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### CP

#### CP Text:

#### The United States should fund the mining of rare earth metals from asteroids by private entities

#### The United States should fund the development of O’Neill Cylinders

#### States should ban the appropriation of outer space by private entities omitting the United States

#### The PIC is key to beat China and protect against Chinese REM gatekeeping

Stavridis 21 [(James, retired US Navy admiral, chief international diplomacy and national security analyst for NBC News, senior fellow at JHU Applied Physics Library, PhD in Law and Diplomacy from Tufts) “U.S. Needs a Strong Defense Against China’s Rare-Earth Weapon,” Bloomberg Opinion, March 4, 2021, <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2021-03-04/u-s-needs-a-strong-defense-against-china-s-rare-earth-weapon>] TDI Re-Cut Ethan Yang

You could be forgiven if you are confused about what’s going on with rare-earth elements. On the one hand, news reports indicate that China may increase production quotas of the minerals this quarter as a [goodwill gesture](https://www.scmp.com/news/china/diplomacy/article/3122501/china-raises-rare-earth-quotas-goodwill-trade-signal-us) to the Joe Biden administration. But other sources say that China may ultimately ban the export of the rare earths altogether on “[security concerns](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-02-19/china-may-ban-rare-earth-technology-exports-on-security-concerns?sref=QYxyklwO).” What’s really going on here? There are 17 elements considered [rare earths](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-02-16/why-rare-earths-are-achilles-heal-for-europe-u-s-quicktake) — lanthanum, cerium, praseodymium, neodymium, promethium, samarium, europium, gadolinium, terbium, dysprosium, holmium, erbium, thulium, ytterbium, lutetium, scandium and yttrium — and while many aren’t actually rare in terms of global deposits, extracting them is difficult and expensive. They are used across high-tech manufacturing, including smartphones, fighter aircraft and components in virtually all advanced electronics. Of particular note, they are essential to many of the clean-energy technologies expected to come online in this decade. I began to focus on rare-earth elements when I commanded the North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s presence in Afghanistan, known as the International Security Assistance Force. While Afghans live in an extremely poor country, [studies](https://thediplomat.com/2020/02/afghanistans-mineral-resources-are-a-lost-opportunity-and-a-threat/) have assessed that they sit atop $1 trillion to $3 trillion in a wide variety of minerals, including rare earths. Some [estimates](https://www.fraserinstitute.org/article/afghanistans-rare-earth-element-bonanza) put the rare-earth levels alone at 1.4 million metric tons. But every time I tried to visit a mining facility, the answer I got from my security team was, “It’s too dangerous right now, admiral.” Unfortunately, despite a great deal of effort by the U.S. and NATO, those security challenges remain, deterring the large foreign-capital investments necessary to harvest the lodes. Which brings us back to Beijing. China controls roughly 80% of the rare-earths market, between what it mines itself and processes in raw material from elsewhere. If it decided to wield the weapon of restricting the supply — something it has repeatedly [threatened](https://www.wsj.com/articles/china-trade-fight-raises-specter-of-rare-earth-shortage-11559304000) to do — it would create a significant challenge for manufacturers and a geopolitical predicament for the industrialized world. It could happen. In 2010, Beijing threatened to cut off exports to Japan over the disputed Senkaku Islands. Two years ago, Beijing was reportedly considering restrictions on exports to the U.S. generally, as well as against specific companies (such as defense giant Lockheed Martin Corp.) that it deemed in violation of its policies against selling advanced weapons to Taiwan. President Donald Trump’s administration issued an executive order to spur the production of rare earths domestically, and created an [Energy Resource Governance Initiative](https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Energy-Resource-Governance-Initiative-ERGI-Fact-Sheet.pdf) to promote international mining. The European Union and Japan, among others, are also aggressively seeking newer sources of rare earths. Given this tension, it was superficially surprising that China announced it would boost its mining quotas in the first quarter of 2021 by nearly 30%, reflecting a continuation in strong (and rising) demand. But the increase occurs under a shadow of uncertainty, as the Chinese Communist Party is undertaking a “review” of its policies concerning future sales of rare earths. In all probability, the tactics of the increase are temporary, and fit within a larger strategy. China will go to great lengths to maintain overall control of the global rare-earths supply. This fits neatly within the geo-economic approach of the [One Belt, One Road](https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2019-10-30/china-is-determined-to-reshape-the-globe) initiative, which seeks to use a variety of carrots and sticks — economic, trade, diplomatic and security — to create zones of influence globally. In terms of rare earths, the strategy seems to be allowing carefully calibrated access to the elements at a level that makes it economically less attractive for competitors to undertake costly exploration and mining operations. This is similar to the oil-market strategy used by Russia and the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries for decades. Some free-market advocates believe that China will not take aggressive action choking off supply because that could [precipitate retaliation](https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2021-02-22/china-weaponizing-rare-earths-technology-will-probably-backfire) or accelerate the search for alternate sources in global markets. What seems more likely is a series of targeted shutdowns directed against specific entities such as U.S. defense companies, Japanese consumer electronics makers, or European industrial concerns that have offended Beijing. The path to rare-earth independence for the U.S. must include: Ensuring supply chains of rare earths necessary for national security; promoting the exploitation of the elements domestically (and removing barriers to responsibly doing so); mandating that defense contractors and other critical-infrastructure entities wean themselves off Chinese rare earths; sponsoring research and development to find alternative materials, especially for clean energy technology; and creating a substantial stockpile of the elements in case of a Chinese boycott. This is a bipartisan agenda. The Trump administration’s [strategic assessment](https://www.commerce.gov/news/press-releases/2019/06/department-commerce-releases-report-critical-minerals) of what needs to be done (which goes beyond just 17 rare earths to include a total of 35 critical minerals) is thoughtful, and should serve as a basis for the Biden administration and Congress.

#### REM access key to military primacy and tech advancement – alts fail

Trigaux 12 (David, University Honors Program University of South Florida St. Petersburg) “The US, China and Rare Earth Metals: The Future Of Green Technology, Military Tech, and a Potential Achilles‟ Heel to American Hegemony,” USF St. Petersberg, May 2, 2012, <https://digital.stpetersburg.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1132&context=honorstheses>] TDI Re-Cut Ethan Yang

The implications of a rare earth shortage aren’t strictly related to the environment, and energy dependence, but have distinct military implications as well that could threaten the position of the United States world’s strongest military. The United States place in the world was assured by powerful and decisive deployments in World War One and World War Two. Our military expansion was built upon a large, powerful industrial base that created more, better weapons of war for our soldiers. During the World Wars, a well-organized draft that sent millions of men into battle in a short amount of time proved decisive, but as the war ended, and soldiers drafted into service returned to civilian life, the U.S. technological superiority over its opponents provided it with sustained dominance over its enemies, even as the numerical size of the army declined. New technologies, such as the use of the airplane in combat, rocket launched missiles, radar systems, and later, GPS, precision guided missiles, missile defense systems, high tech tanks, lasers, and other technologies now make the difference between victory and defeat. The United States military now serves many important functions, deterring threats across the world. The United States projects its power internationally, through a network of bases and allied nations. Thus, the United States is a powerful player in all regions of the world, and often serves as a buffer against conflict in these regions. US military presence serves as a buffer against Chinese military modernization in Eastern Asia, against an increasingly nationalist Russia in Europe, and smaller regional actors, such as Venezuela in South America and Iran in the Middle East. The U.S. Navy is deployed all over the world, as the guarantor of international maritime trade routes. The US Navy leads action against challenges to its maritime sovereignty on the other side of the globe, such as current action against Somali piracy. Presence in regions across the world prevents escalation of potential crisis. These could result in either a larger power fighting a smaller nation or nations (Russia and Georgia, Taiwan and China), religious opponents (Israel and Iran), or traditional foes (Ethiopia and Eretria, Venezuela and Colombia, India and Pakistan). US projection is also key deterring emerging threats such as terrorism and nuclear proliferation. While not direct challenges to US primacy, both terrorism and nuclear proliferation can kill thousands. The US Air Force has a commanding lead over the rest of the world, in terms of both numbers and capabilities. American ground forces have few peers, and are unmatched in their ability to deploy to anywhere in the world at an equally unmatched pace. The only perceived challenge to the United States militarily comes from the People’s Republic of China.76 While the United States outspends all other nations in the world put together in terms of military spending, China follows as a close second, and has begun an extensive modernization program to boot.77 The Chinese military however, is several decades behind the United States in air power and nuclear capabilities.78 To compensate, China has begun the construction of access-denial technology, preventing the US from exercising its dominance in China’s sphere of influence.79 Chinese modernization efforts have a serious long-term advantage over the United States; access to rare earth metals, and a large concentration of rare earth chemists doing research.80 This advantage, coupled with the U.S. losing access to rare earth metals, will even the odds much quicker than policymakers had previously anticipated. 81 The largest example is US airpower. With every successive generation of military aircraft, the U.S. Air Force becomes more and more dependent on Rare Earth Metals.82 As planes get faster and faster, they have to get lighter and lighter, while adding weight from extra computers and other features on board.83 To lighten the weight of the plane, scandium is used to produce lightweight aluminum alloys for the body of the plane. Rare Earth metals are also useful in fighter jet engines, and fuel cells.84 For example, rare earths are required to producing miniaturized fins, and samarium is required to build the motors for the F-35 fighter jet.85 F-35 jets are the next generation fighter jet that works together to form the dual plane combination that cements U.S. dominance in air power over the Russian PAK FA.86 Rare earth shortages don’t just affect air power, also compromising the navigation system of Abrams Tanks, which need samarium cobalt magnets. The Abrams Tank is the primary offensive mechanized vehicle in the U.S. arsenal. The Aegis Spy 1 Radar also uses samarium.87 Many naval ships require neodymium. Hell Fire missiles, satellites, night vision goggles, avionics, and precision guided munitions all require rare earth metals. 88 American military superiority is based on technological advancement that outstrips the rest of the world. Command and control technology allows the U.S. to fight multiple wars at once and maintain readiness for other issues, as well as have overwhelming force against rising challengers. This technology helps the U.S. know who, where, and what is going to attack them, and respond effectively, regardless of the source of the threat. Rare Earth Elements make this technological superiority possible. To make matters worse, the defense industrial base is often a single market industry, dependent on government contracts for its business. If China tightens the export quotas further, major US defense contractors will be in trouble.89 Every sector of the defense industrial base is dependent on rare earth metals. Without rare earths, these contractors can’t build anything, which collapses the industry.90 Rare Earth shortages are actually already affecting our military, with shortages of lanthanum, cerium, europium and gadolinium happening in the status quo. This prevents us not only from building the next generation of high tech weaponry, but also from constructing more of the weapons and munitions that are needed in the status quo. As current weapon systems age and they can’t be replaced, the US primacy will be undermined. Of special concern is that U.S. domestic mining doesn’t produce “heavy” rare earth metals that are needed for many advanced components of military technologies. Given the nature of many military applications, substitutions aren’t possible. 91

