### 1

#### *CP: States ought to ban the appropriation of outer space by private entities except for natural persons, and states ought to recognize the right to property for natural persons in space.*

#### OR

#### *CP: the private appropriation of outer space by natural persons is just.*

#### The individual right to property is a basic human right that should be extended to space.

Faires 19 [Wes Faires, “The role of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in supporting space property rights,” The Space Review, August 5, 2019. <https://www.thespacereview.com/article/3771/1>] CT

A long-discussed issue has been the absence of provisions pertaining to private entities under the 1967 Outer Space Treaty. Interpretations in favor of private property rights hold that the purpose of Article II’s ban on “national appropriation” was to place a limitation on member nations’ attempts to exercise territorial and political sovereignty over any part of outer space: to restrict territorial disputes between countries from extending beyond Earth. Without an explicit prohibition of private property rights in the treaty, their development with respect to private entities is unencumbered. Opposition has fluctuated from the position that the prohibition of national appropriation in Article II served to exclude development of property rights for private citizens: without a national entity with the ability to “confer” or pass down property rights to “sub-national” citizens, forward progress is rendered impossible. There were later attempts to classify private citizens as “nationals” in order to apply to them the prohibition of ‘national appropriation’. The 1979 Moon Agreement places an explicit ban on property for a host of entities, including “natural persons,” until such time as an international regime can be formulated. Two nations, the United States and Luxembourg, have enacted legislation favorable to property and mineral rights regarding space resources. This was met with opposition from some in the international community, who called into question whether such unilateral acts were in and of themselves a violation of the non-appropriation principle of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty. Perhaps in the future, the concept of “property rights” will have evolved beyond the terrestrial concepts of ownership, sovereignty, and territorial acquisition, under a new treaty framework structured by private entities, developed outside the auspices of any nation-state or supranational regime. Until such time, what is needed is a base-level favorable affirmation of private property rights in outer space, one that serves as a foundation for their evolution beyond national borders and which is accepted across the board. To this end, the solution to 50 years of ambiguity regarding private property rights under the under the current UN Outer Space Treaty framework is found within the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), Article 17: (1) Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others. (2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property. -UN General Assembly. "Universal Declaration of Human Rights." United Nations, 217 (III) A,1948, Paris, Art. 17 The commercial space sector would welcome language favorable to private property rights in space, with specific emphasis on the re-affirmation of Article 17 as it pertains to property rights for private entities. Beyond Article 17, utilization of the UDHR as a default mechanism in situations where legislation is not yet developed can yield an immediate benefit for humanity. On the national level, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights can be seamlessly integrated into national space policy. Adoption of the UDHR into space policy by state parties to the Outer Space Treaty is essentially a reaffirmation of one of the fundamental principles of the United Nations, and can take place without litigation or implementation of new national legislation, and with no accusation of violation of “national appropriation.” In the international arena, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights can be seamlessly into to conducting legislative proceedings pertaining to outer space, given that: The overarching thematic priority for UNISPACE + 50 and beyond is “Sustainable Development in Space.” A critical aspect of this calls for ensuring the principles of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development are upheld. The 2030 Agenda is grounded in, and re-affirms, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (A/RES/70/1 para. 10, para. 19). The task at hand is to compel the United Nations Committee on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (UNCOPUOS) to commit to upholding the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Solidarity on such a core foundational UN principle as the UDHR solidifies reflection of Agenda 2030. I propose that UN Secretariat take this opportunity to move forward with Sustainable Development, and lead the way in incorporation the Universal Declaration of Human Rights into international space policy. It is time to recognize property rights as the universally declared human right that it is: “Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.” The definition of property and scope of the UDHR was not limited to any one definition or territory. The UDHR was intended from the outset to be universal: “It is not a treaty; it is not an international agreement […] It is a Declaration of basic principles of human rights and freedoms, to be stamped with the approval of the General Assembly by formal vote of its members, and to serve as a common standard of achievement for all peoples of all nations.” -Eleanor Roosevelt, “On the Adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights” December 9, 1948 Here in its 70th year of adoption, acceptance of the UDHR into space policy by the international community would be both timely and logical. It reaffirms adherence to a fundamental United Nations cornerstone, and provides an opportunity to strengthen the commitment to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. At a time when feasibility of extraction of minerals from celestial bodies is fast approaching, it is our responsibility to ensure that the transition occurs free of any terrestrial shackles. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights offers an acceptable foundational framework from which property rights can evolve off-planet, that can be embraced by the private sector, adopted across national levels, and upheld in the international arena

#### The CP protects individual property rights while solving case since the aff still applies to corporations.

#### No perms: The CP would expand the rights of individuals in space, from the mere right to use, to the full bundle of rights protected by private property.

#### The aff imagines a future that includes space settlement. Space settlement with private appropriation is better than settlement without appropriation.

#### Absent legally enforced personal rights, like property, space settlements are likely to be dominated by tyrannical governments or corporations. Turns case.

Cockell 08 [Charles S. Cockell (Center for Earth, Planetary, Space and Astronomical Research – Open University, Milton Keynes), “AN ESSAY ON EXTRATERRESTRIAL LIBERTY,” JBIS, VOL. 61, pp. 255-275, 2008. <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Charles-Cockell/publication/258317782_An_Essay_on_Extraterrestrial_Liberty/links/0c96053053a02cfb24000000/An-Essay-on-Extraterrestrial-Liberty.pdf>] CT

