### Definitions – Outer Space

#### “Outer space” is the empty vacuum – excludes planets and starts

**Baird ’13** (Christopher Baird; Assistant Professor of Physics at West Texas A&M University. “How does the expansion of the universe make outer space a vacuum?” <https://www.wtamu.edu/~cbaird/sq/2013/10/08/how-does-the-expansion-of-the-universe-make-outer-space-a-vacuum/> 8 October 2013) // ELog

The vacuum of outer space is not caused by the expansion of the universe, but is caused by gravity. First of all, when we say outer space (the space outside the atmosphere of planets and stars) is a "vacuum" or is "empty", we really mean that outer space is nearly empty or almost a perfect vacuum. In reality, even the most remote spot of outer space has gas, dust, radiation, gravity, and a [whole host of other things](https://wtamu.edu/~cbaird/sq/2012/12/20/what-keeps-space-empty/). There is no such thing as truly empty space. If we tried to suck all the particles out of a certain volume, we could still never get it empty. There would still be things like vacuum fluctuations, gravity, and dark matter, which can't be sucked out. With that said, outer space is very close to empty compared to earth's atmosphere. Why?

#### Violation: The affirmative’s advantages are about Mars and Moon colonization

#### Prefer our definition:

#### Intent to define – it’s from an explanation of what outer space is

#### Limits – outer space is literally infinite – letting the Aff have planets and stars gives them extra ground like mining, colonization, alien settlements, solar energy, etc. that’s unpredictable

#### Cross apply the voters from above

### Framework

#### Use util – no conceding the aff’s v/c is bad – this is nonsensical and justifies aff’s using abusive vcs which makes being neg impossible

#### [1] Pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable. People consistently regard pleasure and pain as good reasons for action.

**Moen 16** [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Spr778777u88888888888hyju7=6inger), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] GI

I think several things should be said in response to Moore’s challenge to hedonists. First, I do not think the burden of proof lies on hedonists to explain why the additional values are not intrinsic values. If someone claims that X is intrinsically valuable, this is a substantive, positive claim, and it lies on him or her to explain why we should believe that X is in fact intrinsically valuable. Possibly, this could be done through thought experiments analogous to those employed in the previous section. Second, there is something peculiar about the list of **additional intrinsic values** that counts in hedonism’s favor: the listed values have a strong **tend**ency **to be** well **explained as things that** help **promote pleasure and avert pain.** To go through Frankena’s list, **life** and **consciousness** are necessary presuppositions for pleasure; **activity**, health, and strength **bring about pleasure;** and happiness, beatitude, and contentment are regarded by Frankena himself as “pleasures and satisfactions.” The same is arguably true of beauty, harmony, and “proportion in objects contemplated,” and also of affection, friendship, harmony, and proportion in life, experiences of achievement, adventure and novelty, self-expression, good reputation, honor and esteem. Other things on Frankena’s list, such as understanding, wisdom, freedom, peace, and security, although they are perhaps not themselves pleasurable, are important means to achieve a happy life, and as such, they are things that hedonists would value highly. Morally good dispositions and virtues, cooperation, and just distribution of goods and evils, moreover, are things that, on a collective level, contribute a happy society, and thus the traits that would be promoted and cultivated if this were something sought after. To a very large extent, the intrinsic values suggested by pluralists tend to be hedonic instrumental values. Indeed, pluralists’ suggested intrinsic values all point toward pleasure, for while the other values are reasonably explainable as a means toward pleasure, pleasure itself is not reasonably explainable as a means toward the other values. Some have noticed this. Moore himself, for example, writes that though his pluralistic theory of intrinsic value is opposed to hedonism, its application would, in practice, look very much like hedonism’s: “Hedonists,” he writes “do, in general, recommend a course of conduct which is very similar to that which I should recommend.”24 Ross writes that “[i]t is quite certain that by promoting virtue and knowledge we shall inevitably produce much more pleasant consciousness. These are, by general agreement, among the surest sources of happiness for their possessors.”25 Roger Crisp observes that “those goods cited by non-hedonists are goods we often, indeed usually, enjoy.”26 What Moore and Ross do not seem to notice is that their observations give rise to two reasons to reject pluralism and endorse hedonism. The first reason is that\*7if the suggested non-hedonic intrinsic values are potentially explainable by appeal to just pleasure and pain (which, following my argument in the previous chapter, we should accept as intrinsically valuable and disvaluable), then—by appeal to Occam’s razor—we have at least a pro tanto reason to resist the introduction of any further intrinsic values and disvalues. **It is ontologically** more **costly to posit a plurality of intrinsic values and disvalues, so in case all values admit** of **explanation by** reference to **a single intrinsic value and** a single intrinsic **disvalue, we have reason to reject more complicated accounts.** The fact that suggested non-hedonic intrinsic values tend to be hedonistic instrumental values does not, however, count in favor of hedonism solely in virtue of being most elegantly explained by hedonism; it also does so in virtue of creating an explanatory challenge for pluralists. The challenge can be phrased as the following question: If the non-hedonic values suggested by pluralists are truly intrinsic values in their own right, then why do they te nd to point toward pleasure and away from pain?27

#### [2] Moral uncertainty means preventing extinction should be our highest priority.

**Bostrom 12** [(Nick Bostrom, Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford) “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy, 2012] TDI

These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate.¶ Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving — and ideally improving — our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value. To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

#### Prefer-

#### 1~ Bindingness— I could put my hand on a hot stove and I’d automatically pull it back before a signal is sent to my brain— Anything else fails to be morally binding because one could always ask "why not?"

#### 2~Degrees of wrongness – only consequentialism can explain why breaking a promise to take someone to the hospital is worse than breaking a promise to play video games – absolutist frameworks fail because you can’t weigh between violations of framework That outweighs:

#### 3~ Extinction first under any framework

#### A~ Future lives — trillions of future lives are lost. They are just as valuable as current ones – anything else says some lives are worth less than others which is genocidal rhetoric

#### B~ Reversibility — extinction forecloses future improvement; prefer — if we’re unsure about which interpretation of the world is true, we should preserve it to figure things out.

#### 1. Social contract – you give up rights to get out of the state of nature. The contract doesn’t give you a method to what rights you give up in order to enter society. I don’t give up the right to not be tortured to death or the right to freedom of movement to get out of the state of nature.

#### 2. The Lockean philosophy is outdated and does NOT assume the digital and globalized age that we live in today. It is strictly a philosophy on the way that society functions in the idea of property and ownership, and no country has adopted such a paradigm in the 21st globalized century.

### 1

#### Their rejection of privatization at large collapses capitalism

#### Space-for-space economic growth is sustainable and critical to economic preservation

Weinzierl and Sarang 21 – *Joseph and Jacqueline Elbling Professor of Business Administration at HBS and a Research Associate at the NBER; Research Associate at Harvard Business School and the Lunar Exploration Projects Lead for the MIT Space Exploration Initiative* (Matt Weinzierl and Mehak Sarang, 2-12-2021, "The Commercial Space Age Is Here," Harvard Business Review, https://hbr.org/2021/02/the-commercial-space-age-is-here)//kh

There’s no shortage of hype surrounding the commercial space industry. But while tech leaders promise us moon bases and settlements on Mars, the space economy has thus far remained distinctly local — at least in a cosmic sense. Last year, however, we crossed an important threshold: For the first time in human history, humans accessed space via a vehicle built and owned not by any government, but by a private corporation with its sights set on affordable space settlement. It was the first significant step towards building an economy both in space and for space. The implications — for business, policy, and society at large — are hard to overstate.

