### 1

#### Interp and Violation: The affirmative must only defend th and may only garner offense from the hypothetical implementation of the resolution – they don’t.

#### hold the line, CX and the 1AC prove there’s no I-meet – anything new in the 1AR is either extra-T since it includes the non-topical parts of the Aff or effects-T since it’s a future result of the advocacy which both link to our offense. They should only get offense from a government legalizing a right to strike.

#### Resolved requires policy action

Louisiana State Legislature (<https://www.legis.la.gov/legis/Glossary.aspx>) Ngong

**Resolution**

**A legislative instrument** that generally is **used for** making declarations, **stating policies**, and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; a resolution **uses the term "resolved".** Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor's veto. ( Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11 , 13.1 , 6.8 , and 7.4 and Senate Rules 10.9, 13.5 and 15.1)

#### Reject re-define args 1] obviously doesn’t solve any of our offense 2] multiple definitions means they will always find one that includes their aff

#### [2] Standards to Prefer:

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Fairness – post facto topic adjustment structurally favors the aff by manipulating the balance of prep. They can specialize in 1 area of literature for 4 years which gives them a huge edge over people switching topics every 2 months and locks us into a predictable null set of monolithic criticisms that are susceptible to the perm. Fairness is an impact - a] it’s an intrinsic good – debate is fundamentally a game and some level of competitive equity is necessary to sustain the activity which they’ve ceded validity to by participating, b] probability – individual ballots can’t alter subjectivity even if long term clash over a season can, but they can rectify skews which means the only immediate impact to a ballot is fairness and deciding who wins, c] it internal link turns every impact – a limited topic promotes in-depth research and engagement which is necessary to access all of their education

#### 2] Clash – argumentative testing along a stable tether and SSD are good – they force debaters to consider a controversial issue from multiple perspectives through nuanced 3rd and 4th level testing that only occurs alongside a stasis point for preparation. Non-T affs allow individuals to establish their own metrics for what they want to debate leading to ideological dogmatism – our argument is that the process of defending and answering proposals against a well-researched opponent is a benefit of engaging the topic regardless of the truth value of those proposals.

#### 3] TVA – Legal argumentation can be repurposed to help attend to queer fxlk – banning appropriation in demand of institutional change is valuable.

Outer Space is a spectacle and focusing on it just feeds back into the technocratic landscape which sustains anti-queerness

Obsession with space exploration which employs myths of Manifest Destiny and the Final Frontier to fashion America in the mold of futurism thus banishing the queer to a life of criminality

#### Drop the debater – a) they have a 7-6 rebuttal advantage and the 2ar to make args I can’t respond to, b) it deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

#### Use competing interps – a) reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter, b) collapses to competing interps – we justify 2 brightlines under an offense defense paradigm just like 2 interps.

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms, c) chilling effect – forces you to split your 2AR so you can’t collapse and misconstrue the 2NR, d) topic ed – prevents 1AR blipstorm scripts and allows us to get back to substance after resolving theory

#### Evaluate disclosure before 1AR theory – a) scope of norming b) magnitude – the aff advocacy and disclosure affects a larger portion of the debate since it determines every speech after it and pre round neg prep

#### No impact turns—it’s a procedural that determines case’s validity and every argument says the aff is bad. Exclusions are inevitable because we only have 45 minutes so it’s best to draw those exclusions along reciprocal lines to ensure a role for the negative

#### They can’t weigh the case—lack of preround prep means their truth claims are untested which you should presume false—they’re also only winning case because we couldn’t engage with it

### 2

#### Interpretation—the Affirmative advocacy must be for a singular action taken by a specific actor. To clarify—that actor doesn’t have to be the USFG and the action doesn’t have to be a policy.

#### Violation—it’s unclear what this aff advocates for—what does mestiza consciousness look like? There are so many possible manifestations, all of which they claim offense from.

#### 1] Stasis DA---lack of a mutually agreed upon topic means no common understanding of their advocacy---a singular, actionable definition is key to a stable basis for neg offense---ANY model of debate must center on SOMETHING to enable iterative testing—crossapply the impact from above.

#### 2] Causality DA---debating causal links between specific actions and their effects---be them on social systems or otherwise---creates portable skills in predicting how activist strategies will provoke crackdown and formulating strategies to most effectively bring about redress

3] TVA---defend a specific instance of Mestiza consciousness

### Case

#### The Roll of the Ballot and Judge is to Vote for the Better Debater – anything else is impact justified, self serving, and arbitrary making it impossible to predict.

#### Vote Negative on Presumption – the ballot doesn’t solve any of their offense and is a double turn with itself which makes these arguments offense.

#### 1-- Competitive incentives – tactical gamesmanship overcodes any ethical benefit from the aff because teams think you just want to win and argumentative decisions are undergirded by competition – evidenced by the fact they break new, don’t disclose, and aim for fair playing field.

#### 2—Forced negation - tying your survival strategy to the ballot is dangerous. It A. forces other debaters to deny that you know what’s best for yourself and speak for others and B. it puts judges in the inappropriate position of jeopardizing a debater’s safety with the ballot.

#### 3 - Allies DA – if the aff has a ballot key warrant, then their endurance strategy relies on the approval and activism of white judges who vote for them – if those judges are constitutively antiblack as per their theory, that dooms their project

#### The 1AC foreclosed a chance to develop skills of space policy literacy - space scenario planning can develop emancipatory skills, combat inequality, and fracture expertism in space activities - without stifling the 1AC’s radical energies.