#### Primacy and allied commitments solve arms races and great power war – unipolarity is sustainable, and prevents power vacuums and global escalation

Brands 18 [(Hal, Henry Kissinger Distinguished Professor at Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies and a senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments) "American Grand Strategy in the Age of Trump," Page 129-133] Re-Cut Ethan Yang

Since World War II, the United States has had a military second to none. Since the Cold War, America has committed to having overwhelming military primacy. The idea, as George W. Bush declared in 2002, that America must possess “strengths beyond challenge” has featured in every major U.S. strategy document for a quarter century; it has also been reflected in concrete terms.6 From the early 1990s, for example, the United States consistently accounted for around 35 to 45 percent of world defense spending and maintained peerless global power-projection capabilities.7 Perhaps more important, U.S. primacy was also unrivaled in key overseas strategic regions—Europe, East Asia, the Middle East. From thrashing Saddam Hussein’s million-man Iraqi military during Operation Desert Storm, to deploying—with impunity—two carrier strike groups off Taiwan during the China-Taiwan crisis of 1995– 96, Washington has been able to project military power superior to anything a regional rival could employ even on its own geopolitical doorstep. This military dominance has constituted the hard-power backbone of an ambitious global strategy. After the Cold War, U.S. policymakers committed to averting a return to the unstable multipolarity of earlier eras, and to perpetuating the more favorable unipolar order. They committed to building on the successes of the postwar era by further advancing liberal political values and an open international economy, and to suppressing international scourges such as rogue states, nuclear proliferation, and catastrophic terrorism. And because they recognized that military force remained the ultima ratio regum, they understood the centrality of military preponderance. Washington would need the military power necessary to underwrite worldwide alliance commitments. It would have to preserve substantial overmatch versus any potential great-power rival. It must be able to answer the sharpest challenges to the international system, such as Saddam’s invasion of Kuwait in 1990 or jihadist extremism after 9/11. Finally, because prevailing global norms generally reflect hard-power realities, America would need the superiority to assure that its own values remained ascendant. It was impolitic to say that U.S. strategy and the international order required “strengths beyond challenge,” but it was not at all inaccurate. American primacy, moreover, was eminently affordable. At the height of the Cold War, the United States spent over 12 percent of GDP on defense. Since the mid-1990s, the number has usually been between 3 and 4 percent.8 In a historically favorable international environment, Washington could enjoy primacy—and its geopolitical fruits—on the cheap. Yet U.S. strategy also heeded, at least until recently, the fact that there was a limit to how cheaply that primacy could be had. The American military did shrink significantly during the 1990s, but U.S. officials understood that if Washington cut back too far, its primacy would erode to a point where it ceased to deliver its geopolitical benefits. Alliances would lose credibility; the stability of key regions would be eroded; rivals would be emboldened; international crises would go unaddressed. American primacy was thus like a reasonably priced insurance policy. It required nontrivial expenditures, but protected against far costlier outcomes.9 Washington paid its insurance premiums for two decades after the Cold War. But more recently American primacy and strategic solvency have been imperiled. THE DARKENING HORIZON For most of the post–Cold War era, the international system was— by historical standards—remarkably benign. Dangers existed, and as the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, demonstrated, they could manifest with horrific effect. But for two decades after the Soviet collapse, the world was characterized by remarkably low levels of great-power competition, high levels of security in key theaters such as Europe and East Asia, and the comparative weakness of those “rogue” actors—Iran, Iraq, North Korea, al-Qaeda—who most aggressively challenged American power. During the 1990s, some observers even spoke of a “strategic pause,” the idea being that the end of the Cold War had afforded the United States a respite from normal levels of geopolitical danger and competition. Now, however, the strategic horizon is darkening, due to four factors. First, great-power military competition is back. The world’s two leading authoritarian powers—China and Russia—are seeking regional hegemony, contesting global norms such as nonaggression and freedom of navigation, and developing the military punch to underwrite these ambitions. Notwithstanding severe economic and demographic problems, Russia has conducted a major military modernization emphasizing nuclear weapons, high-end conventional capabilities, and rapid-deployment and special operations forces— and utilized many of these capabilities in conflicts in Ukraine and Syria.10 China, meanwhile, has carried out a buildup of historic proportions, with constant-dollar defense outlays rising from US$26 billion in 1995 to US$226 billion in 2016.11 Ominously, these expenditures have funded development of power-projection and antiaccess/area denial (A2/AD) tools necessary to threaten China’s neighbors and complicate U.S. intervention on their behalf. Washington has grown accustomed to having a generational military lead; Russian and Chinese modernization efforts are now creating a far more competitive environment.

#### O’Neill Cylinders are on the way, but funding and companies like SpaceX and Blue Origin are key because governments are insufficient.

Kanchwalla 11-13-21

Hussain Kanchwalla (scholar at the Indian Institute of technology), 11-13-2021, "What is an O’Neill Cylinder?," Science ABC, https://www.scienceabc.com/nature/universe/what-is-oneill-cylinder.html, // HW AW