In 2019, 95% of the estimated $366 billion in revenue earned in the space sector was from the space-for-earth economy: that is, goods or services produced in space for use on earth. The space-for-earth economy includes telecommunications and internet infrastructure, earth observation capabilities, national security satellites, and more. This economy is booming, and though research shows that it faces the challenges of overcrowding and monopolization that tend to arise whenever companies compete for a scarce natural resource, projections for its future are optimistic. Decreasing costs for launch and space hardware in general have enticed new entrants into this market, and companies in a variety of industries have already begun leveraging satellite technology and access to space to drive innovation and efficiency in their earthbound products and services.

In contrast, the space-for-space economy — that is, goods and services produced in space for use in space, such as mining the Moon or asteroids for material with which to construct in-space habitats or supply refueling depots — has struggled to get off the ground. As far back as the 1970s, research commissioned by NASA predicted the rise of a space-based economy that would supply the demands of hundreds, thousands, even millions of humans living in space, dwarfing the space-for-earth economy (and, eventually, the entire terrestrial economy as well). The realization of such a vision would change how all of us do business, live our lives, and govern our societies — but to date, we’ve never even had more than 13 people in space at one time, leaving that dream as little more than science fiction.

Today, however, there is reason to think that we may finally be reaching the first stages of a true space-for-space economy. SpaceX’s recent achievements (in cooperation with NASA), as well as upcoming efforts by Boeing, Blue Origin, and Virgin Galactic to put people in space sustainably and at scale, mark the opening of a new chapter of spaceflight led by private firms. These firms have both the intention and capability to bring private citizens to space as passengers, tourists, and — eventually — settlers, opening the door for businesses to start meeting the demand those people create over the next several decades with an array of space-for-space goods and services.

Welcome to the (Commercial) Space Age

In our recent research, we examined how the model of centralized, government-directed human space activity born in the 1960s has, over the last two decades, made way for a new model, in which public initiatives in space increasingly share the stage with private priorities. Centralized, government-led space programs will inevitably focus on space-for-earth activities that are in the public interest, such as national security, basic science, and national pride. This is only natural, as expenditures for these programs must qbe justified by demonstrating benefits for citizens — and the citizens these governments represent are (nearly) all on earth.

In contrast to governments, the private sector is eager to put people in space to pursue their own personal interests, not the state’s — and then supply the demand they create. This is the vision driving SpaceX, which in its first twenty years has entirely upended the rocket launch industry, securing 60% of the global commercial launch market and building ever-larger spacecraft designed to ferry passengers not just to the International Space Station (ISS), but also to its own promised settlement on Mars.

Today, the space-for-space market is limited to supplying the people who are already in space: that is, the handful of astronauts employed by NASA and other government programs. While SpaceX has grand visions of supporting large numbers of private space travelers, their current space-for-space activities have all been in response to demand from government customers (i.e., NASA). But as decreasing launch costs enable companies like SpaceX to leverage economies of scale and put more people into space, growing private sector demand (that is, tourists and settlers, rather than government employees) could turn these proof-of-concept initiatives into a sustainable, large-scale industry.

This model — of selling to NASA with the hopes of eventually creating and expanding into a larger private market — is exemplified by SpaceX, but the company is by no means the only player taking this approach. For instance, while SpaceX is focused on space-for-space transportation, another key component of this burgeoning industry will be manufacturing.

Made In Space, Inc. has been at the forefront of manufacturing “in space, for space” since 2014, when it 3D-printed a wrench onboard the ISS. Today, the company is exploring other products, such as high-quality fiber-optic cable, that terrestrial customers may be willing to pay to have manufactured in zero-gravity. But the company also recently received a $74 million contract to 3D-print large metal beams in space for use on NASA spacecraft, and future private sector spacecraft will certainly have similar manufacturing needs which Made In Space hopes to be well-positioned to fulfill. Just as SpaceX has begun by supplying NASA but hopes to eventually serve a much larger, private-sector market, Made In Space’s current work with NASA could be the first step along a path towards supporting a variety of private-sector manufacturing applications for which the costs of manufacturing on earth and transporting into space would be prohibitive.

Another major area of space-for-space investment is in building and operating space infrastructure such as habitats, laboratories, and factories. Axiom Space, a current leader in this field, recently announced that it would be flying the “first fully private commercial mission to space” in 2022 onboard SpaceX’s Crew Dragon Capsule. Axiom was also awarded a contract for exclusive access to a module of the ISS, facilitating its plans to develop modules for commercial activity on the station (and eventually, beyond it).

This infrastructure is likely to spur investment in a wide array of complementary services to supply the demand of the people living and working within it. For example, in February 2020, Maxar Technologies was awarded a $142 million contract from NASA to develop a robotic construction tool that would be assembled in space for use on low-Earth orbit spacecraft. Private sector spacecraft or settlements will no doubt have need for a variety of similar construction and repair tools.

And of course, the private sector isn’t just about industrial products. Creature comforts also promise to be an area of rapid growth, as companies endeavor to support the human side of life in the harsh environment of space. In 2015, for example, Argotec and Lavazza collaborated to build an espresso machine that could function in the zero-gravity environment of the ISS, delivering a bit of everyday luxury to the crew.

To be sure, people have dreamt of using the vacuum and weightlessness of space to source or make things that cannot be made on earth for half a century, and time and again the business case has failed to pan out. Skepticism is natural. Those failures, however, have been in space-for-earth applications. For example, two startups of the 2010s, Planetary Resources, Inc. and Deep Space Industries, recognized the potential of space mining early on. For both companies, however, the lack of a space-for-space economy meant that their near-term survival depended on selling mined material — precious metals or rare elements — to earthbound customers. When it became clear that demand was insufficient to justify the high costs, funding dried up, and both companies pivoted to other ventures.

These were failures of space-for-earth business models — but the demand for in-space mining of raw building material, metals, and water will be enormous once humans are living in space (and are therefore far cheaper to supply). In other words, when people are living and working in space, we are likely to look back on these early asteroid mining companies less as failures and more as simply ahead of their time.

Seizing the Space-for-Space Opportunity

The opportunity presented by the space-for-space economy is huge — but it could easily be missed. To seize this moment, policymakers must provide regulatory and institutional frameworks that will enable the risk-taking and innovation necessary for a decentralized, private-sector-driven space economy. There are three specific policy areas we believe will be especially important:

1. Enabling private individuals to take on greater risk than would be tolerable for government-employed astronauts.

First, as part of a general shift to that more decentralized, market-oriented space sector, policymakers should consider allowing private space tourists and settlers to voluntarily take on more risk than states would tolerate for government-employed astronauts. In the long run, ensuring high safety levels will be essential to convince larger numbers of people to travel or live in space, but in the early years of exploration, too great an aversion to risk will stop progress before it starts.