6. EXTRATERRESTRIAL LIBERTY For Berlin [20], ‘negative’ liberty meant the pursuit of individual liberty by removing those mechanisms that exert control over one’s actions. Western liberal democracies pursue, for the most part, philosophies of negative liberty, by attempting to reduce the role of government in individual lives. A restricted sphere of negative liberty is created by tyrannies, in which encroachment into the lives of individuals reduces the number and scope of activities in which people consider themselves free, or at least able to make decisions that can be implemented independently of the State. Of course, by retreating into a core set of activities in which one is completely free, one is in the process of relinquishing liberty, as the scope of free actions is voluntarily reduced. This is in itself a form of slavery. Societies where the scope of negative liberty is reduced can be described as more enslaved, even if the people there may not describe themselves as such, because they have in fact escaped State slavery by retreating from those very activities in which control is exerted. The crucial point is that the sphere within which negative liberty is possible is necessarily constrained by the environmental conditions under which one exists. The more extreme the environmental conditions, the fewer social activities can occur without collective oversight. More saliently, the people themselves may actually request such oversight, to protect their safety from others who would abuse it, with the resulting dangers. Some of these systems of monitoring can be found in societies on Earth. We cannot drive automobiles without safety checks. Our water must be passed through treatment works— life support systems if you will—that ensure that what we are drinking is safe. Indeed, even in some of the most mature terrestrial democracies, a remarkable quantity of basic consumables and resources come to us through systems of compliance overseen by the State. This is a form of control that most people accept because we consider it in our interest. We do not usually see such invasions of our liberty as tyranny, but rather as benevolent actions by the State to ensure our safekeeping. But they are incursions nevertheless, and while democracy is functioning such oversights need not necessarily concern us; or at least they do not worry most of the public, who are more concerned with having fresh water than more abstract thoughts about the allowable extent to which the State should have influence over their water quality. In extraterrestrial environments, spacesuits, water quality, food production, habitat pressurisation and so on and so forth will be subject to regulation by corporations or the State. As on Earth, perhaps many of these incursions will be regarded as acts of beneficence by the State in the interests of safety, and will be willingly accepted. But one fact is undeniable: the extent of negative liberty must be less in extraterrestrial environments than on Earth, and quite significantly less. Even the air will be subject to quality controls and checks. Forms and permissions will be associated with the very act of breathing. No philosophy of advancing the domain of negative liberty, no clever sophistry, can change this truth, which is brought into being by basic survival needs. An undeniable effect will be to expand the opportunities for tyranny. Where the mechanisms for central control are necessarily enlarged in their scope and diversity, a greater number of levers exist, and enable individuals and organisations to exert control and assume power. A reduction in negative liberty does not necessarily imply greater tyranny, but it certainly makes it possible. In extraterrestrial environments, where centralised interventions must be frequent, how much weaker is freedom and how much easier is tyranny to enforce? We cannot know the answers until we undertake the experiment, but we can be fairly sure that the qualitative answer must be ‘more easily’. More insidiously, the restriction of the borders of negative liberty, caused by the apparent need to protect individuals from the irresponsible actions of others, can itself be perpetuated as a form of liberty. The use of alcohol in extraterrestrial environments is one example. On Earth, the excessive use of alcohol may result in broken windows and arrests, but once the windows are repaired little damage has been done to society as a whole. Hence, although there is a negative social collective impact of excessive alcohol use, the prohibition of alcohol consumption of any kind is generally regarded as an infringement of civil liberties that the public will not tolerate. This is why, of course, attempts to do exactly this in the past have been met by black marketeering. But in extraterrestrial environments, a broken window may imply depressurisation, and the instant death of many individuals. The potential impact on society of the irresponsible and thoughtless actions of individuals is greater, and it might seem justifiable to restrict greatly, or even prohibit, the civil liberty of alcohol use, in the interests of collective safety. This principle can be applied to many diverse social interactions that could be construed as threatening people, and the prevention of which can be advanced as the protection of individual and social freedom through the process of restricting negative liberty. Liberty encompasses the freedom that individuals have to actively pursue their own objectives (‘positive liberty’ sensu Berlin). An obvious mechanism by which this becomes practical is the creation of social mechanisms and institutions through which the ‘active’ pursuit of this ‘positive’ sense of liberty is made possible, for example the welfare State. Organisations established to act as conduits for the free expression of different points of view, or to act as means to achieve practical objectives, are not always liberal. Even in some of the most developed democracies, societies and organisations may become dominated by elite closed circles of people, and media channels may be influenced by moguls who use outlets to perpetuate specific corporate views. What prevents these incursions into the structures of liberty from descending into wholesale tyranny? In reality, very little. The subversion of democratic States, or States on the verge of democracy, into societies more reminiscent of dictatorships has many historical precedents. The principal mechanisms that allow individual freedom to triumph over the slide towards tyranny include the legally agreed freedoms that individuals have to establish competition against dominating organisations, and the culture that ensures that the freedom to create organisations is not then abused to destroy the very democratic organisations that guarantee that freedom. In a society in which the freedom to organise and assemble institutions is protected by law, those organisations that distort and alter their environments, or the information they propagate, are likely to be usurped by institutions that reflect a different style of thinking, by the process of individual choice. However, these alternative visions can only be effective, and one can only assert them over the prevailing opinions with confidence, when one has sufficient information to be confident of their likely veracity. On Earth, to express many ideas and counter-opinions one does not need supreme confidence in the truth. If one’s opinion turns out to be in error one gives up, accepts the viewpoint of the adversary and continues one’s life. These opportunities to challenge, however, are central to the power of the individual to confront institutions. But there is one social situation in which the individual’s power is markedly reduced, even rendered completely ineffective against a collective body. Health and safety is one of the most effective levers of social influence and justified coercion, because it invokes the protection of people confronted with life and death situations. Consider, for example, an oxygen supply system on the Moon. The authority that runs such a system might seek control over a political dissenter by threatening to move him or her and their family to a new zone of habitation, on the grounds that the oxygen supply to their habitat is faulty. By doing this, they will remind these individuals who is in control of their survival, and coerce them through fear into mitigating their dissent, thereby creating a more malleable individual and reducing the challenge to collective authority. Governing organisations have access to a vast realm of information that no single individual can hope to have [21]. They know, for example, about the oxygen demand, its rate of supply, the pipes that supply it, the maintenance history of the oxygen producing machines, and so on and so forth. For an individual to declare that the intention of the authority to move them to another habitat is for controlling political purposes, he or she must also have access to all such information, which they can then use to demonstrate that there is no safety concern. If they do not have access to this information, then it becomes a simple task for the authorities to portray them as dishonourable individuals inveighing against the hard work of other individuals who are working to secure their individual safety and the security of society [22]. They can be then be ostracised, and their general behaviour will be treated as disingenuous. However, to have access to all the information to convincingly uphold a complaint is never possible, because an individual can never know whether they are missing a single crucial fact that makes all the difference to their safety. Even armed with what they perceive to be all the information available, the individual is faced with a choice between allowing an incursion on their home and liberty, or taking the risk that their presumption of having full information is correct. Faced with such a choice, the individual is likely to opt for the former in the interests of caution, particularly in an environment where the other choice may imply death from a failed oxygen system. In the extreme case, this first course of action would be further reinforced in a particularly coercive, venal society where the individual might even be convinced of the capability of the authorities to engineer the failure of their oxygen system and their death, in order to crush dissent, even if their complaint was in fact justified. The end point of this process, when applied across many activities in life, is a colony of automatons performing tasks for an extraterrestrial authority, with their freedom reduced to a withered core of activities in the most private confines of their habitats. Extraterrestrial environments make such an endpoint not merely a possible outcome, but a likely one. This attack on liberty is made possible because the pursuit of individual safety can be made an unchallengeable requirement of a ‘free’ society [23]. Freedom from instantaneous death caused by the external environment is the common freedom on which all individuals should converge, and any social structure or plan that brings people closer to that reality must surely be praiseworthy? The removal of other freedoms to achieve the safety of society is excusable. From this position, the environment can itself become the instrument of positive liberty. In this way, and in a rather unique way, encroachment on freedom of thought and movement, in the interests of ensuring the protection of the freedom of the individual against the lethality of the environment, can be transformed into a justifiable and universalisable doctrine of control [24]. Unfortunately this approach receives succour from every major tradition of social philosophy that we know on Earth. From Grotius to J.S. Mill, the right to self-preservation has been considered the core of individual liberties [25], a point beyond which no State may go, and which every individual has the right to take it upon him or herself to secure—indeed, such a notion has even been referred to as a ‘natural law’ [26]. Even Hobbes’ view of the necessity of sovereign control [27] turns on the right of each individual in a fight to preserve themselves. It is possible to spend much of one’s life on Earth without undue concern for self-preservation. Apart from those unfortunate individuals who confront a burglar or gang, most people will not actually come face to face with the need to infringe others’ rights to self-preservation. Fortunately, although the right to self-preservation is theoretically an unchallengeable right of all people, it remains, in a civil society, one sufficiently protected by the laws, and by regulations against various street crimes that might infringe self-preservation. If, as has been traditional on the Earth, the right to selfpreservation is also held to be a basic right of all people in extraterrestrial environments, then the keys to despotism are handed over to those in control of society. Self-preservation is threatened on a day-to-day basis by the lethality of the environment. In such an environment, each individual does indeed represent a much greater threat to every other individual than on the Earth, because unpredictable and criminal actions against the infrastructure represent a continuously present and potentially catastrophic threat to self-preservation. The authorities therefore have the excuse to implement draconian systems of control to protect the right of every individual to self-preservation. Worse than this, however, the people will voluntarily, in exercising their right to selfpreservation, and to protect themselves, accept more farreaching control over the lives of others [28]. Where death is a more likely outcome of criminal action, the Hobbesian State of nature, and the tendency to vigorously guard against it, becomes a more tangible reality [29].