Weeks, 12—Adjunct Professor of International Relations Online Program, Webster University (Edythe, “OUTER SPACE DEVELOPMENT: THE SOLUTION FOR GLOBAL INEQUALITY,” *Outer Space Development, International Relations and Space Law: A Method for Elucidating Seeds*, Chapter 7, pg 171-174, dml)

This is the time to discuss equality. Once societies in outer space are established it will be too late. The first wave of outer space development in the last half of the 20th century changed the world. This process included establishing a satellite telecommunications infrastructure in the geostationary orbit along with the globalization of new high-tech products and services. The retirement of the NASA space shuttle program symbolized the start of the second wave of outer space development, which is likely to be propelled by the privatization of space tourism and space mining. This type of space industrialization will undoubtedly result in extreme wealth for a few who know what is happening, while those who have no knowledge will be left behind. Decision makers, scholars, trouble-shooters, and others worry constantly about existing inequality gaps, lack of development, poverty, and economic hardship. This chapter suggests a method for preventative maintenance prior to humankind’s next development project. It argues that education, information, and sharing knowledge can become tools for generating perpetual equality as we embark on our journey to colonize the final frontier. Those historically disenfranchised can gain a fresh advantage through preparation and education to develop an expertise aimed at providing valuable knowledge useful for space endeavors. In addition, in these times of crashing economies, job loss, high unemployment rates, and school system failures, people are searching for ways to create prosperous futures for themselves and their families. Outer space could prove to be a way for many to find their answer. Newly Emerging Trends Relevant for Outer Space Development The passage of the NASA Authorization Act of 2010 demonstrates a willingness by the U.S. to fund a stepped-up phase of space activities. During bad economic times, this Act provides $58,400,000,000 for various space-related programs from 2011 to 2013. In 2010/2011, media reports constantly alerted the general public to be ready for the retirement of the NASA Space Shuttle program. This initiative complemented the New Vision for U.S. Space Exploration Policy (2004), as well as various other laws and policies initiated by the United States and discussed in previous chapters. When read together, it is fair to assume the newly emerging space industries will be related to achieving advanced space transportation systems, private spacecraft development, commercial space habitats, space stations, space settlements, commercial space mining, spacecraft trajectory optimization techniques for landing on near-Earth asteroids, commercial spaceport construction, interplanetary telecommunications, and space exploration missions. The thing for teachers, students, and members of the general public to do in order to prepare to take advantage of these linked opportunities is to imagine how these goals are likely to play out, and what types of goods, services, and skill-sets will be needed. Education as the Solution Outer space development historically has been the purview of skilled professionals in the science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) fields. The STEM-oriented opportunities for those proficient in physics, astrophysics, space medicine, engineering, calculus, etc., have always been limited to a few select students. But now global society is calling for something, more since the STEM fields have failed to attract diverse people on an equal footing.186 A bridge can be created by using social and behavioral sciences curricula, thereby to attract people from a wider range of backgrounds to learn about outer space development and newly emerging industries. New education paradigms can help ensure equity and enable wider citizen participation throughout the international community. Curricula using the new paradigm can be used to motivate and inspire a new generation of scholars who can play a key role in the process of outer space development. In effect, an educational system that unleashes human creativity and curiosity will empower students with the knowledge and competencies not only for the second wave of outer space development, but also for the global engagement necessary for the 21st century and beyond (Weeks and Tamashiro, 2011). It is never too early to begin cultivating a person’s intellectual and academic talents. Most children are naturally curious. As part of the curriculum, students of all ages can be shown how to do research, how to write a research paper, to compile and present data, perform critical analytical thinking, and to anticipate and develop relevant skill-sets for newly emerging industry trends. Learning these skills will enable more people to develop an expertise aimed at supplying talent that will be in demand as future industries emerge. This can change people’s lives. Students can learn how to anticipate and prepare for future emerging industries while they are at the K-12 level. Students can also learn at young ages how to get recognized by publishers, editors, the mass media, and others. In situations where the resources necessary for teaching science are unavailable, space studies can be introduced through the social and behavioral sciences and the arts. For many years, space studies has remained the exclusive purview of engineers, scientists, and technology experts. However, there is room at the table for social and behavioral sciences students to join in and develop a specialty area of expertise. Key actors within the outer space development community have expressed an interest in advancing space studies to a broader audience. Orchestrating such a process carries with it the power to improve international relations, education, inspiration, dreams, and creativity, and to boost the global economy by creating a myriad of new jobs and degree programs. We can open an additional door to allow a broader range of knowledge into the minds of more people by introducing outer space development studies through the social and behavioral sciences (Hammond and Weeks, 2011). Unlike engineering, an interdisciplinary social and behavioral sciences lens enables us to interpret the meaning behind sets and patterns of human behaviors—this includes the behavior of individuals, institutions, groups, presidents, members of congress, business and other organizations, mass media, international organizations, and lawmakers. Humankind can progress beyond the “STEMs = space studies” model by including, encouraging, involving, and preparing a new breed of social and behavioral sciences geniuses. These would be people who are naturals in international relations, conflict resolution, and peace studies, as well as versed in international law, politics, social psychology, critical analysis, discourse analysis, international communication, artistic architecture, race and ethnic studies, gender studies, religious studies, economics, finance, business and entrepreneurship, history, and political economy, while also being concerned with inequality gaps, oppression, subjugation, revolts, uprisings, revolutions, and various other social and behavioral phenomena. People who understand the issues concerning human beings now have a way of participating in future emerging space industries. The audience of learners scheduled to receive cutting-edge knowledge of fields relevant for outer space development will be expanded by online learning techniques and sharing of information through the open-source technologies of the Internet. Shaping Ideology Imagine teaching students about the newly emerging trends related to outer space development. This would give students permission to envision and carve out their role in designing future space societies. Students from all disciplines can be taught to see what’s coming next by learning to research and interpret economic policies, laws, and international relations. This will enable them to detect newly emerging industries and to anticipate the elements likely to be in demand. Students can then shape their skill-sets and prepare to satisfy these emerging needs. Students can be taught to perform this type of interdisciplinary analysis and to research combined dynamics—government hearings and transcripts, policy statements and speeches, laws, economic initiatives, and international treaties. They can also be taught to combine this type of primary data with theoretical understandings of historical, ideological, institutional, political, economic, psychological, and structural phenomena.

