### 1

#### Interpretation – the affirmative must defend the resolution through governmental implementation

#### The text of the resolution calls for debate on hypothetical government action: “Resolved” means to enact a policy by law.

**Words & Phrases ’64**(Words and Phrases; 1964; Permanent Edition)

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

#### Government action is necessary to regulate private entities.

**Blaustein 18** (Blaustein, Richard. “Private-Sector Space Activities Require Government Regulation, Says US Report.” Physics World, IOP Publishing, 4 July 2018, physicsworld.com/a/private-sector-space-activities-require-government-regulation-says-us-report/.)//DebateDrills AY

**The US Congress must introduce legislation to regulate the activities of private companies operating in space.** That is according to a new report by the US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine, which says **the need for reform has been heightened by the “burgeoning” commercial space sector** in the US. One leader in the booming US private space sector is [Space X](http://www.spacex.com/), which was founded by Tesla head Elon Musk in 2002. The firm, which has had a number of recent high-profile rocket launches, is setting its sights on missions to Mars. Even Jeff Bezos, who founded the online shopping giant Amazon, is getting in on the act with plans for his firm Blue Origin to send a manned mission to the Moon.

#### Violation: they only defend private action

#### Standards:

1] policy ed – analyzing the nuances of a policy from the perspective of a policymaker is the most real world which o/w on scope

2] critical ed – cps and

3] resolution is stasis point

Ci

### 2

#### Counterplan: Property rights for asteroids should be governed by the doctrine of appropriation. Private appropriation of non-asteroid celestial bodies should be prohibited.

#### No link turns -- rules of appropriation solve waste and abstract claims and alternative approaches don’t

Myers 16 -- Ross Myers (J.D. candidate at the University of Oregon Law School.), The Doctrine of Appropriation and Asteroid Mining: Incentivizing the Private Exploration and Development of Outer Space, 2016, Oregon Review of International Law, https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1794/19850/Meyers.pdf?sequence=1 WJ

Like water during the expansion of the American West, the exploration of space can be financed and incentivized by granting rights in resources to those who secure new resources and put them to beneficial use. Some legal scholars have suggested the traditional rule of capture be applied to asteroids,69 or that rights to asteroids be purchased directly from an international agency and owned as chattel.70 However, like water during America’s westward expansion, asteroids are not easily classified under traditional property regimes. Thus, a doctrine of appropriation would be more appropriate for asteroids than a traditional rule of capture or a chattel system, because a system based on the traditional rule of capture or chattel would result in waste, abstract claims, and complicated legal issues.

First, asteroid claims cannot be adjudicated under the traditional rule of capture, or as chattel, because such systems would be incredibly wasteful. As of now, scientists have observed approximately 450,000 asteroids in our solar system.71

But only a fraction of the observable bodies will be cost effective to mine. While it might one day be possible for a single entity to finance several mining missions at once, current costs associated with such a venture would limit almost any space-mining program to one or two asteroids, at least initially.72 The traditional rule of capture could allow an entity to quickly claim multiple asteroids merely by landing on them and planting a flag, without requiring the entity to show it can reasonably use the resources they have claimed.

Even worse would be a system where the same corporation could claim asteroids simply by discovering their existence and registering the claim. Allowing this type of unregulated claim would incentivize larger corporations capable of space travel to quickly claim reachable asteroids, but the claims could easily outpace those entities’ realistic expectations on what they could use. Under a traditional rule of capture system, the solar system could be divvied up long before the resources could conceivably be mined. A rule similar to the doctrine of appropriation used for water claims in the United States would alleviate this concern by limiting claims to those where a claimant can show a reasonable beneficial use for the resource.

Another concern posed by the traditional rule of capture or chattel system would be the creation of abstract claims. Some legal scholars have advocated for a system where asteroids would be categorized as chattel, and rights in asteroids would be granted to an entity that could identify an asteroid and register ownership of it with an international agency.73 The advantage of such a system would be that it would allow an international agency to keep track of asteroids, and it would allow for the mapping of the reachable solar system. The problem with this approach, however, is that it would result in abstract claims. If an entity could claim the rights to an asteroid without actual possession, there is nothing to prevent that company from claiming ownership long in advance of any real possibility of landing on it. One of the reasons for creating the doctrine of appropriation was to limit abstract claims over resources that were not being used in any reasonable way. Just as the plaintiffs in Hague had no recourse against the third party who wasted the natural gas reserve, there would be no cause of action against an entity that has the rights to an asteroid, but chooses not to exercise them.74 This may be particularly harmful to society because asteroids contain volatiles that may be essential to creating rocket fuel in space, which, in turn, may be crucial to deep space exploration.

