### 1NC – Debris

#### Impact turning every part of the 1AC—first, debris making orbits unusable is good.

#### Uncertainty from debris collisions creates restraint not instability.

MacDonald 16, B., et al. "Crisis stability in space: China and other challenges." Foreign Policy Institute. Washington, DC (2016). (senior director of the Nonproliferation and Arms Control Project with the Center for Conflict Analysis and Prevention)//Elmer

In any crisis that threatens to escalate into major power conflict, political and military leaders will face uncertainty about the effectiveness of their plans and decisions. This uncertainty will be compounded when potential conflict extends to the space and cyber domains, where weapon effectiveness is largely untested and uncertain, infrastructure interdependencies are unclear, and damaging an adversary could also harm oneself or one’s allies. Unless the stakes become very high, no country will likely want to gamble its well-being in a “single cosmic throw of the dice,” in Harold Brown’s memorable phrase. 96 The novelty of space and cyber warfare, coupled with risk aversion and worst-case assessments, could lead space adversaries into a situation of what can be called “hysteresis,” where each adversary is restrained by its own uncertainty of success. This is conceptually shown in Figures 1 and 2 for offensive counter-space capabilities, though it applies more generally. 97 These graphs portray the hypothetical differences between perceived and actual performance capabilities of offensive counter-space weapons, on a scale from zero to one hundred percent effectiveness. Where uncertainty and risk aversion are absent for two adversaries, no difference would exist between the likely performance of their offensive counter-space assets and their confidence in the performance of those weapons: a simple, straight-line correlation would exist, as in Figure 1. The more interesting, and more realistic, case is notionally presented in Figure 2, which assumes for simplicity that the offensive capabilities of each adversary are comparable. In stark contrast to the case of Figure 1, uncertainty and risk aversion are present and become important factors. Given the high stakes involved in a possible large-scale attack against adversary space assets, a cautious adversary is more likely to be conservative in estimating the effectiveness of its offensive capabilities, while more generously assessing the capabilities of its adversary. Thus, if both side’s weapons were 50% effective and each side had a similar level of risk aversion, each may conservatively assess its own capabilities to be 30% effective and its adversary’s weapons to be 70% effective. Likewise, if each side’s weapons were 25% effective in reality, each would estimate its own capabilities to be less than 25% effective and its adversary’s to be more than 25% effective, and so on. In Figure 2, this difference appears, in oversimplified fashion, as a gap that represents the realistic worry that a country’s own weapons will under-perform while its adversary’s weapons will over-perform in terms of effectiveness. If both countries face comparable uncertainty and exhibit comparable risk aversion, each may be deterred from initiating an attack by its unwillingness to accept the necessary risks. This gap could represent an “island of stability,” as shown in Figure 2. In essence, given the enormous stakes involved in a major strike against the adversary’s space assets, a potential attacker will likely demonstrate some risk aversion, possessing less confidence in an attack’s effectiveness. It is uncertain how robust this hysteresis may prove to be, but the phenomenon may provide at least some stabilizing influence in a crisis. In the nuclear domain, the immediate, direct consequences of military use, including blast, fire, and direct radiation effects, were appreciated at the outset. Nonetheless, significant uncertainty and under-appreciation persisted with regard to the collateral, indirect, and climatological effects of using such weapons on a large scale. In contrast, the immediate, direct effects of major space conflict are not well understood, and potential indirect and interdependent effects are even less understood. Indirect effects of large-scale space and cyber warfare would be virtually impossible to confidently calculate, as the infrastructures such warfare would affect are constantly changing in design and technology. Added to this is a likely anxiety that if an attack were less successful than planned, a highly aggrieved and powerful adversary could retaliate in unanticipated ways, possibly with highly destructive consequences. As a result, two adversaries facing potential conflict may lack confidence both in the potential effectiveness of their own attacks and in the ineffectiveness of any subsequent retaliation. Such mutual uncertainty would ultimately be stabilizing, though probably not particularly robust. This is reflected in Figure 2, where each side shows more caution than the technical effectiveness of its systems may suggest. Each curve notionally represents one state’s confidence in its offensive counter-space effectiveness relative to their actual effectiveness. Until true space asset resilience becomes a trusted feature of space architectures, deterrence by risk aversion, and cross-domain deterrence, may be the only means for deterrence to function in space.

#### No one’s going to war over a downed satellite

Bowen 18 [Bleddyn Bowen, Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Leicester. The Art of Space Deterrence. February 20, 2018. https://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/commentary/the-art-of-space-deterrence/]

Space is often an afterthought or a miscellaneous ancillary in the grand strategic views of top-level decision-makers. A president may not care that one satellite may be lost or go dark; it may cause panic and Twitter-based hysteria for the space community, of course. But the terrestrial context and consequences, as well as the political stakes and symbolism of any exchange of hostilities in space matters more. The political and media dimension can magnify or minimise the perceived consequences of losing specific satellites out of all proportion to their actual strategic effect.

#### Won’t go nuclear – seen as a normal conventional attack because of integration with ground forces

Firth 7/1/19 [News Editor at MIT Technology Review, was Chief News Editor at New Scientist. How to fight a war in space (and get away with it). July 1, 2019. MIT Technology Review]

Space is so intrinsic to how advanced militaries fight on the ground that an attack on a satellite need no longer signal the opening shot in a nuclear apocalypse. As a result, “deterrence in space is less certain than it was during the Cold War,” says Todd Harrison, who heads the Aerospace Security Project at CSIS, a think tank in Washington, DC. Non-state actors, as well as more minor powers like North Korea and Iran, are also gaining access to weapons that can bloody the noses of much larger nations in space.

#### Loss of satellites shuts down drones

Daniel Ventre 11, Engineer for CNRS and Researcher for CESDIP, Cyberwar and Information Warfare, p. 198-199

The introduction of cyberspace operations is part of a specific context; a major evolution in the operation environment and the nature of the conflicts, which make irregular wars the rule, and make regular actors the exception to the rule. But the battle against unconventional, non-state governed, irregular actors raises specific problems: there are multiple actors, unpredictable at that, who do not abide by the same rules. New orders in conflicts are imposing the implementation of an ever more important need for information, and information collection and processing. Networks now have an incredible importance. The document refers to the growing threats against American heritage: the USA is a target and the increasing amount of attacks against their networks is indeed the proof of this. There are many obstacles which need to be removed before they can achieve real superiority and freedom to act, especially as vulnerable points may originate within the very operations of the armed forces. An example of this is the vulnerability of using products (software and hardware), commercial products (off-the-shelf), and sometimes even foreign products123. This brings to mind the fact that the US Air Force uses commercial, even foreign, applications for its cyberspace operations.

Information space extends to space124, particularly via communication and observation satellites125. Satellites are the keystone to the cyberspace and communication systems, but also the security system: monitoring (Echelon network is the symbol), observation, communication. These are at the heart of the C4ISR systems, without which a concept such as network-centric warfare could not exist. There would be no drones without satellites. It is even a question of extending the Internet to extra-atmospheric space. Projects in this vein (Interplanetary Networks) were being formed in the 1990s, but ran into several technical difficulties (delays in important transmissions due to high distances and costs) [GEL 06]. NASA dedicates a few pages on its website to this project126. The development of communication systems based on the infrastructures in extra-atmospheric space will also raise questions for legal, geopolitical and geostrategic domains: questions of seizing this space, questions of regulation of human activity in this space, of sovereignty, new territoriality and independence.

#### Drone prolif is inevitable and causes global nuclear war

Dr. Michael C. Horowitz 19, Professor of Political Science at University of Pennsylvania, NDT Champion from Emory University, PhD in Government from Harvard University, Adjunct Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security, “When Speed Kills: Autonomous Weapon Systems, Deterrence, and Stability”, 5/2/2019, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3348356

Thus, the reason to deploy autonomous systems would have to be their reliability and effectiveness rather than signaling. And giving up human control to algorithms in a crisis that could end with global nuclear war would require an extremely high level of perceived reliability and effectiveness. Few things are more important to militaries in crisis situations than informational awareness and control over decisions, and there might be fear that autonomous systems are prone to accidents.

This counterfactual illustrates that the development and deployment of lethal autonomous weapon systems by national militaries, if it occurs, is unlikely to have simple, easy, and linear consequences. Instead, human factors, including the psychological desire for control and organizational politics, will strongly shape how militaries think about developing and using LAWS. This will not just influence the potential for arms races in peacetime, but deterrence and wartime stability due to the organizational processes militaries implement for the deployment and use of autonomous systems on the battlefield.

This paper draws on research in strategic studies and examples from military history to assess how LAWS could influence the development and deployment of military systems, including arms races, crisis stability, and wartime stability, especially the risk of escalation. It also discusses the potential for arms control. It focuses on these questions through the lens of key characteristics of LAWS, especially the potential for increased operational speed and, simultaneously, less human control over battlefield choices. One of the primary attractions of autonomous systems, even compared to remotely piloted systems, is the potential to operate at machine speed. Another potential benefit is the possibility of machine-like accuracy in following programming, but that comes with a potential downside: the loss of control and the accompanying risk of accidents, adversarial spoofing, and miscalculation. Even if LAWS malfunction at the same rate as humans in a given scenario, the ability of operators to control the impact of those malfunctions may be lower, which could make LAWS less predictable on the battlefield. The paper then examines how these issues interact with the large uncertainty parameter associated with AI-based military capabilities at present, both in terms of the range of the possible and the opacity of their programming.

The results highlight several critical issues surrounding the development and deployment of LAWS.1 First, the desire to fight at machine speed with autonomous systems, while making a military more effective in a conflict, could increase crisis instability. As countries fear losing conflicts faster, it will generate escalation pressure, including an increased incentive for first strikes. Second, in addition to the actual risk of accidents and miscalculation from LAWS, the fear of accidents and losing control of autonomous systems could limit the willingness of militaries to deploy them, particularly since many militaries are conservative when it comes to emerging technologies and have high standards for system reliability. Third, the dual-use, or even general purpose, character of the basic science underlying many autonomous systems will make the technology hard to control, giving many countries and actors access to basic algorithms, though whether this is described as diffusion, proliferation, or an arms race will depend on political dynamics as much as anything.

Finally, multiple uncertainty parameters concerning lethal autonomous weapon systems could exacerbate security dilemmas. Uncertainty over the range of the possible concerning the programming of lethal autonomous weapon systems will increase fear of those systems in the near term, making restraint less likely for competitive reasons. Moreover, the inherent differences between remotely piloted systems and LAWS at the platform level come from software, not hardware. There is arguably an inherent opacity to lethal autonomous weapon systems. If an arms race over lethal autonomous weapon systems occurs, it will likely be because of worse-case assumptions about capability development by potential adversaries.

What is Autonomy or Artificial Intelligence?

Artificial intelligence is the use of computing power, in the form of algorithms, to conduct tasks that previously required human intelligence.2 Artificial intelligence in this context is best thought of as an umbrella technology or enabler, like the combustion engine or electricity. Military applications of artificial intelligence are potentially broad – from image recognition for surveillance to more efficient logistics to battle management.3 These include both non-kinetic applications, including in the cyber realm, as well as kinetic applications.4 One potential application of artificial intelligence is through armed autonomous systems that could be deployed on the battlefield, or what are most popularly called lethal autonomous weapon systems or lethal autonomous weapon systems. This differs from remotely-piloted systems where a human, though at a distance, still operates a given vehicle or system.

