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#### Counterplan Text: The appropriation of outer space through asteroid mining by private entities, with the exception of low yield asteroid material collection for scientific study, should be banned.

#### Private extraction key to study of space samples—costs

**OSI ND** (Outer Space Institute, network of world-leading space experts united by their commitment to highly innovative, transdisciplinary research that addresses grand challenges facing the continued use and exploration of space. http://outerspaceinstitute.ca/resources.html. No date but is referencing asteroid probes from 2021.)DR 22

Public-private partnerships are fostering the development of ISRU technology. NASA contracted [four private companies](https://www.nasa.gov/press-release/nasa-selects-companies-to-collect-lunar-resources-for-artemis-demonstrations/) to collect samples of regolith from the Moon’s south pole. Once collected, ownership of the samples will be [transferred to NASA in-situ](https://www.nasa.gov/press-release/nasa-selects-companies-to-collect-lunar-resources-for-artemis-demonstrations) as a move to kick-start space commerce and incentivize further investment in the development of ISRU technology. Additionally, [NASA awarded SpaceX](https://www.nasa.gov/press-release/as-artemis-moves-forward-nasa-picks-spacex-to-land-next-americans-on-moon) a $2.9 billion contract to build a human landing system that will carry astronauts to the lunar surface. China has also made significant progress on the technological front with the success of their [Chang’e 5 spacecraft,](https://spaceflightnow.com/2021/01/01/chinese-mission-returned-nearly-4-pounds-of-lunar-samples/) which extracted a four-pound sample of lunar regolith and returned it to Earth. The sample-return missions underway by [NASA](https://www.nasa.gov/osiris-rex) and [JAXA](https://www.hayabusa2.jaxa.jp/en/) serve as technological demonstrations of the possibilities, challenges, and dangers when interacting with asteroids. Other teams planning to do the same in the near future, some of which are commercial actors, will learn greatly from these missions Mining asteroids could also become a very real prospect decades from now. New sample and return technology, namely the probes deployed by [JAXA](https://www.hayabusa2.jaxa.jp/en/) and [NASA,](https://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/osiris-rex/about) have extracted material from the asteroids Ryugu and Bennu, respectively, and are returning it to Earth. Meanwhile, commercial launch companies, such as SpaceX, are drastically lowering the cost of launching equipment into space, making it accessible to a wider range of actors. Despite [the declining investment into asteroid mining start-ups,](https://www.technologyreview.com/2019/06/26/134510/asteroid-mining-bubble-burst-history/) some ambitious companies remain waiting for a future date when it becomes economically feasible. In the meantime, they undertake other space activities, such as operating Earth imaging satellites, to maintain revenue streams. Mining space resources, such as the Moon and asteroids, could greatly expand humanity’s knowledge about the origins of the solar system, the Earth, the abundance of water, and the origin of life. Ice and water-bearing minerals could be used to produce rocket fuel; fuel that, being sourced in space, will not need to be lifted – at great expense – out of Earth’s heavy gravity. Studying material from asteroids may also prove to be vital in humanity's defence against potential major impactors.

#### Specifically, SpaceX’s Starship enables sample collection at an unprecedented rate.

Heldmann et al 21 “Accelerating Martian and Lunar Science through SpaceX Starship Missions” May 2021 Jennifer L. Heldmann [NASA Ames Research Center, Division of Space Sciences & Astrobiology, Planetary Systems Branch], other authors listed in the article <https://surveygizmoresponseuploads.s3.amazonaws.com/fileuploads/623127/5489366/111-381503be1c5764e533d2e1e923e21477_HeldmannJenniferL.pdf> SM

Given the Starship’s anticipated low cost, high payload capacity, and potential for high flight cadence, the opportunities presented for planetary science missions have the potential to dramatically increase our progress towards NASA Planetary Science & Astrobiology goals and objectives. Building upon the NASA CLPS paradigm (Bussey et al. 2019), use of SpaceX Starships will allow for increased flights for science experiments, technology demonstrations, and capability development to enable human spaceflight missions through NASA partnership and purchase of flight payload accommodation. High priority science objectives as outlined in the Decadal Survey and NASA Strategic Plan for the Moon and Mars can uniquely be achieved through flights to lunar/Martian orbit and/or to the surface of these planetary bodies. In addition, Starship has the ability to deploy orbiters on approach. This capability would provide the opportunity to deliver either relatively large orbital assets with sophisticated remote sensing instrumentation and/or many smaller satellites that could serve a variety of purposes, including development of communications or meteorology networks.

Starship is designed to lift off from its planetary destination and return to Earth, thereby allowing not only the return of crew members but also the return of unprecedented quantities of lunar and Martian samples to Earth for scientific analysis. Because Starship can return tens of tons of payload from the surface of the Moon, the return sample mass of lunar samples from a single mission would dwarf the combined total returned mass of all lunar samples from all sample return missions to date. Many samples with greater sample variety will allow for more scientifically robust analytical studies in laboratories on Earth. Removing the need to severely high-grade and down-select samples on the Moon and Mars will also enable opportunistic science from returned samples to degrees previously not achievable. Never before has the science or exploration community had the potential to send such payload capacity to these destinations and return as much sample material as can be accommodated by Starship. The scientific progress achieved would be unprecedented.

#### Asteroid samples key to planetary defense

**Grove and Powell 20** (Phil Groves, producer of the award-winning documentary *Asteroid Hunters*. Corey Powell, reporter for discover magazine “We're Coming for the Asteroids. Are the Asteroids Coming for Us?” [https://www.discovermagazine.com/the-sciences/were-coming-for-the-asteroids-are-the-asteroids-also-coming-for-us November 30](https://www.discovermagazine.com/the-sciences/were-coming-for-the-asteroids-are-the-asteroids-also-coming-for-us%20November%2030), 2020)DR 22

Groves: The way I internalize that sort of thinking is an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. You have a house. You buy a fire extinguisher, and the expense of that fire extinguisher relative to the overall cost of the house is pretty small. The amount of money that you would have to spend to send up a space telescope to look for asteroids so that we can find it before they find us, is pretty small compared to the overall economy of the world. When you go to sleep at night, you lock your front door. The chances of someone invading your house in the middle of the night is pretty minuscule as well, but you do it. This is the same thing, just on a grander scale.

And it doesn't even cost that much! NASA's budget for finding asteroids is probably less than what it costs to make **one** Hollywood asteroid-disaster movie.

Groves: That might be generous, by the way. NASA's budget for planetary defense in this past year is about 150 million bucks. Just about every Marvel movie made out there cost more than that. And this is the only natural disaster you can actually prevent from happening. You can't cork a volcano. You can't throw a net over a hurricane. You can't glue shut a fault line to stop earthquakes. But this we can stop.

What do you find most scientifically exciting about asteroids?

Groves: The coolest fact that I learned along the way [making Asteroid Hunters] is that the asteroid belt is a planet that never came to be because of this big gravitational bully called Jupiter. It jealously prevented a planet from ever taking shape because of its gravitational influences on planetesimals, which is what asteroids are. They're the leftover materials of construction of the planets of the solar system. The big gap between Mars and Jupiter is because of Jupiter's huge influence. It was the first planet to form, and it's the biggest. It kept things stirred up, gravitationally speaking, in that area, so the asteroids were never given a chance to come together and form a planet.

Then over the four-and-a-half billion years, most of the asteroids have either been sent packing outside of the solar system or sent inward, where they become impactors of the Moon and the Earth, not to mention Venus, Mercury, and Mars. Some also fall into the Sun. The asteroid belt today is maybe 1 percent of what it used to be. All of this stuff, it's a big ammo belt, just being flung outward and inward over the course of the eons.

It's an exciting time in **asteroid exploration**, with Hayabusa2 and OSIRIS-REx bringing asteroid samples back to Earth. Any thoughts **on these missions?**

Groves: They'll help us get an understanding of **the construction** of our solar system and maybe even the formation of life itself. A lot of these asteroids carry with them organic compounds. You want to know: Did they bring water to Earth and Mars and perhaps other planets?

