#### I value justice as the resolution asks us to evaluate the justness of an action. My value criterion is maximizing well-being, or utilitarianism because it’s the only just way to evaluate decisions.

#### Util treats everyone equally

**Nathanson ND**, Stephen Nathanson, Professor at Northeastern University, “Act and Rule Utilitarianism” Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, a peer-reviewed academic resource <https://iep.utm.edu/util-a-r/> Livingston RB

To illustrate this method, suppose that you are buying ice cream for a party that ten people will attend. Your only flavor options are chocolate and vanilla, and some of the people attending like chocolate while others like vanilla. **As a utilitarian**, **you** should **choose** the flavor **that will result in the most pleasure** for the group as a whole. If seven like chocolate and three like vanilla and if all of them get the same amount of pleasure from the flavor they like, then you should choose chocolate. This will yield what Bentham, in a famous phrase, called “**the greatest happiness for the greatest number**.” An important point in this case is that you should choose chocolate even if you are one of the three people who enjoy vanilla more than chocolate. **The utilitarian method requires you to count everyone’s interests equally**. **You may not weigh some people’s interests**—including your own—**more heavily than others**. Similarly, if a government is choosing a policy, it should give equal consideration to the well-being of all members of the society.

#### Util is a lexical pre-requisite to any other framework: Threats to bodily security and life preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively utilize and act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis that inhibit the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose so util comes first

#### Default to util if there’s any uncertainty

Walter **Sinnott-Armstrong 14** [American philosopher. He specializes in ethics, epistemology, and more recently in neuroethics, the philosophy of law, and the philosophy of cognitive science], "Consequentialism", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2014 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed), BE

Even if consequentialists can accommodate or explain away common moral intuitions, that might seem only to answer objections without yet giving any positive reason to accept consequentialism. However, **most people begin with the presumption that we morally ought to make the world better when we can. The question then is only whether any moral constraints or moral options need to be added to the basic consequentialist factor in moral reasoning.** (Kagan 1989, 1998) **If no objection reveals any need for anything beyond consequences, then consequences alone seem to determine what is morally right or wrong, just as consequentialists claim.**

1. **Lives come first under either of our frameworks because death is the largest impact. If we are all dead we can’t do [their framework]**

### Contention 1 is safety net

#### In the status quo, billionaires are looking to space colonization to escape earth

**Tucker 20**, Reed Tucker, 8-8-2020, "Jeff Bezos and Elon Musk’s plans to colonize space are even crazier than we thought," New York Post, https://nypost.com/2020/08/08/billionaires-who-plan-to-colonize-space-live-in-a-dream-world/

