state of Delaware, they lied over and again to cover up this “inconvenient truth”. Why such a thing could happen is now clear. Evidence of their impact was a direct threat to the profits of some of the most powerful corporations on the planet. Profit is the bedrock of capitalism. And as I argue in my new book, **we have allowed capitalism to trump everything: work, life, hope – even good governance**. The most enlightened governments in the world have turned a blind eye to the need for urgent action. Now we’re on the verge of being too late to fix it. Achieving net zero by 2050 is no longer enough. We need much more, much faster to avoid ending up in an unliveable hothouse. Even as I write, record-breaking temperatures, 10-20℃ above the seasonal average, have forced citizens on the west coast of North America into underground shelters to avoid the searing heat. Wildfires are raging in California’s Death Valley, where temperatures have reached an astonishing 54℃. On the storm-struck east coast, flood waters have inundated the New York subway system. Thousands remain homeless and hundreds are still missing, meanwhile, as historic flooding across central Europe has left almost 200 people dead. Firefighters and firetruck in foreground, raging fire behind. Irwindale, California, US, June 15 2021. Firefighters battle brush fire burning in the Santa Fe Dam Recreation Area. Ringo Chiu/ZUMA Wire/Alamy Live News In the face of the blindingly obvious, even recalcitrant presidents and politicians are at last beginning to acknowledge the scale of the peril in which our relentless pursuit of economic growth has placed the planet. And in principle they still have time to do something about it. As I and many colleagues have argued, the pandemic offers us a unique opportunity to fashion a different kind of economy. The 26th Conference of the Parties to the UN Climate Change Convention (COP26) in Glasgow in November 2021 could well be the place to do that. Whether that happens or not will depend as much on vision as it does on science. And on our courage to confront the inequalities of power that led us to this point. It will also depend on us going back to first principles and asking ourselves: how exactly should we aim to live in the only habitable world in the known universe? What is the nature of the good life available to us here? What can prosperity possibly mean for a promiscuous species on a finite planet? The question is almost as old as the hills. But the contemporary answer to it is paralysingly narrow. Cast in the garb of late capitalism, prosperity has been captured by the ideology of “growth at all costs”: an insistence that more is always better. **Despite overwhelming evidence** that **relentless expansion is** undermining nature and **driving us towards** a devastating **climate emergency**, the “fairytales of eternal growth” still reign supreme. Zero gravity It’s an ironic twist in the tale of the debate society kid I used to be that I’ve spent most of my professional life confronting those fairytales of growth. Don’t ask me how that happened. By accident mostly. I toyed with the idea of studying astrophysics. But I ended up studying Maths at Cambridge, where I confess to being baffled by the complexity of it all, until I realised that even math is just a trick. Quite literally a formula. Believe in it and you can travel to the stars and back. In your mind, at least. And there I was wandering around in zero G, when I woke up one day (in April 1986) to find that the Number four reactor at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant in Ukraine had suffered a catastrophic meltdown. I suddenly realised that the very same skills I’d spent my life developing were leading humanity not towards the stars but away from the paradise we already inhabit. So yes. I changed my mind. The next day I walked into the Greenpeace office in London and asked what I could do to help. They set me working on the economics of renewable energy I became, accidentally, an economist. (Economics needs more accidental economists.) And that’s when it began to dawn on me that learning how to live well on this fragile planet is far more important than dreaming about the next one. Mine is bigger than yours Not so the **space race billionaires**. A handful of unbelievably powerful men, whose wealth has exploded massively throughout the pandemic, **are now busy trying to persuade us** that **the future lies** not here on Earth but out there **among the stars**. Tesla founder and serial entrepreneur, Elon Musk is one of these new rocket men. “Those who attack space,” he tweeted recently, “maybe don’t realise that space represents hope for so many people”. That may be true of course in a world where huge inequalities of wealth and privilege strip hope from the lives of billions of people. But, as the spouse of a Nasa flight controller pointed out, it obscures the extraordinary demands of escaping from Mother Earth, in terms of energy materials, people and time. Undeterred, the rocket men gaze starward. If resources are the problem, then space must be the answer. Amazon founder Jeff Bezos is pretty explicit about his own expansionary vision. “We can have a