#### A lack of property rights enables tyranny in space by creating a monopoly on power and stifling individual expression.

Cockell 10 [Charles S. Cockell (Center for Earth, Planetary, Space and Astronomical Research – Open University, Milton Keynes), “Essay on the Causes and Consequences of Extraterrestrial Tyranny,” Journal of the British Interplanetary Society, Vol.63, pp. 15-37, January 2010. <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Charles-Cockell/publication/258402359_Essay_on_the_Causes_and_Consequences_of_Extraterrestrial_Tyranny/links/00b495305364b3f6e8000000/Essay-on-the-Causes-and-Consequences-of-Extraterrestrial-Tyranny.pdf>] CT

Perhaps the most important economic argument is that a centrally-planned system of production is likely to become autarkic, bearing in mind the political problems outlined earlier. In principle, there is no reason why a centrally-planned system of manufacture should not trade its products with other entities, but in reality if there is no profit motive for the organisation to do so, it will not achieve the same level of inducement to put the effort into overcoming the difficult obstacles of interplanetary trade if it is only charged with fabricating enough of a product to satisfy domestic demand. The problem of autarky is just one of the many problems associated with the system, which ultimately lends itself to political tyranny. The centrally-planned economy is unlikely, despite best efforts, to truly produce what people want and, like centrallyplanned states on the Earth, it cannot predict fashions and desires in the future that will necessarily make its economic output limited and dull compared to private entities, which are constantly striving to try to sell consumers new items. The worst effect of the strictly controlled economy will be the stifling of individual creativity, the opportunity to combine to produce, and the emergence of the political culture that results from the need to generate all the functionaries and state officials, with their attendant powers, that will be required to do the planning in the first place. The logic of a centrally-planned economy, and the attraction of this in the face of the possible failure of entities producing things so basic as oxygen, should be resisted even though it may lead to a less ordered and structured economic network [53]. The role of the state in this schemata should be to ensure that sufficient entities exist (and more so for redundancy) to produce what is needed and to encourage a vigorous growth in these industries. It should only intervene to exert wholesale control over the means of production when a failure in some entity, or entities, threatens lives. Rejecting a centrally-planned economy would imply competing means of production, which itself almost certainly implies the presence of a system of private property. The public ownership of all goods might appear superficially to be a security against the possibility of people going short of vital goods. In the early stages of the establishment of settlements, it might well be the case that public ownership of certain commodities such as water and some food provisions will be required to ensure that they are distributed fairly to all occupants. However, for all the reasons just adumbrated, some incentive for production must exist independently of the people running the settlement. Quite apart from this, the problem in a highly isolated group is that complete control of all property by a single authority opens the door to political tyranny. An attraction of a Marxian society might be the economic equality that would result from the previously discussed mechanisms. Central planning, in particular, would obviate the chances of single, private entities accumulating a vast proportion of the wealth and individuals associated with these organisations becoming their own economic tyrants. There is merit in this view, and achieving equality would certainly prevent this outcome. Yet, regulations on monopolies and other tax mechanisms could be used to some degree to prevent excessive and despotic accumulations of wealth. Aside from the most severe cases, there are rational motives for allowing inequality. The environment of outer space is lethal, difficult to work in and a costly place in which to establish enterprises. To rely on the establishment of large networks of human settlements throughout the Solar System, solely on the back of state enterprise and centrally-directed orders, is likely to be folly. There is good reason to question what motives privately-funded people, let alone state organisations, would have for exploring the far reaches of space anyway. So, every incentive must be found to drive groups to establish enterprises for resources, tourism or whatever else is deemed necessary in order to expand. A Marxian system of equality in outer space, even if this could be achieved through some type of agreed social order, will erode the incentive to establish new enterprises from which trade can flow. Arguments that the driven will explore and settle space to expand the reach of humanity, to make it a multiplanet species and to advance science, independent of any economic incentive, are likely to be as ineffective as they were in stimulating productivity in the communist states of the Earth. People are motivated by these laudable and altruistic arguments, but the impulsion to work to secure the common good is not common and it is probably not sufficiently universal to be sure of achieving the results required in outer space. The sense of community, which is perceived to be another golden egg of the Marxian vision, depends of course on what sense of community we are talking about. As I have elaborated elsewhere, the sense of community in a centrally-organised society driven to complete equality is likely - and very rapidly in the environment of outer space - to turn into a highly autarchic control structure in which there is certainly an evident community, but where the freedom of the individual is all but destroyed [54]. The society of contented slaves is most likely to emerge in an environment where continuously lethal external conditions give every excuse for control structures to expand into lives with ever more vigour by the process of the tendency of humans to expand their power bases. The maturation of tyranny will be facilitated because the Marxian vision is a single doctrine vision. How exactly this vision will manifest in the environment of space is unpredictable, but any single doctrine society that seeks to protect centrally planned objectives can never tolerate dissenters. It has been recognised for a long time that it is in the nature of singledoctrine societies to remove countervailing views, either through political dictates, peer pressure or the generation of terror and it follows that, eo ipso, few lesser arguments need be entertained against the Marxian vision of an extraterrestrial society. The ease with which the deadly environment can be turned into the common enemy and used to justify the protection and advancement of a single and inflexible political and economic vision makes any social order that promulgates one — and only one — path to social success dangerous. The details of those parts of a Marxian plan that can succeed and those that cannot, therefore, whither into insignificance in the face of the need to encourage a plurality of ideas about how extraterrestrial society should be ordered.