What is a lethal autonomous weapon system? While simple to describe on first glance, and easy to understand in the extreme – an armed humanoid robot with extremely broad programming making decisions about engaging in warfare – drawing the line between a lethal autonomous weapon system and other weapon systems is complex. In Directive 3000.09, published in 2012, the US Department of Defense defines an autonomous weapon as “A weapon system that, once activated, can select and engage targets without further intervention by a human operator.”5 What it means to select and engage a target is not entirely clear, however. For example, homing munitions, which have existed since World War II, select and engage targets, according to a common sense understanding of the terms.6

Exactly what functions are autonomous also matters. A system could have automatic piloting, for example, that flies or drives a platform to a target, but still have complete human control over the use of the weapon. That would be a system with a high level of automation, though not a lethal autonomous weapon system according to most perspectives. Heather Roff measures the level of autonomy in a weapon system based on three subcomponents: self-mobility, self-direction, and self-determination. This helps distinguish systems where there might be autonomy concerning the best way a missile should get to a target, but the target itself is designated by a person fromsystems where an algorithm might be making higher-level engagement decisions.7 There are already some applications of limited machine autonomy in military systems, with the most prominent example being the automatic mode present on many Close-In Weapon Systems (CIWS), such as the Phalanx, used to defend ships and incoming missiles from attack.8

This article will not resolve the definitional debate surrounding lethal autonomous weapon systems, which is still ongoing in meetings of the Group of Governmental Experts focused on lethal autonomous weapon systems in the United Nations Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. Provisionally, this article adopts the Scharre and Horowitz definition that a lethal autonomous weapon system is “[A] weapon system that, once activated, is intended to select and engage targets where a human has not decided those specific targets are to be engaged.”9 However, moving beyond the close cases (e.g. particular types of missile guidance systems) and considering those weapon systems that clearly use machine intelligence to search for, select, and/or engage targets can help clarify what is at stake in this debate in the first place.10 After all, if most militaries most of the time would not have any need for lethal autonomous weapon systems, or those systems have significant disadvantages relative to remotely-piloted military robotics or soldiers on the battlefield, the stakes are lower. In contrast, if the integration of machine intelligence with military systems could give countries or violent non-state actors a significant advantage in how they employ force, it becomes even more crucial to engage the topic.

It is important to note that this article does not address concerns about existential risk related to artificial general intelligence – the fear that a superintelligence could decide to destroy the human race, either because it decides humans are malign or because humans program it to achieve a goal it can only accomplish by destroying humans.11 The existential risk issue associated with artificial intelligence is not necessarily closely coupled to military applications of artificial intelligence. If a super-intelligent machine learning system has the ability to take over human society in the interest of a goal – any goal – whether autonomous systems at much smaller orders of magnitude already exist in military systems will likely be unimportant. The super-intelligent system would simply create what it needed.

Why Invest in Autonomous Systems?

Militaries are already increasing their investments in remotely-piloted robotic systems. From UAVs such as the MQ-9 Reaper (United States) to uninhabited surface vehicles (USVs) such as the Guardium (Israel) to uninhabited ground vehicles (UGV) such as Platform-M (Russia), militaries around the world are investing in remotely piloted platforms, some of which can carry weapons. In these systems, human control over the use of force is not fundamentally different from the use of force with inhabited systems. In some cases, such as the MQ-9 Reaper, the sensor system a drone pilot uses to launch a weapon might even be the same sensor system a pilot in the cockpit of an inhabited fighter uses. Using remotely piloted systems gives militaries the ability to reduce the risk to their own soldiers while still projecting power in similar ways to how they used force previously.12 The first places militaries are likely to use kinetic lethal autonomous weapon systems include relatively “clear” environments such as air-to-air combat or naval combat, especially in geographic arenas where civilians are extremely unlikely to be present.13

#### Drolif means every hotspot goes nuclear.

Zenko and Kreps, PhDs, 14 \*Micah - Douglas Dillon fellow in the Center for Preventive Action at the Council on Foreign Relations, PhD in political science from Brandeis University; \*Sarah - Stanton nuclear security fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, assistant professor in the department of government and an adjunct professor at Cornell Law School, BA from Harvard University, MSc from Oxford University, and PhD from Georgetown University; “Limiting Armed Drone Proliferation," Council on Foreign Relations, June 2014, http://aspheramedia.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Limiting\_Armed\_Drone\_Proliferation\_CSR69.pdf

The inherent advantages of drones will not alone make traditional interstate warfare more likely—such conflicts are relatively rare anyway, with only one active interstate conflict in both 2012 and 2013.20 Nor will the probable type, quantity, range, and lethality of armed drones that states possess in coming decades make a government more likely to attempt to defeat an opposing army, capture or control foreign territory, or remove a foreign leader from power. However, misperceptions over the use of armed drones increase the likelihood of militarized disputes with U.S. allies, as well as U.S. military forces, which could lead to an escalating crisis and deeper U.S. involvement. Though surveillance drones can be used to provide greater stability between countries by monitoring ceasefires or disputed borders, armed drones will have destabilizing consequences. Arming a drone, whether by design or by simply putting a crude payload on an unarmed drone, makes it a weapon, and thereby a direct national security threat for any state whose border it breaches. Increased Frequency of Interstate and Intrastate Force For the United States, drones have significantly reduced the political, diplomatic, and military risks and costs associated with the use of military force, which has led to a vast expansion of lethal operations that would not have been attempted with other weapons platforms. Aside from airstrikes in traditional conflicts such as Libya, Iraq, and Afghanistan—where one-quarter of all International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) airstrikes in 2012 were conducted by drones—the United States has conducted hundreds in non-battlefield settings: Pakistan (approximately 369), Yemen (approximately 87), Somalia (an estimated 16), and the Philippines (at least 1, in 2006).21 Of the estimated 473 non-battlefield targeted killings undertaken by the United States since November 2002, approximately 98 percent were carried out by drones. Moreover, despite maintaining a “strong preference” for capturing over killing suspected terrorists since September 2011, there have been only 3 known capture attempts, compared with 194 drone strikes that have killed an estimated 1,014 people, 86 of whom were civilians.22 Senior U.S. civilian and military officials, whose careers span the pre– and post–armed drone era, overwhelmingly agree that the threshold for the authorization of force by civilian officials has been significantly reduced. Former secretary of defense Robert Gates asserted in October 2013, for example, that armed drones allow decision-makers to see war as a “bloodless, painless, and odorless” affair, with technology detaching leaders from the “inevitably tragic, inefficient, and uncertain” consequences of war.23 President Barack Obama admitted in May 2013 that the United States has come to see armed drones “as a cure-all for terrorism,” because they are low risk and instrumental in “shielding the government” from criticisms “that a troop deployment invites.”24 Such admissions from leaders of a democratic country with a system of checks and balances point to the temptations that leaders with fewer institutional checks will face. President Obama and his senior aides have stated that the United States is setting precedents with drones that other states may emulate.25 If U.S. experience and Obama’s cautionary words are any guide, states that acquire armed drones will be more willing to threaten or use force in ways they might not otherwise, within both interstate and intrastate contexts. States might undertake cross-border, interstate actions less discriminately, especially in areas prone to tension. As is apparent in the East and South China Seas, nationalist sentiments and the discovery of untapped, valuable national resources can make disputes between countries more likely. In such contested areas, drones will enable governments to undertake strike missions or probe the responses of an adversary—actions they would be less inclined to take with manned platforms. According to the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), there are approximately 430 bilateral maritime boundaries, most of which are not defined by formal agreements between the affected states.26 Beyond the cases of East Asia, other cross-border flashpoints for conflict where the low-risk proposition of drone strikes would be tempting include Russia in Georgia or Ukraine, Turkey in Syria, Sudan within its borders, and China on its western periphery. In 2013, a Chinese counternarcotics official revealed that his bureau had considered attempting to kill a drug kingpin named Naw Kham, who was hiding in a remote region in northeastern Myanmar, by using a drone carrying twenty kilograms of dynamite. “The plan was rejected, because the order was to catch him alive,” the official recalled.27 With armed drones, China might make the same calculation that the United States has made—that killing is more straightforward than capturing—in choosing to target ostensibly high-threat individuals with drone strikes. China’s demonstrated willingness to employ armed drones against terrorists or criminals outside its borders could directly threaten U.S. allies in the region, particularly if the criterion China uses to define a terrorist does not align with that of the United States or its allies. Domestically, governments may use armed drones to target their perceived internal enemies. Most emerging drone powers have experienced recent domestic unrest. Turkey, Russia, Pakistan, and China all have separatist or significant opposition movements (e.g., Kurds, Chechens, the Taliban, Tibetans, and Uighurs) that presented political and military challenges to their rule in recent history. These states already designate individuals from these groups as “terrorists,” and reserve the right to use force against them. States possessing the lower risk—compared with other weapons platforms—capability of armed drones could use them more frequently in the service of domestic pacification, especially against time-sensitive targets that reside in mountainous, jungle, or other inhospitable terrain. Compared with typical methods used by military and police forces to counter insurgencies, criminals, or terrorists—such as ground troops and manned aircraft— unmanned drones provide significantly greater real-time intelligence through their persistent loiter time and responsiveness to striking an identified target. Increased Risk of Misperception and Escalation Pushing limits in already unstable regions is complicated by questions raised regarding rules of engagement: how would states respond to an armed drone in what they contend is their sovereign airspace, and how would opposing sides respond to counter-drone tactics? Japanese defense officials claim that shooting down Chinese drones in what Japan contends is its airspace is more likely to occur than downing manned aircraft because drones are not as responsive to radio or pilot warnings, thereby raising the possibility of an escalatory response.28 Alternatively, Japan might misidentify a Chinese manned fighter as an advanced drone and fire on it, especially if the aircraft’s radar signature is not sufficiently distinctive or if combat drones routinely fly over the disputed area. Thus, the additional risks associated with drone strikes, combined with the lack of clarity on how two countries would react to an attempted downing of a drone, create the potential for miscalculation and subsequent escalation. As U.S. Air Force commanders in South Korea noted, a North Korean drone equipped with chemical agents would not have to kill many or even any people on the peninsula to terrorize the population and escalate tensions.29 This scenario points to the spiraling escalatory dynamic that could be repeated—likely intensified in the context of armed drones—in other tension-prone areas, such as the Middle East, South Asia, and Central and East Africa, where the mix of low-risk and ambiguous rules of engagement is a recipe for escalation. Not all of these contingencies directly affect U.S. interests, but they would affect treaty allies whose security the United States has an interest in maintaining. Compared with other weapons platforms, current practice repeatedly demonstrates that drones make militarized disputes more likely due to a decreased threshold for the use of force and an increased risk of miscalculation. Increased Risk of Lethality The proliferation of armed drones will increase the likelihood of destabilizing or devastating one-off, high-consequence attacks. In March 2013, Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA) observed of drones: “In some respects it’s a perfect assassination weapon. . . . Now we have a problem. There are all these nations that want to buy these armed drones. I’m strongly opposed to that.”30 The worst-case contingency for the use of armed drones, albeit an unlikely circumstance, would be to deliver weapons of mass destruction. Drones are, in many ways, the perfect vehicle for delivering biological and chemical agents.31 A WMD attack, or even the assassination of a political leader, another troubling though unlikely circumstance, would have tremendous consequences for regional and international stability. Deterring such drone-based attacks will depend on the ability of the United States and other governments to accurately detect and attribute them. Technical experts and intelligence analysts disagree about the extent to which this will be possible, but the difficulties lie in the challenges of detecting drones (they emit small radar, thermal, and electron signatures, and can fly low), determining who controlled it (they can be programmed to fly to a preset GPS coordinate), or assigning ownership to a downed system (they can be composed of commercial, off-the-shelf components).32 It is equally noteworthy that civilian officials or military commanders have almost always used armed drones in ways beyond their initially intended applications. Drones do not simply fulfill existing mission requirements; they create new and unforeseen ones, and will continue to do so in the future. Furthermore, U.S. officials would be misguided to view future uses of armed drones solely through the prism of how the United States has used them—for discrete military operations in relatively benign air-defense environments. The potential for misperception is compounded by the fact that few governments seeking or acquiring armed drones have publicly articulated any strategy for how they will likely use them. Conversely, the uncertainty about how other countries will use drones provides the United States with an opportunity to shape drone doctrines, especially for U.S. allies interested in procuring drones from U.S. manufacturers.

#### Internet doesn’t need satellites

Jim Grupé 19, Former Technical Consultant and Strategic Planner at Federal Government of the United States, 40+ years as an Engineer, Mostly “Systems Level”, “Would The Internet Still Function If All Satellites Were Destroyed?”, Quora, 2/16/2019, https://www.quora.com/Would-the-internet-still-function-if-all-satellites-were-destroyed

The internet rarely uses satellites. That’s because a satellite link is slow, and the internet automatically prioritizes fast connections. The only time a satellite link would be in the path is an island that didn’t have a cable connection to the mainland nearby.