trillion humans in the solar system,” he once declared. “Which means we’d have a thousand Mozarts and a thousand Einsteins. This would be an incredible civilisation.” Bezos and Musk have spent their lockdown contesting the top two places on the Forbes rich list. They’ve also been playing “mine is bigger than yours” in their own private space race for a couple of decades now. Bezos’s personal wealth almost doubled during the course of a pandemic that destroyed the lives and livelihoods of millions. He’s now stepping down to spend more time on Blue Origin, the company he hopes will deliver vast human colonies across the solar system. The declared aim of Musk’s rival company, SpaceX, is “to make humanity multiplanetary”. Just like Kim Stanley Robinson’s science fiction trilogy back in the 1990s, Musk aims to establish a permanent human colony on Mars. To get there, he reasons, we need very big rockets – or, in the original terminology of SpaceX, Big Fucking Rockets (BFRs) – eventually capable of transporting scores of people and hundreds of tonnes of equipment millions of miles across the solar system. The BFRs have now given way to a series of (more sedately named) Starships. And to prove his green credentials Musk desperately wants these starships to be reusable. So much so that SpaceX conspired to blow up four consecutive Starship prototypes in quick succession during the first four months of 2021 trying unsuccessfully to re-land them. Move fast and break things is the Silicon Valley motto of course. But eventually you’ve got to bring the goods home. Starship SN15 finally achieved that on May 5 – three weeks after SpaceX had landed a massive US$2.9 billion contract from Nasa, nudging Blue Origin into the space race shadows. Not wanting to be outdone, Bezos came up with what he must have hoped was the ultimate comeback. When Blue Origin’s New Shepard rocket – which is also reusable – made its first manned space flight on July 20, he and his brother Mark would be two of the first few passengers on board. Wow, Jeff! Kudos man! Now you really show us your cojones! Nobody likes coming second. Least of all the most powerful people on the planet. But sometimes you get no choice. Out of the blue, without so much as a by-your-leave, Virgin boss, Richard Branson swooped in to steal everyone’s thunder. On July 11, nine days before Bezos’s big day, Branson became the first ever billionaire to launch himself into space. And for a cool US$250,000, he promised us, you too can be one of Virgin Galactic’s 600 or so breathless customers, waiting to enjoy three or four weightless minutes gazing back in rapture at the planet you’ve left behind. Apparently, Musk has already signed up. Bezos doesn’t need to. He’s made his own virgin space flight now. Prosperity as health **The space rhetoric of the super-rich betrays a mentality that may once have served humanity well.** Some would say **it’s a quintessential feature of capitalism. Innovation upon innovation**. A driving ambition to expand and explore. A primal urge to escape our origins and reach for the next horizon. Space travel is a natural extension of our obsession with economic growth**. It’s the crowning jewel of capitalism**. Further and faster is its frontier creed. I’ve spent much of my professional life as a critic of that creed, not just for environmental reasons but on social grounds as well. The seven years I spent as economics commissioner on the UK’s Sustainable Development Commission and my subsequent research at the Centre for the Understanding of Sustainable Prosperity revealed something fundamental about our aspirations for the good life. Something that has been underlined by the experience of the pandemic. Prosperity is as much about health as it is about wealth. Ask people what matters most in their lives and the chances are that this will come out somewhere near the top of the list. Health for themselves. Health for their friends and their families. Health too – sometimes – for the fragile planet on which we live and on whose health we ourselves depend. There’s something fascinating in this idea. Because it confronts the obsession with growth head on. As Aristotle pointed out in Nicomachean Ethics (a book named after his physician father), the good life is not a relentless search for more, but a continual process of finding a “virtuous” balance between too little and too much. Population health provides an obvious example of this idea. Too little food and we’re struggling with diseases of malnutrition. Too much and we’re tipped into the “diseases of affluence” that now kill more people than under-nutrition does. Good health depends on us finding and nurturing this balance. This task is always tricky of course, even at the individual level. Just think about the challenge of keeping your exercise, your diet and your appetites in line with the outcome of a healthy body weight. But as I’ve argued, living inside a system that has its sights continually focused on more makes the task near impossible. Obesity has tripled since 1975. Almost two-fifths of adults over 18 are overweight. Capitalism not only fails to recognise the point where balance lies. It has absolutely no idea how to