Many people believe that the Earth will soon be in danger and the sprawling nature of humanity is the undeniable cause. With the rapid [technological progress](https://www.scienceabc.com/nature/universe/what-is-kardashev-scale.html) and advancement of the past few centuries, we’re quickly exhausting the resources from planet Earth in order to power our industrial needs and global commerce. Many futurists feel that we will be left with no option but to explore and colonize space if we intend to survive into a future when resources on Earth can no longer meet our requirements. [Overpopulation is an imminent challenge](https://www.scienceabc.com/humans/malthusian-catastrophe-shortage-of-food-sources-population-explosion.html) that makes the need for interstellar travel and colonization even more urgent. That being said, [**building a space habitat**](https://www.scienceabc.com/nature/universe/can-we-build-a-habitable-planet-from-scratch.html) **is no easy pursuit and is loaded with daunting challenges, such as the need for construction facilities in space, the recreation of livable communities in space, the recycling and processing of waste, the simulation of artificial gravity, and most importantly—convincing governments and global organizations that this venture is worth pursuing.** The prospect of space colonization paves the way for devising methods to extract energy from resources on other planets. On Earth, harnessing energy from the Sun using [solar panels](https://www.scienceabc.com/innovation/why-is-there-a-limit-to-the-efficiency-of-solar-panels.html) isn’t particularly efficient, and faces inevitable barriers caused by the atmosphere and the daily occurrence of darkness (e.g., nighttime). However, in space, solar constructs can perpetually harness energy from the Sun without interruption. Utilizing this copious amount of energy would permit us to travel throughout our solar system without worrying about energy expenditure. Moreover, chemical resources would be in great supply in our solar system. To begin with, NASA has recently embarked on a project to generate fuel, water, and oxygen from resources present on the Moon. Given these foundations for why organizations should foray into developing a space habitat, allow me to introduce the **O’Neill cylinder—a space settlement design consisting of two counter-rotating cylinders** proposed by renowned physicist Gerard O’Neill a few decades ago. Aside from being a physicist, O’Neill was also a professor at Princeton University and a space enthusiast. Although he is most widely acclaimed for his work in physics, where he developed new concepts to explore particle physics at higher energies, his work on space colonization turned out to be his truly long-lasting legacy. Origin of the Idea for the O’Neill Cylinder While teaching physics to his students at Princeton University, O’Neill assigned them the task of designing a megastructure in space in order to demonstrate that living and surviving in space is actually a possibility. His students came up with numerous designs to accommodate human habitation in space. After a long session of brainstorming, O’Neill boiled their theories down to the idea of a cylinder-like space settlement design. Later, additional details and the functioning of this design were published in Physics Today in 1974; the cylinder was aptly called the O’Neill cylinder. Design of the O’Neill Cylinder The O’Neill cylinder design consists of two cylinders rotating in opposite directions on a [bearing](https://www.scienceabc.com/eyeopeners/what-is-a-bearing.html) to mitigate the gyroscopic effect. Each cylinder was proposed to be 20 miles long and 5 miles in diameter, with 6 broad stripes along its length (3 habitable spaces and 3 windows). O’Neill envisioned industrial processes and recreational facilities to be located on the central axis in a virtually zero-gravity environment. Gravity Simulation One key difference between living on Earth and living in space (or on any other astronomical body) is the difference in gravity. [Artificial gravity](https://www.scienceabc.com/innovation/can-create-artificial-gravity.html) is needed for stability, and the O’Neill cylinder has a provision to achieve exactly that. As the two giant cylinders rotate on their axis, they would leverage the centripetal force of any object in the inner surface to create artificial gravity. Considering the cylinder’s dimensions, the acceleration equation: a=v²/r, and substituting the acceleration value of Earth (i.e., 9.81), we can deduce that the cylinder would need to rotate roughly 28 times per hour to simulate an appropriate gravitational force. Earthly Environment Simulation Maintaining an atmosphere with a constitution similar to that of Earth is the next challenge when building a space habitation. The O’Neill cylinder is prudently designed with a ratio of gases similar to what is found on Earth. However, there is a caveat; the pressure is half of that at sea level. This would not impact our breathing substantially, but this minor trade-off would translate into a handful of benefits, such as bringing down the need for gas and the construction of thick walls. The proposed O’Neill cylinder also has provisions wherein the habitat would be able to control its own micro-climate using an arrangement of mirrors and by altering the ratio of gases in the cylinder. Day and Night Simulation With the human habitat situated in a vacuum (space), the cylinder essentially turns into a huge thermos! The theoretical O’Neill cylinder tried to overcome this issue by using a series of mirrors hinged on each of the three windows. This way, direct sunlight could be directed into the cylinder to simulate day time. Similarly, by turning the mirror away, a night-like ambience could be created. This simulated ‘night’ would also permit the heat produced biologically to radiate out of the cylinder. **Despite the design of the O’Neill cylinder being technically sound, the idea is too sophisticated to be implemented with our present technology**. Thus far, its implementation has been confined to the realm of science fiction. However, **given the efforts of organizations like SpaceX and Mars One, perhaps some day O’Neill cylinders will actually help humanity settle in the great vastness of space!**

#### **Permanently solves extinction**

Haynes 19, 5/17, Korey "O’Neill colonies: A decades-long dream for settling space," Astronomy, https://astronomy.com/news/2019/05/oneill-colonies-a-decades-long-dream-for-settling-space Top of Form

Bottom of Form

Last week, Amazon founder Jeff Bezos revealed his spaceship company’s new lunar lander, dubbed Blue Moon, and he spelled out a bold and broad vision for humanity’s future in space. Faced with the limits of resources here on Earth, most fundamentally energy, he pointed to life in space as a solution. “If we move out into the solar system, for all practical purposes, we have unlimited resources,” Bezos said. “We could have a trillion people out in the solar system.” And while colonies on other planets would be plagued by low gravity, long distances to Earth (leading to communication delays), and further limits down the road, those weaknesses are avoided if the colonies remain truly in space. To that end, Bezos instead suggested people consider taking up residence in O’Neill colonies, a futuristic concept for space settlements first dreamed up decades ago. “These are very large structures, miles on end, and they hold a million people or more each.” Gerard O’Neill was a physicist from Princeton University who teamed up with NASA in the 1970s on a series of workshops that explored efficient ways for humans to live off-world. Beyond influencing Bezos, his ideas have also deeply affected how many space experts and enthusiasts think about realistic ways of living in space. “What will space colonies be like?” O’Neill once asked the Space Science Institute he founded. “First of all, there’s no point in going out into space if the future that we see there is a sterile future of living in tin cans. We have to be able to recreate, in space, habitats which are as beautiful, as Earth-like, as the loveliest parts of planet Earth — and we can do that.” Of course, neither O’Neill nor anyone since has actually made such a habitat, but in many ways, the concepts he helped developed half a century ago remain some of the most practical options for large-scale and long-term space habitation. While NASA has mostly focused on exploring the moon and Mars in recent years, O’Neill colonies offer an option untethered to any planetary body. Instead, people would live in enormous circular structures in space that would be capable of hosting many thousands of people — or even millions according to Bezos — on a permanent basis. You may have seen these kinds of colonies in science fiction, from Star Trek, to the movie Interstellar. But in real life, researchers have thought up a a few variations: either a sphere, a cylinder, or a ring-shaped torus. All of these are designed to rotate and create a centrifugal force that mimics gravity for the inhabitants. While the sizes and specifications of the colonies vary, there are a few staples. In general, O’Neill colonies were designed to be permanent, self-sustaining structures. That means they would use solar power for electrical energy and for growing crops. The outer walls of an O’Neill colony are generally pictured as a transparent material, so that mirrors can aim sunlight through its walls as needed to provide light and energy – or to allow darkness, a feature humans also need, especially while we sleep. But building these colonies is a challenge beyond any humans have accomplished so far in space, and Bezos acknowledged that. He referred to two “gates” in his announcement, which he clarified as challenges that humans need to overcome. The first, which his company Blue Origin and other space entrepreneurs have been tackling, is to reduce the cost and difficulty of getting to space at all. But the second involves using resources from space, rather than hauling them from Earth. Bezos isn’t alone in such thinking. Most of NASA’s long-term plans for the Moon and Mars involve rely on harvesting materials and manufacturing products locally, using lunar and martian regolith to build and repair structures. And in the shorter term, three of the dozen experiments NASA selected as the first to fly as part of the new lunar program — possibly even by the end of the year — are what NASA terms “resource prospecting instruments.” That pairs well with O’Neill’s vision. These colonies are meant to use resources gathered from space, whether asteroids, the Moon, or even Mars. Doing so avoids the costly effort of heaving materials and goods out of Earth’s deep gravity well. That means they would be built using materials available cheaply in space. The humans and their attendant plants and animals would need to be carried from Earth. But raw materials like oxygen, nitrogen and aluminum are plentiful in the solar system, and mining for resources in space is a common theme across space settlement discussions. Because of their size, the colonies should be able to act as fully independent ecosystems, with plants to cycle air and water and resource cycles not so dissimilar from Earth. Humans are a long way from being able to launch anything like an O’Neill colony in the near future. But it’s somewhat telling that, after 50 years
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#### We should solve extinction

MacAskill 14 [William, Oxford Philosopher and youngest tenured philosopher in the world, Normative Uncertainty, 2014]

The human race might go extinct from a number of causes: asteroids, supervolcanoes, runaway climate change, pandemics, nuclear war, and the development and use of dangerous new technologies such as synthetic biology, all pose risks (even if very small) to the continued survival of the human race.184 And different moral views give opposing answers to question of whether this would be a good or a bad thing. It might seem obvious that human extinction would be a very bad thing, both because of the loss of potential future lives, and because of the loss of the scientific and artistic progress that we would make in the future. But the issue is at least unclear. The continuation of the human race would be a mixed bag: inevitably, it would involve both upsides and downsides. And if one regards it as much more important to avoid bad things happening than to promote good things happening then one could plausibly regard human extinction as a good thing.For example, one might regard the prevention of bads as being in general more important that the promotion of goods, as defended historically by G. E. Moore,185 and more recently by Thomas Hurka.186 One could weight the prevention of suffering as being much more important that the promotion of happiness. Or one could weight the prevention of objective bads, such as war and genocide, as being much more important than the promotion of objective goods, such as scientific and artistic progress. If the human race continues its future will inevitably involve suffering as well as happiness, and objective bads as well as objective goods. So, if one weights the bads sufficiently heavily against the goods, or if one is sufficiently pessimistic about humanity’s ability to achieve good outcomes, then one will regard human extinction as a good thing.187 However, even if we believe in a moral view according to which human extinction would be a good thing, we still have strong reason to prevent near-term human extinction. To see this, we must note three points. First, we should note that the extinction of the human race is an extremely high stakes moral issue. Humanity could be around for a very long time: if humans survive as long as the median mammal species, we will last another two million years. On this estimate, the number of humans in existence in the The future, given that we don’t go extinct any time soon, would be 2×10^14. So if it is good to bring new people into existence, then it’s very good to prevent human extinction. Second, human extinction is by its nature an irreversible scenario. If we continue to exist, then we always have the option of letting ourselves go extinct in the future (or, perhaps more realistically, of considerably reducing population size). But if we go extinct, then we can’t magically bring ourselves back into existence at a later date. Third, we should expect ourselves to progress, morally, over the next few centuries, as we have progressed in the past. So we should expect that in a few centuries’ time we will have better evidence about how to evaluate human extinction than we currently have. Given these three factors, it would be better to prevent the near-term extinction of the human race, even if we thought that the extinction of the human race would actually be a very good thing. To make this concrete, I’ll give the following simple but illustrative model. Suppose that we have 0.8 credence that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 0.2 certain that it’s a good thing to produce new people; and the degree to which it is good to produce new people, if it is good, is the same as the degree to which it is bad to produce new people, if it is bad. That is, I’m supposing, for simplicity, that we know that one new life has one unit of value; we just don’t know whether that unit is positive or negative. And let’s use our estimate of 2×10^14 people who would exist in the future, if we avoid near-term human extinction. Given our stipulated credences, the expected benefit of letting the human race go extinct now would be (.8-.2)×(2×10^14) = 1.2×(10^14). Suppose that, if we let the human race continue and did research for 300 years, we would know for certain whether or not additional people are of positive or negative value. If so, then with the credences above we should think it 80% likely that we will find out that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 20% likely that we will find out that it’s a good thing to produce new people. So there’s an 80% chance of a loss of 3×(10^10) (because of the delay of letting the human race go extinct), the expected value of which is 2.4×(10^10). But there’s also a 20% chance of a gain of 2×(10^14), the expected value of which is 4×(10^13). That is, in expected value terms, the cost of waiting for a few hundred years is vanishingly small compared with the benefit of keeping one’s options open while one gains new information.