#### Loss of satellites will shut down terrestrial mining

Les Johnson 13, Deputy Manager for NASA's Advanced Concepts Office at the Marshall Space Flight Center, Co-Investigator for the JAXA T-Rex Space Tether Experiment and PI of NASA's ProSEDS Experiment, Master's Degree in Physics from Vanderbilt University, Popular Science Writer, and NASA Technologist, Frequent Contributor to the Journal of the British Interplanetary Society and Member of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, National Space Society, the World Future Society, and MENSA, Sky Alert!: When Satellites Fail, p. 105

Resource Location

Looking for rare minerals to be mined for our many gadgets, household appliances, and industrial machines? Soil type is often a strong indicator of whether or not underground deposits of metals and minerals are located. By using satellite data to identify promising surface structural features and different soil types, mining companies can better identify promising mining locations, wasting less time and effort in finding the best places to obtain much-needed industrial resources. Without satellite images, the finding and assessment of promising new mines would grind to a halt as the industries retooled back into the days of much slower and labor-intensive field surveys (but without GPS!).

#### Amazon mining will cause extinction

Charito Ushiñahua 11, Anthropologist Working for the Preservation of Indigenous Amazonian Cultures, “Yanomami Indians: The Fierce People?”, http://www.amazon-indians.org/yanomami.html

A mineralogical survey of the northern Amazon by the Brazilian government in 1975 revealed the presence of gold ore in the Roraima region of Brazil. By the early 1980's, miners in search of gold began invading the Yanomami territory in Brazil and by 1987 it had become a full-fledged gold rush. Over 30,000 prospectors entered Yanomami lands and established over a hundred clandestine mining operations. The resulting massacres and diseases brought by these invaders is estimated to have caused the death of over 2,000 Yanomami. One of the problems with gold mining is the environmental destruction it causes. In order to separate gold from rocks and soil, mercury is used. Mercury in the rivers and streams bio-accumulates and permeates the entire ecosystem. The mercury accumulates in predators and hunters (such as the Yanomami) higher up the food chain and creates a neurotoxin that causes birth defects and abnormal child development. The Yanomami have had increased child mortality rates while their birth rates have declined putting their very existence into risk. Moreover, malaria increased in the area due to the stagnant pools left by the miners that increase the mosquito populations that are vectors of the disease. Some have estimated that malaria is responsible for the deaths of about 13% of the Yanomami population every year. However, the negative influence of the miners extends beyond physical health. Their introduction of alcohol and other western goods has had an immense negative effect on Yanomami society itself.

In response to the crisis created by the gold miners, in 1992 the Yanomami territory was protected by the Brazilian government by creating a federal indigenous reserve. However, the gold miners were not happy about the creation of the reserve and in July, 1993, a group of miners tried to exterminate an entire village in what has become to be known as the "Haximu Massacre." At lease 16 Yanomami were killed in what many have called genocide. Some of the miners were tried and convicted and after numerous appeals on the 7th of August, 2006 the Brazilian Supreme Federal Court reaffirmed that the crime known as the Haximu Massacre and upheld the ruling sentencing the miners to 19 years in prison for genocide. However, to this day there is political pressure by the mining industry to reduce the Yanomami territory and allow commercial mining operations on their lands.

In the year 2000, a journalist named Patrick Tierney published a book called, "Darkness in El Dorado," and accused anthropologist Napoleon Chagnon and his colleague geneticist James Neel of numerous misdeeds, among them intentionally creating an epidemic of measles among the Yanomami people in order to study the effects of natural selection on primitive societies. Tierney states that the resulting epidemic caused the death of hundreds of Yanomami. Incredibly, Tierney charged that the experiments were funded by the US Atomic Energy Commission, who sought to model the societal consequences of mass mortality caused by nuclear war. In addition to the measles epidemic, Tierney charged that Chagnon mischaracterized the Yanomami as "The Fierce People" when in fact it was Chagnon who was causing the violence by introducing enormous amounts of western goods such as machetes into the Yanomami society, thus stimulating warfare over the introduced goods. Tierney also accused Chagnon of fraud by staging films, such as "The Axe Fight" that he helped produce. The journalist charged that the anthropologist prescripted the films and that they were not spontaneous as portrayed.

Tierney's book caused an uproar in the anthropological community and the American Anthropological Association (AAA) got involved in the debate. In fact, the AAA convened a special commission to investigate the allegations against Chagnon and Neel. The report by the AAA issued in May, 2002 exonerated the anthropologist and geneticist from causing a measles epidemic among the Yanomami. Nonetheless, the AAA criticized some aspects of Chagnon's research, including his portrayal of the Yanomami as "The Fierce People," and his bribing of Venezuelan officials. However, the AAA debate was not over and three years later in June, 2005 they rescinded the acceptance of the 2002 report.

As someone who is working to support indigenous people, I would like to point out that over the many years since publishing his first book on the Yanomami (whose revenues made him a millionaire), Chagnon has failed to bring significant aid to the Yanomami people. In fact, he sought to damage the indigenous movement by publicly criticizing Davi Kopenawa, a Yanomami activist who helped establish the Yanomami reserve in Brazil. One might ask if it was proper behavior for an anthropologist to hurt the efforts of an indigenous Amazonian activist attempting to defend his people. Interestingly, the Yanomami leader Davi Kopenawa has predicted the destruction of the entire human race if the Amazon Rainforest is destroyed. Kopenawa states, "The forest-land will only die if it is destroyed by whites. Then, the creeks will disappear, the land will crumble, the trees will dry and the stones of the mountains will shatter under the heat. The xapiripë spirits who live in the mountain ranges and play in the forest will eventually flee. Their fathers, the shamans, will not be able to summon them to protect us. The forest-land will become dry and empty. The shamans will no longer be able to deter the smoke-epidemics and the malefic beings who make us ill. And so everyone will die." Many ecologists seem to agree with Kopenawa, believing that the Amazon Rainforest are the "lungs of the Earth" and that if the Amazon is destroyed, it will cause a global ecological disaster resulting in the eventual destruction of the human race.

#### Satellites are crucial for large, industrial megafarms

Les Johnson 13, Deputy Manager for NASA's Advanced Concepts Office at the Marshall Space Flight Center, Co-Investigator for the JAXA T-Rex Space Tether Experiment and PI of NASA's ProSEDS Experiment, Master's Degree in Physics from Vanderbilt University, Popular Science Writer, and NASA Technologist, Frequent Contributor to the Journal of the British Interplanetary Sodety and Member of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, National Space Society, the World Future Society, and MENSA, Sky Alert!: When Satellites Fail, p. 106

Agriculture

To feed the Earth's growing population affordably, farming has gone from a mostly decentralized, family-owned business to corporate farming on a scale never before imagined. These industrial megafarms are a primary reason that many people in the world can enjoy plentiful and varied foods at a reasonable cost. On this scale, deciding what crop to plant in a given field is not just business - it's science. And the science relies, in large part, on data from space.

Companies such as the Satellite Imaging Corporation (SIC) provide data from space on overall crop health, soil analysis, and irrigation impacts and efficiencies. From space, you can easily map soil variations, finding areas rich in organic matter and others less so - this allows optimized planting to take advantage of crops that thrive in any given soil environment. Very large farms also use satellite images to assess the overall health of their crops by land area, spotting those that are being impacted by non-optimal soil moisture content, etc., allowing the farmer to take corrective action while there is still time to save the crop.

#### Industrial ag’s unsustainable and causes extinction

Alice Friedemann 17, Systems Architect and Engineer For Over 25 Years, Science, Energy, and Agriculture Writer, Investigative Journalist and Energy Expert, Founder of Energy Skeptic, Author of When Trucks Stop Running: Energy and the Future of Transportation, “Chemical Industrial Agriculture is Unsustainable. Here’s Why”, Resilience, 5-27, http://www.resilience.org/stories/2017-03-27/chemical-industrial-farming-unsustainable-heres/

We hear a lot about how we’re running out of antibiotics. But we are also doomed to run out of pesticides, because insects inevitably develop resistance, whether toxic chemicals are sprayed directly or genetically engineered into the plants.

Worse yet, weeds, insects, and fungus develop resistance in just 5 years on average, which has caused the chemicals to grow increasingly lethal over the past 60 years. And it takes on average eight to ten years to identify, test, and develop a new pesticide, though that isn’t long enough to discover the long-term toxicity to humans and other organisms.

And this devil’s bargain hasn’t even provided most of the gains in crop yields, which is due to natural-gas and phosphate fertilizers plus soil-crushing tractors and harvesters that can do the work of millions of men and horses quickly on farms that grow only one crop on thousands of acres.

Yet before pesticides, farmers lost a third of their crops to pests, after pesticides, farmers still lose a third of their crops.

Even without pesticides, industrial agriculture is doomed to fail from extremely high rates of soil erosion and soil compaction at rates that far exceed losses in the past, since soil couldn’t wash or blow away as easily on small farms that grew many crops.

But pest killing chemicals are surely accelerating the day of reckoning sooner rather than later. Enormous amounts of toxic chemicals are dumped on land every year — over 1 billion pounds are used in the United State (US) every year and 5.6 billion pounds globally (Alavanja 2009).

This destroys the very ecosystems that used to help plants fight off pests, and is a major factor biodiversity loss and extinction.

Evidence also points to pesticides playing a key role in the loss of bees and their pollination services. Although paleo-diet fanatics won’t mind eating mostly meat when fruit, vegetable, and nut crops are gone, they will not be so happy about having to eat more carbohydrates. Wheat and other grains will still be around, since they are wind-pollinated.

Agricultural chemicals render land lifeless and toxic to beneficial creatures, also killing the food chain above — fish, amphibians, birds, and humans (from cancer, chronic disease, and suicide).

Surely a day is coming when pesticides stop working, resulting in massive famines. But who is there to speak for the grandchildren? And those that do speak for them are mowed down by the logic of libertarian capitalism, which only cares about profits today. Given that a political party is now in power in the U.S. that wants to get rid of the protections the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and other agencies provide, may make matters worse if agricultural chemicals are allowed to be more toxic, long-lasting, and released earlier, before being fully tested for health effects.

Meanwhile chemical and genetic engineering companies are making a fortune, because the farmers have to pay full price, since the pests develop resistance long before a product is old enough to be made generically. Except for glyphosate, but weeds have developed resistance. Predictably.

In fact, the inevitability of resistance has been known for nearly seven decades. In 1951, as the world began using synthetic chemicals, Dr. Reginald Painter at Kansas State University published “Insect Resistance in Crop Plants”. He made a case that it would be better to understand how a crop plant fought off insects, since it was inevitable that insects would develop genetic or behavioral resistance. At best, chemicals might be used as an emergency control measure.

Farmers will say that we simply must carry on like this, there’s no other choice. But that’s simply not true.

Consider the corn rootworm, that costs farmers about $2 billion a year in lost crops despite spending hundreds of millions on chemicals and the hundreds of millions of dollars chemical companies spend developing new chemicals.

To lower the chances of corn pests developing resistance, corn crops were rotated with soybeans. Predictably, a few mutated to eat soybeans plus changed their behavior. They used to only lay eggs on nearby corn plants, now they disperse to lay eggs on soybean crops as well. Worse yet, corn is more profitable than soy and many farmers began growing continuous corn. Already the corn rootworm is developing resistance to the latest and greatest chemicals.

But the corn rootworm is not causing devastation in Europe, because farms are smaller and most farmers rotate not just soy, but wheat, alfalfa, sorghum and oats with corn (Nordhaus 2017).

Before planting, farmers try to get rid of pests that survived the winter and apply fumigants to kill fungi and nematodes, and pre-emergent chemicals to reduce weed seeds from emerging. Even farmers practicing no-till farming douse the land with herbicides by using GMO herbicide-resistant crops. Then over the course of crop growth, farmers may apply several rounds of additional pesticides to control different pests. For example, cotton growers apply chemicals from 12 to 30 times before harvest.

Currently, the potential harm is only assessed for 2 to 3 years before a permit is issued, even though the damage might occur up to 20 years later.

Although these chemicals appear to be just like antibiotics, that isn’t entirely true. We develop some immunity to a disease after antibiotics help us recover, but a plant is still vulnerable to the pests and weeds with the genetics or behavior to survive and chemical assault.

Although there are thousands of chemical toxins, what matters is how they kill, their method of action (MOA). For herbicides there are only 29 MOAs, for insecticides, just 28. So if a pest develops resistance to one chemical within an MOA, it will be resistant to all of the thousands of chemicals within that MOA.

The demand for chemicals has also grown due the high level of bioinvasive species. It takes a while to find native pests and make sure they won’t do more harm than good. In the 1950s there were just three main corn pests. By 1978 there were 40, and they vary regionally. For example, California has 30 arthropods and over 14 fungal diseases to cope with.