An instructive analogy can be found in how NASA works with its contractors: In the mid-2000s, NASA shifted from using cost-plus contracts (in which NASA shouldered all the economic risk of investing in space) to fixed-price contracts (in which risk was distributed between NASA and their contractors). Because of private companies’ greater tolerance for risk, this shift catalyzed a burst of activity in the sector — sometimes referred to as “New Space.” A similar shift in how we approach voluntary risk-taking by private-sector astronauts may be necessary in order to launch the space-for-space economy.

#### Growth is sustainable.

Hartford, 20—economics columnist for the Financial Times, citing Diane Coyle, Bennett Professor of Public Policy at the University of Cambridge, Vaclav Smil, Distinguished Professor Emeritus in the Faculty of Environment at the University of Manitoba, Chris Goodall, English businessman, author and expert on new energy technologies, alumnus of St Dunstan's College, University of Cambridge, and Harvard Business School, and Jesse Ausubel, Director and Senior Research Associate of the Program for the Human Environment of Rockefeller University (Tim, “Two cheers for the dematerialising economy,” <https://www.ft.com/content/04858216-322e-11ea-9703-eea0cae3f0de>, dml)

If past trends continue, the world’s gross domestic product will be about twice as big by 2040 as it is today. That’s the sort of growth rate that translates to 30-fold growth over a century, or by a factor of a thousand over two centuries.

Is that miraculous, or apocalyptic? In itself, neither. GDP is a synthetic statistic, invented to help us put a measuring rod up against the ordinary business of life. It measures neither the energy and resource consumption that might worry us, nor the things that really lead to human flourishing.

That disconnection from what matters might be a problem if politicians strove to maximise GDP, but they don’t — otherwise they would have hesitated before imposing austerity in the face of a financial crisis, launching trade wars or getting Brexit done. Economic policymaking has flaws, but an obsession with GDP is not one of them.

Nevertheless the exponential expansion of GDP is indirectly important, because GDP growth is correlated with things that do matter, good and bad. Economic growth has long been associated with unsustainable activities such as carbon dioxide emissions and the consumption of metals and minerals.

But GDP growth is also correlated with the good things in life: in the short run, an economy that is creating jobs; in the long run, more important things. GDP per capita is highly correlated with indicators such as the Social Progress Index. The SPI summarises a wide range of indicators from access to food, shelter, health and education to vital freedoms of choice and from discrimination. All the leading countries in the Social Progress database are rich. All the strugglers are desperately poor.

So the prospect of a doubling of world GDP matters, not for its own sake, but for what it implies — an expansion of human flourishing, and the risk of environmental disaster.

So here’s the good news: we might be able to enjoy all the good stuff while avoiding the unsustainable environmental impact. The link between economic activity and the use of material resources is not as obvious as one might think. There are several reasons for this.

The first is that for all our seemingly insatiable desires, sometimes enough is enough. If you live in a cold house for lack of money, a pay rise lets you take off the extra cardigan and turn up the radiators. But if you win the lottery, you are not going to celebrate by roasting yourself alive.

The second is that, while free enterprise may care little for the planet, it is always on the lookout for ways to save money. As long as energy, land and materials remain costly, we’ll develop ways to use less. Aluminium beer cans weighed 85 grammes when introduced in the late 1950s. They now weigh less than 13 grammes.

The third reason is a switch to digital products — a fact highlighted back in 1997 by Diane Coyle in her book The Weightless World. The trend has only continued since then. My music collection used to require a wall full of shelves. It is now on a network drive the size of a large hardback book. My phone contains the equivalent of a rucksack full of equipment.

Dematerialisation is not automatic, of course. As Vaclav Smil calculates in his new book, Growth, US houses are more than twice as large today as in 1950. The US’s bestselling vehicle in 2018, the Ford F-150, weighs almost four times as much as 1908’s bestseller, the Model T. Let’s not even talk about the number of cars; Mr Smil reckons the global mass of automobiles sold has increased 2,500-fold over the past century.

Still, there is reason for hope. Chris Goodall’s research paper “Peak Stuff” concluded that, in the UK, “both the weight of goods entering the economy and the amounts finally ending up as waste probably began to fall from sometime between 2001 and 2003”. That figure includes the impact of imported goods.

In the US, Jesse Ausubel’s article “The Return of Nature” found falling consumption of commodities such as iron ore, aluminium, copper, steel, and paper and many others. Agricultural land has become so productive that some of it is being allowed to return to nature.

In the EU, carbon dioxide emissions fell 22 per cent between 1990 and 2017, despite the economy growing by 58 per cent. Only some of this fall is explained by the offshoring of production. (For a good summary of all this research, try Andrew McAfee’s book More From Less.)

Can we, then, relax? No. To pick a single obvious problem, global carbon dioxide emissions may be rising more slowly than GDP — but they are rising nevertheless, and they need to fall rapidly.

Yet the fact that dematerialisation is occurring is heartening. We all know what the basic policies are that would tilt the playing field in favour of smaller, lighter, lower-emission products and activities. Adopting those policies means we might actually be able to save the planet, preserve human needs, rights and freedoms — and still have plenty of fun into the bargain.

#### Socialism exacerbates structural violence.

Jim Lindgren 18. Professor of Law at Northwestern University. "Can There Be Capitalism Without Racism? – Reason.com". No Publication. 8-20-2018. https://reason.com/volokh/2018/08/20/can-there-be-capitalism-without-racism/?amp

The website Campus Reform points to a multi-year academic program, Racial Capitalism, hosted at the UC-Davis Humanities Institute that explores the links between racism and capitalism (tip to Glenn Reynolds). Among the questions that were asked at the event launching the program are:

1. "Which came first, capitalism or racism?"
2. "Can there be capitalism without racism?"
3. "Is capitalism always racial?"

IMO, the answers to these questions are fairly obvious:

1. Racism came first. Every inhabited continent had slaves, and ethnic out-groups were among the most likely to be enslaved. It is the abolition of slavery that is particularly Western, as Orlando Patterson explains his books Freedom and Slavery and Social Death.
2. (and 3.) If there can be any economic system without racism (I suppose it depends on how high one's standards are), then capitalism is not always racist and there can be capitalism without racism. Capitalism is easier to square with a reduction in racism than most ideologies because (a) it is individualistic, (b) it is not built on envy for despised groups, and (c) in the United States at least, pro-capitalists tend to be less racist personally than anti-capitalists.

Indeed, in the general public it is the opposition to capitalism and the desire for redistribution that are positively associated with racism and intolerance.

I explore this relationship in "Redistribution and Racism, Tolerance and Capitalism," which analyzes data from 20 nationally representative surveys of the general public.

Abstract

In debates over the roles of law and government in promoting the equality of income or in redistributing the fruits of capitalism, widely different motives are attributed to those who favor or oppose capitalism or income redistribution. According to one view, largely accepted in the academic social psychology literature (Jost et al., 2003), opposition to income redistribution and support for capitalism reflect an orientation toward social dominance, a desire to dominate other groups. According to another view that goes back at least to the nineteenth century origins of Marxism, anti-capitalism and a support for greater legal efforts to redistribute income reflect envy for the property of others and a frustration with one's lot in a capitalist system.