Using asteroid-bound volatiles to make rocket fuel would reduce the cost and increase the range of space exploratory missions, possibly improving the human race’s ability to explore and develop space. Under a system were entities could claim asteroids without actual possession, those entities could exclude others from landing on the asteroids and using such resources, even when such resources are languishing unused in space. To prevent the creation of such abstract claims over asteroids, the doctrine of appropriation could be modified as to only grant rights only to entities who are able to demonstrate both actual possession and beneficial use. This would ensure that asteroids claims are limited to those where the resources are actually being used, thus, maximizing the utility of such celestial bodies to society.

Finally, asteroids cannot be adjudicated under the traditional rule of capture or a chattel system because their unique propensity to collide with other celestial bodies would result in vexing legal issues. Pop culture has popularized the notion of an asteroid crashing into the surface of Earth in movies and books, but interspace collisions may be a real concern. Asteroids are constantly moving through space, and they often crash into other asteroids or space debris, and sometimes onto the surface of planets. So real is the concern that space agencies regularly keep track of NEOs, or Near Earth Objects, which include around 10,000 asteroids large enough to be tracked in space.75 Imagine the scenario in the popular movie Armageddon, where society wrestles with the mechanics of destroying a huge asteroid that is headed straight for Earth.76 It would be strange, indeed, if the situation were further complicated by an entity owning the asteroid. Would the Earth have to compensate the company for the loss of resources, or would the company be forced to assume liability for the damage caused by the collision? What if the asteroid, rather than crashing into Earth, crashed instead into another asteroid owned by different entity? It makes sense that a company with actual possession of an asteroid should have a claim for actual mining equipment destroyed, but it seems unreasonable to treat the entire rock as the entity’s chattel. By limiting asteroid claims under a doctrine of appropriation-like system, society will be saved the headache of attempting to adjudicate such absurd situations.

Because the traditional rule of capture or a chattel system for the ownership of asteroids would result in waste, abstract claims, and absurd legal dilemmas, a modified doctrine of appropriation should replace existing outdated international space law relating to asteroids.’

#### Asteroid mining is an unqualified good – it’s essential to advanced asteroid deflection, deep space travel, and fighting climate change

Heise 18 -- Jack Heise (Judicial Law Clerk at U.S. Courts of Appeals), Space, the Final Frontier of Enterprise: Incentivizing Asteroid Mining Under a Revised International Framework, 40 Mich. J. Int'l L. 189 (2018). https://repository.law.umich.edu/mjil/vol40/iss1/5 WJ

Asteroid mining has the potential to facilitate space travel, an outcome the OST holds to be in the interest of humanity as a whole.39 The potential of asteroid mining to reduce the cost of spaceflight, moreover, could facilitate the growth of the space economy. Asteroid mining thus aligns with another stated purposes of the OST in the sense that an expanded space econ- omy could provide substantial benefits to all mankind.40 First, in seeking to face the challenges posed by space travel, the public sector space race gave rise to numerous technological innovations, ranging from LEDs to emergency blankets to memory foam.41 It seems likely that the private space race would result in a similar degree of innovation, the products of which could benefit people across the globe.