#### It allows for discussions of more arguments than just exploitation – that outweighs since not everything is about exploitation
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#### Current law is not a barrier to space settlement.

Gesl 18 [Paul M. Gesl (Maj, USAF JD), “PREPARING FOR THE NEXT SPACE RACE: Legislation and Policy Recommendations for Space Colonies,” A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements for the Degree of MASTER OF OPERATIONAL ARTS AND SCIENCES (April 2018). <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/AD1053024.pdf>] CT

Existing Legal Framework for Space Colonies In 1967, the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (OST) entered into force.43 This document, which is over 50 years old, was drafted when space issues were very different, yet it is still the primary binding international law on space activities. The OST places several limitations on potential colonization; however, it does not forbid the activity. The first hurdle to a potential colony is Article II of the OST. “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.”44 One could argue that this would prevent any colonization. In fact, some do just that. Attorney Michael Listner, who founded Space Law and Policy Solutions, views this article as a non-starter for colonization efforts. “When a private citizen makes a claim to private, real property, basically, that’s saying the United States is making a claim as well, because of that continuing jurisdiction, the U.S. government always has.”45 The publication theoutline.com, relying on an interview with Listner,took this one step further, arguing that this means “any base or settlement on Mars would have to be free to use by anyone who can travel there. A person can’t just set up a colony, claim independence, and create rules that restrict access to it.”46 However, Lister’s interpretation is incorrect as it is too strict an interpretation of the language. Theoutline.com appears to take the interpretation to an untenable conclusion that is not supported by the evidence. Even though this position is not credible, it is important to discuss because as the United States moves towards colonization, it will face similar criticisms from opponents. Article II of the OST was not written to ban establishing a colony on a celestial body. Instead it was written to prevent a country from claiming a celestial body, such as the moon, as their own sovereign territory. This more permissive interpretation is supported by other provisions of the OST. The OST contains language that supports establishing colonies. Article IV, while generally a prohibitive Article, states, “The use of any equipment or facility necessary for peaceful exploration of the Moon and other celestial bodies shall also not be prohibited.”47 If this leaves any doubt, Article XII likely clears up the confusion. All stations, installations, equipment and space vehicles on the Moon and other celestial bodies shall be open to representatives of other States Parties to the Treaty on a basis of reciprocity. Such representatives shall give reasonable advance notice of a projected visit, in order that appropriate consultations may be held and that maximum precautions may be taken to assure safety and to avoid interference with normal operations in the facility to be visited.48 This Article establishes two important facts under the treaty. First, space colonization is acceptable under the OST. A colony easily fits within the definition of a station or installation. Quite simply, if the drafters of the OST intended to prevent States from establishing colonies, they would have most certainly done so in uncertain terms. Second, a State can establish a colony either unilaterally, or with a selected group of international partners. The visits discussed in Article XII would not be necessary if every colony needed to be open to the international community. This also eviscerates claims like those cited by theoutline.com, discussed above. If any colony were open to any party that could reach it, the visits by representatives in Article XII would be nonsensical. Looking at these details in the language of the entire treaty is important, because without it, one could argue that Article I in the OST would prevent a State from establishing a colony. If a space colony established by a single State would deny other states free access to an area of a celestial body (namely the area where the colony is established), then facilities would be banned outright. However, Article XII directly undercuts this weak argument. It is important to note that the OST equally applies to commercial entities. Private corporations are currently leading the way in planning for space colonization. A company that did not sign, or even exist when the OST was signed, is still bound by its provisions. Article VI establishes that these entities have to conform to the treaty, and more importantly that “the appropriate State Party to the Treaty” must both authorize and supervise these companies. 49 While not binding, the United Nations has spoken on the matter. Space activities should require authorization by a competent national authority; such authority or authorities, as well as the conditions and procedures for granting, modifying, suspending and revoking the authorization, should be set out clearly within the regulatory framework; States might employ specific procedures for the licensing and/or for the authorization of different kinds of space activities.”50 These two citations together indicate that the United States must authorize and supervise the activities of commercial companies operating in space. If those activities include colonization, then legislation must appropriately supervise it.

#### But, non-appropriation makes space settlement impossible- that’s their first contention. **AND, even if it’s theoretically possible, without private appropriation space settlement will not happen – no incentives, and would result in conflict.**

Thomas 05 [Jonathan Thomas, “Privatization of Space Ventures: Proposing a Proven Regulatory Theory for Future Extraterrestral Appropriation,” 1 BYU Int'l L. & Mgmt. R. 191 (2005). https://digitalcommons.law.byu.edu/ilmr/vol1/iss1/7]CT

The current corpus juris spatialis based on res communis has received wide criticism by legal commentators, in part because of the practical limitations of its idealistic principles in application. For example, one commentator addressing the potential problems of future colonization of celestial bodies argued that the prohibition against private and national appropriation may cause deleterious effects when colonizers build settlements. Although these colonizers may occupy the property, they will have no legal control of their communities and could be uprooted for the purposes of putting that property to a better use for the benefit of common heritage. This risk may serve as a strong disincentive to the preservation of sectarian colonization in a res communis society. Other commentators argue that the current corpus juris spatialis based on the idealistic res communis principle has actually slowed the development of outer space exploration because privately and publicly funded organizations cannot appropriate outer space.61 Under the corpus juris spatialis, there exists no probability or possibility of return on investments, which results in insufficient monetary incentive for businesses or private persons. Even with the daunting needs created by increasing population and consumption, and decreasing resources on earth, many states may not even attempt to exploit extraterrestrial resources because the current corpus juris spatialis does not guarantee that their own citizens will benefit from the investments made with their tax dollars. A future lack of resources, combined with a body of law that mandates common ownership of potential resources, may create a black market for extraterrestrial resources, or it may engender armed conflicts over the lack of supplies available to states.63 While there is little past precedent to justify it, and little present sentiment to support it, the current corpus juris spatialis clings to the idea that in the future, humans will be able to share the resources of space in common. One commentator illustrates these idealistic ideas and assumptions: The articles of the various [outer space J treaties all predicate themselves upon the theory that mankind will work together for the common good with no real advantage to be gained other than the praise of his fellow man. It assumes that people are able to co-operate, and that they will indeed do so whenever dealing with outer space ventures. While the global effort in researching, developing and exploring space for the sheer joy of the information obtained, accomplished in the spirit of teamwork is a noble goal, it is clear that a world full of economic strife is ripe to intervene.64 These assumptions of the Outer Space Treaty and the Moon Treaty are unrealistic at present. Perhaps someday humankind will develop ideal characteristics that the Outer Space Treaty and Moon Treaty would like it to engender. In the meantime, it may be impractical to attempt to solve the dilemma of space appropriation based on characteristics yet to be consistently demonstrated. Furthermore, res communis principles would become problematic as applied to space law due to the following problems: (1) the application of res communis theory in the Western world has been unsuccessful; and (2) scarcity of resources in res communis society is fatalistic to the society. It could be argued that the success of res communis ideology, albeit on a small scale, indicates that humankind should be able to implement the res communis ideology into corpus juris spatialis. While res communis ideology has seen some success in other societies, it is not prudent to assume that it will enjoy the same successful application in our increasingly capitalistic, modern society. Societies that have successfully implemented res communis ideology have had entirely different goals and values systems than those of the capitalist societies that are now developing the means for further space exploration. 65 While the isolated successes of communal societies in Africa and the Australian Outback are indeed admirable, they are certainly not the pioneers of space exploration and appropriation. Furthermore, it is difficult to posit that capitalistic nations can successfully switch to a res communis ideology. Groups that originated in capitalistic societies and subsequently switched to communal living have ultimately failed and reverted back to the individual ownership system from which they came. 66 The second problem with using res communis as a basis for property endowment in outer space law is the damaging effect of individual appropriation on the community when scarcity arises. Even in a res communis society where the community owns all property, individual members of the community nonetheless use certain parts of that property to the exclusion of the rest of the community. Such individual use and appropriation against the community is seen as permissible under res communis ideology supported by Lockean notions of property endowment; an individual may exclude the community from property if he or she mixes his or her labor with that property. This individual appropriation does not have a damaging impact on the community as long as there IS "'enough and as good left in common for others.71 However, when there IS scarcity, the rights of the community against the individual become increasingly hostile.