#### Queer Futurity and Hope is good – pessimism locks in privilege and re-entrenches violence. Futurity isn’t a denial of current struggles but generates social energy to survive.

Manalansan 15 Martin F. Manalansan IV - Associate Professor of all of the following at The University of Illinois: Gender and Women's Studies, Asian American Studies, Anthropology, Latin American and Caribbean Studies, LAS Global Studies, Center for East Asian and Pacific Studies, and Center for Global Studies. The author holds a Ph.D. in Social Anthropology from The University of Rochester and studied philosophy, Asian Studies and anthropology at the University of the Philippines. As part of claims about futurity, the author references lived excahnges with queer trans women of color. The author also references concurring professional exchanges with David L. Eng, Professor of English at the University of Pennsylvania; Gayatri Gopinath, who  is an associate professor of Social and Cultural Analysis and director of Asian/Pacific/American Studies at New York University.; Roderick Ferguson, who is a professor of African American and Gender and Women's Studies in the African American Studies Department at the University of Illinois, Chicago; Chandan Reddy, who is an Associate Professor of Gender, Women & Sexuality Studies at the University of Washington; and the late José Esteban Muñoz, was an American academic in the fields of performance studies, visual culture, queer theory, cultural studies, and critical theory; "A Question from Bruno Latour" This article is part of the series Queer Futures. Fieldsights - Theorizing the Contemporary, Cultural Anthropology Online, July 21, 2015 - <https://www.culanth.org/fieldsights/703-a-question-from-bruno-latour> //Elmer  
My response to the question of “no future” comes from my encounters, engagements, and conversations with colleagues under the aegis of queer-of-color critique, scholars like David Eng, Gayatri Gopinath, Roderick Ferguson, Chandan Reddy, and the late José Esteban Muñoz, among others. We appreciate the renegade antireproductive stance of the “no future” camp, which states that we should not subscribe to a future that is entrenched in heteropatriarchal dreams of marriage and procreation. However, there was a general sense among us that the issue of “no future” comes from a vantage point and a comfortable perch of privilege. As a scholar invested and immersed in the plight of queers of color, futurity is not just a possibility but a necessity. To paraphrase my queer-of-color critique colleagues, we cannot not think of a future—it is the very fuel of existence, the pivot that animates and propels energies, performances, feelings, and other bodily capacities. The promise and peril of queer, both as a stance and as a field of study, is precisely in its anticipatory and hopeful dimensions. Queer is constituted by a yearning and a longing for something better than what is here right now. It is, as Muñoz would say, a horizon that we are drawn to and which is not yet here. Consider the group of undocumented immigrant queers of color in New York City whose lives I have been following for years. Dwelling in cramped domiciles and working in contingent jobs, there is very little to witness in their lives that suggests a kind of gay/lesbian triumphalism or the bright markers of the new normal. In fact, they live in precarious conditions but—a very important caveat—they live in moments that showcase fleeting gestures and images of fabulosity set amidst the squalor and mess of their lives. These moments, while fleeting, provide some way for them to think of another day, giving them a brief glimpse of a time and a place where there are sequined gowns, plush salons, and many sparkling things. While this might be called naïve hopefulness, thinking of a future that is an alternative to the present is a potent way to think beyond and against the status quo—to plant the seed for social transformation. In other words, there is a political potential to queer futurity. Or, to put it another way, we need to complicate and unravel the negativity inherent in the “no future” stance and to be open to the various alternative ways a future or futures can be imagined, particularly by those in the margins. Otherwise, we can all just pack our bags, go back home, put on some makeup, close the door, and hide under the bedcovers.

#### The move to embody our politics within debate or adopt endurance strategies is shut down as soon as it gets large enough to effect institutions—vote neg on presumption.

**Srnicek and Williams 15** (Nick Srnicek and Alex Williams, 2015, Nick Srnicek is a lecturer in Digital Economy at King's College London. Alex Williams is a lecturer at City University London, INVENTING THE FUTURE Postcapitalism and a World Without Work, Pages 34-37, accessed 7-9-2018)