Second, a successful mission to Mars could provide benefits beyond a mere sense of interplanetary accomplishment. NASA suggests that, given the parallels between the formation and evolution of Mars and Earth, a voyage there could help “us learn more about our own planet’s history and future.”42 The scientific advancements from such a mission cannot currently be anticipated and are difficult to predict, but “expand[ing] the frontiers of knowledge” in this manner could well bring benefits to all mankind.43

Third, the development of asteroid mining technology could also help advance asteroid diversion tactics. The development of the technology required to conduct successful asteroid mining operations could “help us to divert any incoming asteroids.”44 This is of great importance since NASA recently eliminated its Asteroid Redirect Mission due to funding cuts;45 NASA’s project was hailed by some scientists as a “critical step in demonstrating we can protect our planet from a future asteroid impact . . . .”46 Asteroid mining could step in and fill an important void. While the probability of an Armageddon-causing impact is low, the effects of an impact would be extremely severe.47 Even some mitigation of this risk as a byproduct of as- teroid mining would be a benefit to humanity as a whole.

Finally, reduced launch costs could facilitate measures to combat global climate change. One proposed solution for canceling out predicted increases in average worldwide temperature is to “prevent[] . . . about 1% of incoming solar radiation—insolation—from reaching the Earth. This could be done by scattering into space from the vicinity of Earth an appropriately small frac- tion of total insolation.”48 Asteroid mining could facilitate such measures in that “[t]echnologies that could greatly decrease the cost of space-launch could make a telling difference in the practicality of all types of space- deployed scattering systems of scales appropriate to insolation modulation.”49 There are certainly intermediate measures to combat climate change that ought to be taken first, but asteroid mining would facilitate this expedited solution. While some of the benefits of asteroid mining would doubtless accrue primarily to those nations with asteroid mining companies within their borders, the benefits noted in this section—space exploration as a gen- eral proposition, technological and scientific development, improvement of asteroid diversion technology, and facilitated means of swiftly countering climate change—would inure substantially to the benefit of all mankind.

#### Conditionality --- it’s good

#### 1] It’s most logical --- the role of the neg is to prove the Aff bad, while the Aff should prove that they’re optimal. Every counterplan establishes an opportunity cost to the plan --- any limit on that is arbitrary – this also proves you should judge kick if the squo is better than the counterplan

#### 2] Key to neg flex --- they set the terms of debate and know the plan better than us, so multiple options ensures the neg doesn’t auto lose after the 1AR

#### 3] Fosters advocacy skills --- it forces the Aff to defend every component of the plan, allows rigorous testing, and allows better information processing by enabling discussion on a litany of issues

#### 4] It’s most real world – policymakers attack a bill from different angles, and don’t limit themselves to one criticism – they can amend and change positions to find the best option

#### 5] Skews inevitable – speed, card quality, coaching, or topic imbalances all make debate harder – they haven’t proven that we structurally skewed the debate any more

#### 6] Dispo doesn’t solve – neg can read condition of dispo with conditionality

#### Negates even if they don’t defend implementation

### Capitalism

1ar theory – you get is but it’s drop the argument otherwise they can read infinite no-risk shells and allows us to get back to substance after resolving theory.

#### Capitalism is inevitable - greed is innate - capitalism prevents it from getting out of hand because all exchanges are inevitable

Bast and Walberg 3 (Joseph, Fellow @ The American Association for the Advancement of Science and Founder @ The International Academy of Education, Herbert, Distinguished Visiting Fellow @ Hoover, “Education and Capitalism,” Chapter 6, <http://media.hoover.org/sites/default/files/documents/0817939717_137.pdf>)