What's also interesting about OSIRIS-REx is the asteroid it's investigating, Bennu, is one of these potentially hazardous asteroids I was referencing earlier. It's going to pass close to Earth in 2035. It's not going to hit then, but Earth's gravity could have some influence on its orbit around the Sun. After that, Bennu may become a real risk to our planet, and it's a pretty big asteroid. It’s about 500 meters across, more than 1,500 feet.

The images of Bennu are amazing. It's a diamond-shaped hunk of gravel.

Groves: It's a rubble pile, and **knowing that is an** important aspect of planetary defense. How you would mitigate the threat could depend on your understanding of the asteroid structure. Is it mostly metallic, like a big cannon ball? Or is it a rubble pile, where if you whack it too hard, it'll break apart? Then you'd have a pile of buckshot, which could be just as bad.

#### Core to deflection—poorly planned deflection makes collision more likely

**Andrews 21** (Robin George Andrews is a volcanologist and science writer based in London. His upcoming book Super Volcanoes: What They Reveal about Earth and the Worlds Beyond will be released in November 2021.“NASA’s DART Mission Could Help Cancel an Asteroid Apocalypse” <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/nasas-dart-mission-could-help-cancel-an-asteroid-apocalypse/> November 18, 2021)DR 22

Mission planners are reasonably confident that DART’s hushed demise will successfully convey a billiardlike kick to Dimorphos, which seems hefty enough to be sufficiently squeezed by gravity’s clutches. But in the case of a slightly less substantial object, a kinetic impactor could just shoot right through, like a bullet through a cake, blowing it into small but still dangerous chunks. A successful deflection for such threats could require multiple, more gentle impacts rather than a one-and-done wallop.

Another huge unknown is Dimorphos’s appearance. It could be shaped like a potato, a dog bone, a rubber duck, [two bowling balls stuck together](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/new-horizons-may-have-solved-planet-formation-cold-case/), or something else entirely. A colleague recently gifted Adams a donut-shaped fridge magnet, a wink to how often asteroids surprise scientists once unveiled up close by some deep-space robotic emissary. A near-spherical or even potatolike shape would be optimal for a clean hit, whereas the uneven distribution of mass from more **complex morphologies** would raise the chance of a glancing blow, one that could just “spin up the moonlet and not actually change its orbit,” says Olivier de Weck, a systems engineering researcher at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

In the specific and benign case of Dimorphos, all these uncertainties are mostly academic. But in the event of a deflection attempt for a true city-killer, they could prove critical. We could, for instance, **successfully deflect** a potentially hazardous asteroid only to inadvertently put it on a new orbit that makes it more likely to hit Earth in the long run. There are points in space around our planet known as gravitational keyholes, wherein Earth’s pull on the asteroid sets the errant space rock on an assuredly destructive journey. “Once you go through a keyhole, the probability of hitting the Earth is virtually 100 percent,” says de Weck. This, to put it mildly, constitutes a major hurdle for any preemptive strikes against nascent impact threats.

FOREWARNED IS FOREARMED

The emerging calculus is formidable indeed: Protecting ourselves from the most numerous and tricky (and thus most dangerous) space rocks requires more than making shots in the dark, especially when each “shot” is a multimillion-dollar deflection attempt. Ensuring **success** requires first scouting out the threat to learn any given space rock’s exact mass and ability to absorb a weighty impact.

Some of that work [can be done from Earth](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/are-we-doing-enough-to-protect-earth-from-asteroids/), but as Dimorphos is deviously demonstrating, **tiny objects** are hard targets for remote studies. It is far better—albeit more difficult—to get up close and personal with any adversarial asteroid before trying to hit it at all. This was, in fact, ESA’s original plan, before schedule slips ensured that its reconnaissance spacecraft would arrive only after DART’s dramatic impact. In the future, miniaturized kinetic impactors could even be sent alongside scientific scouting missions, meant to merely nudge target asteroids to estimate how they would respond to more powerful deflective blows. “We have to go and characterize them better **before** we rest humanity’s fate in that one golden shot,” de Weck says.

#### Asteroid collisions cause extinction and nuclear miscalc

Baum 19 (Executive director of the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute, “Risk-Risk Tradeoff Analysis of Nuclear Explosives for Asteroid Deflection,” *Risk Analysis*, vol. 39, no. 11 (November 2019), p.2427-2442)DR 22

The most severe asteroid collisions and nuclear wars can cause global environmental effects. The core mechanism is the transport of particulate matter into the stratosphere, where it can spread worldwide and remain aloft for years or decades. Large asteroid collisions create large quantities of dust and large fireballs; the fire heats the dust so that some portion of it rises into the stratosphere. The largest collisions, such as the 10km Chicxulub impactor, can also eject debris from the collision site into space; upon reentry into the atmosphere, the debris heats up enough to spark global fires (Toon, Zahnle, Morrison, Turco, & Covey, 1997). The fires are a major impact in their own right and can send additional smoke into the stratosphere. For nuclear explosions, there is also a fireball and smoke, in this case from the burning of cities or other military targets. While in the stratosphere, the particulate matter blocks sunlight and destroys ozone (Toon et al., 2007). The ozone loss increases the amount of ultraviolet radiation reaching the surface, causing skin cancer and other harms (Mills, Toon, Turco, Kinnison, & Garcia, 2008). The blocked sunlight causes abrupt cooling of Earth’s surface and in turn reduced precipitation due to a weakened hydrological cycle. The cool, dry, and dark conditions reduce plant growth. Recent studies use modern climate and crop models to examine the effects for a hypothetical India Pakistan nuclear war scenario with 100 weapons (50 per side) each of 15KT yield. The studies find **ag**riculture declines in the range of approximately 2% to 50% depending on the crop and location.11 Another study compares the crop data to existing poverty and malnourishment and estimates that the crop declines could threaten starvation for two billion people (Helfand, 2013). However, the aforementioned studies do not account for new nuclear explosion fire simulations that find approximately five times less particulate matter reaching the stratosphere, and correspondingly weaker global environmental effects (Reisner et al., 2018). Note also that the 100 weapon scenario used in these studies is not the largest potential scenario. Larger nuclear wars and large asteroid collisions could cause greater harm. The largest asteroid collisions could even **reduce sunlight below the minimum needed for vision** (Toon et al., 1997). Asteroid risk analyses have proposed that the global environmental disruption from large collisions could cause one billion deaths (NRC, 2010) or the death of 25% of all humans (Chapman, 2004; Chapman & Morrison, 1994; Morrison, 1992), though these figures have not been rigorously justified (Baum, 2018a). The harms from asteroid collisions and nuclear wars can also include important secondary effects. The **food shortages** from severe global environmental disruption could lead to infectious disease outbreaks as public health conditions deteriorate (Helfand, 2013). Law and order could be lost in at least some locations as people struggle for survival (Maher & Baum, 2013). Today’s complex global political-economic system already shows fragility to shocks such as the 2007- 2008 financial crisis (Centeno, Nag, Patterson, Shaver, & Windawi, 2015); an asteroid collision or nuclear war could be an extremely large shock. The systemic consequences of a nuclear war would be further worsened by the likely loss of major world cities that serve as important hubs in the global economy. Even a single detonation in nuclear terrorism would have ripple effects across the global political-economic system (similar to, but likely larger than, the response prompted by the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001). It is possible for asteroid collisions to cause nuclear war. An asteroid explosion could be misinterpreted as a **nuclear attack**, prompting nuclear attack that is believed to be retaliation. For example, the 2013 Chelyabinsk event occurred near an important Russian military installation, prompting concerns about the event’s interpretation (Harris et al., 2015)

## Case

### Hedge

#### 1AR theory is skewed towards the aff – a) the 2NR must cover substance and over-cover theory, since they get the collapse and persuasive spin advantage of the 3min 2AR, b) their responses to my counter interp will be new, which means 1AR theory necessitates intervention. Implications – a) reject 1AR theory since it can’t be a legitimate check for abuse, b) drop the arg to minimize the chance the round is decided unfairly