outer space, scarcity will always be an Issue and thus will limit the utility of res communis based on Lockean principles of property endowment.72 The universe potentially may contain billions of solar systems and planets, but some celestial bodies may prove to be gold mines, while others prove to be "the Sahara."73 More important than the scarcity of limited resources, however, is the scarcity created by human lifespan and technological limitations. The time that space travel presently takes in comparison to the average human life span limits our ability to exploit celestial resources. Furthermore, technological limitations already have created issues of scarcity: such as the increasing problems of satellite positioning and traffic in geostationary orbit.

#### Space Settlement is coming now and prevents inevitable extinction. Settlement requires private industry and rule of law.

Gesl 18 [Paul M. Gesl (Maj, USAF JD), “PREPARING FOR THE NEXT SPACE RACE: Legislation and Policy Recommendations for Space Colonies,” A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements for the Degree of MASTER OF OPERATIONAL ARTS AND SCIENCES (April 2018). <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/AD1053024.pdf>] CT

Why the United States Needs to Think About Space Colonization Now

The United States’ space policies under the previous two Presidential administrations have not matched the ambition of the commercial sector. The author has criticized the National Space Policies of both President Obama and George W. Bush as being too “Earth-Centric.”6 Based on the current state of technologies, it is easy to dismiss space colonization as, at best, a problem to worry about tomorrow and, at worst, mere science fiction. This is irresponsible. Reaching space is difficult. Colonizing it will be even more difficult; however, we cannot overlook it as a likely possibility. NASA viewed space colonization as an endeavor within humanity’s reach in the 1970s.7 Now it is beginning to take shape as a reality. In 2015 at the Pioneering Space National Summit, policy makers, industry leaders and advocates agreed that “The long term goal of the human spaceflight and exploration program of the United States is to expand permanent human presence beyond low-Earth orbit in a way that will enable human settlement and a thriving space economy. This will be best achieved through public-private partnerships and international collaboration (emphasis in original).”8 Additionally, there have been several attempts in Congress to pursue space settlement.9 Private industry appears to be taking the lead in this race. Elon Musk, the CEO of SpaceX intends to establish a colony of a million settlers on the surface of Mars.10 SpaceX is targeting the first manned missions to make this a reality to launch in 2024.11 Mr. Musk envisions the full colonization to take 40-100 years.12 Even if this timeline misses its ambitious deadline by a decade, humanity will be a multi-planetary species in many readers’ lifetimes. It is important to note that Mr. Musk recently stated that SpaceX is “building the first Mars, or interplanetary ship, and I think we’ll be able to do short trips, flights by first half of next year.”13 Even though he joked that the company might miss their timeline, his comments highlight that colonization is an issue that is fast approaching.14 Another factor to consider is that a legal framework needs to be developed before a Martian colony is at its full capacity. Mr. Musk envisions using SpaceX’s BFR to send approximately 100 people per flight to Mars.15 Additionally, SpaceX appears to be planning for humans living on the lunar surface in their Moon Base Alpha.16 SpaceX is not alone in their ambitions. United Launch Alliance (ULA) published their plans to expand the population of humans living and working in space. Their Cis-lunar 1,000 framework is a 30-year plan to develop the cis-lunar economy and grow the population of humans living and working in space from six to 1,000.17 Space colonization is more important to our species than the economic benefits of a space economy and the conquests of exploration. The current world population is 7.4 billion people.18 According to the World Wildlife Foundation and the Global Footprint Network, “the equivalent of 1.7 planets would be needed to produce enough natural resources to match our consumption rates and a growing population.”19 The problem will likely grow worse as the population of the planet continues to grow. According to the United Nations, the Earth’s population will grow to over 11 billion people by 2100.20 Based partially on this, “Prof [Stephen] Hawking said it was only a matter of time before the Earth as we know it is destroyed by an asteroid strike, soaring temperatures or over-population.”21 Hawking further stated that, “When we have reached similar crisis in or (sic.) history there has usually been somewhere else to colonise (sic.). Columbus did it in 1492 when he discovered the new world. But now there is no new world. No Eutopia (sic.) around the corner. We are running out of space and the only places to go are other worlds.”22 The late Professor Hawking is not alone in his view, the National Space Society observed the benefits of expanding into space. “Outer space holds virtually limitless amounts of energy and raw materials, which can be harvested for use both on Earth and in space. Quality of life can be improved directly by utilization of these resources and also indirectly moving hazardous and polluting industries and/or their waste products off planet Earth.”23 These are just several of the many compelling reasons to colonize space advocated by groups such as the National Space Society and the Space Frontier Foundation.24 ULA appears to be taking steps to meet their ambitions for the future. ULA announced the first step towards making their Cis-lunar 1,000 vision a reality. In October 2017, they announced a partnership with Bigelow Aerospace to launch a habitat to low lunar orbit.25 The launch is expected to be completed before the end 2022.26 Some feel that colonization is going to happen, no matter what governments do.27 If colonization is going to happen, then it is in the United States’ best interest to develop a legal framework that supports the efforts and protects our citizens who will travel to and live in these habitats. This is important for several reasons. First, private corporations appear to have an interest in colonizing space, so it is in humanity’s future whether the government is involved nor not. However, governments can take actions that will accelerate things.28 Second, it is in the best interest of the United States’ economy to support commercial companies that are expanding into space. Third, if the United States does not create a favorable legal framework for space colonization, someone else will. Finally, as humanity expands away from the surface of the Earth, it is important to create a free society based on the principles of the Rule of Law rather than some other form of government, or an anarchistic company town.

## 4

### T

#### Interpretation: The aff must defend a policy implementation

#### ‘Resolved’ denotes a proposal to be enacted by law

Words and Phrases 64 Permanent Edition

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### Violation: The affirmative is a general statement, not a proposal or implementation.

#### Standards –

#### Limits – A] By not reading the plan they broaden the scope of what they are debating instead of specifying their advocacy – that justifies tricky perms and aff condo which decks fairness. B] They over-limit their ground by not following the resolution which decks predictability and fairness.

#### Clash – They make it impossible to clash with the affirmative – A] They can shift out of anything I say if they don’t defend a concrete advocacy and B] It’s impossible for me to come up with arguments against you if you don’t defend the resolution – I only prep for the resolution and there are infinite other advocacies you can read.

#### Legal precision – We should focus on the specific definition of words in the resolution – words have precise meaning and if you don’t follow it it’s impossible to understand what they are saying – using exact definitions is key to participating in analyzing governmental positions and making changes in the real world which takes out the reason we are debating in the first place.

## Case

### Climate

#### Tons of alt causes – countries polluting, etc.

#### Warming doesn’t cause extinction

* peer-reviewed journal shows IPCC exaggeration
* history proves resilience
* no extinction- warming under Paris goals
* rock breaking strategy could offset warming

IBD 18 [Investors Business Daily, Citing Study from Peer reviewed journal by Lewis and Curry, “Here's One Global Warming Study Nobody Wants You To See”, 4/25/18, <https://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/global-warming-computer-models-co2-emissions/>] //Re-Cut Ethan Yang

Settled Science: A new study published in a peer-reviewed journal finds that climate models exaggerate the global warming from CO2 emissions by as much as 45%. If these findings hold true, it's huge news. No wonder the mainstream press is ignoring it.

In the study, authors Nic Lewis and Judith Curry looked at actual temperature records and compared them with climate change computer models. What they found is that the planet has shown itself to be far less sensitive to increases in CO2 than the climate models say. As a result, they say, the planet will warm less than the models predict, even if we continue pumping CO2 into the atmosphere.

As Lewis explains: "Our results imply that, for any future emissions scenario, future warming is likely to be substantially lower than the central computer model-simulated level projected by the (United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change), and highly unlikely to exceed that level.

How much lower? Lewis and Curry say that their findings show temperature increases will be 30%-45% lower than the climate models say. If they are right, then there's little to worry about, even if we don't drastically reduce CO2 emissions.

The planet will warm from human activity, but not nearly enough to cause the sort of end-of-the-world calamities we keep hearing about. In fact, the resulting warming would be below the target set at the Paris agreement.