stop when it gets there. You’d think our brush with mortality through the pandemic would have brought some of this home to us. You’d think it would give us pause for thought about what really matters to us: the kind of world we want for our children; the kind of society we want to live in. And for many people it has. In a survey carried out during lockdown in the UK, 85% of respondents found something in their changed conditions they felt worth keeping and fewer than 10% wanted a complete return to normal. When life and health are at stake, the ungodly scramble for wealth and status feels less and less attractive. Even the lure of technology pales. Family, conviviality and a sense of purpose come to the fore. These are the things that many people found they lacked most throughout the pandemic. But their importance in our lives was not a COVID accident: they are the most fundamental elements of a sustainable prosperity. The denial of death Something even more surprising has emerged during my three decades of research. Behind consumer capitalism, behind the frontier mentality, beyond the urge to expand forever lies a deep-seated and pervasive anxiety. What does day two look like, Bezos once asked a crowd of the faithful, referring to his famous maxim about the need to innovate. “Day two is stasis, followed by irrelevance, followed by excruciatingly painful decline, followed by death,” he said. “And that. Is why. It is always. Day one!” His audience loved it. Musk plays out his own inner demons just as disarmingly. “I’m not trying to be anyone’s saviour,” he once told TED’s head curator, Chris Anderton. “I’m just trying to think about the future – and not be sad.” Again, the applause was deafening. A well-trained therapist could have a field day with all of this. Take that miraculous day a few weeks after the Perseverance rover started sending home the most amazing selfies in the universe, when the Ingenuity helicopter made its virgin flight in the wafer thin atmosphere of Mars. It was the kind of outcome that could have intelligence agencies drooling over far less benign uses of the technology. But there was also something pretty existential going on. The faint whispering of the Martian wind, relayed faithfully across the solar system, doesn’t just confirm the possibilities for aerial flight on an alien planet. It’s grist to the mill of an essential belief that human beings are endlessly creative and fiendishly clever. Our visceral response to these momentary triumphs speaks to a branch of psychology called terror management theory drawn from the work of cultural anthropologist Ernest Becker. It was explored in particular in his astonishing 1973 book The Denial of Death. In it, Becker argues that modern society has lost its way, precisely because we’ve become terrified of confronting the inevitability of our own demise. Terror management theory tells us that, when mortality becomes “salient”, instead of addressing the underlying fear, we turn for comfort to the things which make us feel good. Capitalism itself is a massive comfort blanket, designed to help us never confront the mortality that awaits us all. So too are the dreams of the rocket men. Beyond lockdown When Sputnik kickstarted the first “space race” six decades ago, a US newspaper headline called it “one step toward [our] escape from imprisonment to the Earth”. Arendt read those words with astonishment. She saw there a deep-seated “rebellion against human existence”. It isn’t just the pandemic that locks us down, the implication is. It’s the entire human condition. The anxiety we feel is nothing new. The choice between confronting our fears and running away from them has always been a profound one. It’s exactly the choice we’re facing now. As vaccine roll-out brings a glimmer of light at the end of COVID-19, the temptation to rush into wild escapism is massive. But for all its glamour, **the “final frontier” is** at best an amusement and at worst **a fatal distraction from the urgent task of rebuilding a society ravaged by social injustice, climate change and a loss** of faith in **the future**. With most of us still reeling from what the World Health Organisation has called a shadow pandemic in mental health, any kind of escape plan at all looks remarkably like paradise. And emigrating to Mars is one hell of an escape plan. Let’s dream of some “final frontier” by all means. But **let’s focus our minds** too **on** some quintessentially **earthly priorities**. Affordable healthcare. Decent homes for the poorest in society. A solid education for our kids. Reversing the decades-long precarity in the livelihoods of the frontline workers – the ones who saved our lives. Regenerating the devastating loss of the natural world. **Replacing a frenetic consumerism with an economy of care and relationship and meaning**. Never have these things made so much sense to so many. Never has there been a better time to

#### Extending Capitalism violates the autonomy of those on earth and intelligent beings in outer space

Benjamin **Segobaetso**, **2018** (MA Candidate at School of Public Ethics, Saint Paul University. “Ethical Implications of the Colonization, Privatization and Commercialization of Outer Space” <https://ruor.uottawa.ca/bitstream/10393/38318/1/Benjamin_Segobaetso_2018.pdf>; Published 2018; Accessed 1-11-2022; Wally)