Now **the future of space** is largely **in** his and **the hands of** other free-spending, big-dreaming **billionaires** like him, including Amazon’s Jeff Bezos. But what will this future look like? Some answers can be found in the new book “[Star Settlers: The Billionaires, Geniuses, and Crazed Visionaries Out to Conquer the Universe](https://www.amazon.com/Star-Settlers-Billionaires-Geniuses-Visionaries/dp/1643134485/?tag=nypost-20&asc_refurl=https://nypost.com/2020/08/08/billionaires-who-plan-to-colonize-space-live-in-a-dream-world/&asc_source=web)” (Pegasus Books) by Fred Nadis, out now. “I see [guys like Musk] almost like medieval cathedral builders, with this multi-century project that they’re willing to take their time and their livelihood,” Nadis told The Post. That said, the author thinks these billionaires may be dreaming a bit too big. As Matt Damon found in “The Martian,” the red planet’s atmosphere is much thinner than Earth’s and the planet generates no electromagnetic field, meaning it gets pounded by cosmic rays and other harmful-to-humans energy.©20thCentFox/Courtesy Everett C Musk, the founder of Tesla, **has said** that all of his earthly business ventures are just a way to fund **his true passion: colonizing Mars.** His company, SpaceX, is planning to send humans to the red planet in 2024. Within a century, Musk envisions reusable rockets blasting off every two years and ferrying some 200 passengers at a time, ultimately establishing an outpost of a million people. It’s still unclear how they’ll survive. At its closest, Mars is some 35 million miles from Earth, and a trip would take around nine months. Once they get there, the problem explorers will face is that Mars’ atmosphere is much thinner than Earth’s and the planet generates no electromagnetic field, meaning it gets pounded by cosmic rays and other energy harmful to humans. “It’s really challenging,” Nadis says. “Not quite as simple as SpaceX might make it out to be.” Musk has offered sketchy details of what life off-world might look like. Any Mars colony would have to be self-sustaining and not rely on supplies from Earth. Musk has suggested food be grown on hydroponic farms, either underground or in an enclosed structure to protect the crops from radiation, but because Mars’ surface gets about half the sunlight Earth does, whatever plants that can be grown will likely have to be supplemented with artificial lights — and powering those lights will be no small challenge. Musk has said farms will be powered by solar panels, though he’s offered few details. “Really pretty straightforward,” he told Popular Mechanics last year. Princeton physicist Gerard O’Neill imagined space colonies consisting of giant counter-rotating cylinders, simulating gravity.Rick Guidice/NASA In the same interview, the billionaire suggested Mars’ inhabitants might live under a glass dome with an “outdoorsy, fun atmosphere” until the planet is terraformed — artificially transforming the planet to make it more Earth-like, with a livable atmosphere. But that plan also presents a problem: A 2018 NASA-sponsored study concluded that terraforming Mars is impossible, because there is not enough carbon dioxide locked in the soil to release into the air. Musk, however, isn’t daunted. He has suggested exploding 10,000 nuclear missiles over Mars’ surface in order to melt the planet’s ice reserves, thereby releasing the carbon dioxide locked within. His company has even produced “Nuke Mars” T-shirts. Scientists are divided on whether the idea would work. Penn State climate scientist Michael Mann, for example, told US News and World Report in 2015, “There are so many things that could go wrong here, it is difficult to know where to start.” Meanwhile, **Bezos and his company**, Blue Origin**, are also focused on moving off-world** — but **onto space colonies**. **Bezos is worried that the Earth’s resources will be gone in a few hundred years, spurring the need to leave.** Bezos draws much of his inspiration from the work of Gerard O’Neill, a Princeton physicist who in the 1970s laid out a grand design for space colonies.

#### Space colonization if only done by private entities be primarily accessible to the extremely wealthy

**Maney 15**, Kevin Maney, Kevin Maney is a best-selling author, award-winning columnist, and musician still waiting for his big break. Maney co-authored, with Al Ramadan, Dave Peterson and Christopher Lochhead, the 2015 book [Play Bigger: How Pirates, Dreamers and Innovators Create and Dominate Markets](http://www.harperbusiness.com/book/9780062407610/Play-Bigger-by-Al-Ramadan-Dave-Peterson-Christopher-Lochhead-and-Kevin-Maney/), published by Harper Business.  Maney’s other books include [The Two-Second Advantage: How We Succeed by Anticipating the Future...Just Enough](http://www.amazon.com/The-Two-Second-Advantage-Anticipating-Future-Just/dp/0307887650), a 2011 New York Times bestseller. He also co-wrote the most widely distributed business book of 2011, [Making the World Work Better:The Ideas That Shaped a Century and a Company](http://www.amazon.com/Making-World-Work-Better-Century/dp/0132755106), which marked IBM’s centennial. His other books are [Trade-Off: Why Some Things Catch On, and Others Don't](http://www.amazon.com/Trade-Off-Some-Things-Catch-Others/dp/0385525958); [The Maverick and His Machine: Thomas Watson Sr. and the Making of IBM](http://www.amazon.com/The-Maverick-His-Machine-Thomas/dp/0471679259); and [Megamedia Shakeout](http://www.amazon.com/Megamedia-Shakeout-Exploding-Communications-Industry/dp/0471107190). Maney has been a contributor to Fortune, The Atlantic, Fast Company and ABC News, among other media outlets. He was a contributing editor at Conde Nast Portfolio during its brief run from 2007 to 2009. For 22 years, Maney was a columnist, editor and reporter at USA Today. He has been a book and writing consultant to numerous CEOs and companies such as Cisco, IBM, IdeaPaint and Qualcomm. He lives in New York. 12-14-2015, "'Star Wars' Class Wars: Is Mars the Escape Hatch for the 1 Percent?," Newsweek, <https://www.newsweek.com/2015/12/25/mars-colonies-rich-people-404681.html> Livingston RB