More fundamentally, though, Occupy constrained itself by enforcing a rigidly prefigurative politics. The basic prefigurative gesture is to embody the future world immediately – to change our ways of relating to each other in order to live the postcapitalist future in the present. The role of occupations is a classic example of this: they often self-consciously aim to enact the space of a non-capitalist world through mutual aid, rejections of hierarchy and rigorous direct democracy. Yet these spaces are understood and built as explicitly temporary – not spaces for sustained change or the working-out of concrete alternatives, let alone ambitious competitors to global capitalism. Instead they are short-term spaces containing the transitory experiences of an immediate community. A pamphlet from a precursor to the Occupy movement makes this particularly clear: [Students who insisted on no demands] saw the point of occupation as the creation of a momentary opening in capitalist time and space, a rearrangement that sketched the contours of a new society. We side with this antireformist position. While we know these free zones will be partial and transitory, the tensions they expose between the real and the possible can push the struggle in a more radical direction. The acknowledgement that the occupation will be temporary is here combined with a naive belief that maybe this time it will spark a radical change. Prefigurative spaces face a continuous struggle against dissolution for good reasons. First, they require a variety of logistical supports, including housing, food, sanitation, healthcare, defence and legal advice. Most of this does not come from within the prefigurative community, but instead relies upon existing capitalist networks. The social reproduction of encampments is difficult even under the most favourable conditions, and even established utopian communities (often religious in nature) typically find it impossible to remain independent and self-sustaining. Second, prefi gurative spaces are often subject to state and corporate repression – and if they are not, it is typically because they pose no threat to the existing social order. The Zapatistas, for example, are permitted to exist in relative freedom simply because the state and capital do not see them as a threat. The moment a prefigurative space becomes a threat is the moment when repression weighs down on it, and when its fetishisation of horizontalism becomes a serious liability. Prefigurative politics, at its worst, therefore ignores the forces aligned against the creation and expansion of a new world. The simple positing and practising of a new world is insufficient to overcome these forces, as the repression faced by Occupy demonstrated. The immediate question that must be asked of any prefigurative politics is therefore: How can it be expanded and scaled up? Even granting the problematic assumption that most people would want to live as the Occupy camps did, what efforts might be possible to physically and socially expand these spaces? When theorists face up to this question, vague hand-waving usually ensues: moments will purportedly ‘resonate’ with each other; small everyday actions will somehow make a qualitative shift to ‘crack open’ society; riots and blockades will ‘spread and multiply’; experiences will ‘contaminate’ participants and expand; pockets of prefigurative resistance will just ‘spontaneously erupt’. In any case, the difficult task of traversing from the particular to the universal, from the local to the global, from the temporary to the permanent, is elided by wishful thinking. The strategic imperatives to expand, extend and universalise are left unfulfilled.

### Cap

Gang 14 – “The 1AC’s anarchist politics are key to understanding how capitalism operates and destroying capitalism”

#### Gang 18 – “Queerness is a method by which to attack the normative, and capitalism, and the state.”

#### Tech Innovation drives dematerialization that makes Cap Sustainable

McAfee 19, Andrew. More from Less: The Surprising Story of How We Learned to Prosper Using Fewer Resources—and What Happens Next. Scribner, 2019. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1SdXDFeq9gbuG7zVAP-vzCXgbALIm9W9d/view?usp=sharing> (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

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**.

#### 1] Only growth can sustain space colonization and solve extinction

Dale Skran 2016 (Executive Vice President of the National Space Society and a member of the Board of Directors of the Alliance for Space Development. “Settling space is the only sustainable reason for humans to be in space,” <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/2915/1>)