### Framing

#### Moral uncertainty means preventing extinction should be our highest priority. **Bostrom** **12** [Nick Bostrom. Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford. “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy (2012)] <https://www.existential-risk.org/concept.html#:~:text=Existential%20Risk%20Prevention%20as%20Global%20Priority%20ABSTRACT%3A%20Existential,in%20net%20existential%20risk%20have%20enormous%20expected%20value.> These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate.¶ Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving — and ideally improving — our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value. To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

#### They’re wrong about cognitive biases – we’re naturally prone to underestimate existential risks.

GPP 17 (Global Priorities Project, Future of Humanity Institute at the University of Oxford, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, “Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance,” Global Priorities Project, 2017, <https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf>,

1.3. WHY EXISTENTIAL RISKS MAY BE SYSTEMATICALLY UNDERINVESTED IN, AND THE ROLE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY In spite of the importance of existential risk reduction, it probably receives less attention than is warranted. As a result, concerted international cooperation is required if we are to receive adequate protection from existential risks. 1.3.1. Why existential risks are likely to be underinvested in There are several reasons why existential risk reduction is likely to be underinvested in. Firstly, it is a global public good. Economic theory predicts that such goods tend to be underprovided. The benefits of existential risk reduction are widely and indivisibly dispersed around the globe from the countries responsible for taking action. Consequently, a country which reduces existential risk gains only a small portion of the benefits but bears the full brunt of the costs. Countries thus have strong incentives to free ride, receiving the benefits of risk reduction without contributing. As a result, too few do what is in the common interest. Secondly, as already suggested above, existential risk reduction is an intergenerational public good: most of the benefits are enjoyed by future generations who have no say in the political process. For these goods, the problem is temporal free riding: the current generation enjoys the benefits of inaction while future generations bear the costs. Thirdly, many existential risks, such as machine superintelligence, engineered pandemics, and solar geoengineering, pose an unprecedented and uncertain future threat. Consequently, it is hard to develop a satisfactory governance regime for them: there are few existing governance instruments which can be applied to these risks, and it is unclear what shape new instruments should take. In this way, our position with regard to these emerging risks is comparable to the one we faced when nuclear weapons first became available. Cognitive biases also lead people to underestimate existential risks. Since there have not been any catastrophes of this magnitude, these risks are not salient to politicians and the public.72 This is an example of the misapplication of the availability heuristic, a mental shortcut which assumes that something is important only if it can be readily recalled. Another cognitive bias affecting perceptions of existential risk is scope neglect. In a seminal 1992 study, three groups were asked how much they would be willing to pay to save 2,000, 20,000 or 200,000 birds from drowning in uncovered oil ponds. The groups answered $80, $78, and $88, respectively.73 In this case, the size of the benefits had little effect on the scale of the preferred response. People become numbed to the effect of saving lives when the numbers get too large. 74 Scope neglect is a particularly acute problem for existential risk because the numbers at stake are so large. Due to scope neglect, decision-makers are prone to treat existential risks in a similar way to problems which are less severe by many orders of magnitude. A wide range of other cognitive biases are likely to affect the evaluation of existential risks.75

### Advantage

#### They never read a terminal impact to inequality but either way they can’t solve – it’s inevitable.

Gobry 16 — Pascal-Emmanuel Gobry, 5-20-2016, Accessed: 10-1-2017, "Is inequality inevitable?" No Publication, http://theweek.com/articles/625010/inequality-inevitable

This might be the most depressing finding in social science. A new study tried to assess intergenerational mobility by looking at last names and found the highest earners in Florence in 2011 were the descendants of the highest earners in the year 1427, nearly 600 years earlier. Social mobility, or the lack thereof, persisted "despite the huge political, demographic, and economic upheavals that occurred between the two dates." Lest you think this problem is quarantined to Italy, let me assure you: It is not. There have been similar findings across various countries that possess vastly different cultures, histories, and political and economic systems, including Sweden, England, the U.S., and even China, in spite of the Maoist revolution. Those of us in the modern democratic West tend to think intergenerational mobility is desirable and achievable. Sure, social stratification exists, but, we think, with just the right policy tweaks, we can ensure every child at the bottom rung has a shot at joining, if not the 1 percent, then at least the 10 percent. But what if social mobility on a large scale simply isn't possible? If Chairman Mao, who sent his country's entire elite to death camps and labor camps, couldn't shuffle the deck, do you really think Bernie Sanders will? Regardless of circumstances, people with the money will always have the power to pass on their privilege, whether that power takes the form of actual political power, or money, or status, or social capital and social networks, or human capital.

#### Inequality increases without free trade and Neoliberalism

Obhof, Graduate of Yale Law School, 2003

(“WHY GLOBALIZATION? A LOOK AT GLOBAL CAPITALISM AND ITS EFFECTS”. University of Florida Journal of Law & Public Policy. Fall 2003)

B. Openness and Between-Country Inequality Has globalization led to greater inequality between developed and developing countries? That depends on how one interprets the question. Data indicates that globalization may have decreased income inequality between developed and globalizing developing countries. During the 1990s, per capita income grew faster in developing countries that were open to international trade than in developed countries by a ratio of more than two-to-one. n71 Per capita income experienced little or no growth, however, in countries that did not globalize. The income gap therefore increased between non-globalizing, undeveloped countries and developed countries. The difference in performance between globalizing and non-globalizing countries accounts for the general lack of convergence between rich and poor countries taken together.

#### Capitalism is sustainable - Tech Innovation drives dematerialization that makes Cap Sustainable AND solves warming

McAfee 19, Andrew. More from Less: The Surprising Story of How We Learned to Prosper Using Fewer Resources—and What Happens Next. Scribner, 2019. Props to DML for finding. (Cofounder and codirector of the MIT Initiative on the Digital Economy at the MIT Sloan School of Management, former professor at Harvard Business School)//Elmer