It can be argued through Kantian ethics that our record here on Earth paints a picture of neoliberal and capitalist policies with tendencies to favour the highest bidder at the exclusion of the under privileged and puts profit first at the expense of the environment. For Kantians, there are two questions that we must ask ourselves whenever we decide to act: (i) Can I rationally will that everyone act as I propose to act? If the answer is no, then we must not perform the action. (ii) Does my action respect the goals of human beings? Again, if the answer is no, then we must not perform the action. Kantian ethicists would argue that extending to space neoliberal and capitalist policies is immoral because these systems create economic disparities and life threatening environmental injustices; therefore, they are set up in a way that we could 16 not rationally will everyone to act the way they act either here on Earth or in space. Also, Kantian ethicists would ask whether the action of extending neoliberal and capitalist policies to space would respect the goals of extra-terrestrial intelligent life if any rather than merely using them for humans’ own purposes? If the answer is no, then the participating agent must not perform the action. Kant wrote on the possible existence of extra-terrestrial intelligent species in the final pages of the last book that he published, Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View [Anthropologie in pragmatischer Hinsicht] (1978). In this publication, Kant hinted that the highest concept of the Alien species may be that of a terrestrial rational being [eines irdischen vernünftigen ]; however, he argued that it will be difficult to describe its characteristics because there is no knowledge available of a non-terrestrial rational being [nicht irdischen Wesen] which could be used as a reference in regards to its properties and ultimately classify that terrestrial being as rational. This dilemma will continue until extraterrestrial intelligent life is discovered because comparing two species of rational beings has to be on the basis of experience, but that experience has not been possible yet (Kant, 237-238).

### C2

#### Contention 2 is that the public sector is a better actor in space

#### First, The resolution necessitates a shift to The Public Trust Doctrine which is the most ethical means of managing outer space and guarantees that any appropriation is in the best interest of all shareholders

* “PTD” = Public Trust Doctrine

Hope M. **Babcock**, **2019** (Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center. “THE PUBLIC TRUST DOCTRINE, OUTER SPACE, AND THE GLOBAL COMMONS: TIME TO CALL HOME ET” Syracuse Law Review 69, no. 2 (2019): 191-262 Accessed 1-11-2022; Wally)

The **PTD** offers both an approach for managing an open access commons and a gap-filling tool until a regulatory regime is adopted.5 07 The doctrine is **based on the idea that the "sovereign holds certain common properties in trust in perpetuity for the free and unimpeded use of the general public**." 08 **The public's right to access and use trust resources is never lost, and neither the government nor private individuals can alienate or otherwise adversely affect those resources unless for a comparable public purpose.** 509 The resources the doctrine protects "have long been part of a 'taxonomy of property' [that recognizes] the division of natural wealth into private and public property." 5 10 "**The doctrine places on governments 'an affirmative, ongoing duty to safeguard the long-term preservation of those resources for the benefit of the general public**,'"'' thus limiting the sovereign's power on behalf of both present and future individuals.5 12 **It directs the government to manage trust resources for public benefit, not private gain**. 513 It applies to private as well as public resources and is used to preserve the public's access to CPRs. 5 14 **Government agencies have the non-rescindable power to revoke uses of trust resources that are inconsistent with the doctrine**.51s **This effectively places a permanent easement over trust resources that burdens their ownership with an overriding public interest in the preservation of those resources**.5 1 6 However, trust resources can be alienated in favor of private ownership, if the alienation will still serve the public's interest in those resources and not interfere with trust uses of the remaining land.517 The PTD, therefore, protects the "people's common heritage," 1 just as Article 11 of the Moon Treaty protects outer space as part of the common heritage of mankind.519 The doctrine also appears to be infinitely malleable. Original uses of the doctrine were restricted to only that "aspect of the public domain below the low-water mark on the margin of the sea and the great lakes, the waters over those lands, and the waters within rivers and streams of any consequence," 520 and covered only traditional uses of those lands, like fishing and navigation.5 2 1 Over time, the scope and application of the doctrine broadened to protect more public resources and different uses. 522 Thus, the doctrine expanded to protect new trust resources, such as dry sand beaches, inland lakes, groundwater, dry riverbeds, and wildlife,52 3 and passive uses of those resources, like scientific study. 