So why then do Elon Musk, Stephen Hawking, and many others, including organizations like the National Space Society (NSS) and Alliance for Space Development, believe strongly that space settlement is essential to human survival? Although this may seem surprising, the Earth is not a “safe space.” The destiny of virtually all species on Earth is extinction in a relatively short span of geologic time. The Tellers claim that “we live on a planet that is perfect for us.” This statement is both completely true and total nonsense. We fit well on the Earth because we have evolved over millions of years to become creatures that are both adapted to live here and to like living here. It is truer to say that we are perfect for the Earth than the reverse. In fact, the Earth is not such a commodious place. It is subject to periodic calamities of various sorts, ranging from massive asteroid and comet impacts to titanic volcanic eruptions, and from periodic ice ages to disastrous solar flares. In the short run, the Earth seems balmy and comfortable. Viewed from the perspective of deep time, it starts to look more like a death trap, bedeviled by regular mass extinctions. However, things are actually quite a bit worse. Although there are many potentially bad things that might happen to the human race on the Earth from natural sources, there are many more from unnatural sources. We have been dancing with nuclear disaster for a long time. An apocalyptic atomic war is not inevitable, but it is possible. Add to this scenario the genetically engineered killer virus, “gray goo,” a robot revolt, and other horrors as yet undreamt, and the odds against human survival get longer. Hence, the need to abandon the fiction of Earth as our eternal and unchanging perfect home and to appreciate both the need for, and promise of, space settlement. Not so the rich can escape to an Elysium in the sky, or so we can all leave behind a polluted and overheated Earth, but simply so that the human species and human culture has a chance at surviving and flourishing in the long term. The Tellers believe that sustainability on the Earth has no relationship to what we do in space, but the same technologies that enable deep space settlement will have a profound impact on terrestrial sustainability. The Tellers write, “We haven’t even colonized the Sahara desert, the bottom of the oceans… because it makes no economic sense.” This may be true, but it also makes no sense to settle the Sahara desert, the bottom of the oceans, or Antarctica since these locations are on the Earth, and humans living there will not increase the probability of species survival. Near-Earth free space settlements and lunar bases are just stepping stones to ones much further out that are quarantined from Earth by millions of kilometers of vacuum. Once the motivation of species survival is put front and center, it becomes clear that a settlement in low Earth orbit, on the Moon, at L5, or on the Martian surface is not nearly sufficient. What is needed is a large set of thriving communities distributed throughout the solar system, and even ultimately in the Oort Cloud surrounding the solar system proper. This vision is not a small thing. It will be the work of many generations, just as was the settling of the New World or, even earlier in history, the human diaspora out of Africa along the Asian coast to Australia and beyond. The Tellers believe that sustainability on the Earth has no relationship to what we do in space, but the same technologies that enable deep space settlement will have a profound impact on terrestrial sustainability. Space settlements, of necessity, push the limits of food production per square meter and per liter of water. Space settlement agricultural methods can also be applied to growing food in parched California or in vertical farms in crowded urban areas. Space settlements require humans and technology to co-exist in close proximity. This implies an absolute minimization of pollution and sustained recycling of all waste. Such technologies seem highly applicable to sustainability on Earth as well. We will need to provide the best possible medical care for remote space settlements, which will be far from hospitals on Earth. The technologies that make such medicine effective—“tricorders”, telemedicine, and so on—can also bring medical care to underdeveloped and underserved areas of the Earth. The Tellers raise the specter of “winter-over syndrome” in the Antarctic, writing that “living on Mars would be way, way more miserable than living in Antarctica,” and concluding, “Nobody wants to live there.” Although it is clear that the Tellers will not be going, the large numbers who signed up for Mars One’s sketchy settlement plans suggest that a lot of people do want to live on Mars. There are real challenges to constructing space settlements, but current Antarctic bases are not true settlements. Nobody lives there with their families, with the exception of the coastal Esperanza Base, where about ten families routinely winter over. No real effort is made to create any kind of human environment that is comfortable over a long period of time. Conditions in Antarctica might be better compared to living in a campground than a self-sustaining settlement. Additionally, the current Antarctic Treaty essentially prevents any extraction or use of the natural resources found there, thus making economically independent settlements infeasible. The Tellers think that, from an economic perspective, “Mars has nothing to offer in return.” Here, at least in the short run, they have a point. Let us not shy from the truth. Conditions in the early settlements in the New World were difficult at best, and the casualty rate was high. We should expect the same to hold true for early space settlements. However, Jamestown and Plymouth gave rise to vast cities and a tamed landscape on a scale of hundreds of years. We now bring to the table technological means that would seem magical to the Jamestown settlers. Even as difficult an environment as the Moon can be developed and settled using technology that either exists currently or is an engineering project, as one book suggests. The Tellers think that, from an economic perspective, “Mars has nothing to offer in return.” Here, at least in the short run, they have a point. Although Mars may have more of the natural resources a settlement will need than, say, the Moon, it is at the bottom of a fairly steep gravity well and, for the time being, it is not likely that there will be many Mars-to-Earth exports. However, this is like looking at the resources of the New World via a keyhole, seeing a swamp, and reporting back that there is no point in going there. It is worth keeping in mind the example of “Seward’s Folly.” The purchase of Alaska from Russia was mocked as “Seward’s icebox” and a “polar bear garden.” At the time, the oil and mineral riches of Alaska were undiscovered and undreamt of. Space itself teems with valuable resources, including continuous and abundant solar energy and mineral wealth on a scale beyond imagination just in the near Earth asteroids. Just as the Tellers were dismissing space resources as irrelevant, the US Congress was laying the legal groundwork for asteroid and lunar mining with the passage of the Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act, signed by President Obama on November 23, 2015. The Tellers also seem unaware that their leadership at Google, Larry Page and Eric Schmidt, are investors in the asteroid mining firm Planetary Resources. The Tellers say that “we won’t survive [on Earth] unless we learn to live in a resource neutral way.” This statement assumes that that Earth is a closed system, which it is not. The Earth is flooded daily with vast amounts of solar energy that, if exploited, could power just about any civilization we wish to maintain. There is no technical limitation to providing continuous, carbon-free power from space solar power satellites beaming power back to the surface of the Earth anywhere it might be needed. The main opposition to this idea derives from an unwillingness to consider centralized power systems on ideological grounds, combined with the unexpected reality of very cheap natural gas today. Even the most conservative consideration of near-Earth asteroid resources suggests that there is no reason to view the Earth as a closed system to which nothing can be added.

#### 2] Cap solves dehumanization and the environment

Rhonheimer 20 Martin Rhonheimer 2-7-2020 “Capitalism is Good for the Poor – and for the Environment” <https://austrian-institute.org/en/subjects-en/catholic-social-doctrine-2/capitalism-is-good-for-the-poor-and-for-the-environment/> (professor at the Pontifical University of the Holy Cross)//Elmer

It is not social policy but capitalism that has created today’s prosperity. What is important is that what made today’s mass prosperity possible – a phenomenon unprecedented in history – was not social policy or social legislation, organised trade union pressure, or corrective interventions in the capitalist economy, but rather market capitalism itself, due to its enormous potential for innovation and the ever-increasing productivity of human labour that resulted from it. Increasing prosperity and quality of life are always the result of increasing labour productivity. Only increased productivity enabled higher social standards, better working conditions, the overcoming of child labour, a higher level of education, and the emergence of human capital. This process of increasing triumph over poverty and the constantly rising living standards of the general masses is taking place on a global scale – but only where the market economy and capitalist entrepreneurship are able to spread. From industrial overexploitation of nature to ecological awareness The first phase of industrialisation and capitalism was characterised by an enormous consumption of resources and frequent overexploitation of nature, which soon gave the impression that this process could not be sustainable. Since the end of the 19th century, disaster and doom scenarios have repeatedly been put forward, but in retrospect they have proved to be wrong: The combination of technological innovation, market competition, and entrepreneurial profit-seeking (with the compulsion to constantly minimise costs) have meant that these scenarios never occurred. The ever-increasing population has been increasingly better supplied thanks to innovative technologies, ever-increasing output with lower consumption of resources less harmful to the environment – e.g. less arable land in agriculture, or oil and electricity instead of coal for rapidly increasing mobility. More recent disaster scenarios, such as those spread by reputable scientists since the late 1960s and in the 1970s, have also proved to be inaccurate. The reason things developed differently was the always underestimated innovative dynamism of the capitalist market economy, a growing ecological awareness and, as a result, legislative intervention that took advantage of the logic of market capitalism: As a result of the ecological movement that had come out of the United States since 1970, wise legislation began to use the price mechanism to apply market incentives to internalize negative externalities. Environmental pollution was given a price-tag. This led to an enormous decrease in air pollution and other ecological consequences of growth, which is only possible in free, market-based societies, because the production process here is characterized by competition and constant pressure to reduce costs, i.e. to the most profitable use of resources. On the other hand, all forms of socialism, i.e. a state-controlled economy, have proved to be ecological disasters and have left behind destruction of gigantic proportions, without providing the population with anything that is near comparable in prosperity, often even by destroying existing prosperity, such as happened in Venezuela.