The decreases in resource use, pollution, and other exploitations of the earth cataloged in the preceding chapters are great news. But are they going to last? It could be that we're just living in a pleasant interlude between the Industrial Era and another rapacious period during which we massively increase our footprint on our planet and eventually cause a giant Malthusian crash. It could be, but I don't think so. Instead, I think we're going to take better care of our planet from now on. I'm confident that the Second Machine Age will mark the time in our history when we started to progressively and permanently tread more lightly on the earth, taking less from it and generally caring for it better, even as we humans continue to become more numerous and prosperous. The work of Paul Romer, who shared the 2018 Nobel Prize in economics, is one of the sources of this confidence. Growth Mindset Romer's largest contribution to economics was to show that **it's best not to think of new technologies as something that companies buy and bring in from the outside, but instead as something they create themselves** (the title of his most famous paper, published in 1990, is "Endogenous Technological Change"). These technologies are like designs or recipes; as Romer put it, they’re "the instructions that we follow for combining raw materials." This is close to the definitions of technology presented in chapter 7. Why do companies invent and improve technologies? Simply, to generate profits. They come up with instructions, recipes, and blueprints that will let them grow revenues or shrink costs. As we saw repeatedly in chapter 7, capitalism provides ample incentive for this kind of tech progress. So far, all this seems like a pretty standard argument for how the first two horsemen work together. Romer's brilliance was to highlight the importance of two key attributes of the technological ideas companies come up with as they pursue profits. The first is that they're nonrival, meaning that they can be used by more than one person or company at a time, and that they don't get used up. This is obviously not the case for most resources made out of atoms—I can't also use the pound of steel that you've just incorporated into the engine of a car—but it is the case for ideas and instructions. The Pythagorean theorem, a design for a steam engine, and a recipe for delicious chocolate chip cookies aren't ever going to get "used up" no matter how much they're used. The second important aspect of corporate technologies is that they're partially excludable. This means that companies can kind of prevent others from using them. They do this by keeping the technologies secret (such as the exact recipe for Coca-Cola), filing for patents and other intellectual-property protection, and so on. However, none of these measures is perfect (hence the words partially and kind of). Trade secrets leak. Patents expire, and even before they expire, they must describe the invention they're claiming and so let others study it. Partial excludability is a beautiful thing. It provides strong incentives for companies to create useful, profit-enhancing new technologies that they alone can benefit from for a time, yet it also ensures that the **new techs will eventually "spill over**"—that with time they’ll diffuse and get adopted by more and more companies, even if that's not what their originators want. Romer equated tech progress to the production by companies of nonrivalrous, partially excludable ideas and showed that these ideas cause an economy to grow. What's more, he also demonstrated that this **idea-fueled growth** doesn't have to slow down with time. It's **not constrained by** the size of the **labor** force, the amount of natural **resources**, or other such factors. Instead, economic growth is limited only by the idea-generating capacity of the people within a market. Romer called this capacity "human capital" and said at the end of his 1990 paper, "The most interesting positive implication of the model is that an economy with a larger total stock of human capital will experience faster growth." This notion, which has come to be called "increasing returns to scale," is as powerful as it is counterintuitive. Most formal models of economic growth, as well as the informal mental ones most of us walk around with, feature decreasing returns—growth slows down as the overall economy gets bigger. This makes intuitive sense; it just feels like it would be easier to experience 5 percent growth in a $1 billion economy than a $1 trillion one. But Romer showed that as long as that economy continued to add to its human capital—the overall ability of its people to come up with new technologies and put them to use—it could actually grow faster even as it grew bigger. This is because the stock of useful, nonrivalrous, nonexcludable ideas would keep growing. As Romer convincingly showed, economies run and grow on ideas. The Machinery of Prosperity Romer's ideas should leave us optimistic about the planetary benefits of digital tools—hardware, software, and networks—for three main reasons. First, countless examples show us how good these tools are at fulfilling the central role of technology, which is to provide "instructions that we follow for combining raw materials." Since raw materials cost money, profit-maximizing companies are particularly keen to find ways to use fewer of them. So they use digital tools to come up with beer cans that use less aluminum, car engines that use less steel and less gas, mapping software that removes the need for paper atlases, and so on and so on. None of this is done solely for the good of the earth—it's done for the pursuit of profit that's at the heart of capitalism—yet it benefits the planet by, as we've seen, causing us to take less from it. Digital tools are technologies for creating technologies, the most prolific and versatile ones we've ever come up with. They're machines for coming up with ideas. Lots of them. The same piece of computer-aided design software can be used to create a thinner aluminum can or a lighter and more fuel-efficient engine. A drone can be used to scan farmland to see if more irrigation is needed, or to substitute for a helicopter when filming a movie. A smartphone can be used to read the news, listen to music, and pay for things, all without consuming a single extra molecule. In the Second Machine Age, the global stock of digital tools is increasing much more quickly than ever before. It's being used in countless ways by profit-hungry companies to combine raw materials in ways that use fewer of them. In advanced economies such as America's, the cumulative impact of this combination of capitalism and tech progress is clear: **absolute dematerialization** of the economy and society, **and thus a smaller footprint on our planet**. The second way Romer's ideas about technology and growth are showing up at present is via decreased excludability. Pervasive digital tools are making it much easier for good designs and recipes to spread around the world. While this is often not what a company wants—it wants to exclude others from its great cost-saving idea— excludability is not as easy as it used to be. This isn't because of weaker patent protection, but instead because of stronger digital tools. Once one company shows what's possible, others use hardware, software, and networks to catch up to the leader. Even if they can't copy exactly because of intellectual-property restrictions, they can use digital tools to explore other means to the same end. So, many farmers learn to get higher yields while using less water and fertilizer, even though they combine these raw materials in different ways. Steve Jobs would certainly have preferred for Apple to be the only provider of smartphones after it developed the iPhone, but he couldn't maintain the monopoly no matter how many patents and lawsuits he filed. Other companies found ways to combine processors, memory, sensors, a touch screen, and software into phones that satisfied billions of customers around the world. The operating system that powers most non-Apple smartphones is Android, which is both free to use and freely modifiable. Google's parent company, Alphabet, developed and released Android without even trying to make it excludable; the explicit goal was to make it as widely imitable as possible. This is an example of the broad trend across digital industries of giving away valuable technologies for free. The Linux operating system, of which Android is a descendant, is probably the best-known example of free and open-source software, but there are many others. The online software repository GitHub maintains that it's "the largest open source community in the world" and hosts millions of projects. The Arduino community does something similar for electronic hardware, and the Instructables website contains detailed instructions for making equipment ranging from air-particle counters to machine tools, all with no intellectual-property protection. Contributors to efforts such as these have a range of motivations (Alphabet's goals with Android were far from purely altruistic—among other things, the parent of Google wanted to achieve a quantum leap in mobile phone users around the world, who would avail themselves of Google Search and services such as YouTube), but they're all part of the trend of technology without excludability, which is great news for growth. As we saw in chapter 10, smartphone use and access to the Internet are increasing quickly across the planet. This means that people no longer need to be near a decent library or school to gain knowledge and improve their abilities. Globally, people are taking advantage of the skill-building opportunities of new technologies. This is the third reason that the spread of digital tools should make us optimistic about future growth: these tools are helping human capital grow quickly. The free Duolingo app, for example, is now the world's most popular way to learn a second language. Of the nearly 15 billion Wikipedia page views during July of 2018, half were in languages other than English. Google's chief economist, Hal Varian, points out that hundreds of millions of how-to videos are viewed every day on YouTube, saying, "We never had a technology before that could educate such a broad group of people anytime on an as-needed basis for free." Romer's work leaves me hopeful because it shows that it's our ability to build human capital, rather than chop down forests, dig mines, or burn fossil fuels that drives growth and prosperity. His model of how economies grow also reinforces how well capitalism and tech progress work together, which is a central point of this book. The surest way to boost profits is to cut costs, and modern technologies, especially digital ones, offer unlimited ways to combine and recombine materials—to swap, slim, optimize, and evaporate—in cost-reducing ways. **There's no reason to expect that the two horsemen of capitalism and tech progress will stop** riding together anytime soon. Quite the contrary. Romer's insights reveal that they're likely to gallop faster and farther as economies grow. Our Brighter, Lighter Future The world still has billions of desperately poor people, but they won't remain that way. All available evidence strongly suggests that most will become much wealthier in the years and decades ahead. As they earn more and consume more, what will be the impact on the planet? The history and economics of the Industrial Era lead to pessimism on this important question. Resource use increased in lockstep with economic growth throughout the two centuries between James Watt's demonstration of his steam engine and the first Earth Day. Malthus and Jevons seemed to be right, and it was just a question of when, not if, we'd run up against the hard planetary limits to growth. But in America and other rich countries something strange, unexpected, and wonderful happened: we started getting more from less. We decoupled population and economic growth from resource consumption, pollution, and other environmental harms. Malthus's and Jevons's ideas gave way to Romer's, and the world will never be the same. This means that instead of worrying about the world's poor becoming richer, we should instead be helping them upgrade economically as much and as quickly as possible. Not only is it the morally correct thing to do, it's also the smart move for our planet. As today’s poor countries get richer, their institutions will improve and most will eventually go through what Ricardo Hausmann calls "the capitalist makeover of production." This makeover doesn't enslave people, nor does it befoul the earth. As today’s poor get richer, they'll consume more, but they'll also consume much differently from earlier generations. They won't read physical newspapers and magazines. They'll get a great deal of their power from renewables and (one hopes) nuclear because these energy sources will be the cheapest. They’ll live in cities, as we saw in chapter 12; in fact, they already are. They'll be less likely to own cars because a variety of transportation options will be only a few taps away. Most important, they'll come up with ideas that keep the growth going, and that benefit both humanity and the planet we live on. Predicting exactly how technological progress will unfold is much like predicting the weather: feasible in the short term, but impossible over a longer time. Great uncertainty and complexity prevent precise forecasts about, for example, the computing devices we’ll be using thirty years from now or the dominant types of artificial intelligence in 2050 and beyond. But even though we can't predict the weather long term, we can accurately forecast the climate. We know how much warmer and sunnier it will be on average in August than in January, for example, and we know that global average temperatures will rise as we keep adding greenhouse gases to the atmosphere. Similarly, we can predict the "climate" of future technological progress by starting from the knowledge that it will be heavily applied in the areas where it can affect capitalism the most. As we've seen over and over, tech progress supplies opportunities to trim costs (and improve performance) via dematerialization, and capitalism provides the motive to do so. As a result, the Second Enlightenment will continue as we move deeper into the twenty-first century. I'm confident that it will accelerate as digital technologies continue to improve and multiply and global competition continues to increase. We’ll see some of the most striking examples of slim, swap, evaporate, and optimize in exactly the places where the opportunities are biggest. Here are a few broad predictions, spanning humanity's biggest industries. Manufacturing. Complex parts will be made not by the techniques developed during the Industrial Era, but instead by three- dimensional printing. This is already the case for some rocket engines and other extremely expensive items. **As 3-D printing** improves and becomes cheaper, it will spread to automobile engine blocks, manifolds and other complicated arrangements of pipes, airplane struts and wings, and countless other parts. Because 3-D printing **generates virtually no waste** and doesn't require massive molds, it accelerates dematerialization.