This would be tremendously good news.

The fact that the Lewis and Curry study appears in the peer-reviewed American Meteorological Society's Journal of Climate lends credibility to their findings. This is the same journal, after all, that recently published widely covered studies saying the Sahara has been growing and the climate boundary in central U.S. has shifted 140 miles to the east because of global warming.

The Lewis and Curry findings come after another study, published in the prestigious journal Nature, that found the long-held view that a doubling of CO2 would boost global temperatures as much as 4.5 degrees Celsius was wrong**.** The most temperatures would likely climb is 3.4 degrees.

It also follows a study published in Science, which found that rocks contain vast amounts of nitrogen that plants could use to grow and absorb more CO2, potentially offsetting at least some of the effects of CO2 emissions and reducing future temperature increases.

### Colonization Good

#### Space settlement outweighs every impact. Even slight delays result in an unfathomable loss of life.

Bostrom 03 [Nick Bostrom, “Astronomical Waste: The Opportunity Cost of Delayed Technological Development,” Utilitas Vol. 15, No. 3 (2003): pp. 308-314. https://nickbostrom.com/astronomical/waste.html#\_edn8,] CT

II. THE OPPORTUNITY COST OF DELAYED COLONIZATION From a utilitarian perspective, this huge loss of potential human lives constitutes a correspondingly huge loss of potential value. I am assuming here that the human lives that could have been created would have been worthwhile ones. Since it is commonly supposed that even current human lives are typically worthwhile, this is a weak assumption. Any civilization advanced enough to colonize the local supercluster would likely also have the ability to establish at least the minimally favorable conditions required for future lives to be worth living. The effect on total value, then, seems greater for actions that accelerate technological development than for practically any other possible action. Advancing technology (or its enabling factors, such as economic productivity) even by such a tiny amount that it leads to colonization of the local supercluster just one second earlier than would otherwise have happened amounts to bringing about more than 10^29 human lives (or 10^14 human lives if we use the most conservative lower bound) that would not otherwise have existed. Few other philanthropic causes could hope to match that level of utilitarian payoff. Utilitarians are not the only ones who should strongly oppose astronomical waste. There are many views about what has value that would concur with the assessment that the current rate of wastage constitutes an enormous loss of potential value. For example, we can take a thicker conception of human welfare than commonly supposed by utilitarians (whether of a hedonistic, experientialist, or desire-satisfactionist bent), such as a conception that locates value also in human flourishing, meaningful relationships, noble character, individual expression, aesthetic appreciation, and so forth. So long as the evaluation function is aggregative (does not count one person’s welfare for less just because there are many other persons in existence who also enjoy happy lives) and is not relativized to a particular point in time (no time-discounting), the conclusion will hold. These conditions can be relaxed further. Even if the welfare function is not perfectly aggregative (perhaps because one component of the good is diversity, the marginal rate of production of which might decline with increasing population size), it can still yield a similar bottom line provided only that at least some significant component of the good is sufficiently aggregative. Similarly, some degree of time-discounting future goods could be accommodated without changing the conclusion.[7] III. THE CHIEF GOAL FOR UTILITARIANS SHOULD BE TO REDUCE EXISTENTIAL RISK In light of the above discussion, it may seem as if a utilitarian ought to focus her efforts on accelerating technological development. The payoff from even a very slight success in this endeavor is so enormous that it dwarfs that of almost any other activity. We appear to have a utilitarian argument for the greatest possible urgency of technological development. However, the true lesson is a different one. If what we are concerned with is (something like) maximizing the expected number of worthwhile lives that we will create, then in addition to the opportunity cost of delayed colonization, we have to take into account the risk of failure to colonize at all. We might fall victim to an existential risk, one where an adverse outcome would either annihilate Earth-originating intelligent life or permanently and drastically curtail its potential.[8] Because the lifespan of galaxies is measured in billions of years, whereas the time-scale of any delays that we could realistically affect would rather be measured in years or decades, the consideration of risk trumps the consideration of opportunity cost. For example, a single percentage point of reduction of existential risks would be worth (from a utilitarian expected utility point-of-view) a delay of over 10 million years. Therefore, if our actions have even the slightest effect on the probability of eventual colonization, this will outweigh their effect on when colonization takes place. For standard utilitarians, priority number one, two, three and four should consequently be to reduce existential risk. The utilitarian imperative “Maximize expected aggregate utility!” can be simplified to the maxim “Minimize existential risk!”.

#### And they can’t provide an example of a good socialized project and why it’s better off the top of their head – that proves that there is no reason why public companies are better

#### Private companies better – k2 better research, science, technology, etc.

### Capitalism Good

#### Cap is good:

#### 1] It’s sustainable – data proves we’re entering the golden age

**Hausfather 21** – a climate scientist and energy systems analyst whose research focuses on observational temperature records, climate models, and mitigation technologies. He spent 10 years working as a data scientist and entrepreneur in the cleantech sector, where he was the lead data scientist at Essess, the chief scientist at C3.ai, and the cofounder and chief scientist of Efficiency 2.0. He also worked as a research scientist with Berkeley Earth, was the senior climate analyst at Project Drawdown, and the US analyst for Carbon Brief. He has masters degrees in environmental science from Yale University and Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and a PhD in climate science from the University of California, Berkeley. (Zeke, "Absolute Decoupling of Economic Growth and Emissions in 32 Countries," Breakthrough Institute, 4-6-2021, https://thebreakthrough.org/issues/energy/absolute-decoupling-of-economic-growth-and-emissions-in-32-countries, Accessed 4-11-2021, LASA-SC)

The past 30 years have seen immense progress **in improving the quality of life for much of humanity**. Extreme poverty — the number of people living on less than $1.90 per day — has fallen by nearly two-thirds, from 1.9 **billion to** around 650 **million**. Life expectancy has risen in most of the world, along with literacy and access to education, while infant mortality has fallen. Despite perceptions to the contrary, **the average person born today is likely to have access to more opportunities and have a better quality of life than at any other point in human history**. Much of this increase in human wellbeing has been propelled by rapid economic growth driven largely by state-led industrial policy, particularly in poor-to-middle income countries. However, this growth has come at a cost: between 1990 and 2019, global emissions of CO2 **increased by 56%.** Historically, economic growth has been closely linked to increased energy consumption — and increased CO2 emissions in particular — leading some to argue that a more prosperous world is one that necessarily has more impacts on our natural environment and climate. There is a lively academic debate about our ability to “absolutely decouple” emissions and growth — that is, the extent to which the adoption of clean energy technology can allow emissions to decline while economic growth continues. Over the past 15 years, however, **something has begun to change.** Rather than a 21st century dominated by coal that energy modelers foresaw, **global coal use peaked in 2013 and is now in structural decline**. We have succeeded in making clean energy cheap, with solar power and battery storage costs falling 10-fold since 2009. The world produced more electricity from clean energy — solar, wind, hydro, and nuclear — than from coal over the past two years. And, according to some major oil companies, **peak oil is upon us** — not because we have run out of cheap oil to produce, but because demand is falling and companies expect further decline as consumers increasingly shift to electric vehicles. The world has long been experiencing a relative **decoupling** between economic growth and CO2 emissions, with the emissions per unit of GDP **falling for the past 60 years**. This is the case even in countries like **India and China** that have been undergoing rapid economic growth. But relative decoupling alone is inadequate in a world where global CO2 emissions need to peak and decline in the next decade to give us any chance at limiting warming to well below 2℃, in line with Paris Agreement targets. Thankfully, there is increasing evidence that the world is on track **to absolutely decouple CO2 emissions and economic growth** — with global CO2 emissions potentially having peaked in 2019 **and unlikely to increase substantially in the coming decade**. While an emissions peak is just the first and easiest step towards eventually reaching the net-zero emissions required to stop the world from continuing to warm, it demonstrates that linkages between emissions and economic activity are not an immutable law, but rather simply a result of our current means of energy production. In recent years we have seen more and more examples of absolute decoupling — economic growth accompanied by falling CO2 emissions. Since 2005, 32 countries with a population of at least one million people **have absolutely decoupled** emissions from economic growth, both for terrestrial emissions (those within national borders) and consumption emissions (emissions embodied in the goods consumed in a country). This includes the United States, Japan, Mexico, Germany, United Kingdom, France, Spain, Poland, Romania, Netherlands, Belgium, Portugal, Sweden, Hungary, Belarus, Austria, Bulgaria, El Salvador, Singapore, Denmark, Finland, Slovakia, Norway, Ireland, New Zealand, Croatia, Jamaica, Lithuania, Slovenia, Latvia, Estonia, and Cyprus. Figure 1, below, shows the declines in territorial emissions (blue) and increases in GDP (red). To qualify as having experienced absolute decoupling, we require countries included in this analysis to pass four separate filters: a population of at least one million (to focus the analysis on more representative cases), declining territorial emissions over the 2005-2019 period (based on a linear regression), declining consumption emissions, and increasing real GDP (on a purchasing power parity basis, using constant 2017 international $USD). We chose not to include 2020 in this analysis because it is not particularly representative of longer-term trends, and consumption and territorial emissions estimates are not yet available for many countries. There is a wide range of rates of economic growth between 2005-2019 among countries experiencing absolute decoupling. Somewhat counterintuitively, there is no significant relationship between the rate of economic growth and the magnitude of emissions reductions within the group. **While it is unlikely that there is not at least some linkage between the two factors, there are plenty of examples of countries (e.g., Singapore, Romania, and Ireland) experiencing both extremely rapid economic growth and large reductions in CO2 emissions.** One of the primary criticisms of some prior analyses of absolute decoupling is that they ignore **leakage**. Specifically, the offshoring of manufacturing from high-income countries over the past three decades to countries like China has led to “illusory” drops in emissions, where the emissions associated with high-income country consumption are simply shipped overseas and no longer show up in territorial emissions accounting. There is some truth in this critique, as there was a large increase in emissions embodied in imports from developing countries between 1990 and 2005. After 2005, however, structural changes in China and a growing domestic market led to a reversal of these trends; the amount of emissions “exported” from developed countries to developing countries **has actually declined over the past 15 years.** This means that, for many countries, both territorial emissions and consumption emissions (which include any emissions “exported” to other countries) **have jointly declined**. In fact, on average, consumption emissions have been declining slightly faster than territorial emissions since 2005 in the 32 countries we identify as experiencing absolute decoupling. Figure 2, below, shows the change in consumption emissions (teal) and GDP (red) between 2005 and 2019. There is a pretty wide variation in the extent to which these countries have reduced their territorial and consumption emissions since 2005. Some countries — such as the UK, Denmark, Finland, and Singapore – have seen territorial emissions fall faster than consumption emissions, while the US, Japan, Germany, and Spain (among others) have seen consumption emissions fall faster. Figure 3 shows reductions in consumption and territorial emissions for each country, with the size of the dot representing the size of the population in 2019. **Absolute decoupling is possible.** There is no physical law requiring economic growth — and broader increases in human wellbeing — to necessarily be linked to CO2 emissions. All of the **services that we rely on today that emit fossil fuels** — electricity, transportation, heating, food — can in principle **be replaced by near-zero carbon alternatives**, though these are more mature in some sectors (electricity, transportation, buildings) than in others (industrial processes, agriculture).