When I was learning how to grow food organically back in the 90s, I remember how outraged organic farmers were that Monsanto was going to genetically engineer plants to have the Bt bacteria in them. This is because the only insecticide organic farmers can use is Bt bacteria, because it is found in the soil. It’s natural. Organic farmers have been careful to spray only in emergencies so that insects didn’t develop resistance to their only remedy. Since 1996, GMO plants have been engineered to have Bt in them, and predictably, insects have developed resistance. For example, in 2015, 81% of all corn was planted with genetically engineered Bt. But corn earworms have developed resistance, especially in North Carolina and Georgia, setting the stage for damage across the nation. Five other insects have developed resistance to Bt as well.

GMO plants were also going to reduce pesticide use. They did for a while, but not for long. Chemical use has increased 7% to 202,000 tons a year in the past 10 years.

Resistance can come in other ways than mutations. Behavior can change. Cockroach bait is laced with glucose, so cockroaches that developed glucose-aversion now no longer take the bait.

It is worth repeating that chemicals and other practices are ruining the long-term viability of agriculture. Here is how author Dyer explains it:

“Ultimately the practice of modern farming is not sustainable” because “the damage to the soil and natural ecosystems is so great that farming becomes dependent not on the land but on the artificial inputs into the process, such as fertilizers and pesticides. In many ways, our battle against the diverse array of pest species is a battle against the health of the system itself. As we kill pest species, we also kill related species that may be beneficial. We kill predators that could assist our efforts. We reduce the ecosystem’s ability to recover due to reduced diversity, and we interfere with the organisms that affect the biogeochemical processes that maintain the soils in which the plants grow.

Soil is a complex, multifaceted living thing that is far more than the sum of the sand, silt, clay, fungi, microbes, nematodes, and other invertebrates. All biotic components interact as an ecosystem within the soil and at the surface, and in relation to the larger components such as herbivores that move across the land. Organisms grow and dig through the soil, aerate it, reorganize it, and add and subtract organic material. Mature soil is structured and layered and, very importantly, it remains in place. Plowing of the soil turns everything upside down. What was hidden from light is exposed. What was kept at a constant temperature is now varying with the day and night and seasons. What cannot tolerate drying conditions at the surface is likely killed. And very sensitive and delicate structures within the soil are disrupted and destroyed.

Conventional tillage disrupts the entire soil ecosystem. Tractors and farm equipment are large and heavy; they compact the soil, which removes air space and water-holding capacity. Wind and water erosion remove the smallest soil particles, which typically hold most of the micronutrients needed by plants. Synthetic fertilizers are added to supplement the loss of oil nutrients but often are relatively toxic to many soil organisms. And chemicals such as pre-emergents, fumigants, herbicides, insecticides, acaricides, fungicides, and defoliants eventually kill all but the most tolerant or resistant soil organisms. It does not take long to reduce a native, living, dynamic soil to a relatively lifeless collection of inorganic particles with little of the natural structure and function of undisturbed soil”.

When I told my husband all the reasons we use agricultural chemicals and the harm done, my husband got angry and said “Farmers aren’t stupid, that can’t be right!”

I think there are a number of reasons why farmers don’t go back to sustainable organic farming.

First, there is far too much money to be made in the chemical herbicide, pesticide, and insecticide industry to stop this juggernaut. After reading Lessig’s book “Republic, Lost”, one of the best, if not the best book on campaign finance reform, I despair of campaign financing ever happening. So chemical lobbyists will continue to donate enough money to politicians to maintain the status quo. Plus the chemical industry has infiltrated regulatory agencies via the revolving door for decades and is now in a position to assassinate the EPA, with newly appointed Scott Pruitt, who would like to get rid of the EPA.

Second, about half of farmers are hired guns. They don’t own the land and care about passing it on in good health to their children. They rent the land, and their goal, and the owner’s goal is for them to make as much profit as possible.

Third, renters and farmers both would lose money, maybe go out of business in the years it would take to convert an industrial monoculture farm to multiple crops rotated, or an organic farm.

Fourth, it takes time to learn to farm organically properly. So even if the farmer survives financially, mistakes will be made. Hopefully made up for by the higher price of organic food, but as wealth grows increasingly more unevenly distributed, and the risk of another economic crash grows (not to mention lack of reforms, being in more debt now than 2008, etc).

Fifth, industrial farming is what is taught at most universities. There are only a handful of universities that offer programs in organic agriculture.

Sixth, subsidies favor large farmers, who are also the only farmers who have the money to profit from economies of scale, and buy their own giant tractors to farm a thousand acres of monoculture crops. Industrial farming has driven 5 million farmers off the land who couldn’t compete with the profits made by larger farms in the area.

But farmers will have to go organic whether they like it or not

It’s hard to say whether this will happen because we’ve run out of pesticides, whether from resistance or a financial crash reducing new chemical research, or whether peak oil, peak coal, and peak natural gas will cause the decline of chemical farming. Agriculture uses about 15 to 20% of fossil fuel energy, from natural gas fertilizer, oil-based chemicals, farm vehicle and equipment fuel, the agricultural cold chain, distribution, packaging, refrigeration, and cooking to name a few of the uses.

At some point of fossil decline, there won’t be enough fuel or pesticides to continue business as usual.

Farmers will be forced to go organic at some point. Wouldn’t it be easier to start the transition now?

### 1NC – Space Col

#### The Private Industry is the only avenue for Space Colonization – Governments have no incentive and are bound by I-Law.

Eure 16 (, J., 2016. Space… the final frontier. [online] Campbell Law Observer. Available at: <http://campbelllawobserver.com/space-the-final-frontier/> [Accessed 28 December 2021] Jonathan Eure is a 2017 graduate of Campbell Law School, winner of the 2017 J. Bryan Boyd Award for Excellence in Legal Journalism, and served as a senior staff writer for the Campbell Law Observer. He lived in Morganton, in the foothills of North Carolina, before moving to Raleigh for law school. He earned BA’s in Political Science and History from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, graduating in 2014. The summer after his first year of law school, Jonathan worked as a legislative research intern with Representative Rob Bryan in the North Carolina General Assembly. Jonathan now interns with the Honorable Paul Newby at the North Carolina Supreme Court. Jonathan is the Secretary for the Campbell Public Interest Law Student Association (CPILSA).)-rahulpenu

Space… the final frontier With the recent discovery of a new earth-like planet, many countries are beginning serious talks about inhabiting and colonizing a planet in outer space. We very soon might turn on the news and hear stories of interstellar exploration and colonization. We might even hear about voyages of a starship named Enterprise. This probably sounds like wild speculation, or the contents of a cheesy science fiction novel. However, after a European research team announced the discovery of an earth-like planet circling the inhabitable zone of Proxima Centauri in August, 2016, we may soon see more discussions of the logistics and technology required to reach out into the stars. The part of that discussion we ultimately must address is the legal ramifications of colonization, essentially what are the laws to which nations and private individuals must adhere, when claiming portions of a new planet, moon, or asteroid. Proxima Centauri is the closest star to our own, lying a mere 4.54 light years from the Sun. In interstellar terms, that is a stone’s throw away, though clearly still an impossible journey for a civilization who has yet to visit another planet in our own Solar System. Still, Proxima Centauri’s vicinity to Earth has garnered a fair amount of interest from parties who hope to discover an inhabitable, one day reachable, planet. Guillem Anglada-Escudé led a research team of 31 scientists from eight different countries for months studying Proxima Centauri through the European Southern Observatory’s HARPS spectrograph and 3.6 meter telescope in La Silla, Chile. While investigating a tiny wobble Proxima Centauri experiences, the team discovered that the cause of the wobble is an Earthlike planet, promptly named “Proxima b.” “…overall, Proxima b is the best opportunity we have ever had for an inhabitable planet that may be reachable in the foreseeable future.” To be classified as “Earthlike,” Proxima b was studied based on likely mass, position, and orbit around Proxima Centauri, and the effects of Proxima Centauri on Proxima b. The researchers believe Proxima b has a similar mass to Earth, possibly indicating a similar, rocky makeup. Though Proxima Centauri, as a red dwarf star, releases less energy than our Sun, Proxima b is located in the so-called “goldilocks zone” of Proxima Centauri; in other words, not too hot, not too cold. Therefore, the researchers believe the basic elements for human life, heat, oxygen, and water could exist on Proxima b. There is some concern that the amount of solar radiation expelled by Proxima Centauri could make Proxima b uninhabitable, but overall, Proxima b is the best opportunity we have ever had for an inhabitable planet that may be reachable in the foreseeable future. “A ratified treaty is then given the full force of domestic law in the U.S., and the U.S. government would generally be bound to uphold the tenets of that treaty. Being bound to a treaty in this case means the U.S. could not claim any portion of Proxima b as U.S. property.” Obviously we have to get there first, and at this very moment, some of the most brilliant minds on Earth are attempting to develop interstellar travel. Ideas such as asteroid mining and economic incentives of resources available in space are already pushing us toward the day when we might visit another planet. Once we do, our current legal framework may make colonization difficult, at least on a national level. The best starting place for understanding space law is the “Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies,” better known as the “Outer Space Treaty.” Signed in 1967 by the member nations of the UN, including space race powerhouses the U.S. and U.S.S.R., the Outer Space Treaty created a series of broad principles controlling the manner in which nations would explore space. These principles include provisions that exploration is permitted in all states, that no celestial bodies may be appropriated by individual states, that nations take responsibility for the environments of space and celestial bodies, and that non-governmental space activities must be authorized and continually supervised by the states which have jurisdiction over such activities. In order to have ratified such a treaty in the U.S., the President would have sent the treaty to Congress for their “advice and consent,” and the treaty would have to be approved by a two-thirds majority. The treaty would then be sent back to the President to be ratified, as described in Article II, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution. A ratified treaty is then given the full force of domestic law in the U.S., and the U.S. government would generally be bound to uphold the tenets of that treaty. Being bound to a treaty in this case means the U.S. could not claim any portion of Proxima b as U.S. property. Fortunately, this is also true for Russia and China, the U.S.’s primary competitors in space, and none of these nations can violate the treaty without risking adverse reactions from the others. The Outer Space Treaty is the only one of the U.N.’s treaties on outer space to which the U.S. or any other major space-faring nation belongs, and is therefore the only treaty that really matters, though the U.N. has passed other resolutions on the issue. “**Private** **exploration** of space **becomes** **more** of a **reality** each day, with private corporations such as SpaceX, Blue Origin, and Virgin Galactic testing **new** **platforms** for space travel.” As a policy matter, though the **O**uter **S**pace **T**reaty uses lofty ideals to **bind** **nations** into mutual respect and perhaps even unity of purpose, focusing solely on those ideals discounts a key ingredient of the original space race. Promulgation of national ideology was the original motivator of the space race between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. Without national ideology, prestige, or power as a motivating factor, there is really **no** **incentive** **for** the **governments** of major spacefaring nations **to** **spend** massive amounts of money over long periods of time **on** such risky endeavors as space **colonization**. For this reason, the **colonization** of Proxima b would more likely **fall** **to** private **corporations** with much to gain from the resources other worlds might offer. Private exploration of space becomes more of a reality each day, with private corporations such as SpaceX, Blue Origin, and Virgin Galactic testing new platforms for space travel. A **movement** has **grown** **up** **alongside** these private spacefaring **companies** **claiming** planets such as Proxima b might become a **new** **frontier**, where private citizens can stake their own personal claims. This movement has even **proposed** **legislation** in Congress. The “Space Settlement Prize Act,” which would **ultimately** **guarantee** that **any** **settlement** built privately on other planets, moons, asteroids, etc., would be **owned** **by** the private citizens or **corporations** **who** **claim** **them**. This act would likely function similarly to the Homestead Acts, which allowed settlers who worked unclaimed land, to buy that land at very little cost. Furthermore, these groups claim that they are **not** **subject** **to** the **O**uter **S**pace **T**reaty, as the treaty’s provisions only govern nations. “The language of the Outer Space Treaty does not forbid private claims on and settlement of celestial bodies, only national appropriations. Furthermore, nations themselves are answerable in case of any environmental damages.” It is an interesting theory, and these 21st century frontiersmen and women might be correct. The Outer Space Treaty does not only govern nations themselves, but national oversight of non-governmental organizations as well. As all private attempts at space colonization on Proxima b and any other celestial body would be through corporate entities. These corporate entities would certainly fall under the national mandate to authorize and continually supervise the operation of such groups. But just because governments must have some form of oversight in place to manage private space exploration corporations, does not mean there is a mandate to control the legal operation of such corporations. The language of the Outer Space Treaty does not forbid private claims on and settlement of celestial bodies, only national appropriations. Furthermore, nations themselves are answerable in case of any environmental damages. Nations can certainly pass laws regulating the actions of private corporations consistent with the Outer Space Treaty’s mandate, and in fact the U.S. is already considering and attempting to create policies governing private space craft and travel. The problem is that none of this law has become official yet. The reality behind this entire discussion is that it will not become truly important until either nations or private corporations prove they can travel to another planet. Until then, the laws of space colonization are nothing more than an academic exercise. However, they have been proven important in one sense: protection of our moon. Prohibitions on national appropriation, military use, or exploitation have certainly been effective in keeping the moon unmolested (though technological and financial constraints also played a major role). So perhaps there is a reasonable groundwork for the future laws of space colonization. Proxima b may not be the first place they are exercised, but the discovery of a relatively nearby Earthlike planet is sure to hasten the need for such laws to be in place before we land. The law now needs to boldly go where no law has gone before.