#### Technocracy and scientific expertise are good– they direct us towards most efficient outcomes and eliminate unnecessary production.

Chai 5 (Andreas, Evolutionary Economics Unit, Max Planck Institute for Research into Economic Systems, “Menger’s theory of ‘imaginary goods’ and the historical emergence of British medical experts”, https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/view/4601020/mengers-theory-of-imaginary-goods-and-the-historical-emergence-)

For Menger, all things are subject to the laws of cause and effect (Menger 1950:51). But which cause and which effect? A fundamental prerequisite to understanding why people consume certain things is to first comprehend how they learn to associate these things to certain consequences, and how the strength of such associations change over time. Rather than define a good as anything that is exchanged on a market, he defined a good as anything that can be causally associated with the servicing of human wants (Menger 1950:2). In this way, what is and what is not a good is not constant or set over time, rather things can loose their ‘goods characteristics’ according to what consumers know, learn and do (Menger, 1950:56). Acts of consumption can become complex since a thing does not need to serve a human want directly in order to be considered a good, rather it can become a ‘indirect good’ by serving as a input into a transformation process which results in the production of final goods (Menger, 1950). This is problematic because whether or not such a indirect good is used successfully depends on not only its objective characteristics but on the consumers ability to use and transform it as well as the other higher order goods that are simultaneously used in the transformation. For example, a consumer may know how to operate a mobile telephone which may be in perfect working order, but if she is outside the network’s range, the phone is useless to the consumer. Similarly, if the consumer does not have the adequate knowledge to engage in a mobile phone contract, the phone will remain a ‘thing’ rather than a ‘good’. Menger also recognized that the duration it takes to consume is not just a costly input, but also complicates the act of discerning what the causal associations are between goods and observed effects (Menger, 1950:68). Hence, complexity increases the possibility of consumers making errors and mistakes in their decisions. In this way, the degree of complexity which the consumer faces exponentially increases the more goods she uses and the more knowledge and command these require, as well as the time taken between engaging in a transformation and observing its results. Juxtaposing his approach to both the neoclassical and institutional methods of studying consumption change, there are simultaneously some interesting similarities and notable differences to observe. Both Lancaster (Lancaster, 1966) as well as Stigler and Becker (Stigler and Becker, 1977) make an important start in capturing the transformative nature of consumption by specifying that utility is not a direct function of market goods consumed, but rather a function of final goods which are produced from market goods. This enables scholars to study how consumption patterns change with the introduction of new goods (Bianchi, 2002). However some problems still exist. While a transformation does occur, it is not one that addresses how a thing becomes a good, since the model starts with specifying given goods that can be changed with full certainty into final goods (Ruprecht, 2002). Furthermore, these models do not fully take into account the impact of increasing complexity that results from an increase in the number of inputs used. Other than perhaps affecting how much time it takes to consume, the actual number of inputs used, their complexity and how they relate to each other are not explicitly accounted for. Indeed the way such models treat time as just another input is itself questionable (Steedman, 2001). In this sense Menger seriously challenges economists to study consumption as a phenomena that is not just related to price and income effects, but also related to how consumer actually learn to consume and make associations between goods and their effects. In comparison to institutionalist approaches, Menger’s systematic examination of consumption via the law of cause and effect bring into question their tendency to simply rely on social influences to explain the nature of consumer behavior (Trigg, 2001). Yet at the same time, Menger does recognize that certain institutions do play an important role in guiding consumer behavior. Specifically, he suggests that the scientific knowledge that comes with economic development improves consumer’s welfare by promoting those consumption technologies which are in some sense relatively more ‘objectively accurate’(Menger, 1950:53). Such progress will essentially wipe out those goods that are consumed on pretenses that are essentially false, such as aphrodisiacs, love potions and amulets. These he labeled ‘imaginary goods’ and argued that they occur when 1) attributes are erroneously ascribed to things that do not really posses them, or 2) when non-existent human needs are mistakenly thought to exist. Notably, in the first category he mentions ‘the majority of medicines administered to the sick by peoples of early civilization’ and in the second category he mentions ‘medicines for diseases that do not actually exist’ (Menger 1950:53). Without doubt, experts play an important role in influencing contemporary consumption patterns. Studying how consumers react to information from other consumers and experts has been widely explored both in the optimizing framework (Akerlof, 1980;Banerjee, 1993;Bikhchandani et al., 1992;Conlisk, 1980;Nelson, 1970;Rosen, 1981) as well as from a more heterodox perspective (Cowan et al., 1997;Mokyr, 2002;Morlacchi, 2004;Rogers, 1962). Beyond economics, many scholars point out that how agents coordinate learning is not only vital to understanding economic behavior, but also to accounting for how civilizations evolve and function in general (Bandura, 1986;Richerson and Boyd, 2004). Continuing Menger’s concern for how consumers cope in increasingly complex environments, it has been postulated that the growing predominance of service industries reflects a greater role for experts in forming ‘low level consumption preferences’ (Earl and Potts, 2004). Consequently such conditions have been argued to both stimulate and require greater coordination between supply and demand (Langlois and Cosgel, 1998;Scitovsky, 1976).

#### Musk plans for a direct democracy on Mars to reduce corruption.

Freeman 12/31. [staff writer at Outsider] 31 December 2021. Outsider. “Here’s How Elon Musk Says a New Government on Mars Should Work” Accessed 2 February 2022. <https://outsider.com/news/entertainment/elon-musk-new-government-mars-should-work/> //L. Su

Elon Musk is a big advocate for landing on Mars and getting us there soon. However, something that isn’t often discussed is what government there will be like. Recently, he disclosed his thoughts on how it should operate. Appearing on the Lex Fridman podcast, Elon Musk and Lex Fridman discussed a variety of subjects. Given Musk prominently mentioning Mars, Fridman brought up landing on the planet. In this case though, merely landing there was glossed over and harder-hitting questions came up, like the government. Though Musk expressed wanting similarities to the United States, he stated wanting a more direct, efficient system of laws and voting. The first thing Musk discusses is representation. “I mean, I would suggest having a direct democracy, like people vote directly on things as opposed to representative democracy,” he said. “So, uh, representative democracy I think is too subject to a special interest and you know, a coercion of the politicians and that kind of thing.” Along those lines, he suggests people directly have a say regarding laws rather than electing representatives. Additionally, the laws must be short enough people can understand them. Fridman then talks about transparency and the government being completely open with everything so people make informed decisions. Another big point Musk mentions is the lifespan of laws. He states the US has methods of easily implementing new laws, but not eliminating old, archaic ones. Simply put, some laws overstay their welcome and become a hindrance. So, he suggests there being an active process for removing old laws and when voting to remove laws, it takes fewer votes than to approve one. For instance, a new law may need 60 percent of voter support while removing one may only need 40 percent.

#### Guess who’s working on decarbonizing space flight? It’s the capitalists! Err neg – there’s no explanation as to how socialism can create the tech outlined in Roberts 21.