#### Property rights are the essential building blocks of a fully inclusive and functional government. Turns case since they envision a democratically governed space that is impossible without appropriation.

UNDP ’08 - Working Group on Property Rights, 2008, 'Empowering the Poor Through Property Rights', in Making the Law Work for Everyone Volume II, Commission on Legal Empowerment of the Poor, United Nations Development Programme, New York, pp. 63-128 <https://www.mercatus.org/system/files/ch2.pdf> AT

This transition has reduced global poverty substantially, but as outlined above, billions of people around the world still lack secure property rights, which hinders their economic, political and social security. In order to examine how poverty can best be relieved, and why access to property rights is fundamental to the empowerment of the poor, it is necessary to identify building blocks of a fully-functional property system. Such a system operates in the following four ways: 1) As a system of rules that defines the bundle of rights and obligations between people and assets.15 Property ownership creates ties that bind individual citizens together through the formation of networks of economic and legal rights and corresponding obligations. The credible enforcement of these rights and obligations requires a judicial mechanism that allows for equitable, transparent and efficient dispute resolution. 2) As a system of governance. Property systems are a central facet of state functionality, and as such are an important measurement of fiduciary and administrative effectiveness. The institutional order of the state is based on technical rules and relationships which define interactions between stakeholders, ranging from direct ownership of land to promulgation of rules that govern security of land and house tenure, land planning, zoning, taxing and other aspects of property management. Technological innovation, which has radically reduced the cost of information, has generated the possibility for further transparency and accountability in property systems as an instrument of governance. 3) As a functioning market for the exchange of assets. A fully functional property system allows land, houses, moveable property, equity shares, and ideas to be transformed into assets to be bought and sold at rates determined by market forces. This subjects the exchange of property to a level of transparency and accountability, and allows for the development of financial mechanisms — including credit 67 and insurance — to facilitate transactions and improve economic outcomes. Land, houses and moveable property can thus be leveraged, and assets transformed from static investments into capital which can be bought and sold. However, property rights are a necessary but not sufficient precondition for the development of these financial mechanisms; they also develop through partnership between the market, special funds targeted at access to finance, and the state. 4) As an instrument of social policy. In the absence or failure of the market, the state often plays a direct role in addressing the needs of the poor. The state has at its disposal instruments that can be used to endow its citizens with assets as they relate to property, such as public housing, low interest loans and the distribution of state land. Such instruments help to overcome natural competition for assets. The state also supports social cohesion through the development of co-ownership of infrastructure and services by government and the citizen, supporting the equilibrium between individual and collective interests. Provision of infrastructure by the state critically affects the value and desirability of assets, and can therefore fundamentally affect opportunities for the poor.

#### Impact is Democide – Empirically, murder by tyrannical governments is the biggest impact. It outweighs war and cap. There is a direct relationship between the lack of personal freedom and democide.

Wayman 17 summarizing Rummel [Wayman F.W. (2017) Rummel and Singer, DON and COW. In: Gleditsch N. (eds) R.J. Rummel: An Assessment of His Many Contributions. SpringerBriefs on Pioneers in Science and Practice, vol 37. Springer, Cham. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-54463-2_9>] CT

At Rummel’s website, the dominant theme is that power kills (http://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/). As he began one of his books (Rummel, 1994: 1), ‘Power kills; absolute power kills absolutely. This new Power Principle is the message emerging from my previous work on the causes of war and from this work on genocide and government mass murder … The more power a government has, the more it can act arbitrarily.’

A major supporting idea is the term regime, as operationalized by Rummel (1995) and used as the organizing principle for his datasets on ‘democide—genocide and mass murder’ (Rummel, 1998: 1). This idea of a regime is important to his work because there is a lot of variation from regime to regime in the regime’s amount of power, and also in the number of people the regime kills. And Rummel’s dominant theme is that those two characteristics of a regime (power and deaths) co-vary. In my own ordinary language, a regime is a type of government controlling a state apparatus. As Rummel (1995: 9) says, ‘The changes from the Kaiser monarchy to the Weimar Republic to Hitler’s rule … give us three different German regimes. … I count 432 distinct state regimes during the period from 1900 to 1987’. Hence, there would be the czarist regime in Russia until 1917, and then the communist regime from 1917 to 1991. Between February and October 1917, there should I think be a transition period and transitional regime (under Kerensky). Individual rulers, such as general secretaries Stalin, Khrushchev, and Brezhnev, and their governments, do not represent distinct regimes of their own, but instead are all leaders, successively, of different administrations in the communist regime.

To me, Rummel’s (1983) article made the first really convincing case for the inter-liberal or inter-democratic peace. I have since challenged thousands of people, from classrooms to conferences where I am speaking, to name any other proposition in the social sciences that is surprising or counter-intuitive, and that has (according to its advocates at least) no exceptions. No one has ever been able, in my presence, to name such a proposition—other than Rummel’s.

The COW Project generated the data for the bulk of the hypothesis tests in IR for decades (Wayman & Singer, 1990: 247–248). And ‘realist theory informed 90% of the hypotheses tested by IR scholars up to the 1970s’ (Walker, 2013: 148). It was a bit of a shock that an anti-realist hypothesis, the inter-democratic peace, had produced such a paradigm-shattering result. Sadly, I never heard Singer say a good word about Rummel’s studies confirming the inter-democratic peace hypothesis. Rummel had used COW data on wars, plus other people’s data on democracy, Liberalism, and freedom of nations, to contradict one of Singer’s claims (namely, Singer’s contention that the inter-democratic peace was based on too few cases and too flawed in other ways to be taken to be true; Small & Singer, 1976). Deciphering Singer’s true position on this is complicated. When Geller & Singer (1998) produced a literature review of scientific studies of international conflict, while they did caution that the evidence is ‘not indisputable’, they did acknowledge that ‘the evidence in the area of the joint freedom proposition is consistent and cumulative. Democratic dyads are less likely to engage in war than are non-democratic pairs’ (Geller & Singer, 1998: 87–88). But on the other hand, on his own at his weekly COW seminar, Singer was much more skeptical about the inter-democratic peace. So it is not surprising that, four years after Geller & Singer’s assessment, one of Singer’s students, Henderson (2002) wrote a book that constituted an attack on the democratic peace literature. In the opening paragraph, Henderson says, ‘It struck me as strange that one of the doyen of the behavioral revolution would be such an avid critic of what some scholars hail as the closest thing to an empirical law in the field’.