This is the unspoken flip side of Musk's [SpaceX](http://dcinno.streetwise.co/2015/12/07/spacex-2016-elon-musks-internet-satellites-nasa-missions/) and Bezos's [Blue Origin](https://www.businessinsider.com/about-blue-origins-be-4-engine-2015-12). The space travel companies say they are creating a way for the human species to endure by populating other planets. But **the bottom line is that only the wealthy will have the means to move to Mars**. Musk's target ticket price is $500,000 a person in 2015 dollars, and that's just to get there. Imagine the new outfits you'll have to buy to go with that space helmet. So **you can picture a scenario that's something like the 1970s**[**white flight**](http://www.citylab.com/work/2013/11/mapping-60-years-white-flight-brain-drain-and-american-migration/7449/)**from inner cities, when the wealthier classes moved to freshly built suburbs, leaving the declining neighborhoods to the lower classes.** In fact, **the fleeing upper classes sped up the decrepitude of that era's older cities by relocating their money and clout with them**. Today, we're seeing a similar situation in Syria, as the wealthiest and most educated people [escape](https://www.ibtimes.com/europe-refugee-crisis-facts-wealthy-educated-syrians-risking-lives-leave-war-2089018) to the West, which will make the country even harder to stabilize and rebuild.

#### This means that it allows for the extremely wealthy to have a safety net to turn to if things on earth go bad

**Moran 20**, Michael Moran, 08-02-2020, "Billionaires could leave Earth behind 'for space colony' as 'climate collapses'," Dailystar.co.uk, <https://www.dailystar.co.uk/news/weird-news/billionaires-could-leave-earth-behind-21445413> Livingston RB

But noted American media theorist Douglas Rushkoff has written that **the overall direction of technological development was about creating an escape route for the super-rich**. He pointed out that combat robots would serve very well to guard the bolt-holes of billionaires remaining on Earth **once climate change reached its end-game** and described Elon Musk’s **planned Mars** colony **as “less a continuation of the human diaspora than a lifeboat for the elite.”** They can certainly afford a lifeboat. The world’s richest people have seen their share of the world’s total money supply increase from 42.5% at the height of the 2008 financial crisis to just over 50.% by the end of 2017. That adds up to about or $140trillion (£106tn), according to a report from Credit Suisse.

#### And the ultra-wealthy are the ones exploiting earth in the squo

**Zimmerman 15**, Jess Zimmerman, 9-16-2015, "What if the mega-rich just want rocket ships to escape the Earth they destroy?," Guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/sep/16/mega-rich-rocket-ships-escape-earth> Livingston RB

Of course, **uber-wealthy** tech entrepreneurs **aren’t just buying rockets for their personal amusement.** They’re founding or investing in space travel – they want to get you off-planet, too. Well, not you-you, but someone like you with much, much, much more money. And that’s where the vogue for billionaire space travel magnates gets a little weird –and maybe even sinister. It’s already very true that **money expands your world**; the person with the funds to have a car is less restricted in her movements than the person without one, and the person with a huge plane and the money to fly it is less restricted still. The expansion of rich people’s travel horizons comes at a price for everyone, both rich and poor. With the exception of America’s weirdly-expensive Amtrak system, cost and luxury scale with fossil fuel consumption; travel that costs more and feels more indulgent is also travel that has a cataclysmic effect on the environment. The faster and further you can afford to travel, the greater your environmental footprint. And often, the people less able to travel are the ones left holding the toxic-chemical and pollution-filled bag. **Companies** like Blue Origin **are using** money and **resources to push outwards**, to expand the worlds of their rich customers all the way into space. **But those same customers** – and some of the owners – **are** making their terrestrial money in the classic capitalist terrestrial way: by **working around any obstacle to profit, including environmental regulations and conservation efforts**. Almost **all industry is environmentally disastrous**, after all; truly prioritizing earth-friendliness would destroy most companies. Some people with a great deal of money care more about the fate of the world than others, but they’re all willing to cut corners if it affects the bottom line. You can tell because they have a great deal of money; you can also tell because they’re willing to spend it on a ride in a spaceship. Which raises the question: are they just gearing up to wash their hands of the planet and leave the rest of us to clean up? **By pushing outward while ignoring the problems it causes back on the home turf**, are **they effectively** **creat**ing **a galactic upper class that rests on the backs of the earthbound**? Even if that’s not literally the plan, it may be the ultimate outcome.