#### Carbon capture for space flight coming now.

**Whittington 1/9**. [MARK R. WHITTINGTON, OPINION CONTRIBUTOR] 9 January 2022. The Hill. “SpaceX's Elon Musk is going into the carbon capture business.” Accessed 24 January 2022. <https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/588784-spacexs-elon-musk-is-going-into-the-carbon-capture-business> //L. Su

In any case, Musk is interested in developing both the carbon capture from the air and the Sabatier technologies for his planned Mars settlement. The idea is to capture CO2 from the Martian atmosphere, hydrogen from water ice, and then convert them to rocket fuel for spacecraft headed back to Earth from the Red Planet.  Musk has funded a $100 million X-Prize to encourage development of carbon capture technologies, noting that “to win the grand prize, teams must demonstrate a working solution at a scale of at least 1000 tonnes removed per year; model their costs at a scale of 1 million tonnes per year; and show a pathway to achieving a scale of gigatonnes per year in future.”   If and when a direct air capture solution is achieved, a win-win result will have been achieved. Human civilization will have available one or more technologies that will go a long way toward solving the climate crisis. Musk will have a source of CO2 to make his own rocket fuel and continue pursuing his grand design to build a Mars settlement, not to mention taking humans back to the moon and a number of other goals.

**Capitalism solves environmental crisis - industrial development, technological advances, and any alternative fails**

Zitelmann 20 [(Dr. Rainer, a historian and sociologist. He is also a world-renowned author, successful businessman and real estate investor. Zitelmann has written a total of 24 books and has a doctorate in political science and sociology) “‘System Change Not Climate Change’: Capitalism And Environmental Destruction” Forbes, 7/13/2020] BC

The Price Of Growth—Destruction Of The Environment? But isn’t there a price for this growth: environment devastation? Of course, nobody would deny that industrialization causes environmental problems. *Bu*t the assertion that growth automatically leads to ever accelerating environmental degradation is simply false. Yale University’s Environmental Performance Index (EPI) uses 16 indicators to rank countries on environmental health, air quality, water, biodiversity, natural resources and pollution. These indicators have been selected to reflect both the current baseline and the dynamics of national ecosystems. One of the Index’s most striking findings is that there is a strong correlation between a state’s wealth and its environmental performance. Most developed capitalist countries achieve high environmental standards. Those countries with the worst EPI scores, such as Ethiopia, Mali, Mauritania, Chad and Niger, are all poor. They have both low investment capacity for infrastructure, including water and sanitation, and tend to have weak environmental regulatory authorities. Contrary to prevailing perceptions, industrial development and technological advances have contributed significantly to relieving the burden on the environment. Both Indur Goklany in his book The Improving State of the World and Steven Pinker in chapter ten (“The Environment”) of his book Enlightenment Now demonstrate that we are not only living longer, healthier lives in unprecedented prosperity, but we are also doing so on a comparatively clean planet. Researchers have confirmed that economic freedom—in other words, more capitalism—leads to higher, not lower, environmental quality. Every year, the Heritage Foundation compiles its Index of Economic Freedom, which analyzes individual levels of economic freedom, and thus capitalism, in countries around the world. The Heritage Foundation’s researchers also measure the correlation between each country’s environmental performance and its economic freedom. The results couldn’t be clearer: the world’s most economically free countries achieve the highest environmental performance rankings with an average score of 76.1, followed by the countries that are “mostly free,” which score an average of 69.5. In stark contrast, the economically “repressed” and “mostly unfree” countries all score less than 50 for environmental performance. Is Government The Best Solution To Environmental Problems? Anti-capitalists frequently claim that central government is the best solution to environmental problems. And there is no doubt that state regulations to safeguard the environment are important. But state regulations, cited by anti-capitalists as a panacea for environmental issues, often achieve the opposite of what they were intended to do. Hardly any other country in the world touts its green credentials as much as Germany. According to even the most conservative estimates, Germany’s so-called “energy transition” is set to cost a total of almost €500 billion by 2025. But the results of this massive investment is sobering, as an analysis by McKinsey reveals, “Germany is set to miss several key energy transition targets for the year 2020, and the country’s high power supply security is at risk unless new generation capacity and grid infrastructure are built in time for the coal and nuclear exit and electrification of transportation networks is accelerated.” For decades, environmentalists in Germany focused on shutting down nuclear power plants. However, the phasing out of nuclear power has left Germany in a poor position in terms of CO2 emissions compared to other countries. It is not without good reason that Germany’s energy policy has been described as the dumbest in the world. The latest generation of nuclear power plants are much safer than their predecessors. Despite what environmentalists might claim, impartial calculations have confirmed that it is impossible to meet the world’s energy needs from solar and wind power alone. Enlightened environmentalists are therefore now calling for nuclear power to be rightfully included in the fight against climate change. And yet, this is precisely what is being prevented in Germany by politicians—not capitalism. This example, just one of many, shows that government environmental policy is often ineffective. In some instances, it even achieves the opposite of what it was originally intended to, i.e. it exacerbates existing environmental problems. It is also wrong to think that capitalism necessarily leads to ever greater waste of limited natural resources. Just take the smartphone for example, one of the most environmentally friendly of capitalism’s many achievements. With just one small device, a whole plethora of devices that used to consume resources in the past, such as the telephone, camera, calculator, navigation system, dictation machine, alarm clock, flashlight and many others, have been replaced. Smartphones also help to reduce the consumption of paper as many people choose not to take notes on paper and, for example, use their iPhone instead of a calendar to enter appointments. Those who call for “system change” instead of “climate change” do not usually say which system they would prefer. All they are really sure of is that any new system should not be based on free market economics and that the state should play the decisive role. The simple fact is that socialism has failed in every country every time it has been tried—and socialism has damaged the environment more than any capitalist system. Murray Feshbach documents examples of the environmental destruction wrought by socialism in his book Ecological Disaster. Cleaning Up the Hidden Legacy of the Soviet Regime. As the book progresses through chapters such as “A Nuclear Plague,” “Dying Lakes, Rivers, and Inland Seas” and “Pollution of the Air and Land,” it becomes clear that this non-capitalist system was responsible for the greatest environmental destruction in history. Anti-capitalists may well reply that they do not want a system like the Soviet Union. And yet, they cannot name a single real-world system—at any time in the history of mankind—that provides better environmental solutions than capitalism.

#### **It’s try or die for mining – the aff guarantees conflict over the limited resources on Earth but space is nearly infinite.**

Smith 21. [Fisher Smith is a second year law student at the University of Mississippi where he is currently part of the Space Law concentration program. Additionally, he is part of the Ole Miss Trial Advocacy Board and a junior staff editor on the Air and Space Law Journal at the university. Since he was a child, Fisher has always been interested in science and outer space. Whether the thrilling adventures of Luke Skywalker in Star Wars, the exploration of the cosmos by Captain Kirk in Star Trek, or the boundless possibilities created in Isaac Asimov’s stories, outer space has been a world of wonder for Fisher. Throughout his undergraduate studies at Rhodes College, Fisher focused his Political Science and International Studies interests towards outer space policies. These research interests showed him that by cooperating as a multinational community, humanity can harness outer space to improve conditions here on Earth. This interest in outer space possibilities led him to the Air and Space Law Society at Ole Miss, and he hopes to use these motivations to aid the NSS mission.] 5 January 2021. National Space Society. “To Space—To save the Earth” Accessed 29 January 2022. <<https://space.nss.org/to-space-to-save-the-earth/>> //L. Su