Instead, Singer seemed more interested in the international or interstate system. While Waltz (1979: 94) defined ‘international political structures in terms of states’, Singer spoke of ‘the national state as level of analysis’ (Singer, 1961: 82–89). Thus, whereas Waltz writes of a system whose basic units are sovereign states, Singer ends up with two systems: an inter-state system and an international system. The international system consists of entities that have an international political goal (including … state creation or survival), engage in international political behavior (including inter-state or extra-state conflict, alliances, trade, or international organizations), or engage in political behavior that has international consequences (such as civil wars). The [international] system … includes … terrorist groups (Sarkees & Wayman, 2010: 27).

Nested within this international system is the interstate system, beginning in 1816, distinguished in terms of ‘recurring international interactions between and among the interstate system members’ (Sarkees & Wayman, 2010: 16). Singer’s COW data are organized around a focus on state system membership. Basically, between 1816 and 1919 an entity is a state system member if it has 500,000 people or more and is diplomatically recognized at an adequate level by Britain and France, while after 1919 it is a state if it is a League of Nations or UN member or has 500,000 people and diplomatic recognition by two major powers. (Note that ‘state’ becomes a short-hand for ‘state system member’; Bremer & Ghosn, 2003.)

Much confusion results from the short-hand expressions ‘state’ and ‘system’. ‘Whenever the word “system” was used without a modifier, Singer & Small were referring to the interstate system’ (Sarkees & Wayman, 2010: 16). Likewise, the ‘states’ whose characteristics are listed in the COW datasets are not the population of states, but the population of state system members.

Singer’s most widely-cited explanatory articles on interstate war are probably Deutsch & Singer (1964) and Singer, Bremer & Stuckey (1972). Both operate at the system level of analysis. It may be that Singer’s devotion to the interstate system is part of what made him reluctant to embrace the inter-democratic peace. As he said in another widely-cited article, the international system level of analysis ‘almost inevitably requires that we postulate a high degree of uniformity in the foreign policy codes of our national actors’, and ‘the system-oriented approach tends to produce a sort of “black box” or “billiard ball” concept of national actors’. This is consistent with his foreign policy instincts, which were loath to attribute ‘white hats’ to the ‘free world’ and ‘black hats’ to the Soviet Union, in the assigning of blame for the dangers to world peace in the Cold War era. Singer’s posture was very different from Rummel’s, with Rummel in favor of Reagan’s foreign policy and against détente. In these Cold War contexts, Singer may have been uncomfortable with Rummel’s summary that ‘freedom preserves peace and life’.

Singer wrote ‘it is evident that my research and teaching has unambiguously been problem-driven’, and ‘for reasons that I struggle to articulate, the problem has been, and remains, that of war’ (Singer, 1990: 2). The COW Project was founded by him at the University of Michigan in 1963, the year after the world nearly was destroyed, had the Cuban Missiles Crisis gone badly. International war attracted Singer’s best efforts at finding the ‘causes of war and conditions of peace’ (1990: 3). As he and Small put it, their focus is a ‘preoccupation with the elimination of international war and the possible role of solid explanatory knowledge in that enterprise’ (Small & Singer, 1982: 17). The first COW war handbook, Wages of War (Singer & Small, 1972) was consequently limited to international wars. Karl Deutsch subsequently convinced Singer that there was a need for a comparable list of civil wars. This led to a new handbook, Resort to Arms: International and Civil Wars, 1816–1980, presenting a ‘comprehensive list that will enhance … study of civil wars’ (Small & Singer, 1982: 204). The civil war list is accompanied with a cautionary note, ‘International war remains our major concern … A research assault on [explanation of] civil war … is clearly a task better left to others’ (Small & Singer, 1982: 17). Consequently, the COW project had many datasets (such as the Militarized Interstate Dispute dataset) on the correlates of interstate war, but nothing comparable on the civil war data. Nevertheless, the publication of the civil war data was a valuable contribution to studies of civil war, and was also a step toward the full delineation of the totality of modern war. This was followed, in the third COW handbook (Sarkees & Wayman, 2010) with a definition and list of non-state wars, completing the full reckoning of the patterns of war in the past two centuries. Also, the focus of Singer on international war was somewhat vindicated by his co-authored article revealing that, over the time since the Congress of Vienna, inter-state wars had resulted in 32 million battle deaths, intra-state wars only 18 million (Sarkees, Wayman & Singer, 2003).

Critics often ask if the COW project has a state-centric bias. A more subtle and I think effective line of inquiry is to ask why the COW project has emphasized state-system-membership rather than simple sovereignty and independence as the defining characteristic of the state. This can cause confusion. For example, a number of non-state wars, including the main phase of one of the deadliest wars in history, the Taiping Rebellion, have been fought in areas that would be considered to be states by students of comparative politics. This and other related difficulties have led pioneers outside the COW project (Gleditsch, 2004; Fazal, 2007), as well as Singer’s successor at the COW Project (Bremer & Ghosn, 2003) to propose various revisions and expansions of the concept of the state, to go beyond the COW state membership definition. These difficulties and challenges continue to provide important frontiers for research on war and the state in coming years.

In contrast to Singer, Rummel seems to me to have taken a more inductivist, practical approach to states and similar entities. On his website, powerkills.com, one finds a focus on killing, even of one person. The perpetrators are often leaders of totalitarian states, such as Mao, but can also be rebel leaders (the young Mao) or a king (Leopold of Belgium) who controls what some call a colony (the Belgian Congo) but Rummel calls Leopold’s personal property. The unit of analysis becomes the regime and regime-like power-centers such as Leopold’s Congo or Mao’s rebel territory.