#### Space colonization solves extinction

Filling Space 19, 4-19, "Deflecting Existential Risk with Space Colonization," Filling Space, https://filling-space.com/2019/04/19/deflecting-existential-risk-with-space-colonization/

The first living organism on Earth emerged approximately three and a half billion years ago. Since then, life has evolved into countless forms and colonized the planet. But the story of life is not a rosy one. At least five mass extinctions have occurred, and nearly all species that have ever existed on our planet are now dead. One of the most well-understood mass extinctions occurred when the Alvarez asteroid impacted Earth and, likely combined with other factors, killed many dinosaurs and other species. Life then had no tools to detect the coming asteroid or to be able to plan proactively to ensure its survival.

In order to avoid sharing the same fate as the dinosaurs, scholars argue that humans should become a multi-planetary species. We spoke with Professor Gonzalo Munevar, Emeritus Professor at Lawrence Technical University, to hear his thoughts on the existential risks we face and how colonization of the cosmos can help us address them. He has written extensively about the philosophy of space exploration and human consciousness.

Why do you argue that “failure to move into the cosmos would condemn us to oblivion”?

By having a significant presence in the solar system in the next few thousands of years and beyond, we will be in a better position to deflect asteroids and comets that might bring the end of humanity, and much other Earth life, in a horrible collision. And if perchance one such catastrophe proves inevitable (e.g. a rogue planet passing through the solar system), humanity would still survive by having colonized Mars and other bodies, as well as by having built artificial space colonies of the type advocated by Gerard O’Neill.

Once the sun begins to turn into a red giant in a few billion years, we must have long moved into the outer solar system. In the very long run, we have to move into other solar systems. Relativistic-speed starships would be nice, but they are not necessary for the task of moving humanity to the stars. We can reach them, slowly but surely, by propelling some of our space colonies away from the sun, carrying perhaps millions of human beings. They would take advantage of the many resources to be found in the Oort Cloud, and then of equivalent clouds in other solar systems. Even interstellar space has resources to offer. Nuclear energy, probably fusion, would likely be required. It may take us tens of thousands of years, but in the cosmic time scale, that is but a blink in the eye.

What are these catastrophic threats? Are there any records of catastrophic events happening before humans appeared on Earth?

I have already mentioned collisions with asteroids and comets. Although the active geology of our planet tends to erase the record of many collisions, we can find a well-preserved record on the Moon and Venus, the two closest bodies to Earth. On the 600-million-years-old Venusian surface, the spacecraft Magellan discovered about one thousand impact craters at least twice the diameter of meteor craters on Earth. This impact record makes it reasonable to estimate a catastrophic impact on Earth every half a million years or so. Collisions with bodies of 5 km across would happen, on the average, every 20 million years. Apart from the Alvarez asteroid (crater near Yucatan) that led to the extinction of the dinosaurs and the majority of species on Earth 65 million years ago, there have been at least two more impacts by asteroids 10 km or larger in the last 300 million years.

How could human colonization of outer space save other terrestrial life?

On both O’Neill types of colonies as well as on colonies on other planets, and particularly on terraformed planets, we would need all sorts of organisms like bacteria and plants for food, medicine, and ornamentation, as well as many animals for food and other purposes. We cannot have a proper colony without an Earthly environment to surround and nourish us. So, we have to take much other terrestrial life with us in order to survive and flourish. And given the value of biodiversity we would make it a point to take a great variety of organisms that contribute to our biosphere. Of course, we should heed Mark Twain and be sure not to include mosquitoes in our future space arks. I myself would keep out tarantulas and some other obnoxious viruses, bacteria, plants, and animals.

#### Space col key to innovation, space tourism, and heg

West 20 Darrell M. West, 8-18-2020, "Five reasons to explore Mars," Brookings, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/techtank/2020/08/18/five-reasons-to-explore-mars/> TDI

The recent launch of the Mars rover Perseverance is the latest U.S. space mission seeking to understand our solar system. Its [expected arrival at the Red Planet in mid-February](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/30/science/nasa-mars-launch.html) 2021 has a number of objectives linked to science and innovation. The rover is equipped with sophisticated instruments designed to search for the remains of ancient microbial life, take pictures and videos of rocks, drill for soil and rock samples, and use a small helicopter to fly around the [Jezero Crater landing spot](https://mars.nasa.gov/resources/22474/jezero-crater-mars-2020s-landing-site/).

Mars is a valuable place for exploration because it can be reached in 6 ½ months, is a major opportunity for scientific exploration, and has been mapped and studied for several decades. The mission represents the first step in a long-term effort to bring Martian samples back to Earth, where they can be analyzed for residues of microbial life. Beyond the study of life itself, there are a number of different benefits of Mars exploration.

UNDERSTAND THE ORIGINS AND UBIQUITY OF LIFE

The site where Perseverance is expected to land is the place where experts believe 3.5 billion years ago held a lake filled with water and flowing rivers. It is an ideal place to search for the residues of microbial life, test new technologies, and lay the groundwork for human exploration down the road.

The mission plans to investigate whether microbial life existed on Mars billions of years ago and therefore that life is not unique to Planet Earth. As noted by Chris McKay, a research scientist at NASA’s Ames Research Science Center, that would be an extraordinary discovery. “Right here in our solar system, [if life started twice](https://www.space.com/9329-earth-unique-life-common-universe.html), that tells us some amazing things about our universe,” he pointed out. “It means the universe is full of life. Life becomes a natural feature of the universe, not just a quirk of this odd little planet around this star.”

The question of the origins of life and its ubiquity around the universe is central to science, religion, and philosophy. For much of our existence, humans have assumed that even primitive life was unique to Planet Earth and not present in the rest of the solar system, let alone the universe. We have constructed elaborate religious and philosophical narratives around this assumption and built our identity along the notion that life is unique to Earth.

If, as many scientists expect, future space missions cast doubt on that assumption or outright disprove it by finding remnants of microbial life on other planets, it will be both invigorating and illusion-shattering. It will force humans to confront their own myths and consider alternative narratives about the universe and the place of Earth in the overall scheme of things.

As noted in my Brookings book, [Megachange](https://www.brookings.edu/book/megachange-economic-disruption-political-upheaval-and-social-strife-in-the-21st-century/), given the centrality of these issues for fundamental questions about human existence and the meaning of life, it would represent a far-reaching shift in existing human paradigms. As argued by scientist McKay, discovering evidence of ancient microbial life on Mars would lead experts to conclude that life likely is ubiquitous around the universe and not limited to Planet Earth. Humans would have to construct new theories about ourselves and our place in the universe.

DEVELOP NEW TECHNOLOGIES

The U.S. space program has been an extraordinary [catalyst for technology innovation](https://www.jpl.nasa.gov/infographics/infographic.view.php?id=11358). Everything from Global Positioning Systems and medical diagnostic tools to wireless technology and camera phones owe at least part of their creation to the space program. Space exploration required the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to learn how to communicate across wide distances, develop precise navigational tools, store, transmit, and process large amounts of data, deal with health issues through digital imaging and telemedicine, and develop collaborative tools that link scientists around the world. The space program has pioneered the miniaturization of scientific equipment and helped engineers figure out how to land and maneuver a rover from millions of miles away.

Going to Mars requires similar inventiveness. Scientists have had to figure out how to search for life in ancient rocks, drill for rock samples, take high resolution videos, develop flying machines in a place with gravity that is 40 percent lower than on Earth, send detailed information back to Earth in a timely manner, and take off from another planet. In the future, we should expect large payoffs in commercial developments from Mars exploration and advances that bring new conveniences and inventions to people.

ENCOURAGE SPACE TOURISM

In the not too distant future, wealthy tourists likely will take trips around the Earth, visit space stations, orbit the Moon, and perhaps even take trips around Mars. For a substantial fee, they can experience weightlessness, take in the views of the entire planet, see the stars from outside the Earth’s atmosphere, and witness the wonders of other celestial bodies.

The Mars program will help with space tourism by improving engineering expertise with space docking, launches, and reentry and providing additional experience about the impact of space travel on the human body. Figuring out how weightlessness and low gravity situations alter human performance and how space radiation affects people represent just a couple areas where there are likely to be positive by-products for future travel.

The advent of space tourism will [broaden human horizons](https://unitedearth.us/religion-and-spirituality/does-seeing-earth-from-space-alter-your-perspective/) in the same way international travel has exposed people to other lands and perspectives. It will show them that the Earth has a delicate ecosystem that deserves protecting and why it is important for people of differing countries to work together to solve global problems. Astronauts who have had this experience say it has altered their viewpoints and had a profound impact on their way of thinking.

FACILITATE SPACE MINING

Many objects around the solar system are made of similar minerals and chemical compounds that exist on Earth. That means that some asteroids, moons, and planets could be rich in minerals and rare elements. Figuring out how to [harvest those materials](https://www.sciencefocus.com/space/space-mining-the-new-goldrush/) in a safe and responsible manner and bring them back to Earth represents a possible benefit of space exploration. Elements that are rare on Earth may exist elsewhere, and that could open new avenues for manufacturing, product design, and resource distribution. This mission could help resource utilization through advances gained with its Mars Oxygen Experiment (MOXIE) equipment that converts Martian carbon dioxide into oxygen. If MOXIE works as intended, it would help humans live and work on the Red Planet.

ADVANCE SCIENCE

One of the most crucial features of humanity is our curiosity about the life, the universe, and how things operate. Exploring space provides a means to satisfy our thirst for knowledge and improve our understanding of ourselves and our place in the universe.

Space travel already has exploded centuries-old myths and promises to continue to confront our long-held assumptions about who we are and where we come from. The next decade promises to be an exciting period as scientists mine new data from space telescopes, space travel, and robotic exploration. Ten or twenty years from now, we may have [answers to basic questions](https://www.brookings.edu/book/turning-point/) that have eluded humans for centuries, such as how ubiquitous life is outside of Earth, whether it is possible for humans to survive on other planets, and how planets evolve over time.