52 4 The original link to navigable water and tidelands disappeared.5 2 5 Supporters of the doctrine successfully advocated that it be applied to "wildlife, parks, cemeteries, and even works of fine art," 526 while arguing more recently its application to the atmosphere.5 27 **A doctrine that imposes a perpetual duty on the sovereign to preserve trust resources, prevents their alienation for private benefit, assures public access to them, and can be invoked by anyone seems particularly useful as a management tool in outer space**.5 2 8 The fact that public access to trust resources is so central to **the doctrine makes it reflective**, not contradictory, **of international space law's bar against appropriation of outer space** **and of the principle of space being the "province of all mankind**." 52 9 It avoids the problems of alienation and exclusion associated with any of the management approaches associated with some form of private property and requires neither the creation of a new administrative authority nor the presence of a close-knit group of like-minded people.53 0 **Members of the public, both rich and poor, can invoke and enforce the doctrine as easily as the sovereign**. 5 3 1 It is cost effective to the extent that no separate apparatus is required to implement it, and the doctrine has shown itself to be highly adaptable and innovative as different needs arise.5 32 It could also fill the gap in international law with respect to managing celestial property. Therefore, of all the management approaches studied here, the PTD seems the most suited to keep order in space until a regulatory regime is imposed.

#### And there is no innovation tradeoff - Public commons create clear and concerted innovation for mutual benefit without excess resource use

**Glynn 20** (Dr. Simon Glynn received his Ph.D. in philosophy from the University of Manchester (U.K.), after receiving an M.A. in philosophy from McMaster University (Canada) and a B.A. in philosophy and politics from the University of Keele (U.K.), with subsidiary degree qualifications in economics and mathematics. He is a professor of Philosophy at Florida Atlantic University. The Alternative: The Pragmatic and Moral Advantages of Globalized Socialist Cooperation,"  [https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2F978-3-030-52667-2\_17.pdf)sw](https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2F978-3-030-52667-2_15.pdf)sw)

Socialist economies, rejecting competitive profitability in favor of cooperation by which all benefit from the progress of each, consequently eschew “free rider,” development inhibiting, strategies. **Furthermore, unlike competitive economies’ wasteful duplication and dispersion of R&D expertise, socialisms’ cooperative ethos pools it to great synergistic effect.** Moreover, unconstrained by competition and profit maximization, as soon as the most basic material needs are met socialism moves to enhance worker, and general social and environmental, welfare; remaining surpluses being reinvested in economic growth. Thus, notwithstanding the introduction of profit taking to motivate production in some non-essential economic areas, the direct reinvestment of surplus in the other areas further contributes to the dynamic growth of the Chinese economy; development in the USSR falling victim to an arms race. In contrast to capitalist economies, **socialist economies** being, at least insofar as they are not in competition with capitalist economies, cooperative— all thereby benefiting from the progress made by each—**have no reason,** as do competitive capitalists in a free market**, to** hold back on investment and attempt to catch a “**free ride**”; no reason to **thereby slow technological innovation** and economic growth, for fear of loss of private competitiveness or/and profitability vis-à-vis those who may attempt to derive a “free ride” at their expense. **Nor**, insofar as they are unconcerned with competitive profitability, are they **inhibited by the logic of** **capitalism from investing in environmental** and welfare **programs**, and the like, aimed at promoting general social wellbeing or utility. **Rather**, on the contrary, **they are** both pragmatically free and **ideologically** or morally **inclined**, to do so, even if unfortunately sometimes at the indisputable cost of individual rights.1 Moreover, in cutting out profit taking from the return on their investments they reduce the expense of technological R&D and ensure that if not all, then a large proportion, of the wealth generated thereby is directly funneled back into the real economy, thereby stimulating supply side investment, which rather than being used to increase profits may be used to enable increasing demand side wages and benefits. All of which factors, in addition to helping accelerate the pace of technological innovation, as well as fending off any potential crisis of overproduction, ensures