In this paper I expand and test the first (social dominance) thesis using twenty nationally representative General Social Surveys conducted by the National Opinion Research Center between 1977 and 2010, involving over 21,000 respondents. I first show that respondents who express traditionally racist views (on segregation, interracial marriage, and inborn racial abilities) tend to support greater income redistribution. Traditional racists also express less positive views toward free-market capitalism and its consequences, tending to want the government to guarantee jobs for everyone and to fix prices, wages, and profits. Next, I report a similar pattern for those who express intolerance for unpopular groups on the fifteen Stouffer tolerance questions (regarding racists, homosexuals, communists, extreme militarists, and atheists). Those who express less tolerance for unpopular groups tend to favor income redistribution and to be less supportive of capitalism and its discontents. Using full latent variable structural equation modeling shows similar results. The data are broadly inconsistent with the standard belief in the social psychology literature that pro-capitalist and anti-redistributionist views are positively associated with racism and intolerance.

I then explore an alternative hypothesis, showing that, compared to anti-redistributionists, strong redistributionists have much higher odds of reporting anger, sadness, loneliness, outrage, and other negative emotions. Similarly, anti-redistributionists had much higher odds of reporting being happy or at ease. Last, both redistributionists and anti-capitalists expressed lower overall happiness, less happy marriages, and lower satisfaction with their financial situations and with their jobs or housework. Further, in several General Social Surveys anti-redistributionists were generally more likely to report altruistic behavior than those who favored a stronger policy of government redistribution of income.

In addition, in a 1996 survey:

Not only do redistributionists report more anger, but they report that their anger lasts longer. Further, when asked about the last time they were angry, strong redistributionists were more than twice as likely as strong opponents of leveling to admit that they responded to their anger by plotting revenge.

The more interesting question (than whether you can have capitalism without racism) is whether you can have socialism without racism. The answer is yes, but the reason is an enlightening one.

In the long run, a robust socialism (that dominates most of the economy) tends to lead to the scapegoating

of demonized out-groups, because there must be someone to blame for economic failure. Thus, the Soviet Union began with hating the Kulaks and the ownership class more generally, but once these were destroyed, they needed someone else to blame. Though it took many decades, the Soviet Union went beyond targeting "counter-revolutionaries" to add Jews to the list. So the demonized out-groups under socialism don't have to be defined by race or ethnicity; they could instead be defined by economic class, religion, or nationality. Accordingly, socialism doesn't have to be racist, but when it dominates the economy almost inevitably there must be some group to despise.

It would be good if the academy in general–and the UC-Davis Racial Capitalism program in particular–were ideologically diverse enough to reflect some of the substantial evidence from the last few decades on the relationship of capitalism and racism in the views of the general public, evidence that tends to point to a negative association between racism and support for capitalism.

#### Cap solves war.

Dafoe 14, Political Science and International Economics (Allan & Nina Kelsey; assistant professor in political science at Yale & research associate in international economics at Berkeley; Journal of Peace Research, “Observing the capitalist peace: Examining market-mediated signaling and other mechanisms,” http://jpr.sagepub.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/content/51/5/619.full)