#### Unmitigated warming will cause extinction.

Xu 17 Yangyang Xu 9-6-2017 “Well below 2 °C: Mitigation strategies for avoiding dangerous to catastrophic climate changes”; https://www.pnas.org/content/114/39/10315 (Assistant Professor of Atmospheric Sciences at Texas A&M University; and Veerabhadran Ramanathan, Distinguished Professor of Atmospheric and Climate Sciences at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography)//Elmer

From the IPCC burning embers diagram and from the language of the Paris Agreement, we infer that the DAI begins at warming greater than 1.5 °C. Our criteria for extending the risk category beyond DAI include the potential risks of climate change to the physical climate system, the ecosystem, human health, and species extinction. Let us first consider the category of catastrophic (3 to 5 °C warming). The first major concern is the issue of tipping points. Several studies (48, 49) have concluded that 3 to 5 °C global warming is likely to be the threshold for tipping points such as the collapse of the western Antarctic ice sheet, shutdown of deep water circulation in the North Atlantic, dieback of Amazon rainforests as well as boreal forests, and collapse of the West African monsoon, among others. While natural scientists refer to these as abrupt and irreversible climate changes, economists refer to them as catastrophic events (49). Warming of such magnitudes also has catastrophic human health effects. Many recent studies (50, 51) have focused on the direct influence of extreme events such as heat waves on public health by evaluating exposure to heat stress and hyperthermia. It has been estimated that the likelihood of extreme events (defined as 3-sigma events), including heat waves, has increased 10-fold in the recent decades (52). Human beings are extremely sensitive to heat stress. For example, the 2013 European heat wave led to about 70,000 premature mortalities (53). The major finding of a recent study (51) is that, currently, about 13.6% of land area with a population of 30.6% is exposed to deadly heat. The authors of that study defined deadly heat as exceeding a threshold of temperature as well as humidity. The thresholds were determined from numerous heat wave events and data for mortalities attributed to heat waves. According to this study, a 2 °C warming would double the land area subject to deadly heat and expose 48% of the population. A 4 °C warming by 2100 would subject 47% of the land area and almost 74% of the world population to deadly heat, which could pose existential risks to humans.

#### 3] Cap is the only way to solve Pandemics

Jackson 16 Kerry Jackson 12-19-2016 “Free Market Policies Needed To Incentivize Creation Of New Life-Saving Treatments” <https://www.pacificresearch.org/article/free-market-policies-needed-to-incentivize-creation-of-new-life-saving-treatments/> (Researcher at the Pacific Research Institute)//Elmer

The International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers says the problem is caused by “a dearth of new antibiotic medicines.” At the same time that there’s been an increase in AMR, there has been “a sharp decline in the development of new antibiotic medicines.” The group reports that only two new classes of antibiotics have been discovered in the last three decades compared to 11 in the previous 50 years. The answers to many medical problems are still not within reach of researchers. But the hazards of AMR can be diminished. Winegarden suggests we begin with public health campaigns that encourage handwashing, which he calls a highly effective and low-cost way to reduce the spread of infection. He further recommends policy that would address the problem of antibiotic overuse and greater use of vaccines to cut the incidents of infection. But Winegarden’s primary concern is establishing the correct incentives for developing new antimicrobial medicines that would be effective against AMR microorganisms. He’s specifically referring to policies “based on a thorough understanding of the disincentives that are currently inhibiting their development.” “These disincentives are well-recognized,” he writes. “Despite the medical need, and despite the generally strong return on investment for many other drug classes, the return on investment for developing new antimicrobial medicines (particularly antibiotics) is too low.” Producing a new drug is a grinding and expensive endeavor. It can take 10 to 15 years to develop a single prescription drug that is introduced to the market, and a company can spend as much as $5.5 billion on research and development for each medication that is eventually approved and prescribed. Less than 2 percent of all projects launched to create new drugs succeed. This is not an environment in which pharmaceutical companies can get too amped up about pursuing new treatments. Yet new drug approvals increased over the last decade. Don’t look for a surge of antimicrobial drugs in that pipeline, though. Winegarden says that particular drug class is among several that “face unique impediments” that serve as disincentives for innovation. To overcome the steep hill that impedes the development of new AMR drugs, lawmakers must implement policies that unleash the incentives of the free market. Policymakers also should look at the 1983 federal Orphan Drug Act and its market-oriented reforms that increased the number of drugs developed to treat rare diseases. More than 400 have been introduced to the market since the law was enacted, compared to fewer than 10 in the 1970s. Put another way, government needs to remove its anchors from the process and let the market do what it does so well. In this case, that’s restoring patients’ health, enriching innovative companies that create jobs, and inspiring biotech start-ups such as the group of Stanford undergraduates that has been capitalized to develop new antibiotics. If the proper incentives are in place, the needed treatments will follow.