#### This leads to worse warming of earth. Billionaires already do it and space means there are no consequences. Warming harms the least well off the most

**Paddinson 21** Laura Paddison, 21-10-2021, "How the rich are driving climate change," No Publication, https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20211025-climate-how-to-make-the-rich-pay-for-their-carbon-emissions

In 2018, Stefan Gössling and his team spent months scouring the social media profiles of some of the richest celebrities, from Paris Hilton to Oprah Winfrey. The tourism professor from Linnaeus University in Sweden was looking for evidence of how much they were flying.  The answer was a lot. Bill Gates, one of the world's most high-profile environmental advocates, took 59 flights in 2017, according to Gössling's [calculations](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S016073831930132X?via%3Dihub), covering a distance of around 343,500km (213,000 miles) – more than eight times around the world – generating more than 1,600 tonnes of greenhouse gases (that's equivalent to the [average yearly emissions of 105 Americans](https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EN.ATM.CO2E.PC?locations=US)).  Gössling's aim was to try to uncover **the individual consumption levels of the mega rich**, whose lifestyles **are often shrouded in secrecy**. His research coincided with a growing environmental movement, spearheaded by Greta Thunberg, which put a spotlight on personal accountability. Flying, one of the most carbon-intensive forms of consumption, became a symbol of this new accountability.  "**The bigger your carbon footprint, the bigger your moral duty,**" Thunberg [wrote in the Guardian](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/jan/25/our-house-is-on-fire-greta-thunberg16-urges-leaders-to-act-on-climate) in 2019.  The last few decades have shone a spotlight on global inequality. From the 2008 financial crisis, to the pandemic and the [increasingly severe impacts of climate change](https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20200618-climate-change-who-is-to-blame-and-why-does-it-matter) – disruptive events tend to hit the poorest first and hardest.But in debates about how to solve inequality, over-consumption is often overlooked. "Each unit you overshoot means someone has to give [something] up," says Lewis Akenji, managing director of Hot or Cool Institute, a Berlin-based think tank. As a result, the outsized carbon footprints of society's richest entrench inequality and threaten the world's ability to stave off catastrophic climate change. The statistics are startling. **The world's wealthiest 10% were responsible for around half of global emissions in 2015, according to a 2020**[**report**](https://www.sei.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/research-report-carbon-inequality-era.pdf) from Oxfam and the Stockholm Environment Institute. **The top 1% were responsible for** 15% of emissions, **nearly twice as much as the world's poorest 50%,** **who** were responsible for just 7% and **will feel the brunt of climate impacts despite bearing the least responsibility for causing them.**

#### Climate Change leads to extinction

**Specktor 19.** Brandon Specktor. June 04 2019. LiveScience. “Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims.” https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html. – Livingston RB