Countries with liberal political and economic systems rarely use military force against each other. This anomalous peace has been most prominently attributed to the ‘democratic peace’ – the apparent tendency for democratic countries to avoid militarized conflict with each other (Maoz & Russett, 1993; Ray, 1995; Dafoe, Oneal & Russett, 2013).More recently, however, scholars have proposed that the liberal peace could be partly (Russett & Oneal, 2001) or primarily (Gartzke, 2007; but see Dafoe, 2011) attributed to liberal economic factors, such as commercial and financial interdependence. In particular, Erik Gartzke, Quan Li & Charles Boehmer (2001), henceforth referred to as GLB, have demonstrated that measures of capital openness have a substantial and statistically significant association with peaceful dyadic relations. Gartzke (2007) confirms that this association is robust to a large variety of model specifications. To explain this correlation, GLB propose that countries with open capital markets are more able to credibly signal their resolve through the bearing of greater economic costs prior to the outbreak of militarized conflict. This explanation is novel and plausible, and resonates with the rationalist view of asymmetric information as a cause of conflict (Fearon, 1995). Moreover, it implies clear testable predictions on evidential domains different from those examined by GLB. In this article we exploit this opportunity by constructing a confirmatory test of GLB’s theory of market-mediated signaling. We first develop an innovative quantitative case selection technique to identify crucial cases where the mechanism of market-mediated signaling should be most easily observed. Specifically, we employ quantitative data and the statistical models used to support the theory we are probing to create an impartial and transparentmeans of selecting cases in which the theory – as specified by the theory’s creators –makes its most confident predictions.We implement three different case selection rules to select cases that optimize on two criteria: (1) maximizing the inferential leverage of our cases, and (2) minimizing selection bias. We examine these cases for a necessary implication of market-mediated signaling: that key participants drew a connection between conflictual events and adverse market movements. Such an inference is a necessary step in the process by which market-mediated costs can signal resolve. For evidence of this we examine news media, government documents, memoirs, historical works, and other sources. We additionally examine other sources, such as market data, for evidence that economic costs were caused by escalatory events. Based on this analysis, we assess the evidence for GLB’s theory of market mediated costly signaling. Our article then considers a more complex heterogeneous effects version of market-mediated signaling in which unspecified scope conditions are required for the mechanism to operate. Our design has the feature of selecting cases in which scope conditions are most likely to be absent. This allows us to perform an exploratory analysis of these cases, looking for possible scope conditions. We also consider alternative potential mechanisms. Our cases are reviewed in more detail in the online appendix.1 To summarize our results, our confirmatory test finds that while market-mediated signaling may be operative in the most serious disputes, it was largely absent in the less serious disputes that characterize most of the sample of militarized interstate disputes (MIDs). This suggests either that other mechanisms account for the correlation between capital openness and peace, or that the scope conditions for market-mediated signaling are restrictive. Of the signals that we observed, strategic market-mediated signals were relatively more important than automatic market-mediated signals in the most serious conflicts. We identify a number of potential scope conditions, such as that (1) the conflict must be driven by bargaining failure arising from uncertainty and (2) the economic costs need to escalate gradually and need to be substantial, but less than the expected military costs of conflict. Finally, there were a number of other explanations that seemed present in the cases we examined and could account for the capitalist peace: capital openness is associated with greater anticipated economic costs of conflict; capital openness leads third parties to have a greater stake in the conflict and therefore be more willing to intervene; a dyadic acceptance of the status quo could promote both peace and capital openness; and countries seeking to institutionalize a regional peace might instrumentally harness the pacifying effects of liberal markets. The correlation: Open capital markets and peace The empirical puzzle at the core of this article is the significant and robust correlation noted by GLB between high levels of capital openness in both members of a dyad and the infrequent incidence of militarized interstate disputes (MIDs) and wars between the members of this dyad (Gartzke, Li & Boehmer, 2001). The index of capital openness (CAPOPEN) is intended to capture the ‘difficulty states face in seeking to impose restrictions on capital flows (the degree of lost policy autonomy due to globalization)’ (Gartzke & Li, 2003: 575). CAPOPEN is constructed from data drawn from the widely used IMF’s Annual Reports on Exchange Arrangements and Exchange Controls; it is a combination of eight binary variables that measure different types of government restrictions on capital and currency flow (Gartzke, Li & Boehmer, 2001: 407). The measure of CAPOPEN starts in 1966 and is defined for many countries (increasingly more over time). Most of the countries that do not have a measure of CAPOPEN are communist.2 GLB implement this variable in a dyadic framework by creating a new variable, CAPOPENL, which is the smaller of the two dyadic values of CAPOPEN. This operationalization is sometimes referred to as the ‘weak-link’ specification since the functional form is consonant with a model of war in which the ‘weakest link’ in a dyad determines the probability of war. CAPOPENL has a negative monotonic association with the incidence of MIDs, fatal MIDs, and wars (see Figure 1).3 The strength of the estimated empirical association between peace and CAPOPENL, using a modified version of the dataset and model from Gartzke (2007), is comparable to that between peace and, respectively, joint democracy, log of distance, or the GDP of a contiguous dyad (Gartzke, 2007: 179; Gartzke, Li & Boehmer, 2001: 412). In summary, CAPOPENL seems to be an important and robust correlate of peace. The question of why specifically this correlation exists, however, remains to be answered. The mechanism: Market-mediated signaling? Gartzke, Li & Boehmer (2001) argue that the classic liberal account for the pacific effect of economic interdependence – that interdependence increases the expected costs of war – is not consistent with the bargaining theory of war (see also Morrow, 1999). GLB argue that ‘conventional descriptions of interdependence see war as less likely because states face additional opportunity costs for fighting. The problem with such an account is that it ignores incentives to capitalize on an opponent’s reticence to fight’ (Gartzke, Li & Boehmer, 2001: 400.)4 Instead, GLB (see also Gartzke, 2003; Gartzke & Li, 2003) argue that financial interdependence could promote peace by facilitating the sending of costly signals. As the probability of militarized conflict increases, states incur a variety of automatic and strategically imposed economic costs as a consequence of escalation toward conflict. Those states that persist in a dispute despite these costs will reveal their willingness to tolerate them, and hence signal resolve. The greater the degree of economic interdependence, the more a resolved country could demonstrate its willingness to suffer costs ex ante to militarized conflict. Gartzke, Li & Boehmer’s mechanism implies a commonly perceived costly signal before militarized conflict breaks out or escalates: if market-mediated signaling is to account for the correlation between CAPOPENL and the absence of MIDs, then visible market-mediated costs should occur prior to or during periods of real or potential conflict (Gartzke, Li & Boehmer, 2001). Thus, the proposed mechanism should leave many visible footprints in the historical record. This theory predicts that these visible signals must arise in any escalating conflict, involving countries with high capital openness, in which this mechanism is operative Clarifying the signaling mechanism Gartzke, Li & Boehmer’s signaling mechanism is mostly conceptualized on an abstract, game-theoretic level (Gartzke, Li & Boehmer, 2001). In order to elucidate the types of observations that could inform this theory’s validity, we discuss with greater specificity the possible ways in which such signaling might occur. A conceptual classification of costly signals The term signaling connotes an intentional communicative act by one party directed towards another. Because the term signaling thus suggests a willful act, and a signal of resolve is only credible if it is costly, scholars have sometimes concluded that states involved in bargaining under incomplete information could advance their interests by imposing costs on themselves and thereby signaling their resolve (e.g. Lektzian & Sprecher, 2007). However, the game-theoretic concept of signaling refers more generally to any situation in which an actor’s behavior reveals information about her private information. In fact, states frequently adopt sanctions with low costs to themselves and high costs to their rivals because doing so is often a rational bargaining tactic on other grounds: they are trying to coerce their rival to concede the issue. Bargaining encounters of this type can be conceptualized as a type of war-of-attrition game in which each actor attempts to coerce the other through the imposition of escalating costs. Such encounters also provide the opportunity for signaling: when states resist the costs imposed by their rivals, they ‘signal’ their resolve. If at some point one party perceives the conflict to have become too costly and steps back, that party ‘signals’ a lack of resolve. Thus, this kind of signaling arises as a by-product of another’s coercive attempts. In other words, costly signals come in two forms: self-inflicted (information about a leader arising from a leader’s intentional or incidental infliction of costs on himself) or imposed (information about a leader that arises from a leader’s response to a rival’s imposition of costs). Additionally, costs may arise as an automatic byproduct of escalation towards military conflict or may be a tool of statecraft that is strategically employed during a conflict. The automatic mechanism stipulates that as the probability of conflict increases, various economic assets will lose value due to the risk of conflict and investor flight. However, the occurrence of these costs may also be intentional outcomes of specific escalatory decisions of the states, as in the case of deliberate sanctions; in this case they are strategic. Finally, at a practical level, we identify three different potential kinds of economic costs of militarized conflict that may be mediated by open capital markets: capital costs from political risk, monetary coercion, and business sanctions.

#### Spreading capitalism creates global prosperity and environmental sustainability. Abandoning it is disastrous.

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

It is not social policy but capitalism that has created today’s prosperity.

What is important is that what made today’s mass prosperity possible – a phenomenon unprecedented in history – was not social policy or social legislation, organised trade union pressure, or corrective interventions in the capitalist economy, but rather market capitalism itself, due to its enormous potential for innovation and the ever-increasing productivity of human labour that resulted from it.

Increasing prosperity and quality of life are always the result of increasing labour productivity. Only increased productivity enabled higher social standards, better working conditions, the overcoming of child labour, a higher level of education, and the emergence of human capital. This process of increasing triumph over poverty and the constantly rising living standards of the general masses is taking place on a global scale – but only where the market economy and capitalist entrepreneurship are able to spread.

From industrial overexploitation of nature to ecological awareness

The first phase of industrialisation and capitalism was characterised by an enormous consumption of resources and frequent overexploitation of nature, which soon gave the impression that this process could not be sustainable. Since the end of the 19th century, disaster and doom scenarios have repeatedly been put forward, but in retrospect they have proved to be wrong: The combination of technological innovation, market competition, and entrepreneurial profit-seeking (with the compulsion to constantly minimise costs) have meant that these scenarios never occurred. The ever-increasing population has been increasingly better supplied thanks to innovative technologies, ever-increasing output with lower consumption of resources less harmful to the environment – e.g. less arable land in agriculture, or oil and electricity instead of coal for rapidly increasing mobility. More recent disaster scenarios, such as those spread by reputable scientists since the late 1960s and in the 1970s, have also proved to be inaccurate.

The reason things developed differently was the always underestimated innovative dynamism of the capitalist market economy, a growing ecological awareness and, as a result, legislative intervention that took advantage of the logic of market capitalism: As a result of the ecological movement that had come out of the United States since 1970, wise legislation began to use the price mechanism to apply market incentives to internalize negative externalities. Environmental pollution was given a price-tag.

This led to an enormous decrease in air pollution and other ecological consequences of growth, which is only possible in free, market-based societies, because the production process here is characterized by competition and constant pressure to reduce costs, i.e. to the most profitable use of resources. On the other hand, all forms of socialism, i.e. a state-controlled economy, have proved to be ecological disasters and have left behind destruction of gigantic proportions, without providing the population with anything that is near comparable in prosperity, often even by destroying existing prosperity, such as happened in Venezuela.