Rummel (1986) concluded that ‘War isn’t this century’s biggest killer’. As he said then, ‘About 35,654,000 people have died in this century’s international and domestic wars, revolutions, and violent conflicts. … The number of people killed by totalitarian or extreme authoritarian governments already far exceeds that for all wars, civil and international. Indeed, this number already approximates the number that might be killed in a nuclear war’. He itemized 95 million killed by communist governments, but only ‘831,000 killed by free democratic governments’. Those killed by free democratic governments were always foreigners:

In no case have I found a democratic government carrying out massacres, genocide and mass executions of its own citizens … Absolutist governments (those that Freedom House would classify as not free) are not only many times deadlier than war, but are themselves the major factor causing war and other forms of violent conflict. They are a major cause of militarism. Indeed, absolutism, not war, is mankind’s deadliest scourge of all. In light of all this, the peaceful, nonviolent fostering of civil liberties and political rights must be made mankind’s highest humanitarian goal … because freedom preserves peace and life (Rummel, 1986).

### CASE

**Solvency**

#### LINK FILTER – The affirmative does not stop the commercialization of space. Barring appropriation only limits the ownership of real property, use is still allowed. 100% of aff harms result from use, like the claiming of resources in space, not ownership of real estate.

#### *The aff doesn’t have a single piece of solvency or link evidence that is actually about appropriation, or even says the word appropriation, so you should give it ZERO WEIGHT. Go ahead, control F the doc.*

Švec et al 20 [Martin Švec, Petr Boháček, and Nikola Schmidt, “Utilization of Natural Resources in Outer Space: Social License to Operate as an Alternative Source of Both Legality and Legitimacy,” Oil Gas Energy Law J, 2020. <https://planetary-defense.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/ov18-1-article17-notitle.pdf>] CT

2.2.1. Is the Utilization of Space Resources Implicitly Prohibited by the OST?

When the OST was drafted, exploitation of space resources was not considered feasible. Thus, the treaty does not contain any specific reference to space resource activities. However, silence of the OST does not necessarily imply unlawfulness of these activities. On the contrary, the freedom of exploration, use and access is one of the most fundamental principles of international space law. Art I of the OST reads: “Outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, shall be free for exploration and use by all States without discrimination of any kind, on a basis of equality and in accordance with international law, and there shall be free access to all areas of celestial bodies.“25 It is worth mentioning that France already in 1966, during the negotiations of the OST, emphasised that it is important to know exactly what is meant by the term ‘use’, and whether it is an equivalent to the term ‘exploitation’. 26 While there is a general consensus on the interpretation of the term “exploration” as referring to discovery activities of the space environment for scientific reasons, a large disagreement exists concerning the term ‘use’.27 In this context the Board of Directors of the International Institute of Space Law (IISL) hold that there is no international agreement whether the right of “free use” includes the right to take and consume nonrenewable natural resources, including minerals and water on celestial bodies.28 The authors of this article are of the opinion that the term “use” seems to be broad enough to encompass the exploitation of natural resources. Pursuant to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a treaty shall be interpreted in good faith in accordance with the ordinary meaning to be given to the terms of the treaty in their context and in the light of its object and purpose. First, the term “use” usually refers to both the non-economic and economic utilization and, thus, the use of outer space for economic ends can include exploitation with the objective of making economic profit.29 Second, the OST’s preamble reveals that the treaty does not aim to restrict the use of outer space, but rather to promote free exploration and use of outer space and the opposite interpretation would lead to an unnecessary impediment to the development of the uses of outer space.30 What is more, these conclusions may also be derived from the Moon Agreement. Although this agreement has been ratified only by 18 states, it may help understand the meaning of the international space law principles enshrined in the OST. The preamble of the Moon Agreement refers to the “benefits which may be derived from the exploitation of the natural resources of the moon and other celestial bodies,” and art 11 envisages the establishment of an international regime to govern the exploitation of natural resources of the Moon. In addition, Hobe argues, that specific uses are only excluded if they are explicitly excluded in other provisions of the OST, such as prohibition of certain military activities.31

2.2.2. Does the Utilization of Space Resources Contradict the Principle of NonAppropriation?

The principle of non-appropriation is one of the most fundamental rules regulating the exploration and use of outer space. Art II of the OST reads as follows: “Outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means.” As a consequence, outer space is generally understood as a res communis omnium, 32 in its legal characterisation similar to the law governing the high seas or the deep seabed. An analysis of these already existing regimes based on the non-appropriation principle reveals that an exploitation of natural resources is perfectly compatible with the principle of nonappropriation.33 Additionally, even the Moon Agreement suggests that the exploitation of the natural resources of the moon does not constitute a means of appropriation. In particular, art 11 of the Moon Agreement reiterates that outer space is not subject to national appropriation and it explicitly envisages the establishment of an international legal regime to govern the exploitation of space resources.34

#### The question of the resolution is not whether private activity in space is unjust, but rather GIVEN the reality of private use, whether private ownership of real estate in space ought to be allowed, or not. All of their advantages should be filtered by whether it proves that the private use of space without property rights is better than the use of space with property rights.

**Impact - General**

**Cap has increased every measure of progress**

**Feyman 14** (Yevgeniy Feyman 14, Manhattan Institute Fellow, "The Golden Age Is Now", May 23, www.city-journal.org/2014/bc0523yf.html)

Bjørn Lomborg is well-known as a climate “skeptic.” He has frequently voiced concerns that money spent battling climate change could shift scarce resources away from more urgent global problems, such as malaria and HIV/AIDS. But the most recent book by the self-proclaimed “skeptical environmentalist” does more than just voice concern; it attempts to evaluate the damage caused by a variety of problems—from climate change to malnutrition to war—and project future costs related to these same issues. In How Much Have Global Problems Cost the World? , Lomborg and a group of **economists conclude that**, with a few exceptions, **the world is richer, freer, healthier, and smarter than** it’s **ever been**. These gains have coincided with the near-universal rejection of statism and the flourishing of capitalist principles. At a time when political figures such as New York City mayor Bill de Blasio and religious leaders such as Pope Francis frequently remind us about the evils of unfettered capitalism, this is a worthwhile message. The doubling of human life expectancy is one of the most remarkable achievements of the past century. Consider, Lomborg writes, that “the twentieth century saw life expectancy rise by about 3 months for every calendar year.” The average child in 1900 could expect to live to just 32 years old; now that same child should make it to 70. This increase came during a century when worldwide economic output, driven by the spread of capitalism and freedom, grew by more than 4,000 percent. These gains occurred in developed and developing countries alike; among men and women; and even in a sense among children, as child mortality plummeted. Why are we living so much longer? Massive improvements in public health certainly played an important role. The World Health Organization’s global vaccination efforts essentially eradicated smallpox. But this would have been impossible without the innovative methods of vaccine preservation developed in the private sector by British scientist Leslie Collier. Oral rehydration therapies and antibiotics have also been instrumental in reducing child mortality. Simply put, technological progress is the key to these gains—and market economies have liberated, and rewarded, technological innovation. People are not just living longer, but better—sometimes with government’s help, and sometimes despite it. Even people in the developing countries of Africa and Latin America are better educated and better fed than ever before. Hundreds of thousands of children who would have died during previous eras due to malnutrition are alive today. Here, we can thank massive advancements in agricultural production unleashed by the free market. In the 1960s, privately funded agricultural researchers bred new, high-yield strains of corn, wheat, and various other crops thanks to advances in molecular genetics. Globalization helped spread these technologies to developing countries, which used them not only to feed their people, but also to become export powerhouses. This so-called “green revolution” reinforced both the educational progress (properly nourished children tend to learn more) and the life-expectancy gains (better nutrition leads to better health) of the twentieth century. These children live in a world with fewer armed conflicts, netting what the authors call a “peace dividend.” Globalization and trade liberalization have surely contributed to this more peaceful world (on aggregate). An interdependent global economy makes war costly. Of course, problems remain. As Lomborg points out, most foreign aid likely does little to boost economic welfare, yet hundreds of billions of dollars in “development assistance” continue to flow every year from developed countries to the developing world. Moreover, climate change is widely projected to intensify in the second half of the twenty-first century, and will carry with it a significant economic cost. But those familiar with the prior work of the “skeptical environmentalist” understand that ameliorating these effects over time could prove wasteful. Lomborg notes that the latest research on climate change estimates a net cost of 0.2 to 2 percent of GDP from 2055 to 2080. The same report points out that in 2030, mitigation costs may be as high as 4 percent of GDP. Perhaps directing mitigation funding to other priorities—curing AIDS for instance—would be a better use of the resources. Lomborg’s main message? Ignore those pining for the “good old days.” Thanks to the immense gains of the past century, **there has never been a better time to be alive.**