#### 2] Tech dematerialization secures sustainability.

**McAfee 19**, \*Andrew Paul McAfee, a principal research scientist at MIT, is cofounder and codirector of the MIT Initiative on the Digital Economy at the MIT Sloan School of Management; (2019, “More from Less: The Surprising Story of How We Learned to Prosper Using Fewer Resources and What Happens Next”, https://b-ok.cc/book/5327561/8acdbe)

There is **no shortage** of examples of dematerialization. I chose the ones in this chapter because they illustrate a set of fundamental principles at the intersection of business, economics, innovation, and our impact on our planet. They are:

We do want more all the time, but **not more resources**. Alfred Marshall was right, but William Jevons was wrong. Our wants and desires keep growing, evidently without end, and therefore so do our economies. But our use of the earth’s resources **does not**. We do want more beverage options, but we don’t want to keep using more aluminum in drink cans. We want to communicate and compute and listen to music, but we don’t want an arsenal of gadgets; we’re happy with a single smartphone. As our population increases, we want more food, but we don’t have any desire to consume more fertilizer or use more land for crops.

Jevons was correct at the time he wrote that total British demand for coal was increasing even though steam engines were becoming much more efficient. He was right, in other words, that the price elasticity of demand for coal-supplied power was greater than one in the 1860s. But he was wrong to conclude that this would be permanent. Elasticities of demand can change over time for several reasons, the most fundamental of which is **technological change**. Coal provides a clear example of this. When fracking made natural gas much cheaper, total **demand** for coal in the United States **went down** even though its price decreased.

With the help of **innovation** and **new technologies**, economic growth in America and other rich countries—growth in all of the wants and needs that we spend money on—has become **decoupled** from resource **consumption**. This is a recent development and a **profound** one.

Materials cost money that companies locked in competition would rather **not spend**. The root of Jevons’s mistake is simple and **boring**: resources cost **money**. He realized this, of course. What he didn’t sufficiently realize was how strong the **incentive** is for a company in a contested market to **reduce** its spending on **resources** (or anything else) and so eke out a bit more profit. After all, a penny saved is a penny earned.

Monopolists can just pass costs on to their customers, but companies with a lot of competitors can’t. So American farmers who battle with each other (and increasingly with tough rivals in other countries) are eager to cut their spending on land, water, and fertilizer. Beer and soda companies want to minimize their aluminum purchases. Producers of magnets and high-tech gear run away from REE as soon as prices start to spike. In the United States, the 1980 Staggers Act removed government subsidies for freight-hauling railroads, forcing them into **competition** and **cost cutting** and making them all the more eager to not have expensive railcars sit idle. Again and again, we see that **competition** spurs **dematerialization**.

There are multiple paths to dematerialization. As profit-hungry companies seek to use fewer resources, they can go down four main paths. First, they can simply find ways to use **less** of a **given material**. This is what happened as beverage companies and the companies that supply them with cans teamed up to use less aluminum. It’s also the story with American farmers, who keep getting bigger harvests while using less land, water, and fertilizer. Magnet makers found ways to use fewer rare earth metals when it looked as if China might cut off their supply.

Second, it often becomes possible to **substitute** one resource for **another**. Total US coal consumption started to decrease after 2007 because fracking made natural gas more attractive to electricity generators. If nuclear power becomes more popular in the United States (a topic we’ll take up in chapter 15), we could use both less coal and less gas and generate our electricity from a small amount of material indeed. A kilogram of uranium-235 fuel contains approximately 2–3 million times as much energy as the same mass of coal or oil. According to one estimate, the total amount of energy that humans consume each year could be supplied by just seven thousand tons of uranium fuel.

Third, companies can use **fewer molecules** overall by making better use of the materials they **already own**. Improving CNW’s railcar utilization from 5 percent to 10 percent would mean that the company could cut its stock of these thirty-ton behemoths in half. Companies that own expensive physical assets tend to be fanatics about getting as much use as possible out of them, for clear and compelling financial reasons. For example, the world’s commercial airlines have improved their load factors—essentially the percentage of seats occupied on flights—from 56 percent in 1971 to more than 81 percent in 2018.

Finally, some materials get replaced by **nothing** at all. When a telephone, camcorder, and tape recorder are separate devices, three total microphones are needed. When they all collapse into a smartphone, only one microphone is necessary. That smartphone also uses no audiotapes, videotapes, compact discs, or camera film. The iPhone and its descendants are among the world champions of dematerialization. They use vastly less metal, plastic, glass, and silicon than did the devices they have replaced and don’t need media such as paper, discs, tape, or film.

If we use more renewable energy, we’ll be replacing coal, gas, oil, and uranium with **photons** from the **sun** (solar power) and the **movement** of **air** (wind power) and water (hydroelectric power) on the earth. All three of these types of power are also among dematerialization’s **champions**, since they use up essentially **no resources** once they’re up and running.

I call these four paths to dematerialization slim, swap, optimize, and evaporate. They’re not mutually exclusive. Companies can and do pursue all four at the same time, and all four are going on all the time in ways both obvious and subtle.

Innovation is **hard** to **foresee**. Neither the fracking revolution nor the world-changing impact of the iPhone’s introduction were well understood in advance. Both continued to be underestimated even after they occurred. The iPhone was introduced in June of 2007, with no shortage of fanfare from Apple and Steve Jobs. Yet several months later the cover of Forbes was still asking if anyone could catch Nokia.

Innovation is not **steady** and **predictable** like the orbit of the Moon or the accumulation of interest on a certificate of deposit. It’s instead inherently jumpy, uneven, and **random**. It’s also **combinatorial**, as Erik Brynjolfsson and I discussed in our book The Second Machine Age. Most new technologies and other innovations, we argued, are combinations or recombinations of preexisting elements.

The iPhone was “just” a cellular telephone plus a bunch of sensors plus a touch screen plus an operating system and population of programs, or apps. All these elements had been around for a while before 2007. It took the vision of Steve Jobs to see what they could become when combined. Fracking was the combination of multiple abilities: to “see” where hydrocarbons were to be found in rock formations deep underground; to pump down pressurized liquid to fracture the rock; to pump up the oil and gas once they were released by the fracturing; and so on. Again, none of these was new. Their effective combination was what changed the world’s energy situation.

Erik and I described the set of innovations and technologies available at any time as **building blocks** that ingenious people could combine and recombine into useful new configurations. These new configurations then serve as more blocks that later innovators can use. Combinatorial innovation is exciting because it’s unpredictable. It’s not easy to foresee when or where powerful new combinations are going to appear, or who’s going to come up with them. But as the number of both building blocks and innovators increases, we should have **confidence** that more breakthroughs such as fracking and smartphones are ahead. Innovation is highly decentralized and largely uncoordinated, occurring as the result of **interactions** among **complex** and **interlocking** social, technological, and economic systems. So it’s going to keep surprising us.