#### Space innovation solves extinction – generates ecological survival mechanisms.

Sadedin 17 (Suzanne, PhD in Evolutionary Biology, 10-9, "Will Human Innovation Save Us From Future Extinction?," Forbes, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/quora/2017/10/09/will-human-innovation-save-us-from-future-extinction/?sh=773a4f276c65>) TDI

Does the human ability to innovate suggest an immunity to total extinction? Yes and no. Currently, innovation reduces our chance of extinction in some ways, and increases it in others. But if we innovate cleverly, we could become just about immune to extinction. The species that survive mass extinctions tend to share three characteristics. They're widespread. This means local disasters don't wipe out the entire species, and some small areas, called refugia, tend to be unaffected by global disasters. If you're widespread, it's more likely that you have a population that happens to live in a refugium. They're ecological generalists. They can cope with widely varying physical conditions, and they're not fussy about food. They're r-selected. This means that they breed fast and have short generation times, which allows them to rapidly grow their populations and adapt genetically to new conditions. Innovation gives humans the ability to be widespread ecological generalists. With technology, we can live in more diverse conditions and places than any other species. And while we can't (currently) grow our populations rapidly like an r-selected species, innovation does allow us to adapt quickly at the cultural level. Technology also increases our connections to one another and connectivity is a two-edged sword. Many species consist of a network of small, local populations, each of which is somewhat isolated from the others. We call this a metapopulation. The local populations often go extinct, but they are later re-seeded by others, so the metapopulation as a whole survives. Humans used to be a metapopulation, but thanks to innovation, we're now globally connected. Archaeologists believe that many past civilizations, such as the Easter Islanders, fell because of unsustainable ecological and cultural innovations. The impact of these disasters was limited because these civilizations were small and disconnected from other such civilizations. These days, a useful innovation can spread around the world in weeks. So can a lethal one. With many of the technologies and chemicals we're currently inventing, we can't be certain about their long-term effects; human biology is complex enough that we often can't be absolutely certain something won't kill us in a decade until we've waited a decade to see. We try to be careful and test things before they're released, and the probability that any particular invention could kill us all is tiny, but since we're constantly innovating, it's a real possibility. Pandemics pose the same problem for a well-connected species. There are certain possibilities where species extinction is really hard to avoid; fortunately, they're also very unlikely, but we are definitely not immune from this. The most likely cause of our extinction, in my opinion, is innovation in machine learning/AI. This could destroy the planet, but even if it doesn't, humans will be ultimately redundant to the dominant systems. They might keep us alive in a zoo somewhere, but I doubt it. A happier scenario (to me at least) is transhumanism, where humans become extinct in a sense because we've managed to liberate ourselves from biology. So how could innovation prevent our extinction? We seed the galaxy with independently evolving human populations to create a new metapopulation. These local populations would hopefully be sufficiently isolated that some would survive an innovation or disaster that wipes out the rest. They would, of course, evolve in response to local conditions, perhaps creating several new species. So you could say this is still extinction, but it's as close as we'll come to persistence in our ever-changing universe.

#### Space colonization encourages healthcare innovations- solves diseases

Donoviel 19 (Dorit Donoviel, 7-19-2019, "Space exploration is reinventing healthcare," [20+ years leadership experience as executive director of R&D overseeing diverse areas of biomedical research from basic to applied science, drug discovery, and technology development. Executing a multi-million dollar national research portfolio of grants addressing the plethora of physiological and behavioral challenges of humans in space. Executive Director, Translational Research Institute for Space Health at Baylor College of Medicine] The Hill, <https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/453853-space-exploration-is-reinventing-healthcare>) TDI

Though many do not realize it, humans have been living and working in space continuously for the past two decades. The conditions of spaceflight have accelerated our ability to study progressive degenerative diseases. This novel paradigm of understanding human physiology under the stresses of living in space holds great promise for new sources of medical breakthroughs for Earth.

Although astronauts are carefully selected to be exceptionally healthy and exhibit peak physical and mental performance, after only four to six months in space, they can develop numerous medical [conditions](https://humanresearchroadmap.nasa.gov/Risks/). Without appropriate exercise, they lose bone and muscle mass. They become prone to developing kidney stones. Their hearts become deconditioned. Their blood vessels stiffen. A subset of astronauts develop a swelling of the optic nerve and possibly an increase in pressure on the brain. Even dormant viruses become activated, alongside changes to the immune system. There is a sense of urgency to solve these problems if we are to send humans to Mars and return them safely in the next decade or two.

This is why NASA is investing in cutting-edge research for human health and performance including high-risk high-reward approaches funded through the [Translational Research institute for Space Health](https://www.bcm.edu/centers/space-medicine/translational-research-institute) (TRISH). Supporting potentially ground-breaking innovations requires a leap of faith in the right direction.

Keeping astronauts healthy during deep space exploration missions — where there are no hospitals and no medical specialists — requires a different paradigm for healthcare. Astronauts are typically engineers and scientists, and only occasionally physicians. On the way to Mars, when communications with Earth will be limited, they could be forced to act as both patients and healthcare providers. If a medical condition is allowed to progress when they are millions of miles away from Earth, the situation could become catastrophic.

Therefore, astronauts will need to detect even the most subtle changes in their own health status early enough to prevent disease. This requires a healthcare paradigm of predicting, preventing and mitigating ailments by intervening early.

This means enabling monitoring, diagnostic and therapeutic medical capabilities that are simple to use, safe, robust and miniaturized. Additionally, what will work in a small spacecraft in the hands of an engineer is also likely to work in a community clinic with limited resources. Or even in our homes. This different approach to healthcare can help save lives and reduce costs — at a global level.

Space demands the best in healthcare innovations, focusing on prevention and early intervention using smart, creative solutions. On a mission to Mars, blood tests will be done in a matter of minutes, by the patient, on a single [drop of blood](https://www.1dropdx.com/). A trained and adaptive computer [algorithm](https://www.visualdx.com/) will track health status based on a variety of physiological parameters and alert astronauts when important deviations from normal become evident.

[Automated eye exams](https://www.healio.com/ophthalmology/retina-vitreous/news/online/%7Bb1a85e81-9e54-4976-9717-3218fd7fa175%7D/web-vision-technologies-awarded-grants-to-develop-devices-for-nasa) will be performed by the astronauts on themselves and images will be analyzed by a computer for changes. Customized [medications](http://news.mit.edu/2016/portable-pharmacy-on-demand-0331) will be tailor-made for the patient on the spot. If a minor medical procedure is required, the caregiver will learn and practice beforehand using augmented reality tools and software [simulations](https://www.level-ex.com/) adjusted for zero-gravity.

Kidney stones will be found early and treated quickly and painlessly using [ultrasound](http://www.sonomotion.com/) to “push” them out of the kidney so they can be cleared naturally with urination. Sleep and mood will be improved using [sound stimulation](https://www.usa.philips.com/a-w/about/news/archive/standard/news/press/2019/20190617-philips-smartsleep-deep-sleep-headband-selected-by-nasa-funded-institute-for-studies-to-improve-sleep-and-behavioral-health.html) and health will be improved by individualized diets which will be enriched with high-nutrient [plants](https://news.ucr.edu/articles/2019/04/25/astronauts-might-soon-grow-space-tomatoes) grown efficiently within a small footprint. Most importantly, all these advances have clear and important applications on Earth.

Space exploration has already yielded hundreds of inventions that filled our [arsenal](https://spinoff.nasa.gov/) for fighting diseases. To land women and men on Mars and return them healthy, we must reinvent healthcare. The positive consequences of this work will impact all of humanity. The spirit of Apollo is alive and well in space health research today. And for science, medicine and technology pioneers, our most important work is still ahead.

### 1NC – Cap

#### Top level – they can’t just tell you cap is bad they have to tell you what is better or else it’s try or die for capitalism – the 1AC dumps on cap bad but provides zero alternative.

#### Growth is sustainable and solves a laundry list of threats.

Mark Budolfson 21. PhD in Philosophy. Assistant Professor in the Department of Environmental and Occupational Health and Justice at the Rutgers School of Public Health and Center for Population–Level Bioethics "Arguments for Well-Regulated Capitalism, and Implications for Global Ethics, Food, Environment, Climate Change, and Beyond". Cambridge Core. 5-7-2021. https://www-cambridge-org.proxy.library.emory.edu/core/journals/ethics-and-international-affairs/article/arguments-for-wellregulated-capitalism-and-implications-for-global-ethics-food-environment-climate-change-and-beyond/96F422D04E171EECDEF77312266AE9DD

Discourse on food ethics often advocates the anti-capitalist idea that we need less capitalism, less growth, and less globalization if we want to make the world a better and more equitable place, with arguments focused on applications to food, globalization, and a just society. For example, arguments for this anti-capitalist view are at the core of some chapters in nearly every handbook and edited volume in the rapidly expanding subdiscipline of food ethics. None of these volumes (or any article published in this subdiscipline broadly construed) focuses on a defense of globalized capitalism.1

More generally, discourse on global ethics, environment, and political theory in much of academia—and in society—increasingly features this anti-capitalist idea as well.2 The idea is especially prominent in discourse surrounding the environment, climate, and global poverty, where we face a nexus of problems of which capitalism is a key driver, including climate change, air and water pollution, the challenge of feeding the world, ensuring sustainable development for the world's poorest, and other interrelated challenges.

It is therefore important to ask whether this anti-capitalist idea is justified by reason and evidence that is as strong as the degree of confidence placed in it by activists and many commentators on food ethics, global ethics, and political theory, more generally.

In fact, many experts argue that this anti-capitalist idea is not supported by reason and argument and is actually wrong. The main contribution of this essay is to explain the structure of the leading arguments against the anti-capitalist idea, and in favor of the opposite conclusion. I begin by focusing on the general argument in favor of well-regulated globalized capitalism as the key to a just, flourishing, and environmentally healthy world. This is the most important of all of the arguments in terms of its consequences for health, wellbeing, and justice, and it is endorsed by experts in the empirically minded disciplines best placed to analyze the issue, including experts in long-run global development, human health, wellbeing, economics, law, public policy, and other related disciplines. On the basis of the arguments outlined below, well-regulated capitalism has been endorsed by recent Democratic presidents of the United States such as Barack Obama, and by progressive Nobel laureates who have devoted their lives to human development and more equitable societies, as well as by a wide range of experts in government and leading nongovernmental organizations.

The goal of this essay is to make the structure and importance of these arguments clear, and thereby highlight that discourse on global ethics and political theory should engage carefully with them. The goal is not to endorse them as necessarily sound and correct. The essay will begin by examining general arguments for and against capitalism, and then turn to implications for food, the environment, climate change, and beyond.

Arguments for and against Forms of Capitalism

The Argument against Capitalism

Capitalism is often argued to be a key driver of many of society's ills: inequalities, pollution, land use changes, and incentives that cause people to live differently than in their ideal dreams. Capitalism can sometimes deepen injustices. These negative consequences are easy to see—resting, as they do, at the center of many of society's greatest challenges.3

And at the same time, it is often difficult to see the positive consequences of capitalism.4 What are the positive consequences of allowing private interests to clear-cut forests and plant crops, especially if those private interests are rich multinational corporations and the forests are in poor, developing countries whose citizens do not receive the profits from deforestation? Why give private companies the right to exploit resources at all, since exploitation almost always has some negative consequences such as those listed above? These are the right questions to ask, and they highlight genuine challenges to capitalism. And in light of these challenges, it is reasonable to consider the possibility that perhaps a different economic system altogether would be more equitable and beneficial to the global population.

The Argument for Well-Regulated Capitalism

However, things are more complicated than the arguments above would suggest, and the benefits of capitalism, especially for the world's poorest and most vulnerable people, are in fact myriad and significant. In addition, as we will see in this section, many experts argue that capitalism is not the fundamental cause of the previously described problems but rather an essential component of the best solutions to them and of the best methods for promoting our goals of health, well-being, and justice.

To see where the defenders of capitalism are coming from, consider an analogy involving a response to a pandemic: if a country administered a rushed and untested vaccine to its population that ended up killing people, we would not say that vaccines were the problem. Instead, the problem would be the flawed and sloppy policies of vaccine implementation. Vaccines might easily remain absolutely essential to the correct response to such a pandemic and could also be essential to promoting health and flourishing, more generally.