**Capitalism decreases war for 3 reasons.**

**Griswold 05** – Daniel Griswold (director of the Cato Institute Center for Trade Policy Studies); “Peace on Earth? Try Free Trade among Men”, Cato Institute; December 28, 2005; https://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/peace-earth-try-free-trade-among-men

Buried beneath the daily stories about car bombs and insurgents is an underappreciated but comforting fact during this Christmas season: The world has somehow become a more peaceful place.∂ As one little-noticed headline on an Associated Press story recently reported, “War declining worldwide, studies say.” According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, **the number of armed conflicts around the world has been in decline for the past half-century.** In just the past 15 years, ongoing conflicts have dropped from 33 to 18, with all of them now civil conflicts within countries. As 2005 draws to an end, no two nations in the world are at war with each other.∂ The death toll from war has also been falling. According to the AP story, “The number killed in battle has fallen to its lowest point in the post-World War II period, dipping below 20,000 a year by one measure. Peacemaking missions, meanwhile, are growing in number.” Those estimates are down sharply from annual tolls ranging from 40,000 to 100,000 in the 1990s, and from a peak of 700,000 in 1951 during the Korean War.∂ Many causes lie behind the good news — the end of the Cold War and the spread of democracy, among them — but expanding trade and globalization appear to be playing a major role. Far from stoking a “World on Fire,” as one misguided American author has argued, growing commercial ties between nations have had a dampening effect on armed conflict and war, for three main reasons.∂ **First, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies don’t pick fights with each other.** Freedom to trade nurtures democracy by expanding the middle class in globalizing countries and equipping people with tools of communication such as cell phones, satellite TV, and the Internet. With trade comes more travel, more contact with people in other countries, and more exposure to new ideas. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world’s countries today are democracies — a record high.∂ **Second, as national economies become more integrated** with each other**,** those **nations have more to lose should war break out**. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war.∂ **Third, globalization allows nations to acquire wealth through production and trade rather than conquest of territory and resources.** **Increasingly, wealth is measured in terms of** intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital. Those are **assets that cannot be seized by armies.** If people need resources outside their national borders, say oil or timber or farm products, they can acquire them peacefully by trading away what they can produce best at home.

**Global trade has decreased worldwide hunger and poverty. Easterbrook ‘17**

**Easterbrook, Gregg. [Brookings Institute Fellow 2000-2008; contributing editor of The Atlantic Monthly and the Washington Monthly] "The Arrow of History Points Upward,” *Brookings Institution* (Web). Mar. 2, 2017. Accessed Mar. 8, 2017. < https://www.brookings.edu/blog/future-development/2017/02/28/the-arrow-of-history-points-upward/?utm\_campaign=Brookings%20Brief&utm\_source=hs\_email&utm\_medium=email&utm\_content=43847687> AJ**

**A generation ago, 50 percent of humanity was malnourished**, with calamitous famines widely predicted. The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization reported **in 2015**, the most recent year for which statistics are available, that **malnutrition** has **declined to the lowest level in human history**. Today only 12 percent of the world’s population goes hungry. Of course 12 percent is too high, but the number means there are more than 6 billion people who eat sufficient meals. That’s four times the total number of people alive when Theodore Roosevelt was the United States president.¶ Per-capita production of grain, beef, poultry, and dairy is rising faster than population almost everywhere in the world, in no small part owing to efforts supported by the U.S.¶ American agronomists of the 1940s and 1950s developed hybrid cereals that made the farms of poor nations more productive. Mexico played a little-appreciated role in this effort: Its International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center, known by the Spanish acronym CIMMYT, was groundbreaking in more than the punning sense. Under U.S. President Barack Obama, the Agency for International Development shifted attention toward agricultural research specific to the soil and climate of poor nations. Owing in part to this, some regions in Africa are already on track to become agricultural exporters. ¶In the summer of 2016, as election-year negativism went off the charts, a genuine bipartisan event occurred on Capitol Hill. There was a bill to fund Green Revolution crop research in Africa—not for Africa but in Africa, at research installations such as the Africa Rice Center in Côte d’Ivoire. Had this proposal triggered fist-shaking legislative gridlock, it would have been all over the news. Instead, the legislation passed the Senate by voice vote and the House by 369-53, with Republicans and Democrats reaching broad agreement—and so the bill was ignored by the White House contenders and by the mainstream media. The result is that most Americans don’t know that world hunger is in dramatic decline partly because of U.S.-led research. ¶This is not an isolated example. The American media pays considerable attention to violence and air pollution in the developing world, as well it should. What about progress? Most Americans don’t know that global poverty is in dramatic decline, again with a U.S. connection. A 2013 survey of the U.S. and United Kingdom by Novus, a social-change organization in Sweden, found that two-thirds of Americans and Britons believe destitution in the developing world has doubled in recent years. Actually, extreme poverty is less than half of what it was not so long ago.¶ The World Bank reports that **the number of people** mired **in extreme poverty**—defined as living on less than $1.90 per day—**dropped** from 37 percent in 1990 to less than 10 percent, the lowest fraction in history, in 2015, again latest year for which statistics are available. That’s a drop **from 2 billion people in 1990 to less than 700 million today**.¶Taking into account population growth, from 1990 to 2015, the share of humanity that does not live in deep poverty rose from 3.4 billion to 6.5 billion. In the current generation 3 billion people—most of them in developing nations—have joined the ranks of those who are not impoverished. Three billion is more than the total number of people alive in the entire world on the day Donald Trump was born.¶ But just as declining global hunger happens beyond the sight of citizens in Western nations, the news about rising living standards in the developing world cannot be observed in the Western communities that cast votes on presidents, prime ministers, or Brexit.¶ The bulk of global reduction of want is ongoing in **China and India**, nations that share these salient features: They are the globe’s most populous; around the year 1990, **both switched from state-controlled economies to market forces**; **and** around the year 2000, both **embraced** the **globalized trade** advocated by the U.S.¶ By **encouraging economic expansion in the developing world,** globalization cost the U.S. some jobs. Though as the Brookings Institution economists Martin Baily **and** Barry Bosworth have shown, nearly all the decline of manufacturing employment as a share of U.S. GDP was already over before the year 2000. **Siding with open trade has turned out to** be a tremendous favor the U.S. did for other nations, helping **lift hundreds of millions out of deprivation.**¶ Of course if you told a worker who lost a job in a Wisconsin factory, “The same globalization that harmed you is helping vast numbers of poor people by reducing global poverty,” the Wisconsin worker might reply with a colorful expletive. But this is the world’s dynamic: relatively small economic concessions from the top Western nations coupled to substantial gains for huge numbers in other nations. There are drawbacks, of course, as the same forces reducing poverty in China also are increasing inequality there. But the dynamic that goes unseen in the West increasingly makes the human family better off.