#### Future pandemics will cause extinction – it only takes one ‘super-spreader’

Bar-Yam 16 Yaneer Bar-Yam 7-3-2016 “Transition to extinction: Pandemics in a connected world” <http://necsi.edu/research/social/pandemics/transition> (Professor and President, New England Complex System Institute; PhD in Physics, MIT)//Elmer

When we introduce long range transportation into the model, the success of more aggressive strains changes. They can use the long range transportation to find new hosts and escape local extinction. Figure 3 shows that the more transportation routes introduced into the model, the more higher aggressive pathogens are able to survive and spread. As we add more long range transportation, there is a critical point at which pathogens become so aggressive that the entire host population dies. The pathogens die at the same time, but that is not exactly a consolation to the hosts. We call this the phase transition to extinction (Figure 4). With increasing levels of global transportation, human civilization may be approaching such a critical threshold. In the paper we wrote in 2006 about the dangers of global transportation for pathogen evolution and pandemics [8], we mentioned the risk from Ebola. Ebola is a horrendous disease that was present only in isolated villages in Africa. It was far away from the rest of the world only because of that isolation. Since Africa was developing, it was only a matter of time before it reached population centers and airports. While the model is about evolution, it is really about which pathogens will be found in a system that is highly connected, and Ebola can spread in a highly connected world. The traditional approach to public health uses historical evidence analyzed statistically to assess the potential impacts of a disease. As a result, many were surprised by the spread of Ebola through West Africa in 2014. As the connectivity of the world increases, past experience is not a good guide to future events. A key point about the phase transition to extinction is its suddenness. Even a system that seems stable, can be destabilized by a few more long-range connections, and connectivity is continuing to increase. So how close are we to the tipping point? We don’t know but it would be good to find out before it happens. While Ebola ravaged three countries in West Africa, it only resulted in a handful of cases outside that region. One possible reason is that many of the airlines that fly to west Africa stopped or reduced flights during the epidemic [9]. In the absence of a clear connection, public health authorities who downplayed the dangers of the epidemic spreading to the West might seem to be vindicated. As with the choice of airlines to stop flying to west Africa, our analysis didn’t take into consideration how people respond to epidemics. It does tell us what the outcome will be unless we respond fast enough and well enough to stop the spread of future diseases, which may not be the same as the ones we saw in the past. As the world becomes more connected, the dangers increase. Are people in western countries safe because of higher quality health systems? Countries like the U.S. have highly skewed networks of social interactions with some very highly connected individuals that can be “superspreaders.” The chances of such an individual becoming infected may be low but events like a mass outbreak pose a much greater risk if they do happen. If a sick food service worker in an airport infects 100 passengers, or a contagion event happens in mass transportation, an outbreak could very well prove unstoppable.