The argument is similar with capitalism according to the leading mainstream arguments in favor of it: Capitalism is an essential part of the best society we could have, just like vaccines are an essential part of the best response to a pandemic such as COVID-19. But of course both capitalism and vaccines can be implemented poorly, and can even do harm, especially when combined with other incorrect policy decisions. But that does not mean that we should turn against them—quite the opposite. Instead, we should embrace them as essential to the best and most just outcomes for society, and educate ourselves and others on their importance and on how they must be properly designed and implemented with other policies in order to best help us all. In fact, the argument in favor of capitalism is even more dramatic because it claims that much more is at stake than even what is at stake in response to a global pandemic—what is at stake with capitalism is nothing less than whether the world's poorest and most vulnerable billion people will remain in conditions of poverty and oppression, or if they will instead finally gain access to what is minimally necessary for basic health and wellbeing and become increasingly affluent and empowered. The argument in favor of capitalism proceeds as follows:

Premise 1. Development and the past. Over the course of recorded human history, the majority of historical increases in health, wellbeing, and justice have occurred in the last two centuries, largely as a result of societies adopting or moving toward capitalism. Capitalism is a relevant cause of these improvements, in the sense that they could not have happened to such a degree if it were not for capitalism and would not have happened to the same degree under any alternative noncapitalist approach to structuring society. The argument in support of this premise relies on observed relationships across societies and centuries between indicators of degree of capitalism, wealth, investments in public goods, and outcomes for health, wellbeing, and justice, together with econometric analysis in support of the conclusion that the best explanation of these correlations and the underlying mechanism is that large increases in health, wellbeing, and justice are largely driven by increasing investments in public goods. The scale of increased wealth necessary to maximize these investments requires capitalism. Thus, as capitalist societies have become dramatically wealthier over the past hundred years (and wealthier than societies with alternative systems), this has allowed larger investments in public goods, which simply has not been possible in a sustained way in societies without the greater wealth that capitalism makes possible. Important investments in public goods include investments in basic medical knowledge, in health and nutrition programs, and in the institutional capacity and know-how to regulate society and capitalism itself. As a result, capitalism is a primary driver of positive outcomes in health and wellbeing (such as increased life expectancy, lowered child and maternal mortality, adequate calories per day, minimized infectious disease rates, a lower percentage and number of people in poverty, and more reported happiness);5 and in justice (such as reduced deaths from war and homicide; higher rankings in human rights indices; the reduced prevalence of racist, sexist, homophobic opinions in surveys; and higher literacy rates).6 These quantifiable positive consequences of global capitalism dramatically outweigh the negative consequences (such as deaths from pollution in the course of development), with the result that the net benefits from capitalism in terms of health, wellbeing, and justice have been greater than they would have been under any known noncapitalist approach to structuring society.7

Premise 2. Economics, ethics, and policy. Although capitalism has often been ill-regulated and therefore failed to maximize net benefits for health, wellbeing, and justice, it can become well-regulated so that it maximizes these societal goals, by including mechanisms identified by economists and other policy experts that do the following:

* optimally8 regulate negative effects such as pollution and monopoly power, and invest in public goods such as education, basic healthcare, and fundamental research including biomedical knowledge (more generally, policies that correct the failures of free markets that economists have long recognized will arise from “externalities” in the absence of regulation);9
* ensure equity and distributive justice (for example, via wealth redistribution);10
* ensure basic rights, justice, and the rule of law independent of the market (for example, by an independent judiciary, bill of rights, property rights, and redistribution and other legislation to correct historical injustices due to colonialism, racism, and correct current and historical distortions that have prevented markets from being fair);11 and
* ensure that there is no alternative way of structuring society that is more efficient or better promotes the equity, justice, and fairness goals outlined above (by allowing free exchange given the regulations mentioned).12

To summarize the implication of the first two premises, well-regulated capitalism is essential to best achieving our ethical goals—which is true even though capitalism has certainly not always been well regulated historically. Society can still do much better and remove the large deficits in terms of health, wellbeing, and justice that exist under the current inferior and imperfect versions of capitalism.

Premise 3. Development and the future. If the global spread of capitalism is allowed to continue, desperate poverty can be essentially eliminated in our lifetimes. Furthermore, this can be accomplished faster and in a more just way via well-regulated global capitalism than by any alternatives. If we instead opt for less capitalism, less growth, and less globalization, then desperate poverty will continue to exist for a significant portion of the world's population into the further future, and the world will be a worse and less equitable place than it would have been with more capitalism. For example, in a world with less capitalism, there would be more overpopulation, food insecurity, air pollution, ill health, injustice, and other problems. In part, this is because of the factors identified by premise 1, which connect a turn away from capitalism with a turn away from continuing improvements in health, wellbeing, and justice, especially for the developing world. In addition, fertility declines are also a consequence of increased wealth, and the size of the population is a primary determinant of food demand and other environmental stressors.13 Finally, as discussed at length in the next section of the essay, capitalism can be naturally combined with optimal environmental regulations.14 Even bracketing anything like optimal regulation, it remains true that sufficiently wealthy nations reduce environmental degradation as they become wealthier, whereas developing nations that are nearing peak degradation will remain stuck at the worst levels of degradation if we stall growth, rather than allowing them to transition to less and less degradation in the future via capitalism and economic growth.15 In contrast, well-regulated capitalism is a key part of the best way of coping with these problems, as well as a key part of dealing with climate change, global food production, and other specific challenges, as argued at length in the next section. Here it is important to stress that we should favor well-regulated capitalism that includes correct investments in public goods over other capitalist systems such as the neoliberalism of the recent past that promoted inadequately regulated capitalism with inadequate concern for externalities, equity, and background distortions and injustices.16

Conclusion. Therefore, we should be in favor of capitalism over noncapitalism, and we should especially favor well-regulated capitalism, which is the ethically optimal economic system and is essential to any just basic structure for society.

This argument is impressive because, as stated earlier in the essay, it is based on evidence that is so striking that it leads a bipartisan range of open-minded thinkers and activists to endorse well-regulated capitalism, including many of those who were not initially attracted to the view because of a reasonable concern for the societal ills with which we began. To better understand why such a range of thinkers could agree that well-regulated capitalism is best, it may help to clarify some things that are not assumed or implied by the argument for it, which could be invoked by other bad arguments for capitalism.

One thing the argument above does not assume is that health, wellbeing, or justice are the same thing as wealth, because, in fact, they are not. Instead, the argument above relies on well-accepted, measurable indicators of health and wellbeing, such as increased lifespan; decreased early childhood mortality; adequate nutrition; and other empirically measurable leading indicators of health, wellbeing, and justice.17 Similarly, the argument that capitalism promotes justice, peace, freedom, human rights, and tolerance relies on empirical metrics for each of these.18

Furthermore, the argument does not assume that because these indicators of health, wellbeing, and justice are highly correlated with high degrees of capitalism, that therefore capitalism is the direct cause of these good outcomes. Rather, the analyses suggest instead that something other than capitalism is the direct cause of societal improvements (such as improvements in knowledge and technology, public infrastructure, and good governance), and that capitalism is simply a necessary condition for these improvements to happen.19 In other words, the richer a society is, the more it is able to invest in all of these and other things that are the direct causes of health, wellbeing, and justice. But, to maximize investment in these things societies need well-regulated capitalism.

As part of these analyses, it is often stressed that current forms of capitalism around the world are highly defective and must be reformed in the direction of well-regulated capitalism because they lack investments in public goods, such as basic knowledge, healthcare, nutrition, other safety nets, and good governance.20 In this way, an argument for a particular kind of progressive reformism is an essential part of the analyses that lead many to endorse the more general argument for well-regulated capitalism.

Although these analyses are nuanced, and appropriately so, it remains the case that the things that directly lead to health, wellbeing, and justice require resources, and the best path toward generating those resources is well-regulated capitalism. And on the flip side, according to the analyses behind premise 1 described above, an anti-capitalist system would not produce the resources that are needed, and would thus be a disaster, especially for the poorest billion people who are most desperately in need of the resources that capitalism can create and direct, to escape from extreme poverty.21

#### Free markets key to solve disease cures

Jackson 16. Kerry, Pacific Research Institute; 12/19/16; 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/

“Our strongest antibiotics don’t work and patients are left with potentially untreatable infections,” Director Dr. Tom Frieden said when the CDC issued its warning. He asked doctors, hospitals and public health officials to “work together” to “stop these infections from spreading.” The 2014 Report to the President expressed a similar concern: “The evolution of antibiotic resistance is now occurring at an alarming rate and is outpacing the development of new countermeasures capable of thwarting infections in humans. This situation threatens patient care, economic growth, public health, agriculture, economic security and national security.” For those thinking this sort of thing shouldn’t be happening when medical science is more advanced than can almost be conceived, be assured that it is. And unless there are public policy interventions, it’s likely to get worse. “More and more microorganisms will continue to gain resistance to the current drug therapies because (antimicrobial resistance, or AMR) is basic evolution,” Wayne Winegarden writes in the Pacific Research Institute’s newly-released report “Incenting the Development of Antimicrobial Medicines to Address the Problem of Drug-Resistant Infections.” 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.

#### Pandemics end civilization – no burnout

Kerscher 14. Karl-Heinz, professor and management consultant “Space Education”, Wissenschaftliche Studie, 2014

The death toll for a pandemic is equal to the virulence, the deadliness of the pathogen or pathogens, multiplied by the number of people eventually infected. It has been hypothesized that there is an upper limit to the virulence of naturally evolved pathogens. This is because a pathogen that quickly kills its hosts might not have enough time to spread to new ones, while one that kills its hosts more slowly or not at all will allow carriers more time to spread the infection, and thus likely out-compete a more lethal species or strain. This simple model predicts that if virulence and transmission are not linked in any way, pathogens will evolve towards low virulence and rapid transmission. However, this assumption is not always valid and in more complex models, where the level of virulence and the rate of transmission are related, high levels of virulence can evolve. The level of virulence that is possible is instead limited by the existence of complex populations of hosts, with different susceptibilities to infection, or by some hosts being geographically isolated. The size of the host population and competition between different strains of pathogens can also alter virulence. There are numerous historical examples of pandemics that have had a devastating effect on a large number of people, which makes the possibility of global pandemic a realistic threat to human civilization.

#### Independently profit motive key to effective resource management

Fitzmaurice 15. Matthew, CEO, EcoAlpha Asset Management LLC. “ONLY CAPITALISM CAN SAVE THE PLANET,” Ensla. 3/23/2015. http://ensia.com/voices/only-capitalism-can-save-the-planet/

Here’s the thing, though: where there are problems to be solved, there’s money to be made. And where there’s money to be made, we awaken one of the world’s most powerful forces for change: capitalism. ¶ Of course capitalism has played a starring role in distressing the planet’s resources. Historically, the combination of unchecked industry, a readiness to externalize costs and a relentless thirst for growth have plundered and polluted the earth. It’s not a debate, but simple fact that our population size and economies cannot continue on their present trajectories without exhausting the world’s resources. Yet, a rapidly expanding global middle class — increasingly urbanized and hungry for protein — threatens further and accelerating distress. ¶ The hopeful news is that businesses, with their almost singular focus on economic self-interest, and governments, motivated by a variety of interests, are beginning to recognize and address in earnest these inevitable problems. ¶ Today, the businesses that develop practical and affordable solutions to burdened resource problems will end up being the world’s most profitable companies. No longer can they be considered “sustainability” businesses. They are everyday businesses with a long view, targeting problems that are not going away. That’s smart business. Burdened resources have become a strong economic driver for businesses of all sizes, in all industries everywhere to spend and change — and one that will only grow in scope and intensity over time. ¶ The companies that provide effective solutions to burdened resources will provide superior risk-adjusted returns to their investors as business and governments accelerate their solutions spending out of their own economic self-interest. And because the products, technologies and services these companies provide are common solutions to global problems — and are therefore exponentially repeatable — these investments will have amplified positive impact on global resource scarcity issues. ¶ Too often people have a narrow view of these solutions, thinking only of solar panels and windmills. But solutions are enormously diverse: They include, among many others, agricultural drones that monitor soil conditions, smart irrigation technology that delivers water only where and when it’s really needed, more efficient distributed energy generation and component suppliers that make cars use less gas. ¶ We face a new reality in which our economic self-interest and the long-term well-being of the planet are coming into alignment.¶ As a whole, the human race has a poor track record when it comes to altruism. Although there are a great many saints among us who spend — and even sacrifice — their lives to help others, most of us are hard pressed to take care of ourselves and our families. We have a much better track record when it comes to investing money in our own self- interest, which has fueled the unprecedented innovation, economic and life-expectancy growth of the past century. ¶ In the past, many people who invested in sustainable solutions were motivated principally by conscience, willing to accept reduced returns in order to invest their money in a way that was consistent with their beliefs and convictions — be they religious, social or environmental. Now, however, we face a new reality in which our economic self-interest and the long-term well-being of the planet are coming into alignment. Because we have to face the reality of burdened resources, there’s money in it. ¶ Recently, some asset managers have based investments on environmental, social and governance screening, betting that good corporate citizens are inherently better-managed companies, which will therefore be more profitable over time. Increasingly, however, ESG screening is becoming more pervasive and will likely over time become commonplace, robbing this sort of screening as a differentiator when making investment decisions. ¶ The primary goal for investing in sustainable solutions is to achieve superior risk-adjusted returns. Companies that provide solutions to the issues of burdened resources will be the recipients of a massive global spend cycle, no matter one’s motivation. The fact that one’s investment is also part of the solution rather than the problem is worth getting excited about. Self-interest is what moves markets. According to McKinsey’s report, How to make Green Growth the new normal, “In order to mobilize the US$3 trillion a year that will be needed to build a resource-efficient growth model, investing in the markets of the future needs to be seen as possessing superior risk-return characteristics.”¶ No government subsidy or charity case can move the needle for long. Only capitalism has the power to retool industries, reshape economies and rebuild infrastructure across the planet. It’s a big part of what got us into this mess, but it’s also what will get us out.