Recognizing the challenge capitalism presents to some of our traditional notions of morality does not mean that capitalism is an immoral way to organize an economy. The most common error made by critics of capitalism is failing to recognize that greed or ambition (the desire to gain power or distinction without regard to its effects on others) long predates capitalism. Greed, Max Weber wrote in 1904, “exists and has existed among waiters, physicians, coachmen, artists, prostitutes, dishonest officials, soldiers, nobles, crusaders, gamblers, and beggars. One may say that it has been common to all sorts and conditions of men at all times and in all countries of the earth, wherever the objective possibility of it is or has been given.” 6 All political and economic systems must cope with greed. Societies that rely on tradition to shape their economies allow some people—usually those with inherited status or willingness to use force against others—to express their greed by imposing their will on others. Sociologist Orlando Patterson calls this sovereignal freedom, or the freedom to rule others. 7 Nietzsche termed it “Will to Power.” Although it may fulfill the material and psychological needs of those who exercise it, this is the freedom that led to the slave societies of ancient Rome, the nationalism of Nazism, and the tribal societies of much of impoverished Africa today. Socialism, as it was formulated by Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, and the British Fabians, assumed greed to be a social phenomenon conjured by man’s alienation from his work and the rest of society, allegedly caused by the institutions of capitalism. Greed could be extinguished, they thought, if social institutions were organized along collectivist lines, such as those described in the 1962 Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union: Joint planned labor by the members of society, their daily participation in the management of state and public affairs, and the development of communist relations of comradely cooperation and mutual support, recast the minds of people in a spirit of collectivism, industry, and humanism. Increased communist consciousness of the people furthers the ideological and political unity of the workers, collective farmers, and intellectuals and promotes their gradual fusion in the single collective of the working people of communist society. 8 The New Soviet Man, as he was called, never emerged. Repression of the most severe type was justified in the spirit of collectivism, and the result was a criminal society. Socialists are quick to deny that the collapse of the Soviet Union reflects in any way on the tenets of their faith. But the passage of time has revealed that the rot that destroyed the footings of the Soviet Union began in the denial of individual liberty, especially the denial of property rights that stands at the core of socialist thinking. 9 Unlike its alternatives, capitalism does a remarkably good job of constraining greed and ambition. The most basic rule of capitalism—that all exchanges are voluntary—is a formidable check on the pursuit of selfish interest at the expense of others. In a capitalist society, attaining wealth, respect, and status requires appealing to the self-interest of others, specifically by discovering, creating, and delivering goods and services that others are willing to buy. Getting around this requirement— attempting to live at other people’s expense by using force or fraud to take things from them or enslave them—violates the laws of property, exchange, and voluntary contract. Assuming government is performing its proper role, those who would break the rules are stopped and punished. Capitalism goes beyond simply checking greed and ambition by yoking the pursuit of self-interest to the advancement of the public good. Once we learn the use of force is forbidden, we discover that the more effectively we serve others the greater the rewards we receive. As explained in Chapter 4, markets tend to place control over goods and property in the hands of those who value them most and who make decisions that produce the most benefit to others. Competition makes the ban on the use of coercion self-enforcing because others will refuse to trade or contract with us if we violate the rules.

#### CCS. Markets are key.

Gregory F. Nemet et al. 16, Associate Professor, La Follette School of Public Affairs, University of Wisconsin–Madison, Martina Kraus, German Institute for Economic Research Vera Zipperer, German Institute for Economic Research, November, 2016, The Valley of Death, the Technology Pork Barrel, and Public Support for Large Demonstration Projects, La Follette School Working Paper No. 2016-007

Because the ultimate (but not immediate) goal of supporting demonstrations is to facilitate widespread adoption, demand a6nd thus markets are of course key (Kingsley et al., 1996). In climate change, policies are central to those markets (Taylor et al., 2003; Zhou et al., 2015), thus credibility in those policies is also central (Rai et al., 2010; Finon, 2012). But it is striking how many demonstration programs confronted markets that involved negative shocks around the time that projects came on-line—we see it in synfuels, biofuels, and solar thermal electricity (Figure 9), and CCS (Figure 10). The 1.9 year average lag from project initiation to time on-line is crucial. It would be a mistake to assume a Hotelling price path in which prices of an exhaustible resource (e.g. oil, atmospheric storage of CO2) rise at a constant pure rate of time preference. In this case the relevant price is the level at which avoided CO2 emissions are remunerated. Rather the experience of the past suggests we are more likely to see shocks and boom–bust cycles (Krautkraemer, 1998; Zaklan et al., 2011). We see it in our data in the prices related to each demonstration program (Figure 8). Lupion and Herzog (2013) attribute the failure of the NER300 program to stimulate the construction of any CCS projects to 4 factors: competition with renewables, project complexity, low carbon prices, and a combination of fiscal austerity and weak climate policy around the global financial crisis. Note that three of the four problems involved future demand, not the funding structure itself. Demonstrations need markets that pay off innovation investments not just under a steadily increasing Hotelling-style market, but under a broad range of market conditions. Features of robust demand pull include niche markets (Kemp et al., 1998), hedging across jurisdictions (Nemet, 2010), and flexible production (Sanchez and Kammen, 2016). Government price guarantees have played an important role as we have seen on synfuels, solar thermal electricity, and on a smaller scale, photovoltaics.