Why should we spend the money, effort and time focusing on outer space exploration and development? After all, it’s a very expensive process to get resources, people and infrastructure into space. Wouldn’t that money be better spent elsewhere? As it turns out the money and time we spend developing outer space can create substantial benefits for our terrestrial world, benefits that we can’t get here on Earth, and I believe that will more than offset the cost of space development. The world we live in is shaped by a number of forces. In the last few decades, we’ve become more technologically advanced through the advent of computer technology, and that technology has become the basis of our interactions with society (especially so during COVID-19 lockdowns and quarantines). As technology advances, the materials (such as rare-earth elements) that we need to build and maintain that technology become **more heavily used**. **Tensions between the major political powers on the Earth continue to rise** as competition over these resources, namely energy-generating resources and **rare minerals, continue to shape international conflict**. Each of these areas shape our world, and each presents a problem. In many ways, they each share a solution: expansion into outer space. We can solve the problem of limited resources connected to our technological advances by sourcing materials from beyond the Earth. Our planet is formed from the same stellar material as every other celestial body in our solar system. That means that many of the same resources found here on Earth can be found elsewhere in the solar system, in some cases in far richer ores. The National Space Society (NSS) notes that near-Earth asteroids are prime targets for resource mining efforts. From these asteroids, we can recover and transport the raw materials we require on Earth; and we can refine them in space too. By obtaining and then processing resources in outer space, we could almost completely remove the environmental impact of such activities on the planet we live on. Not only would outer space development ensure that supplies of vital minerals continue, but it would also correct some of the environmental strain caused by humanity on our planet. The above discussion demonstrates **outer space’s potential to ameliorate international political strife caused by energy and mineral resource scarcity**. The goal of a government is to protect the interests of itself and its citizens. As nations accumulate power and resources, they use them to gain more power, resources and stability. As more nations seek access to the same, limited resources, conflicts arise. Outer space provides an outlet for these interests. If we turn our attention to space, we can secure access to **potentially infinite resources**.

#### Resource shortages cause war

Frosty Woolridge 9, Former Officer at the US Army Medical Service Corps, “America Galloping Toward Its Greatest Crisis in the 21st Century”, The Examiner, 5-22, http://www.examiner.com/examiner/x-3515-Denver-Political-Issues-Examiner~y2009m5d22-America-galloping-toward-its-greatest-crisis-in-the-21st-century

“It is clear that most politicians and most citizens do not recognize that returning to “more of the same” is a recipe for promoting the first collapse of a global civilization. The required changes in energy technology, which would benefit not only the environment but also national security, public health, and the economy, would demand a World War II type mobilization -- and even that might not prevent a global climate disaster. Without transitioning away from use of fossil fuels, humanity will move further into an era of resource wars (remember, Africom has been added to the Pentagon’s structure -- and China has noticed), clearly with intent to protect US “interests” in petroleum reserves. The consequences of more resource wars, many likely triggered over water supplies stressed by climate disruption, are likely to include increased unrest in poor nations, a proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, widening inequity within and between nations, and in the worst (and not unlikely) case, a nuclear war ending civilization.

#### US leads the private space sector now but other countries sectors are growing— US private sector is key to growth

Harding 7/16 [(Luke, a Guardian foreign correspondent. His book Shadow State is published by Guardian Faber. Click here for Luke's public key) “The space race is back on – but who will win?” The Guardian, 7/16/21. <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2021/jul/16/the-space-race-is-back-on-but-who-will-win>] RR

Half a century on, space has opened up. It is less ideological and a lot more crowded. About 72 countries have space programmes, including India, Brazil, Japan, Canada, South Korea and the UAE. The European Space Agency is active too, while the UK boasts the most private space startups after the US. Space today is also highly commercial. On Sunday Richard Branson flew to the edge of space and back again in his Virgin Galactic passenger rocket. On Tuesday, Branson’s fellow billionaire Jeff Bezos is due to travel in his own reusable craft, New Shepard, built by the Amazon founder’s company Blue Origin and launched from west Texas. Non-state actors play an increasingly important role in space exploration. Elon Musk’s SpaceX vehicles have made numerous flights to the International Space Station (ISS), and since last year they have transported people as well as cargo. Later this year Musk is due to send his own all-civilian crew into orbit – though he isn’t going himself. Even so, space still reflects tensions on Earth. “Astropolitics follows terrapolitics,” says Mark Hilborne, a lecturer in defence studies at King’s College London. Up there anything goes, he adds. “Space governance is a bit fuzzy. Laws are few and very old. They are not written for asteroid mining or for a time when companies dominate.” The biggest challenge to US space supremacy comes not from Russia – heir to the Soviet Union’s pioneering space programme, which launched the Sputnik satellite and got the first human into space in the form of Yuri Gagarin – but from China. In 2011 Congress prohibited US scientists from cooperating with Beijing. Its fear: scientific espionage. Taikonauts are banned from visiting the ISS, which has hosted astronauts from 19 countries over the past 20 years. The station’s future beyond 2028 is uncertain. Its operations may yet be extended in the face of increasing Chinese competition. In its annual threat assessment this April, the office of the US Director of National Intelligence (DNI) described China as a “near-peer competitor” pushing for global power. It warns: “Beijing is working to match or exceed US capabilities in space to gain the military, economic, and prestige benefits that Washington has accrued from space leadership.” The Biden administration suspects Chinese satellites are being used for non-civilian purposes. The People’s Liberation Army integrates reconnaissance and navigation data in military command and control systems, the DNI says. “Satellites are inherently dual use. It’s not like the difference between an F15 fighter jet and a 737 passenger plane,” Hilborne says. Once China completes the Tiangong space station next year, it is likely to invite foreign astronauts to take part in missions. One goal: to build new soft-power alliances. Beijing says interest from other countries is enormous. The low Earth orbit station is part of an ambitious development strategy in the heavens rather than on land – a sort of belt and rocket initiative. According to Alanna Krolikowski, an assistant professor at the Missouri University of Science and Technology, a “bifurcation” of space exploration is under way. In one emerging camp are states led by China and Russia, many of them authoritarian; in the other are democracies and “like-minded” countries aligned with the US. Russia has traditionally worked closely with the Americans, even when terrestrial relations were bad. Now it is moving closer to Beijing. In March, China and Russia announced plans to co-build an international lunar research station. The agreement comes at a time when Vladimir Putin’s government has been increasingly isolated and subject to western sanctions. In June, Putin and his Chinese counterpart Xi Jinping renewed a friendship treaty. Moscow is cosying up to Beijing out of necessity, at a time of rising US-China bipolarity. These rival geopolitical factions are fighting over a familiar mountainous surface: the moon. In 2019 a Chinese rover landed on its far side – a first. China is now planning a mission to the moon’s south pole, to establish a robotic research station and an eventual lunar base, which would be intermittently crewed. Nasa, meanwhile, has said it intends to put a woman and a person of colour on the moon by 2024. SpaceX has been hired to develop a lander. The return to the moon – after the last astronaut, commander Eugene Cernan, said goodbye in December 1972 – would be a staging post for the ultimate “giant leap”, Nasa says: sending astronauts to Mars. Krolikowski is sceptical that China will quickly overtake the US to become the world’s leading spacefaring country. “A lot of what China is doing is a reprisal of what the cold war space programmes did in the 1960s and 1970s,” she said. Beijing’s recent feats of exploration have as much to do with national pride as scientific discovery, she says. But there is no doubting Beijing’s desire to catch up, she adds. “The Chinese government has established, or has plans for, programmes or missions in every major area, whether it’s Mars missions, building mega constellations of telecommunications satellites, or exploring asteroids. There is no single area of space activity they are not involved in.” “We see a tightening of the Russia-China relationship,” Krolikowski says. “In the 1950s the Soviet Union provided a wide range of technical assistance to Beijing. Since the 1990s, however, the Russian space establishment has experienced long stretches of underfunding and stagnation. China now presents it with new opportunities.” Russia is poised to benefit from cost sharing, while China gets deep-rooted Russian technical expertise. At least, that’s the theory. “I’m sceptical this joint space project will materialise anytime soon,” says Alexander​ Gabuev, a senior fellow at the Carnegie Moscow Centre. Gabuev says both countries are “techno-nationalist”. Previous agreements to develop helicopters and wide-bodied aircraft saw nothing actually made, he says. The Kremlin has been a key partner in managing and resupplying the ISS. US astronauts used Russian Soyuz rockets to reach the station, taking off from a cosmodrome in Kazakhstan, after the Space Shuttle programme was phased out. But this epoch seems to be coming to an end as private companies such as SpaceX take over. “I expect US-Russian relations to get worse,” Gabuev says, adding that Americans “no longer need” Russia’s help. Moscow’s state corporation for space activities, Roscosmos, has faced accusations of being more interested in politics than space research. Last month the newspaper Novaya Gazeta reported that Roscosmos’s executive director of manned space programmes, former cosmonaut Sergei Krikalev, had been fired. His apparent crime: questioning an official decision to shoot a film on the Russian section of the ISS. The film, Challenge, is about a female surgeon operating on a cosmonaut in space, and has been backed and financed by Roscosmos . It stars Yulia Peresild, who is due to head to space in October with director Klim Shipenko. The launch seems timed to beat Tom Cruise, who is due to shoot his own movie on board the ISS with director Doug Liman. Krikalev, who spent more than 800 days in space and was in orbit when the USSR collapsed, apparently told Roscomos’s chief, Dmitry Rogozin, that the film was pointless. Rogozin – its co-producer – has called on the west to drop sanctions in return for Russia’s cooperation on space projects. Putin, Rogozin’s boss, appears to not be very interested in other planets, though, and is more concerned with nature and the climate crisis these days. “Space is one of the areas that has traditionally transcended politics. The Mir space station worked at a time of east-west tensions. There was symbolic cooperation. Whether this will continue in the future is really up for debate,” Hilborne says. “The US is very sensitive about what happens in space.” Most observers think the US will remain the world’s pre-eminent space power, thanks to its innovative and flourishing private sector. China’s Soviet-style state programme appears less nimble. Despite ambitious timetables, and billions spent by Beijing, it is unclear when – or even if – an astronaut will return to the moon. The 2030s, perhaps? Will they be American or Chinese? Or from a third country? It may well be that the first person to boldly go again doesn’t merely represent a nation or carry a flag. More likely, they will emerge from a lunar lander wearing a spacesuit with a SpaceX logo on the back – a giant leap not only for mankind, but for galactic marketing.