**The extensions of property rights offer a solution to environmental problems.**

**Navanit, Raj. [George Washington University],"Crisis: Capitalism, Economics and the Environment." Undergraduate Economic Review 8.1 (2010): 3. AJ**

Argument 1: **Tragic commons can be mitigated by** quasi or fully established **property rights.** **The free market solution to the tragic commons is to extend fully realizable,** enforceable and transferable **property rights to members of the commons so as to internalize the costs of resource use** on the person using the resource. **Extension of property rights thus mitigates the depletion and degradation of the natural resource** **without the** theoretical **cost of** severely **compromising** **the** ingrained and necessary **psychological constitution of the homo economicus agent that is required** **for markets to work efficiently** (I.e. without violating the ‘self-interest’ clause of economic agents, a staple of most neo-classical models). My point here concerns economics as a science in general. **Market based solutions are**, on the whole, **committed to the premise that agents do not act altruistically independent of an overarching self-interest** **and thus the** notion of the **extension of property rights gives the economist theoretical tools to tackle the dilemma of the tragic commons without violating what seems to be a fundamental tenet of the science**.6

#### Cap good for the environment- turns their impacts

Nicolas **Loris, 19** - ("Breathe Free: Capitalism Helps Protect the Environment," Heritage Foundation, 10-23-2019, <https://www.heritage.org/environment/commentary/breathe-free-capitalism-helps-protect-the-environment)/AK>

Arecent Rasmussen poll found 20% of voters feel we should eliminate capitalism to protect the environment. That’s like saying we should eliminate teachers to improve education. Truth be told, capitalism has helped cleanse our planet — improving living standards while protecting the environment. Rather than eliminate capitalism, policymakers need to unleash it. Markets incentivize efficiency by rewarding people for coming up with ways to do more or do better with less. People choose — and businesses make — more efficient products because it saves them money while delivering what customers want. Over the past decade, market forces have driven a massive transition within the energy industry. In 2008, coal provided roughly half of the country’s electricity generation. Now, coal’s share is about a quarter. Increased production of natural gas has driven energy bills and emissions downward. In direct response to cheap gas, the Nuclear Energy Institute organized nuclear power plants nationally to find operating efficiencies that have reduced costs by 19%, saving consumers $1.6 billion and keeping emissions-free electricity in the marketplace. >>>The Right Way to Ensure a Cleaner Environment The energy industry is far from the only sector that has made positive economic and environmental contributions. For instance, the cement industry is collaborating with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to explore how to refine its processes in ways that will improve resiliency, reduce emissions and save lives. Investments in cement, steel, plastic and other building materials will make our houses and highways sturdier and our products more durable — with a smaller environmental footprint. All of these activities result directly from free enterprise — companies providing consumers with the goods and services they want while using fewer resources and emitting fewer unwanted emissions. As a country prospers, its citizens are better able to care for the environment and reduce pollutants emitted from industrial growth. In fact, The Heritage Foundation’s Index of Economic Freedom and Yale University’s Environmental Performance Index show a strong correlation between a country’s environmental performance and economic freedom (i.e., its embrace of capitalism). The bigger problem, typically, is that Washington can’t keep up. Policy and regulations significantly lag behind the pace of innovation, market trends and consumer preferences. Thus, government ends up retarding economic and environmental progress. A significant obstacle to investment in producing or switching to cleaner energy sources is the lack of infrastructure needed to deliver the energy to would-be customers. Natural gas offers a cheaper, cleaner alternative to home heating oil; however, pipeline capacity is lacking in America’s Northeast. Of the 5.7 million American households still relying on oil heat, 85% are in the Northeast, where nimbyism and opposition to any carbon-based fuel run strong. The obstructionism isn’t limited to conventional fuels, either. Efficiently siting and permitting new transmission lines could expand the consumption of renewable power from, say, Canada, which enjoys a surplus of hydroelectric power. Additional infrastructure would also allow energy-intensive manufacturing processes, like the cement industry, to switch to cleaner, cheaper fuel. Another sound policy would be to make immediate expensing a permanent of fixture of the tax code. This would allow newer equipment to come online faster, improving energy efficiency and the overall economy. The current system of depreciation raises the cost of capital and discourages companies from hiring more workers and increasing wages for existing employees. Too often, we use phrases like “balancing economic growth and environmental protections.” This suggests that more growth necessarily degrades the environment. But the two aren’t mutually exclusive. When America and the rest of the world embrace policies rooted in economic freedom, both prosperity and the environment flourish. In this instance, you really can have your cake and eat it, too.

#### Capitalism is the driving force behind innovation and entirely responsible for improved living standards that are often overlooked – electricity, scientific knowledge, and modern society are all a result of knowledge that is commercialized with economic incentive-all of this has happened UNDER A CAPITALIST SYSTEM and there is no viable alternative.