It seems every week there's a scary new report about how man-made climate change is going to cause the [collapse of the world's ice sheets](https://www.livescience.com/65524-antarctica-ice-unstable.html), result in the extinction of up to [1 million animal species](https://www.livescience.com/65314-human-influence-species-extinction.html) and — if that wasn't bad enough — make our [beer very, very expensive](https://www.livescience.com/63832-climate-change-will-ruin-beer.html). This week, a new policy paper from an Australian think tank claims that those other reports are slightly off; the risks of climate change are actually much, much worse than anyone can imagine. [According to the paper](https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/148cb0_b2c0c79dc4344b279bcf2365336ff23b.pdf), **climate change poses a** "near- to mid-term **existential threat to human civilization**," **and there's a good chance society could collapse as soon as 2050 if serious mitigation actions aren't taken in the next decade**. **Published by the Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration in Melbourne (an independent think tank focused on climate policy) and authored by a climate researcher and a former fossil fuel executive,** the paper's central thesis is that climate scientists are too restrained in their predictions of how climate change will affect the planet in the near future. [[Top 9 Ways the World Could End](https://www.livescience.com/36999-top-scientists-world-enders.html)] The current climate crisis, they say, is larger and more complex than any humans have ever dealt with before. General climate models — like the one that the [United Nations' Panel on Climate Change](https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/) (IPCC) used in 2018 to predict that a global temperature increase of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius) could put hundreds of millions of people at risk — fail to account for the sheer complexity of Earth's many interlinked geological processes; as such, they fail to adequately predict the scale of the potential consequences. The truth, the authors wrote, is probably far worse than any models can fathom. How the world ends What might an accurate worst-case picture of the planet's climate-addled future actually look like, then? The authors provide one particularly grim scenario that begins with world governments "politely ignoring" the advice of scientists and the will of the public to decarbonize the economy (finding alternative energy sources), resulting in a global temperature increase 5.4 F (3 C) by the year 2050. At this point, the world's **ice sheets vanish; brutal droughts kill** many of the **trees** in the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.livescience.com/57266-amazon-river.html) (removing one of the world's largest carbon offsets); and the **planet** plunges **into a feedback loop of ever-hotter, ever-deadlier conditions.** "Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and **55 percent of the** global **population**, are **subject to** more than 20 days a year of [**lethal heat conditions**](https://www.livescience.com/55129-how-heat-waves-kill-so-quickly.html)**, beyond** the threshold of **human survivability**," the authors hypothesized. Meanwhile, droughts, floods and wildfires regularly ravage the land. Nearly one-third of the world's land surface turns to desert. Entire **ecosystems collapse**, beginning with the planet's coral reefs, the rainforest and the Arctic ice sheets. The world's **tropics are hit** hardest by these new climate extremes, destroying the region's agriculture and turning more than **1 billion** people into **refugees**. This mass movement of refugees — coupled with [shrinking coastlines](https://www.livescience.com/51990-sea-level-rise-unknowns.html) and severe drops in food and water availability — begin to **stress the fabric of the world's largest nations,** including the United States. **Armed conflicts over resources**, perhaps culminating in nuclear war, are likely. The result, according to the new paper, is "**outright chaos**" and perhaps "**the end of human global civilization as we know it."** How can this catastrophic vision of the future be prevented? Only with the people of the world accepting climate change for the emergency it is and getting to work — immediately. According to the paper's authors, **the human race has about one decade left to mount a global movement to transition the world economy to a zero-carbon-emissions system**. (Achieving zero-carbon emissions requires either not emitting carbon or balancing carbon emissions with carbon removal.) The effort required to do so "would be akin in scale to the [World War II](https://www.livescience.com/65025-nazi-massacre-site-artifacts.html) emergency mobilization," the authors wrote. The new policy paper was endorsed with a foreword by Adm. Chris Barrie, a retired Australian defense chief and senior royal navy commander who has testified before the Australian Senate about the devastating possibilities climate change poses to national security and overall human well-being. "I told the [Senate] Inquiry that, after [nuclear war](https://www.livescience.com/65603-doomsday-plane-can-survive-nuclear-attack.html), human-induced global warming is the greatest threat to human life on the planet," Barrie wrote in the new paper. "Human life on Earth may be on the

### Contention 2 is developing countries

#### Outer space houses tons of valuable resources, it’s about who can get there first

**Blair 15**, Brad Blair, Expert in commercial space law, Winter 2015, "Space Mineral Resources," National Space Society - Working to Create a Spacefaring Civilization, <https://space.nss.org/space-mineral-resources/> Livingston RB