#### **Government handouts key to keep the US competitive and ensure our dominance in space.**

Lawler 21. [Richard, senior news editor] 9 June 2021. Engadget. “Senate passes competitiveness bill with $52 billion for chip manufacturing.” Accessed 10 February 2021. <https://www.engadget.com/senate-usica-endless-frontier-act-035551920.html> //L. Su

On Tuesday afternoon the Senate passed S.1260, an amended version of Chuck Schumer's Endless Frontier Act that authorizes billions in funding to strengthen US tech and research. Dubbed the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act, it's also intended to build up US manufacturing and tech to compete with options from China, and passed by a 68 - 32 vote. As Reuters notes, of the $190 billion in spending laid out in the bill, more than $50 billion is available to "increase U.S. production and research into semiconductors and telecommunications equipment," with $2 billion focused specifically on chips used by automakers — ones that have been in short supply, stalling production lines across the country. In a tweet after the vote, Schumer said "This legislation will set the United States on a path to out-innovate, out-produce, and out-compete the world in the industries of the future." The original bill proposed last year committed over $100 billion to boost research and create regional technology hubs, however this version has expanded to $250 billion, as Bloomberg notes it's added legislation from a number of committees focusing on competition with China.

#### China circumvents - private Chinese space ventures are subsumed by the public sphere under Xi.

Patel '21 (Neel V. Patel; science and tech journalist, currently working as a senior editor at The Daily Beast and space reporter for MIT Tech Review; 1-21-2021; "China’s surging private space industry is out to challenge the US"; https://www.technologyreview.com/2021/01/21/1016513/china-private-commercial-space-industry-dominance/, MIT Technology Review, accessed 1-14-2022; JPark)

Although China is taking inspiration from the US in building out its private industry, the nature of the Chinese state also means these new companies face obstacles that their rivals in the West don’t have to worry about. While Chinese companies may look private on paper, they must still submit to government guidance and control, and accept some level of interference. It may be difficult for them to make a case to potential overseas customers that they are independent. The distinction between companies that are truly private and those that are more or less state actors is still quite fuzzy, especially if the government is a frequent customer. “That could still lead to a lack of trust from other partners,” says Goswami. It doesn’t help that the government itself is often very cagey about what its national program is even up to. And Hines adds that it’s not always clear exactly how separate these companies are from, say, the People’s Liberation Army, given the historical ties between the space and defense sectors. “Some of these things will pose significant hurdles for the commercial space sector as it tries to expand,” he says.

#### **Losing the space race means losing US heg.**

Weichert 21. [Brandon J. Weichert is the author of “Winning Space: How America Remains a Superpower," from Republic Book Publishers, and a geopolitical analyst who manages The Weichert Report: World News Done Right. He can be followed via Twitter @WeTheBrandon] 13 March 2021. Real Clear Politics. “China and Russia Are Winning the New Space Race” Accessed 31 December 2021. <https://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2021/03/13/china\_and\_russia\_are\_winning\_the\_new\_space\_race\_145394.html#!> //L. Su

Conflict, not cooperation, is going to define international affairs for the foreseeable future. This will be true both on Earth and, more importantly, in the strategic high ground of space. Fact is, the second space race is on. The world’s powers are playing for keeps. Whoever wins the second space race will rule the world. Despite the competitive advantages that the United States has in this arena, America’s rivals — namely Russia and China — are catching up. Unless the Biden administration takes a radical departure from where its nascent space policy is heading, America will lose space and, in so doing, the United States will cease being the world’s superpower. Some people reading this might not understand why it matters if America surrendered space to China. You might be questioning why we should care if the country remains a superpower. But without America’s once unquestionable dominance of space, without access to critical satellites in orbit, the America you and I know would ground to a halt. Everything in our society today relies on signals and those signals must pass through satellites. The U.S. military could not defend itself or American interests abroad nor could everyday life for average Americans continue should U.S. satellites be destroyed or rendered inoperable

**Hegemony solves global nuclear war---decline emboldens China, Russia, and Iran---causes counter-balancing and transition wars**

**Twining, 17** - director of the Asia Program at The German Marshall Fund of the United States, based in Washington, DC, MPhil & PhD degrees from Oxford University (Daniel, "Abandoning the Liberal International Order for a Spheres-of-Influence World is a Trap for America…," *Medium*, 3-21-2017, https://medium.com/out-of-order/abandoning-the-liberal-international-order-for-a-spheres-of-influence-world-is-a-trap-for-america-7bfcdbb83df4)

The liberal world order is **under assault**. Polls suggest an American ambivalence about upholding the rules-based global system. Populists are besieging governing elites in the West while Russia works strategically to destabilize European and American governments through propaganda and proxies. A rising China wants to create a global system that is not U.S.-centric, one in which smaller powers defer to bigger ones and norms of democracy and rule of law do not prevail. Meanwhile, the U.S. alliance system looks adrift while competitors in China and Russia appear to be on the march. If it holds, this trend could produce a **spheres-of-influence world** — which many, including the current presidents of the United States, China, and Russia, find **intuitively attractive**. But were such an order to replace one based on global integration and American leadership in the geopolitical cockpits of Europe and Asia, it would only engender **insecurity** and **conflict**. In a spheres-of-influence world, great powers order their regions. The United States would go back to a “Monroe Doctrine” version of grand strategy; Russia would dominate the former Soviet space; China would govern East Asia, and India South Asia. The problem with this kind of order, however, is several-fold. Too many **spheres overlap** in ways that would **generate conflict** rather than clean lines of responsibility. Japan would oppose Chinese suzerainty in East Asia, including by **developing nuclear weapons**; India and China would **compete vigorously** in Southeast Asia; Russia and China would **contest the resources** and loyalties of Central Asia; Europe and Russia would clash over primacy of Central and Eastern Europe. The Middle East would be an even more likely arena for **hot war** between Saudi Arabia and Iran, and Turkey would contest regions also claimed by Russia, Europe, and possibly China. Russia, like the Soviet Empire before it, would keep pushing west until it met enough hard power to stop it. A spheres of influence world would also **sharpen great power competition** outside of each region