Capitalist profit motive combined with digitalization as a solution: Increasing decoupling of growth and resource consumption

Moreover, technological innovations combined with capitalist profit-seeking and market competition have led to a new and surprising phenomenon over the past decades, which is still hardly noticed in the public debate: the decoupling of growth and resource consumption (“dematerialization”). In a wide variety of industrial sectors, the developed countries, above all the U.S., are now achieving ever greater productive output with increasingly fewer resources. This has a lot to do with technology, especially the digitalization of the economy and of our entire lives.

As the well-known MIT professor Andrew McAfee shows in his book More from Less, published in October 2019, this process also follows the logic of capitalist profit maximization. To get it going, we do not need politics, even though wise, properly incentivizing legislation can be helpful and sometimes necessary. Above all, however, it is the combination of technological innovation, capitalist profit-seeking, and market-based entrepreneurial competition that will also solve the problem of man-made global warming.

In addition, property rights and their protection are decisive for the careful use of natural resources. And where this is not possible, legal support for collective self-governing structures, in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity, are important—as is analysed by Nobel Economic Prize winner Elinor Ostrom. By contrast, the growing ideologically motivated anti-capitalist eco-activism, and the policies influenced by it, are leading in the wrong direction, distracting precisely from what would be best for the climate and the environment—and distracting us from what could help protect us against the inevitable consequences of global warming.

### 2

#### CP text: The United States federal government should:

#### Fund a public-private partnership for deep space exploration

#### Triple NASA’s budget and earmark increased funding for cooperative deep space exploration

#### Public private co-operation solves – and avoids the both disads and allows increases public entity checks on privatization

Smith 21, Fisher Smith, 3-31-2021, "Public-Private Partnerships: The Way to Space," National Space Society - Working to Create a Spacefaring Civilization, https://space.nss.org/public-private-partnerships-the-way-to-space/)//SRA

In recent years, **private companies** have begun to push the boundaries of outer space, making it more affordable to launch rockets and developing new technologies that **have revolutionized the industry**. SpaceX, Blue Origin, Nanoracks, Rocket Lab, and Made in Space (now Redwire), among others, have changed the space industry dramatically. As recently as the early 2000’s, the only way to launch payloads into space was to go through governmental entities such as NASA, European Space Agency, Roscosmos and the China National Space Administration (CNSA). Today, the U.S. has been leading the way in purchasing launch services from private companies, and the private companies themselves work with other companies and investors to launch non-government payloads.

However, while these companies have accomplished much, **there is still a need for an organized, governmental role in space development**. Government involvement is necessary to ensure that the public maintains access to space and to advance the frontier of development beyond Earth. For instance, consider NASA and the American government. NASA’s ongoing scientific efforts are characterized by [four key strategic goals](https://trumpadministration.archives.performance.gov/NASA/): 1) expanding knowledge of our human species, 2) creating “sustainable long-term exploration and utilization” of outer space for the whole species, 3) addressing national challenges and aiding in economic development, and 4) continuing to optimize and develop their capabilities and operations within outer space. NASA’s ongoing commitments are to develop outer space and technology for the United States and for humanity as a whole. Their missions of exploration, scientific discovery and technological development have continued to advance humanity.

The fundamental structure of democratic governments such as those in the U.S. allow regular people to influence and participate in space development policy. People can vote for and petition their elected representatives to promote certain policies for the use of outer space, or join non-profits such as the National Space Society (NSS) to represent their views. This allows anyone to have a say in our development of outer space.

While private companies are pushing the boundaries of outer space, **NASA and the US government have the ability to create policies that encourage more rapid and beneficial development in space**. The National Space Society (NSS) advocates that the government promote policies for infrastructure development and reusability for outer space expansion. **The successful model of public-private partnerships that has been used to transport both cargo and crew to the International Space station via the commercial purchase of launch services should be extended throughout cis-lunar space**. Further, through NASA, NSS recommends that the government continue to promote international cooperation. The international community has cooperated in the past, particularly with the International Space Station. By continuing this partnership, multiple States can contribute to outer space exploration and development, and private organizations can continue provide vital services at lower cost, allowing government funds to accomplish more in space.

While past developments in outer space have been led by governments and governmental space agencies, that is no longer true. **Private organizations have reignited space exploration and provided a way for humanity to continue to expand and revolutionize technology needed to expand beyond Earth**, without many of the hurdles, including cost and regulations, that sometimes hamper government advances. But, the path to the stars is not paved by one or the other. Instead, **cooperation, between States, governmental agencies, and private companies, will ensure that we continue to push our boundaries into space.**

A detailed look at NSS recommendations for NASA and governmental actions to propel humanity into the stars can be found in the NSS Position Paper on [U.S. Development and Settlement of the Moon and Near Earth Asteroids](https://space.nss.org/wp-content/uploads/NSS-Position-Paper-Development-of-Moon-and-NEOs-2015.pdf).

### 2

#### The 1967 Outer Space Treaty restricts lunar development for states, but doesn’t apply to corporations – private entities are the only route to space colonization

**Stockwell ’20** (Samuel Stockwell; Research assistant at RAND Europe working in defense, security and infrastructure. “Legal ‘Black Holes’ in Outer Space: the Regulation of Private Space Companies” <https://www.e-ir.info/2020/07/20/legal-black-holes-in-outer-space-the-regulation-of-private-space-companies/> 20 July 2020) // ELog