#### Try or die for CCS to solve warming

Moniz 9/23/19 - 13th Secretary of Energy (2013 to 2017) and is the founder and CEO of the Energy Futures Initiative

Fredd Krupp is president of the Environmental Defense Fund, Ernest Moniz, “Cutting Climate Pollution Isn’t Enough — We Also Need Carbon Removal,” Text, TheHill, September 23, 2019, <https://thehill.com/opinion/energy-environment/462609-cutting-climate-pollution-isnt-enough-we-also-need-carbon-removal>.

It has been almost four years since the Paris climate agreement was signed. But as leaders gather in New York this week for the United Nations Climate Change Summit, the world remains far off track from meeting the Paris objective of limiting global warming to well below 2 degrees Celsius -- and pursuing efforts at 1.5 degrees.

To meet that target, the world must achieve a 100 percent clean economy — one that produces net zero emissions, or no more climate pollution than can be removed from the atmosphere — soon after mid-century, with the United States and other advanced economies reaching that milestone no later than 2050. It’s a daunting but doable task.

The consequences of falling short are enormous. This year, the U.S. government’s fourth National Climate Assessment documented the huge economic and social impacts of unchecked warming. The Pentagon has repeatedly warned of the impacts on national security and our troops.

Achieving a 100 percent clean economy will require a swift transition to renewables and other zero-carbon energy sources. But we also need to face the reality that meeting the Paris target will require taking carbon out of the atmosphere at massive scale. In part, that’s because eliminating emissions will be very challenging for some sectors, especially the transportation industry and agriculture. Removing carbon from the atmosphere would also bring concentrations down, helping to stabilize the climate at safer levels. So, the push for clean energy must be supplemented by a suite of technologies known as carbon dioxide removal (CDR).

It is not a question of what we’d prefer. It’s a question of insurmountable math.

The crucial role carbon removal must play is becoming more widely recognized. The 2018 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report stressed the importance of carbon removal, and the U.S. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine late last year estimated that ten billion tons of CO2 will need to be pulled from the atmosphere annually by 2050, and double that by 2100. For context, today’s global emissions are less than 40 billion tons per year. If the 10 billion tons of CO2 from CDR were stored underground, that would be roughly double the world’s annual oil production.

The good news is that there are a surprisingly large number of promising pathways for carbon dioxide removal. Nature-based approaches include reforestation and forest management as well as agricultural practices that increase carbon stored in soils. Some of the attendant challenges include competition for land and permanence of the carbon sequestration.

Technological approaches include direct air capture — machines that actually suck carbon from the air — and technologically-enhanced natural processes, such as plants genetically modified with deep roots to fix carbon in the soil; enhanced mineralization, which uses certain reactive rocks to bind with carbon from the air; and accelerated ocean uptake in phytoplankton. These technologies are immature and require considerable research, development and demonstration to ensure viability and affordability at very large scale.

Despite the urgency, there is no dedicated federal effort to develop these crucial technologies; existing programs are piecemeal and largely focused on sequestering emissions from industrial and electricity generating sources.

The National Academies recommended the rapid establishment of a robust, focused, scalable and accelerated federal research program spanning the Departments of Energy and Agriculture, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the National Science Foundation, among others. Such a program would encompass the full range of technological pathways that can remove CO2 from the environment. ‘’Clearing the Air,’’ an analysis of CDR’s value and a proposed plan to deploy it, has been completed by the Energy Futures Initiative. Over the next decade, the program scale would be about a billion dollars a year.

Carbon dioxide removal is not a magic bullet. We must do everything we can to deploy innovative low- and zero-carbon methods to generate electricity, heat homes, fuel vehicles, and power industry, creating new economic opportunities in the process. Tackling the climate crisis also requires placing a declining limit and a price on carbon pollution, as well as a significant increase in energy technology innovation and deployment across the board.