As the Second Machine Age progresses, dematerialization **accelerates**. Erik and I coined the phrase Second Machine Age to draw a contrast with the Industrial Era, which as we’ve seen transformed the planet by allowing us to overcome the limitations of muscle power. Our current time of great progress with all things related to **computing** is allowing us to **overcome** the **limitations** of our mental power and is **transformative** in a different way: it’s allowing us to **reverse** the Industrial Era’s bad habit of taking **more** and **more** from the earth every year.

Computer-aided design tools help engineers at packaging companies design generations of aluminum cans that keep getting lighter. Fracking took off in part because oil and gas exploration companies learned how to build **accurate** computer **models** of the rock formations that lay deep underground—models that predicted where hydrocarbons were to be found.

Smartphones took the place of many separate pieces of gear. Because they serve as GPS devices, they’ve also led us to print out many fewer maps and so contributed to our current trend of using less paper. It’s easy to look at generations of computer paper, from 1960s punch cards to the eleven-by-seventeen-inch fanfold paper of the 1980s, and conclude that the Second Machine Age has caused us to chop down ever more trees. The year of peak paper consumption in the United States, however, was 1990. As our devices have become more capable and interconnected, always on and always with us, we’ve sharply turned away from paper. Humanity as a whole probably hit peak paper in 2013.

As these examples indicate, computers and their kin help us with all four paths to **dematerialization**. Hardware, software, and networks let us slim, swap, optimize, and evaporate. I contend that they’re the **best tools** we’ve **ever invented** for letting us tread more **lightly** on our planet.

All of these principles are about the **combination** of technological **progress** and **capitalism**, which are the first of the two pairs of forces causing **dematerialization**.

#### 3] The alternative locks in warming – its Try-Or-Die.

**Klein** 8/31/**21**, Opinion Writer at the New York Times, former Founder of Vox, and author of “Why We’re Polarized” (Ezra, “Transcript: Ezra Klein Answers Listener Questions” from ‘The Ezra Klein Show’ podcast, *The New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/08/31/podcasts/transcript-ezra-klein-ask-me-anything.html>, Accessed 09-1-2021)

But now let me talk about degrowth more in the terms of it is a direct political project, which is as an answer to climate change. I would cut this into a few pieces. Is degrowth necessary for addressing climate change? Is it the fastest way to address climate change? And is it desirable? It has to be at least one of those things to be the strategy you’d want to take. And I don’t think it is. Let’s start with necessary. Many countries in Europe, even the United States, are **growing while reducing their carbon footprint**. Now, you could say they’re not doing so fast enough depending on the country. But they could all do so much faster if there was enough political will to deploy more renewable technology, to tax carbon, to do a bunch of things that we have not been able to pass. So it is clearly true that we **can decouple growth and energy usage**. Hickel, to be fair, will say that that may be true. But given the speed at which we need to act, we can’t just be deploying renewable energy technology. It would also help the situation if we stopped using as much through material consumption. That is, I think, conceptually true and politically false. I mean, let’s just state that **speed** is, first and foremost, a **political problem**. There is a delta between where we are right now in terms of what we are doing on climate change and where we could be. That delta is big, and that delta gets bigger every year because it gets harder every year. And the time we have to act before we start getting some of the really truly catastrophic feedback loops in play is **shortening**. So you’re now talking here about the speed at which you can move politics. So for something to be faster, it doesn’t just need to be faster if you implemented it. It needs to be something you can implement such it **accelerates the politics** of radical climate action. And that’s where I think **degrowth** completely **falls apart**. And I have tried to look for the answer people give on this, and I’ve never found one that is convincing.

#### 4] People use low-cost fuels instead of renewables.

George MONBIOT 9. Fellowship and Professorships, Oxford. “Is There Any Point in Fighting to Stave Off Industrial Apocalypse.” *Guardian*. August 17. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cif-green/2009/aug/17/environment-climate-change>.

The problem we face is not that we have too little fossil fuel but too much. As oil declines, economies will switch to tar sands, shale gas and coal; as accessible coal declines they’ll switch to ultra-deep reserves (using underground gasification to exploit them) and methane clathrates. The same probably applies to almost all minerals: we will find them, but exploiting them will mean trashing an ever greater proportion of the world’s surface. We have enough non-renewable resources of all kinds to complete our wreckage of renewable resources: forests, soil, fish, fresh water, benign weather. Collapse will come one day, but not before we have pulled everything else down with us.¶ And even if there were an immediate economic cataclysm, it’s not clear that the result would be a decline in our capacity for destruction. In east Africa, for example, I’ve seen how, when supplies of paraffin or kerosene are disrupted, people don’t give up cooking; they cut down more trees. History shows us that wherever large-scale collapse has occurred, psychopaths take over. This is hardly conducive to the rational use of natural assets.

#### 5] Capitalism solves war – its anti-imperialist.

Mousseau 19, Michael. "The end of war: How a robust marketplace and liberal hegemony are leading to perpetual world peace." International Security 44.1 (2019): 160-196. Props to DML for finding. (Professor in the School of Politics, Security, and International Affairs at the University of Central Florida)//Elmer

Is war becoming obsolete? There is wide agreement among scholars that war has been in sharp decline since the defeat of the Axis powers in 1945, even as there is little agreement as to its cause.1 Realists reject the idea that this trend will continue, citing states' concerns with the “security dilemma”: that is, in anarchy states must assume that any state that can attack will; therefore, power equals threat, and changes in relative power result in conflict and war.2 Discussing the rise of China, Graham Allison calls this condition “Thucydides's Trap,” a reference to the ancient Greek's claim that Sparta's fear of Athens' growing power led to the Peloponnesian War.3 This article argues that there is no Thucydides Trap in international politics. Rather, the world is moving rapidly toward permanent peace, possibly in our lifetime. Drawing on economic norms theory,4 I show that what sometimes appears to be a Thucydides Trap may instead be a function of factors strictly internal to states and that these factors vary among them. In brief, leaders of states with advanced market-oriented economies have foremost interests in the principle of self-determination for all states, large and small, as the foundation for a robust global marketplace. War among these states, even making preparations for war, is not possible, because they are in a natural alliance to preserve and protect the global order. In contrast, leaders of states with weak internal markets have little interest in the global marketplace; they pursue wealth not through commerce, but through wars of expansion and demands for tribute. For these states, power equals threat, and therefore they tend to balance against the power of all states. Fearing stronger states, however, minor powers with weak internal markets tend to constrain their expansionist inclinations and, for security reasons, bandwagon with the relatively benign market-oriented powers. I argue that this liberal global hierarchy is unwittingly but systematically buttressing states' embrace of market norms and values that, if left uninterrupted, is likely to culminate in permanent world peace, perhaps even something close to harmony. My argument challenges the realist assertion that great powers are engaged in a timeless competition over global leadership, because hegemony cannot exist among great powers with weak markets; these inherently expansionist states live in constant fear and therefore normally balance against the strongest state and its allies.5 Hegemony can exist only among market-oriented powers, because only they care about global order. Yet, there can be no competition for leadership among market powers, because they always agree with the goal of their strongest member (currently the United States) to preserve and protect the global order

#### 8] Yes Transition Wars and they cause Extinction

Nyquist 5 J.R. Nyquist 2-4-2005 “The Political Consequences of a Financial Crash” [www.financialsense.com/stormw...2005/0204.html](http://www.financialsense.com/stormw...2005/0204.html) (renowned expert in geopolitics and international relations)//Elmer

Should the United States experience a severe economic contraction during the second term of President Bush, the American people will likely support politicians who advocate further restrictions and controls on our market economy – guaranteeing its strangulation and the steady pauperization of the country. In Congress today, Sen. Edward Kennedy supports nearly all the economic dogmas listed above. It is easy to see, therefore, that the coming economic contraction, due in part to a policy of massive credit expansion, will have serious political consequences for the Republican Party (to the benefit of the Democrats). Furthermore, an economic contraction will encourage the formation of **anti-capitalist** majorities and a turning away from the free market system. The danger here is not merely economic. The political left openly favors the collapse of America’s strategic position abroad. The withdrawal of the **U**nited **S**tates from the Middle East, the Far East and Europe would **catastrophically impact an international system that presently allows 6 billion** people to live on the earth’s surface in relative peace. Should anti-capitalist dogmas overwhelm the global market and trading system that evolved under American leadership, the planet’s economy would contract and untold **millions would die of starvation**. Nationalistic totalitarianism, fueled by a politics of blame, would once again bring war to Asia and Europe. But this time the war would be **waged with mass destruction weapons** and the United States would be blamed because it is the center of global capitalism. Furthermore, if the anti-capitalist party gains power in Washington, we can expect to see policies of appeasement and unilateral disarmament enacted. American appeasement and disarmament, in this context, would be an admission of guilt before the court of world opinion. Russia and China, above all, would exploit this admission to justify aggressive wars, invasions and mass destruction attacks. A future financial crash, therefore, must be prevented at all costs.