On 30th April 2020, NASA – the US government’s space agency – awarded three private space companies a jointcontract worth $967m to complete a lunar mission by 2024, in what was celebrated as “the last piece that [America] need[s] in order to get to the moon” by NASA administrator Jim Brindestine (The Telegraph, 2020). Yet, whilst this development was widely covered in the media, less coverage has focused on the extent to which existing international legislation surrounding outer space endeavours appropriately applies to private entities. Indeed, the prospect of a corporate foothold within the extra-terrestrial domain has thrown up both a mixture of optimism and concern regarding the potential benefits of expanding capital projects into space (Adolph, 2006; Dickens & Ormrod, 2007). By adopting the 1967 UN Outer Space Treaty (OST) as an analytical framework in relation to the rise of the so-called US ‘NewSpace’ actors, this essay argues that there are significant legal ambiguities regarding the status of private space companies in orbital space. Such loopholes allow the US government to circumvent its own obligations to the OST, whilst simultaneously undermining the notion of space as a ‘global commons’ through a commodification process. The lack of specificity within the OST surrounding private property rights over extra-terrestrial resources risks the prospect of reinforcing Earth-bound wealth inequalities and US dominance in space, by restricting the potential economic benefits for the broader global citizenry in favour of a narrow class of wealthy American investors. Moreover, the OST’s weak clause regarding the regulation of space surveillance risks the incentivisation of a ‘global panopticon’ network of US satellites. The rise of dual-use technology is blurring the boundaries between military and civilian observations, raising serious ethical concerns over the nature of US space-based data collection. Finally, the increasing number of private satellite constellations is facilitating the possibility of cataclysmic space debris collisions which could exacerbate geopolitical tensions. Such developments are also contributing towards the contamination of the broader space environment in ways that the OST had never envisioned. The UN Outer Space Treaty and Rise of the ‘NewSpace’ Actors Although ratified into international law in 1967, the UN Outer Space Treaty (OST) is perhaps still the most relevant piece of legislation for analysing state and non-state entity activity in outer space. Designed to prevent both the militarisation of space and national appropriation of celestial bodies at the height of Cold War tensions, the UN OST holds significant influence as a form of customary international law (Hebert, 2014: 6). Ratified by over 100 nations – including major spacefaring nations such as the United States, Russia and China – the treaty is widely accepted as an authoritative document and has formed the basis for all other space treaties that have succeeded it (Kramer, 2017: 129). This is in contrast to more recent legislation such as the 1972 Moon Treaty designed to promote cooperation in Moon exploration and development, which the US and other major space superpowers have refrained from signing (Adolph, 2006: 968-969). The type of American actors becoming involved in the realm of outer space has undergone significant diversification. Despite working alongside NASA since the 1950s, commercial enterprises were largely confined to the manufacturing of parts utilised in rockets and other equipment for space activities (Lal, 2016: 63-66). However, the continuous sharp decline in NASA’s overall budget that has occurred since the Apollo 11 moon landing, and the increasing trends towards the privatisation of government functions has drastically altered both the capabilities and the outlooks of private space companies. Indeed, although the space economy is growing overall, global government spending decreased by 1.3% between 2012 and 2013 while commercial-sector growth increased by roughly 7% (Conklin, 2017: 33). Central to the impetus behind this private sector space boom has been the emergence of the socalled ‘NewSpace’ actors – “a broad range of primarily US-based entrepreneurs… who, for more than 30 years, have aimed to commercialise space” (Valentine, 2012: 1046). Driven by a libertarian outlook of economics, and critical of NASA’s historical grip on space exploration, these individuals portray themselves as the pioneers of the ‘final frontier’ who will save humanity from extinction through privately-funded extra-terrestrial missions (Kearnes & van Dooren, 2017: 182). Near-Earth Object and Lunar Resource Mining: US Private Property in Space Lunar rock samples from the Apollo missions containing rare Earth resources, such as Helium-3 which produces more power and less waste than traditional nuclear reactors on Earth, have since fuelled incentives for extraterrestrial resource mining (Brearley, 2006: 44-46). This was further facilitated by suggestions that near-earth objects (NEOs) like the so-called ‘Anteros asteroid’ could comprise of over five trillion dollars’ worth of magnesium silicate and aluminium (Kramer, 2017: 131). Envisaging appropriation concerns that might arise from the future extraction of space assets by spacefaring nations, Article II of the UN OST declared that: “Outer space is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means” (UN, 1967). The emphasis on claims of national sovereignty were intimately tied to the Cold War context at the time, where space activities were under the exclusive monopoly of governmental agencies and initiated for goals of military dominance or national prestige (Sachdeva, 2017: 210). However, the privatisation of the space industry that has occurred since the 1980s has meant that the legislation leaves an enormous amount of legal ambiguity and interpretation regarding the regulation of private resource mining in space. As Shaer (2016) demonstrates, the Article II provision fails to address either the exploitation of space for financial gain or the property claims of commercial enterprises (Shaer, 2016: 47). Nevertheless, Article VI of the UN OST asserts that: “States shall be responsible for national space activities whether carried out by governmental or non-governmental entities” (UN, 1967; own emphasis). Some scholars have suggested that this clause significantly restrains the activities of private space corporations by incentivising states to regulate their domestic organisations for fear of liability concerns (Abeyratne, 1998: 168). However, the US government recently enacted a piece of legislation which exploited this clause, in order to circumvent its own restrictions and strengthen US economic influence in space. The passage of the 2015 SPACE Act enabled US citizens to privately “possess, own, transport, use, and sell the resources” they obtain in outer space, whilst making careful consideration to deny national sovereign claims over such materials (Leon, 2018: 500). Yet, regardless of whether it is an American private company or public venture, the US is still satisfying its geopolitical interests; by exclusively siphoning off extra-terrestrial resources for American gain, the nation’s soft power is thereby extended at the expense of spacefaring adversaries such as China (Basu & Kurlekar, 2016: 65). Indeed NewSpace actors cleverly played on these strategic concerns prior to the bill’s passage, with billionaire space entrepreneur Robert Bigelow asserting that the biggest danger wasn’t private enterprises on the Moon, but that “America is asleep and does nothing, while China comes along… surveying and laying claim [to the Moon]” (Klinger, 2017: 222). The US government’s support for private space companies is also likely to lead to the reinforcement of Earth-bound wealth inequalities in space. Many NewSpace actors frame their long-term ambitions in space with strong anthropogenic undertones, by offering the salvation of the human race from impending extinction through off-world colonial developments (Kearnes & Dooren: 2017: 182). Yet, this type of discourse disguises the highly exclusive nature of these missions. Whilst they seem to suggest that there is a stake for ordinary citizens in the vast space frontier, the reality is that these self-described space pioneers are a member of a narrow ‘cosmic elite’ – “founders of Amazon.com, Microsoft, Pay Pal… and a smattering of games designers and hotel magnates” (Parker, 2009: 91). Indeed, private space enterprises have themselves suggested that they have no obligation to share mineral resources extracted in space with the global community (Klinger, 2017: 208). This is reflected in the speeches of individuals such as Nathan Ingraham, a senior editor at the tech site EngadAsteroid mining, who claimed that asteroid mining was “how [America is] going to move into space and develop the next Vegas Strip” (Shaer, 2016: 50). Such comments highlight a form of what Beery (2016) defines as ‘scalar politics’. In similar ways to the ‘scaling’ of unequal international relations that has constituted our relationship with outer space under the guise of the ‘global commons’ (Beery, 2016: 99), private companies – through their anthropogenic discourse – are scaling existing Earthbound wealth inequalities and social relations into space by siphoning off extra-terrestrial resources. By constructing their endeavours in ways that appeal to the common good, NewSpace actors are therefore concealing the reality of how commercial resource extraction serves the exclusive interests of their private shareholders at the expense of the vast majority of the global population.

#### Colonization of outer space is essential to humanity – 5 warrants

Orwig 15 [(Jessica, a senior editor at Insider. She has a Master of Science in science and technology journalism from Texas A&M University and a Bachelor of Science in astronomy and physics from The Ohio State University. Before NY she spent time as an intern at: American Physical Society in MD International Center for Theoretical Physics in Italy Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory in IL American Geophysical Union in DC), “5 undeniable reasons humans need to colonize Mars — even though it's going to cost billions,” Slate, 4/21/2015, https://www.businessinsider.com/5-undeniable-reasons-why-humans-should-go-to-mars-2015-4] MN