that, other things being equal, socialist economies have the potential to grow much more rapidly than do their capitalist counterparts. **And as if all of this were not impressive enough, unlike capitalist economies**, in which competition results in wasteful duplication of R&D as well as the dispersion of research expertise into any number of competitive companies or corporations, **socialist economies can foster cooperative R&D, bringing expertise together to great synergistic effect**, as well as other, more obvious, advantage. **Indeed it was surely precisely in recognition of the potential efficiency of cooperative as opposed to competitive R&D, that when the “chips were down” The Manhattan Project’s research into and development of nuclear weapons technology was government funded, unitraly organized, and directed**, as indeed was the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA),2 **along with the initial development of internet technology by the military, much, as previously noted, to subsequent US corporate advantage**. And all of the aforementioned benefits derivable from socialism, are certainly no less pronounced under communism; and this regardless of whether or not one agrees on what individual freedoms should be limited, and to what degree, in the name of overall social utility.3 Thus, surprising as it will undoubtedly seem to many, growth rates in the Soviet Union, fueled not only by its own form of colonial or neocolonial exploitation of “Iron Curtain” countries, but by government funded, organized and controlled R&D, unburdened by the capitalist imperative either of profit generation or profit taking, were much greater than in the capitalist West. 4 A point exemplified if not demonstrated by, for instance, the fact that the nations of what would become the Soviet Union managed to go from being predominantly feudal, or quasi-feudal, agricultural societies at the time of the Russian Revolution in 1917, to being, as the USSR, the first into Space, with Sputnik, within 40 years.5 Although given that much of its investment was directed to the development of military technologies in order to counter the threat perceived to be emanating from a hostile capitalist adversary—which not only already had nuclear weapons, but had, in bombing Nagasaki and Hiroshima, shown itself to be prepared to use them against civilian populations—this growth did not translate into as significant economic development in other areas as it otherwise surely would have, nor therefore into a vast increase in domestic consumption, as it has in China. The eventual collapse of the Soviet economy, despite its rapid economic growth, being in large part6 due to the economic burden of an arms race, strategically imposed on the USSR economically devastated by WWII7 by the US whose economy had benefited, as we have seen, from massive growth-stimulating Allied demand for its products during that period. Turning to China, although it is certainly true that, returning to the previously outlined de facto obstacles to economic development, unlike the colonized or neo-colonized economies, China’s political elite were in no way dependent upon overseas patrons to maintain them in power, and consequently did not have an incentive to collude with them in the suppression of wage levels and resource prices, nevertheless it is certainly to be acknowledged that, not unlike capitalist profit takers, some Communist Party members benefited disproportionately from improvements in the national economy. However their levels of conspicuous consumption never approached those characteristic of many of the political or economic elites in lots of developing, or even undeveloped, countries. While premier Xi Jinping’s recently crackdown on corruption at even the highest levels has been significant enough to continue to limit, and even to substantially reduce, corruption, as well as to prevent the investment of any great percentage of whatever disproportionate benefits accrued to Party members in foreign economies. Furthermore, although, in accordance with Deng Xiaoping’s “Socialism with Chinese Characteristics,” China has, particularly when interacting with competitive, not to say predatory, capitalist economies, certainly incorporated some aspects of the competitive free market into its economy, nevertheless, no matter whether motivated by principled idealism or in a pragmatic attempt to avoid any crisis of overproduction which may undermine their legitimacy, or both,8 the Chinese government has remained committed to the communist ideology of the Communist Party of China (CPC) and to socialist principles. Thus spared from the capitalist imperative to generate profits, much of the wealth generated by the Chinese economy has been directly reinvested in its future growth which, in addition to the many aforementioned advantages accruing to cooperative or socialist (in contrast to competitive or capitalist) economies, has meant that unlike capitalist economies, most of which, even prior to the Great Recession struggled to maintain a 3% exponential or cumulative annual growth rate, China managed to maintain a cumulative of exponential growth rate of around 11% for many