#### 4] Markets results in contractualism that solves War – the only threat is the Alt

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

If my argument is correct, the world is on the cusp of tremendous change: across the globe, **contractualism** is overtaking status-personalism and, in so doing, **launching an era of peace and prosperity.** This conclusion is reached without any monotonic or teleological assumptions: anything that collapses the contractualist economies for a generation or two would stop or **reverse this trend**.81 All else being equal, the contractualist hegemony has made the odds of unit-level change from a status to a contractualist economy more likely than the reverse. At the start of the twentieth century, only the United States had a contractualist economy; by the end, at least thirty-five states were contractualist.82 The Westphalian system has never been as conducive to transitions to contractualist economies as it has been under the contractualist hegemony, which prohibits states from starting wars for booty, debt collection, or territory. **Nor has the world ever had such widespread access to capital, mobility, and equity in trade as it has had since the contractualist hegemony made it so with the signing of the Atlantic Charter and the implementation of the Bretton Woods agreements.** The number of transitions also predictably increased after the Cold War, when the contractualist hegemony emerged as largely unchallenged. In this way, system change toward contractualist hegemony within the anarchic order, rooted in unit-level change, ultimately promotes more unit-level change toward a contractualist world. Reports of the Demise of the Liberal Order Are Greatly Exaggerated I have argued that the liberal global order is on the rise; yet, liberal values around the world seem to be in retreat. In recent years, two contractualist states with populist governments—Hungary and Poland—have begun to embrace anti-immigrant and anti-globalization positions. In the United States, President Donald Trump appears to favor status values such as power, rank, and loyalty over contractualist values such as equity and respect for the rule of law. In foreign policy, Trump does not seem to share contractualists' opposition to Russia's efforts to sow chaos, and he sees trade in terms of winners and losers. Reports of the demise of the liberal order, however, are greatly exaggerated. First, Hungary and Poland are newly contractualist states. The sociological nature of economic norms theory means that contractualist values should be more firmly rooted in older contractualist societies than in newer ones. This is corroborated with the natural experiment of Germany: in 1962 West Germany embraced contractualism (see table 1), but it was only after 1991 that East Germany could have become contractualist, when massive investments from the Federal Republic caused incomes in the marketplace to become higher than incomes obtainable from status relationships. Today, Germany's populist movement is concentrated in the eastern part of the country and is largely nonexistent in the western part,83 which corroborates the expectation that some newly contractualist societies retain some of their status values even after a generation of robust opportunity in the marketplace. Deeper changes in values may not occur until generational cohorts initially socialized into status or axial economies have passed on. Second, the electorates in most of the thirty-five contractualist states listed in table 1 in 2010 have not experienced substantial increases in populist sentiment. Italy's Five Star movement is often called populist but largely because of its anti-immigrant stance. Although an embrace of immigrants would seem consistent with contractualist values, opposition to large numbers of immigrants is arguably a rational response to what is essentially a huge external shock that has intensified in recent years. Britons voted to leave the European Union, but largely because they believed they were being treated unfairly in it. The rejection of unfair terms of trade, whether perceived correctly or not, is consistent with contractualist values. Third, the strength of institutions far exceeds that of any one person, including the president of the United States. **Liberal values and institutions are rooted in** contractualist **economic norms** and will not disappear simply because some leaders choose not to abide by them. For instance, although Trump may want the United States to withdraw from the North Atlantic alliance, this is not a view shared by Congress and the American people. Even members of Trump's administration have often restrained him in ways consistent with contractualist values and institutions.84 In economic norms theory, the only way the United States' contractualist values could shift to status or axial values would be through radical economic change. As mentioned above, economics is ultimately at the mercy of politics, as an influential coalition of rent-seekers could potentially collapse a contractualist economy by failing to sustain the highly inclusive marketplace or uphold the state's credibility in enforcing of contracts. In recent years, the U.S. economy has begun tilting toward rent-seekers, given the growing role of private money in electoral campaigns and the increasing sophistication of rent-seekers in masking their activities though the manipulation of public opinion, including through their concentrated ownership of media outlets. Such rentierism could precipitate a change in U.S. values if it results in a retraction of the market substantial enough that newer generations began to obtain higher wages in newfound status networks than in the marketplace. In this way, the Trump phenomenon may reflect a pathology in U.S. governing institutions; but at least so far, it arguably has not extended to the American people. Most of Trump's supporters seem to be drawn to him not for his expressions of status values, but for his pledges to fight a “rigged” system and create well-paying jobs. Whether or not Trump means what he says, many of his supporters saw a vote for him as an act of protest against the increasing corruption occurring in the United States, a clear contractualist expression.85 Although a collapse of the U.S. economy and transition to an axial or a status economy is always possible, the feedback loop of popular insistence on economic growth and a highly inclusive marketplace makes this unlikely. Aside from an external shock (such as nuclear war or climate devastation), such a transition could happen only if the rentiers somehow manage to remain in power long enough to institutionalize a permanently underemployed underclass. Fourth, even if the U.S. economy were to collapse and the United States became an axial or a status power, the combined economic might of all the other contractualist countries in the world is nearly twice that of the United States. The soft power of the United States in world politics lies not in its power to persuade, but in it being the largest of the contractualist states, and in its willingness to provide the public good of global security since the collapse of the pound sterling in late 1946. If the United States withdrew from its leadership role, the remaining contractualist powers would fill the vacuum. None of them has an economy relatively large enough to enable it to act as a natural leader and principal provider of global security, but it is the temperament of these states that they can easily form an international organization to coordinate and act on their shared security interests, even if some may choose to free ride. Fifth, current events need to be viewed within a larger context. Fernand Braudel pinpoints the rise of the modern world economy as starting around the year 1450 in northwestern Europe.86 The first contractualist economy emerged more than two centuries ago. Since then, contractualist states have confronted numerous shocks and threats to their systems, including the American Civil War, the Great Depression, two world wars, and the Cold War. The present populist mini-wave and pathologies in U.S. democracy are mere trifling episodes in a larger historical frame. Conclusion This article has introduced a new liberal theory of global politics and argues that global alignments are rooted in factors internal to states: status states want expansion and disorder wherever they lack control; contractualist states want universal stability and order based on the principle of self-determination for all states. **As such, global patterns of war, peace, and cooperation can be explained without recourse to such external factors as trade interdependence, international institutions, interstate images, or intersubjective structure; economic norms theory can explain these patterns from states' internal conditions alone.** If this argument is correct, then the relative power of states does determine the perception of threat, as realists have long maintained, but with an essential qualifi- cation: only among status states. In this way, internal conditions can explain why 2,400 years ago Sparta feared the rising power of Athens, and why today the distribution of power seems to be playing an ever reduced role in global politics. My analyses of most states from 1946 to 2010 corroborate the prediction of a liberal global hierarchy managed by a natural alliance of states with contractualist economies. States with contractualist and export-oriented economies tend to agree on issues voted on in the United Nations General Assembly, regardless of their power status or capability, because they have common interests in a global order based on self-determination. Among states with status and insular economies, in contrast, major powers and those with greater capability are more likely to balance the contractualist hegemony, which they fear. Meanwhile, minor powers and those with less capability are more likely to bandwagon with it, which they fear less than they do the status major powers. Additionally, the theory provides an explanation for a large number of observed facts in international politics. It can explain the decline of war. It can explain the United States' enduring soft power, and why its leadership continues utterly unchallenged by other market powers, despite its relative economic decline since the mid-twentieth century. It offers an account for why developing states with weak institutions tend to bandwagon with the Western powers;87 and why land powers tend to provoke counterbalancing coalitions, and sea powers, which tend to be trading powers, do not.88 It can account for the democratic peace; why democracies tend to win their wars; and why the probability of war among market democracies is practically zero. It can explain how states become prosperous; how democracy consolidates; the tenacity of corruption in developing countries; why Western powers reproach their clients for their corruption;89 and why states fail. It can explain global terrorism and anti-Americanism.90 If the theory is right, war is becoming obsolete, and not for reasons supposed in most international relations theorizing. There is no security dilemma in international politics, as realists contend there is: relative power reliably matters only to leaders of status states, which always consider all other states enemies. Yet, the trajectory of peace is not at all caused by democracy, trade, or international institutions, as liberals maintain. As argued here, democracy, trade, and institutions are epiphenomenal. Contractualist economies are not the only explanation for these factors, but they **are a cause of democratic consolidation**, foreign policy preferences for equitable trade, and international organization. Leaders of contractualist states assess threats based not on their images of other states' regime types, economic types, or their capabilities, but on their behavior. What economic norms theory cannot explain is the triggering environmental and political origins of economic change. Although the theory predicts systemic effects (contractualist hegemony) on unit-level change (national transitions toward contractualist economies), it cannot predict when and where leaders of status and axial states might seek to support the market; when and where contractualist economies will emerge; or when and where systemic effects will result in changes in the units. The theory treats economic change largely exogenously.91
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