Establishing a permanent colony of humans on Mars is not an option. It's a necessity. At least, that's what some of the most innovative, intelligent minds of our age — Buzz Aldrin, Stephen Hawking, Elon Musk, Bill Nye, and Neil deGrasse Tyson — are saying. Of course, it's extremely difficult to foresee how manned missions to Mars that would cost hundreds of billions of dollars each, could benefit mankind. It's easier to imagine how that kind of money could immediately help in the fight against cancer or world hunger. That's because humans tend to be short-sighted. We're focused on what's happening tomorrow instead of 100 years from now. "If the human race is to continue for another million years, we will have to boldly go where no one has gone before," Hawking said in 2008 at a lecture series for NASA's 50th anniversary. That brings us to the first reason humans must colonize Mars: 1. Ensuring the survival of our species The only home humans have ever known is Earth. But history shows that surviving as a species on this tiny blue dot in the vacuum of space is tough and by no means guaranteed. The dinosaurs are a classic example: They roamed the planet for 165 million years, but the only trace of them today are their fossilized remains. A colossal asteroid wiped them out. Putting humans on more than one planet would better ensure our existence thousands if not millions of years from now. "Humans need to be a multiplanet species," Musk recently told astronomer and Slate science blogger Phil Plait. Musk founded the space transport company SpaceX to help make this happen. Mars is an ideal target because it has a day about the same length as Earth's and water ice on its surface. Moreover, it's the best available option: Venus and Mercury are too hot, and the Moon has no atmosphere to protect residents from destructive meteor impacts. 2. Discovering life on Mars Nye, the CEO of The Planetary Society, said during an episode of StarTalk Radio in March that humanity should focus on sending humans instead of robots to Mars because humans could make discoveries 10,000 times as fast as the best spacecraft explorers we have today. Though he was hesitant to say humans should live on Mars, he agreed there were many more discoveries to be made there. One monumental discovery scientists could make is determining whether life currently exists on Mars. If we're going to do that, we'll most likely have to dig much deeper than NASA's rovers can. The theory there is that life was spawned not from the swamps on adolescent Earth, but from watery chasms on Mars. The Mars life theory suggests that rocks rich with microorganisms could have been ejected off the planet's surface from a powerful impact, eventually making their way through space to Earth. It's not a stretch to imagine, because Martian rocks can be found on Earth. None of those, however, have shown signs of life. "You cannot rule out the fact that a Mars rock with life in it landing on the Earth kicked off terrestrial life, and you can only really test that by finding life on Mars," Christopher Impey, a British astronomer and author of over a dozen books in astronomy and popular science, told Business Insider. 3. Improving the quality of life on Earth "Only by pushing mankind to its limits, to the bottoms of the ocean and into space, will we make discoveries in science and technology that can be adapted to improve life on Earth." British doctor Alexander Kumar wrote that in a 2012 article for BBC News where he explored the pros and cons of sending humans to Mars. At the time, Kumar was living in the most Mars-like place on Earth, Antarctica, to test how he adapted to the extreme conditions both physiologically and psychologically. To better understand his poignant remark, let's look at an example: During its first three years in space, NASA's prized Hubble Space Telescope snapped blurry pictures because of a flaw in its engineering. The problem was fixed in 1993, but to try to make use of the blurry images during those initial years, astronomers developed a computer algorithm to better extract information from the images. It turns out the algorithm was eventually shared with a medical doctor who applied it to the X-ray images he was taking to detect breast cancer. The algorithm did a better job at detecting early stages of breast cancer than the conventional method, which at the time was the naked eye. "You can't script that. That happens all the time — this cross pollination of fields, innovation in one, stimulating revolutionary changes in another," Tyson, the StarTalk radio host, explained during an interview with Fareed Zakaria in 2012. It's impossible to predict how cutting-edge technologies used to develop manned missions to Mars and habitats on Mars will benefit other fields like medicine or agriculture. But we'll figure that out only by "pushing humankind to its limits" and boldy going where we've never been before. 4. Growing as a species Another reason we should go to Mars, according to Tyson, is to inspire the next generation of space explorers. When asked in 2013 whether we should go to Mars, he answered: "Yes, if it galvanizes an entire generation of students in the educational pipeline to want to become scientists, engineers, technologists, and mathematicians," he said. "The next generation of astronauts to land on Mars are in middle school now." Humanity's aspirations to explore space are what drive us toward more advanced technological innovations that will undoubtedly benefit mankind in one way or another. "Space is like a proxy for a lot of what else goes on in society, including your urge to innovate," Tyson said during his interview with Zakaria. He added: "There's nothing that drives ambitions the way NASA does." 5. Demonstrating political and economic leadership At a February 24 hearing, Aldrin told the US Senate's Subcommittee on Space, Science and Competitiveness that getting to Mars was a necessity not only for science, but also for policy. "In my opinion, there is no more convincing way to demonstrate American leadership for the remainder of this century than to commit to a permanent presence on Mars," he said. If Americans do not go to Mars, someone else will. And that spells political and economic benefit for whoever succeeds. "If you lose your space edge," Tyson said during his interview with Zakaria, "my deep concern is that you lose everything else about society that enables you to compete economically."

#### Living in space will make us more ethical, social beings – turns structural violence

Jovan Milivojević 17, Faculty of Engineering, University of Kragujevac, with; Tijana Cvetić, Ivan Savović, Nebojša Nikolić, Miloš Petronijević; June 2017, “QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE FOLLOWING CENTURIES,” http://cqm.rs/2017/cd1/pdf/papers/focus\_1/53.pdf

b) Social dimension

This dimension will not be able to follow the development that takes place on Earth. Here in the harsh conditions of survival people must be leaning on each other, and the fellowship must be dominant in relation to the selfishness of individuals and groups. The idea of globalism here melts like snow under the July sun. Here all are important as the different philosophy leads the fragile human community to the collapse and it takes a long time to it to start up a strong development that leads to the development of s new human civilization.

c) Environmental dimension

Environmental dimension suffers radical changes, because we talk about very harsh living conditions that have to be adapted with the help of the latest knowledge and technologies. So, virtually there is no atmosphere on the Moon, gravity is six times smaller, one side of the Moon is extremely hot, and the other is extremely cold and the entire Moon is a huge stone desert. There is no running water, nor is it possible to produce food in the open. And a number of other parameters of the Moon indicate a totally inhospitable celestial body. Knowledge of terraforming the Moon are absolutely at the beginning and are related to the huge energy regardless of the process (the development of the atmosphere, clouds and rain, the development of vegetation and wildlife, etc.). Even in the 22nd century, it will be a problem and a huge scientific endeavour which should be solved with the enormous and concerted efforts.

d) Science and Technology dimension

This dimension of quality of life in cosmic conditions becomes dominant. It needs to find effective solutions for high-quality adaptation of man as a biological system to new radically altered environmental conditions, as well as an efficient and sustainable growth and development of human communities, which should enable the development of new cosmic civilizations. Of course, it also means an effectively terraforming of celestial bodies, for example, Mars and the Moon. To begin with, the scientific and technological development of new human communities and / or civilizations must rely on the capacities of the parent planet, but eventually the development of own scientific capacities will create conditions for a normal and decent life of people in cosmic environment.

e) Value system dimension

This dimension of quality of life will also experience important changes. Philosophical views on life, the basic value systems, cultures and beliefs will assume many new forms. On the other hand, the new environmental conditions (gravity, brightness, atmospheric pressure, etc.) will significantly change the man's physical appearance, and the absence of earthly paradise (rivers, seas, lakes, flora and fauna, atmospheric phenomena, etc.) will significantly change the psyche of people. This will affect the development of the significantly changed system of values and views on quality of life and enjoyment of happiness.