decades! As a consequence of which, again in accordance with the communist ideology of substantial distribution of wealth “to each according to their needs” as well as to those whose physical or/and intellectual labor produce it, China has, as no less an august body than the World Bank has acknowledged, reduced the overall poverty rate among Chinese from 88% in 1981 to less than 0.7% by 2015, even as 2 billion, or around 30% of the those in the Capitalist economies, live, as previously noted, on under $2 a day; half of whom live on under $1a day! While also spared in wake of the Great Recession that hit the capitalist economies in 2008, of the apparent imperative to ensure the continuing survival of capitalism, and thus to bail out the banks and other financial institutions, China, facing reduced foreign demand for its products, invested instead in infrastructure. For example, although with few exceptions—such as the Shanghai Airport to Shanghai City magnetic levitation (Maglev) train which routinely whisks travels between the two at speeds well over 430 km/hr—in the early 2000s China had few high-speed trains, and a relatively limited subway system, it now has the world’s largest (22,000 miles/35,000 km) high-speed (250–350 km/hr) rail network, and the world’s three longest subway systems. Similarly, notwithstanding its initially heavy, early, investment in the previously proven coal-burning power stations, China—whose government investment in, and transition to, potentially planet saving solar, wind, and hydroelectric energy production is not restricted, as it is in the US, by unremitting opposition from the taxpayer subsidized oil, gas, and coal (fossil fuel) lobby—is now the world’s leader in electricity production from renewable resources, generating over twice as much from such sources as the US. Its production of solar cells, increasing 100 fold between 2005 and 2014, while it now produces well over half of world supply. And in addition to such photovoltaic energy cells, solar-powered water heaters, which heat water and radiators directly (without electrical intervention) from the sun’s heat have long been extensively employed throughout China. And as with Chinese investment in transportation and energy production, so too with information infrastructure, to the point where China currently leads the world in 5G technology for example. Nor has the wealth generated by the Chinese economy all been directly reinvested in its future growth, but, again in accord with the government’s ideological commitment and concomitant concern for general social utility or wellbeing, there is increasing investment in the creation or/and maintenance of fulfilling social and cultural spaces and interactions and so on, and the provision of healthcare and education for all, which is to say in enhancing purely qualitative aspects of life, as well as in pensions, rising wages and other financial benefits. All of which tend, of course, to be positively correlated with the increase in the sum total of human happiness that is Utilitarianism’s moral yardstick.9 In sum then, although capitalist enterprises, which if they are to survive in a genuinely competitive, transparent, and free market, must maximize the interest or/and dividends derived from investment, which is to say maximize the financial value of output divided by input, and must therefore, other things being equal, pursue profit maximization at the expense of all else—including any less than economically optimal social utility10— even as, by concomitantly pushing wages down and production up, this inevitably culminates in capitalism’s self-destructive crises of overproduction, communism, and socialism, by way of contrast, face no such moral, or indeed pragmatic, not to say ontological dilemmas. Rather, **relieved of the competitive capitalist** **imperative** to generate profit, **not only has China been able to directly reinvest** the quantitative **productive** **capacity** demonstrably resulting **from a cooperative economic system into** more productively **efficient** (as oppose to economically profitable) **clean energy**, public and industrial transportation, and **information infrastructure**, as well as robotic production systems, **pharmaceuticals**, medical technology and infrastructure, semiconductors, quantum computing, artificial intelligence, **and other high tech capacities, but it** has **also** been free to, indeed **ideologically obliged to**, invest much of what has not been **invested in such projects in** **more direct** qualitative sociocultural and quantitative economic **benefits for its citizenry**. Strategies which, in addition to achieving what may be perceived as a moral objective, have had the undeniable pragmatic consequence of producing a rapidly expanding middle class, thereby boosting domestic demand; demand that not only enabled it to compensate, at least in part, for the reduction in foreign demand resulting from global capitalism’s Great Recession, but, more generally, constitutes a virtuous circle which, the coronavirus notwithstanding, enables its economy to continue growing at a healthy rate, and thus to underwrite even greater commitments of the same sort.