**A recently released study** by the International Academy of Astronautics (IAA) **found that space mineral resources** (SMR) **can serve as an economic gamechang**er, **opening a vast new source of wealth to benefit humanity**. The study examined technical, economic, legal, and policy-related requirements to enable SMR, and offered specific recommendations to international space agencies and commercial enterprise for moving humanity forward into a new era of space settlement and commercial resource development. The study was assembled by two prominent space lawyers. Art Dula is a professor of law at the Houston Law School, trustee of the Heinlein Prize Trust, and founder of Excalibur Exploration Limited. Zhang Zhenjun is secretary general of the China Institute of Space Law, a resident director of the Chinese Society of Astronautics, and holds an MBA from George Washington University. The work solicited and included extensive input by entrepreneurial startup companies including Deep Space Industries, Shackleton Energy Company, Planetary Resources, Excalibur Exploration, Moon Express, and Tethers Unlimited. Study findings on SMR technology and engineering design are that **mining asteroids and lunar regolith is within reach of the current state of the technical art.** The extrapolation of Earth-based mining appears to be a one-for-one trade with alterations due to vacuum, low gravity, and temperature, with bench and lab-scale testing to date in private and government labs on Earth affirming this conclusion. Indeed, the primary roadblocks to SMR today are more intimately related to reducing market, legal, and financial risk. A focus on customers, demographics, and increasing market certainty is needed to create a solid foundation for the future of space enterprise. The study found that the cost to develop Moon or asteroid water sources could become significantly lower than the delivery price from Earth, especially as distance increases, making space water a potential basis for future currency. Indeed, establishing spaceports and selling water mined in space is a key to unlocking a robust and sustainable space economy, enabling human expansion into the Solar System.

#### The ability to appropriate space keeps developing nations out of these valuable resources- it’s already happened with satellites

**Giacomin 19**, Nicolas Giacomin, author on space, 12-4-2019, "The Bogotá Declaration and space law," Space Legal Issues, <https://www.spacelegalissues.com/the-bogota-declaration-and-space-law/> Livingston RB

The practice of developed states **is based** on free access and priority given to the first **satellites** placed in the geostationary orbit. The placing into orbit of satellites is in accordance with the 1967 Outer Space Treaty. These satellites have the right to pursue a trajectory without interference from satellites later placed in orbit. In addition, the international regulation of the radio spectrum has favored the development of satellite telecommunications systems. Increasing congestion of the orbit and frequencies may **limit the access and opportunities of developing countries in the future**. **It will become more and more difficult** to use frequencies from the geostationary orbit under satisfactory conditions (without creating or suffering radio interference, or without incurring additional costs). Common law regime for the use of frequencies traditionally protects the first users against such interference. In this situation, new entrants must design their space telecommunication systems taking into account both the trajectory and the frequencies used by the satellites in place. Unlike the regime of orbit and outer space in general, for more than half a century, there has already been an institutionalized mechanism for access to radio frequencies. This mechanism makes it possible to coordinate the use of frequencies and thereby, prevents harmful interference between radio stations under the jurisdiction of different states. In order to avoid anarchy in this area, ITU distributes radio waves between recognized radio services. Thus, the frequencies used by the various services at the international level are determined in advance before the establishment of telecommunications stations. Any state wishing to establish a station and allocate a frequency band, must comply with the service allocation deriving from international regulations. While inter-service distribution is pre-established, the distribution among states within a given service is traditionally done according to their order of arrival: the first to notify the use of a frequency band by a station under its jurisdiction acquires a right of priority at the international level. Frequency assignments by states must be registered with the ITU. Within the latter, the International Frequency Registration Board examines the compliance of these assignments with the regulations in force and the possibility of interference with other stations already in operation. In case of conflict between an existing user registered before the International Frequency Registration Board and a newcomer, preference is given to the first one; this is sometimes described as **“first come, first served”**. Some **developing countries have argued that** the utilization of geostationary **orbit by developed countries is contrary to the 1967 Outer Space Treaty** and, in particular, to the principle of non-appropriation. For a variety of reasons, **this challenge to current practice does not really addresses the problem** of orbital saturation. First, the 1967 Outer Space Treaty and the prohibition of appropriation do not limit the use of orbital space. In addition, this instrument appears unable to provide a solution to the problem of saturation of the orbit, because it is primarily due to exogenous constraints related to the use of radio frequencies. Access to the frequency spectrum depends on International Telecommunications Law and not on space law.