#### Ineffective resource management degrades public health, kills global air quality, and causes tensions over water scarcity in South Asia—culminates in extinction

Thompson 13. Thomas, President of Analytics Inc., a financial research and economic analysis firm. Citing Wang Shucheng, China’s former minister of water resources. “Choking on China,” Foreign Affairs. 6/8/2013. https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2013-04-08/choking-china

The dangers of China’s environmental degradation go well beyond the country’s borders, as pollution threatens global health more than ever. Chinese leaders have argued that their country has the right to pollute, claiming that, as a developing nation, it cannot sacrifice economic growth for the sake of the environment. In reality, however, China is holding the rest of the world hostage -- and undermining its own prosperity.¶ According to the World Bank, only one percent of China’s 560 million urban residents breathe air considered safe by EU standards. Beijing’s levels of PM2.5s -- particles that are smaller than 2.5 micrometers in diameter and can penetrate the gas exchange regions of the lungs -- are the worst in the world. Beijing’s 2012 March average reading was 469 micrograms of such particles per cubic meter, which compares abysmally with Los Angeles’ highest 2012 reading of 43 micrograms per cubic meter.¶ Such air pollution contributed to 1.2 million premature deaths in China in 2010, according to the Global Burden of Disease Study. The unrelenting pace of construction of coal-fired power plants is only making matters worse. In his recent monograph, Climate Change: The China Problem, environmental scholar Michael Vandenbergh writes, “On average, a new coal-powered electric plant large enough to serve a city the size of Dallas opens in China every seven to ten days.” The lack of widespread coal-washing infrastructure and scrubbers at Chinese industrial facilities exacerbates the problem.¶ Carbon dioxide emissions from cars in China are also growing exponentially, replacing coal-fired power plants as the major source of pollution in major Chinese cities. Deutsche Bank estimates that the number of passenger cars in China will reach 400 million by 2030, up from today’s 90 million. And the sulfur levels produced by diesel trucks in China are at least 23 times worse than those in the United States. Acid rain, caused by these emissions, has damaged a third of China’s limited cropland, in addition to forests and watersheds on the Korean Peninsula and in Japan. This pollution reaches the United States as well, sometimes at levels prohibited by the U.S. Clean Water Act. In 2006, researchers at the University of California–Davis discovered that almost all of the harmful particulates over Lake Tahoe originated in China. The environmental experts Juli Kim and Jennifer Turner note in their essay “China’s Filthiest Export” that “by the time it reaches the U.S., mercury transforms into a reactive gaseous material that dissolves easily in the wet climates of the Pacific Northwest.” At least 20 percent of the mercury entering the Willamette River in Oregon most likely comes from China. Black carbon soot from China also threatens to block sunlight, lower crop yields, heat the atmosphere, and destabilize weather throughout the Pacific Rim.¶ China’s use of fresh water resources also threatens those beyond its borders. As Mark Twain reportedly said, in reference to California in the late nineteenth century, “Whiskey is for drinking; water is for fighting over.” The sentiment holds true in modern-day Asia as well. Asia’s per capita fresh water availability is less than half the global average. China and India, for example, are home to 40 percent of the world’s population but make do with ten percent of the world’s fresh water. China is guzzling and polluting this limited resource at an alarming rate. The country has dammed every major river on the Tibetan plateau, including the Mekong, the Salween, the Brahmaputra, the Yangtze, the Yellow, the Indus, the Sutlej, the Shweli, and the Karnali, and there are large-scale plans to dam others. Of the 50,000 largest dams in the world, more than half are in China. As a result, China now controls the river water supply to 13 nearby countries but so far has refused to sign any treaties or cooperate with other countries on water issues. Beijing also voted against the UN attempt to regulate water sharing in the region. China’s former minister of water resources, Wang Shucheng, described China’s water policy as “fight for every drop of water or die.” This philosophy, combined with China’s unabated pursuit of economic development, will have profoundly destabilizing consequences for the region, both politically and environmentally.¶ Unfortunately for China, compromising the environment and health in pursuit of economic growth is not a sustainable strategy. The threat of water scarcity and the adverse domestic health effects of pollution darken China’s future. Pollution-related illnesses are soaring. A recent social media campaign led by locals and international activities shed light on the growing phenomena of “cancer villages” -- areas where water pollution is so bad that it has led to a sharp rise in diseases like stomach cancer. China’s own Ministry of Environmental Protection has concluded that 70 percent of the country’s major waterways are heavily polluted. According to Scott Moore of the Sustainability Science Program at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government, pollutants have even seeped into the country’s subsurfaces, with more than half of monitored wells deemed unsafe to use for drinking water. The China Geological Survey now estimates that 90 percent of China’s cities depend on polluted groundwater supplies. Water that has been purified at treatment plants is often recontaminated en route to homes. China has plundered its groundwater reserves, drilling massive underground tunnels that have even caused some cities to literally sink.¶ China has also completely botched its waste-removal efforts. Eighty percent of the East China Sea, one of the world’s largest fisheries, is now unsuitable for fishing, according to Elizabeth C. Economy, a China and environmental expert at the Council on Foreign Relations. Most Chinese coastal cities pump at least half of their waste directly into the ocean, which causes red tides and coastal fish die-offs. According to the World Wildlife Fund, the country is now the largest polluter of the Pacific Ocean.¶ The economic costs of pollution have been the focus of various government-backed studies in China. A recent study by the Chinese Academy of Environmental Planning found that environmental damage to forests, wetlands, and grasslands shaved 3.5 percent off China’s 2012 GDP. The World Bank puts the total cost of China’s environmental degradation in the late 1990s at between 3.5 and 8 percent of GDP. China’s pollution problem is holding back its economy -- and poisoning its own people and the rest of the world in the process. The international community should push China to realize that if it continues to ravage the environment, it will be unable to secure its future health and prosperity -- or avoid a global disaster.

#### Sino-India Conflict – goes Nuclear

Klare 20 — Five College professor emeritus of peace and world security studies, and director of the Five College Program in Peace and World Security Studies (PAWSS), holds a B.A. and M.A. from Columbia University and a Ph.D. from the Graduate School of the Union Institute. (Michael; Published: 2020; "Climate Change, Water Scarcity, and the Potential for Interstate Conflict in South Asia"; Journal of Strategic Security 13, No. 4, Pages 109-122; https://doi.org/10.5038/1944-0472.13.4.1826 Available at: https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jss/vol13/iss4/8)//CYang

China, India, and the Brahmaputra River

The potential for interstate conflict—even nuclear conflict—over shared water supplies arises in the case of another major river at risk from climate change: The Brahmaputra, which originates in China and traverses much of northeastern India before merging with the Ganges in Bangladesh and emptying into the Bay of Bengal. The fifth-largest river in the world by volume of water flow, the Brahmaputra starts on the northern slopes of the Himalayas and flows easterly across the southern Tibetan plateau (where it is known as the Yarlung Tsangpo) before making a nearly 180-degree turn and crossing into the Indian state of Arunachal Pradesh; from there, it flows in a southwesterly direction towards its confluence with the Ganges and thence its exit into the Bay of Bengal. For the Chinese, the Brahmaputra is an important engine of hydroelectric power; they have already installed one dam on the river, at Zangmu, and have announced plans for at least three more. For the Indians, it is a valuable source of irrigation water, especially in agriculture-dependent regions of the northeast. Leaders of both countries are fully aware of their counterparts’ interests and concerns over the river but have made little effort to reach a mutual understanding—let alone any formal agreements—regarding its future development.31

Several factors make the future status of the Brahmaputra a matter of deep concern to security analysts. To begin with, the river enters India through the state of Arunachal Pradesh, an area of northeastern India abutting Tibet that is claimed by both countries. Beijing insists that this region was once part of the kingdom of Tibet, and so belongs to China; New Delhi claims it is a legitimate part of India under a 1914 treaty between Tibet and Great Britain. The two sides fought a war here in 1962, with India suffering significant battlefield setbacks but China agreeing to restore the status quo ante. The countries have not been able to resolve the ownership dispute in subsequent years, despite intermittent negotiations, and both continue to maintain substantial military forces in the region. To this day, discord over Arunachal Pradesh remains a continuing source of friction in Sino-Indian relations and a potential spark for violent conflict.32

Another potential source of friction between China and India arises from Chinese plans (or rumors of such plans) to divert water from the upper Brahmaputra and funnel it via a series of tunnels and canals to northeastern China, where existing supplies are hugely inadequate.33 While dismissed by many Chinese experts as overly ambitious and costly, the notion of diverting water from the Brahmaputra has generated considerable anxiety in India, where experts fear that the resulting decline in water flow into the Indian section of the river would threaten agricultural productivity. Given the centrality of farming in the Indian economy and political system, any Chinese move to proceed with such a diversion project could lead to increased tension between the two countries. 34

Few analysts believe that a Sino-Indian conflict over the Brahmaputra is likely in the years immediately ahead. Both countries have strong motives for maintaining friendly—if not necessarily, warm—relations between them, and water issues have not yet dominated the bilateral agenda. This, however, is where global warming enters the picture. The Brahmaputra, like the Indus, draws much of its flow during dry seasons from the melting of Himalayan glaciers—and these, as has already been noted, are melting as a result of climate change, and could eventually disappear. For both China and India, the melting of the Himalayan glaciers will have momentous consequences. Given the Brahmaputra’s critical importance to agriculture and economic activity in both countries, any significant long-term decline in its flow would be highly disruptive, causing widespread hardship and social unrest.35

Under these more stressful conditions, the Chinese leadership, desperate to provide additional supply to China’s water-starved northeast, might be more inclined to proceed with water diversion projects on the Brahmaputra and other shared river systems.36 Coming at a time of equivalent water scarcity in India, such an effort is almost certain to trigger a harsh Indian response. “The most salient climate-related point of conflict [between China and India] could be China’s move to divert the upstream waters of rivers originating in the Himalayan watershed,” the NIC warned in a special report on climate change and India. “If China was determined to move forward with such a scheme, it could become a major element in pushing China and India towards an adversarial rather than simply a competitive relationship. Border clashes related to control of the rivers are not out of the question.”37

Any conflict between China and India over the waters of the Brahmaputra, should one occur, is most likely to remain a localized affair, without provoking a full-scale mobilization of forces on both sides. During the 1962 war over Arunachal Pradesh, Chinese army troops engaged their Indian counterparts in disputed areas along the border, but neither side escalated to large-scale combat. However, once fighting breaks out, it is impossible to predict the succeeding chain of events, and any outcome is conceivable. A minor skirmish along the Indo-Chinese border might not be a cause for alarm in the United States, but a larger war between those two countries undoubtedly would be. Both are armed with nuclear weapons, and Washington views India as a strategic counterweight to China.38 A crushing defeat of India would be viewed as a potential threat to American national interests and might conceivably precipitate U.S. military intervention. Where that might lead is anyone’s guess, but the mere possibility of such combat has made this scenario a matter of deep concern for security analysts in Washington.39

#### Rejection of neoliberalism causes massive transition wars

Harris 3. Lee, Analyst – Hoover Institution and Author of The Suicide of Reason, “The Intellectual Origins of America-Bashing”, Policy Review, January, http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/3458371.html

This is the immiserization thesis of Marx. And it is central to revolutionary Marxism, since if capitalism produces no widespread misery, then it also produces no fatal internal contradiction: If everyone is getting better off through capitalism, who will dream of struggling to overthrow it? Only genuine misery on the part of the workers would be sufficient to overturn the whole apparatus of the capitalist state, simply because, as Marx insisted, the capitalist class could not be realistically expected to relinquish control of the state apparatus and, with it, the monopoly of force. In this, Marx was absolutely correct. No capitalist society has ever willingly liquidated itself, and it is utopian to think that any ever will. Therefore, in order to achieve the goal of socialism, nothing short of a complete revolution would do; and this means, in point of fact, a full-fledged civil war not just within one society, but across the globe. Without this catastrophic upheaval, capitalism would remain completely in control of the social order and all socialist schemes would be reduced to pipe dreams.

#### Extinction

Nyquist 5. J.R. renowned expert in geopolitics and international relations, WorldNetDaily contributing editor, “The Political Consequences of a Financial Crash,” February 4, www.financialsense.com/stormw...2005/0204.html

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