#### This locks in existing global structural violence by perpetuating inequality into space

**Reinstein 99**, Ezra J. Reinstein, Owning Outer Space, 20 Nw. J. Int'l L. & Bus. 59 (1999-2000) <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1500&context=njilb> Livingston RB

The rights of less-developed nations create a concern that is both political and moral in character. As a matter of political reality, the less developed nations wield considerable power, due in no small part to majority voting systems in the major international regulatory bodies. Some feel, and developing nations argue, that **it is morally imperative to take the interests of the non-space-capable nations into account when designing a system of space property law.** A regime based on **the "right of grab,"** the first-come, first-served theory of property acquisition**, should be feared**. **By the time space-incapable nations develop the** technological **prowess and capital** reserves **to fund** meaningful **development of** outer **space, the earlier** space-faring **nations,** left unchecked, might already **have locked up the** most accessible and valuable **resources. Present inequities of global wealth distribution** thus **would be carried forward into** the **space** age. 38

#### Global Inequality has severe impacts for all

**Doucouliagos 17** Chris Doucouliagos, Professor of Economics, Department of Economics, Deakin Business School and Alfred Deakin Institute for Citizenship and Globalisation, Deakin University 8-6-2017, "Don't listen to the rich: inequality is bad for everyone," Conversation, <https://theconversation.com/dont-listen-to-the-rich-inequality-is-bad-for-everyone-81952> Livingston RB

A world where a few people have most of the wealth [motivates others](https://www.economist.com/blogs/economist-explains/2015/06/economist-explains-11) who are poor to strive to earn more. And when they do, they’ll [invest](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2296292?origin=JSTOR-pdf&seq=1#fndtn-page_scan_tab_contents) in businesses and other areas of the economy. That’s the argument for inequality. But it’s wrong. [**Our study**](http://business.monash.edu/__data/assets/pdf_file/0017/455111/1816inequalitymadsenislamdoucouliagos-002.pdf)**of 21 OECD countries over more than a 100 years shows income inequality actually** **restricts** people from **earning** more, **educating** themselves **and** becoming **entrepreneurs**. That flows on to businesses who in turn invest less in things like plant and equipment**. Inequality makes it harder for economies to benefit from innovation.** However, if people have access to credit or the money to move up, it can offset this effect. We measured the impact of this by looking at the number of patents for new inventions and then also looking at the Gini coefficient and the income share of the top 10%. The Gini coefficient is a measure of the distribution of income or wealth within a nation. Don’t let yourself be misled. Understand issues with help from experts. How inequality reduces innovation From 1870 to 1977, inequality measured by the Gini coefficient fell by about 40%. During this time people actually got more innovative and productivity increased, incomes also increased. **But inequality has increased in recent decades and it’s** having the opposite effect Inequality is **preventing pe**ople [with less income and wealth](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2297811?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents) **from reaching their potential in terms of education and invention**. There’s also less [entrepreneurship](http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/261876). Inequality also means **the market for new goods shrinks.** [One study](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/A:1009889321237) shows that if incomes are more equal among people, people who are less well off, buy more. Having this larger market for new products, incentivises companies to create new things to sell. If wealth is concentrated among only a small group of people, [it actually increases](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2937810?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents) demand for imported luxuries and handmade products. In contrast to this, distributed incomes means more mass produced goods are manufactured. What’s been driving inequality since the 1980s is changes to economies - countries trading more with each other and advances in technology. As this happens old products and industries fade while new ones take their place. These changes have delivered significant [net benefits](http://www.pc.gov.au/research/completed/rising-protectionism/rising-protectionism.pdf) to society. **Reducing trade and innovation will only make everyone poorer.**