But CDR is also not a “Plan B.” It is a critical part of any “Plan A” for climate, a necessary complement to emission reduction. It can provide more flexibility and optionality in policy planning, which could ease the transition to a carbon-neutral economy while minimizing transition costs and providing greater assurance that science-based climate goals can be met in a timely manner. It would eventually enable a net negative global economy that could bring the atmospheric carbon concentrations down — and global temperatures with it.

We have delayed meaningful action for far too long. As a result, the scale and urgency of the challenge is such that we cannot simply work on doing better in the future. We need to correct what we did in the past. Carbon removal is the enabler.

#### Warming causes extinction

Yangyang Xu 17, Assistant Professor of Atmospheric Sciences at Texas A&M University; and Veerabhadran Ramanathan, Distinguished Professor of Atmospheric and Climate Sciences at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego, 9/26/17, “Well below 2 °C: Mitigation strategies for avoiding dangerous to catastrophic climate changes,” Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, Vol. 114, No. 39, p. 10315-10323

We are proposing the following extension to the DAI risk categorization: warming greater than 1.5 °C as “dangerous”; warming greater than 3 °C as “catastrophic?”; and warming in excess of 5 °C as “unknown??,” with the understanding that changes of this magnitude, not experienced in the last 20+ million years, pose existential threats to a majority of the population. The question mark denotes the subjective nature of our deduction and the fact that catastrophe can strike at even lower warming levels. The justifications for the proposed extension to risk categorization are given below.

From the IPCC burning embers diagram and from the language of the Paris Agreement, we infer that the DAI begins at warming greater than 1.5 °C. Our criteria for extending the risk category beyond DAI include the potential risks of climate change to the physical climate system, the ecosystem, human health, and species extinction. Let us first consider the category of catastrophic (3 to 5 °C warming). The first major concern is the issue of tipping points. Several studies (48, 49) have concluded that 3 to 5 °C global warming is likely to be the threshold for tipping points such as the collapse of the western Antarctic ice sheet, shutdown of deep water circulation in the North Atlantic, dieback of Amazon rainforests as well as boreal forests, and collapse of the West African monsoon, among others. While natural scientists refer to these as abrupt and irreversible climate changes, economists refer to them as catastrophic events (49).

Warming of such magnitudes also has catastrophic human health effects. Many recent studies (50, 51) have focused on the direct influence of extreme events such as heat waves on public health by evaluating exposure to heat stress and hyperthermia. It has been estimated that the likelihood of extreme events (defined as 3-sigma events), including heat waves, has increased 10-fold in the recent decades (52). Human beings are extremely sensitive to heat stress. For example, the 2013 European heat wave led to about 70,000 premature mortalities (53). The major finding of a recent study (51) is that, currently, about 13.6% of land area with a population of 30.6% is exposed to deadly heat. The authors of that study defined deadly heat as exceeding a threshold of temperature as well as humidity. The thresholds were determined from numerous heat wave events and data for mortalities attributed to heat waves. According to this study, a 2 °C warming would double the land area subject to deadly heat and expose 48% of the population. A 4 °C warming by 2100 would subject 47% of the land area and almost 74% of the world population to deadly heat, which could pose existential risks to humans and mammals alike unless massive adaptation measures are implemented, such as providing air conditioning to the entire population or a massive relocation of most of the population to safer climates.

Climate risks can vary markedly depending on the socioeconomic status and culture of the population, and so we must take up the question of “dangerous to whom?” (54). Our discussion in this study is focused more on people and not on the ecosystem, and even with this limited scope, there are multitudes of categories of people. We will focus on the poorest 3 billion people living mostly in tropical rural areas, who are still relying on 18th-century technologies for meeting basic needs such as cooking and heating. Their contribution to CO2 pollution is roughly 5% compared with the 50% contribution by the wealthiest 1 billion (55). This bottom 3 billion population comprises mostly subsistent farmers, whose livelihood will be severely impacted, if not destroyed, with a one- to five-year megadrought, heat waves, or heavy floods; for those among the bottom 3 billion of the world’s population who are living in coastal areas, a 1- to 2-m rise in sea level (likely with a warming in excess of 3 °C) poses existential threat if they do not relocate or migrate. It has been estimated that several hundred million people would be subject to famine with warming in excess of 4 °C (54). However, there has essentially been no discussion on warming beyond 5 °C.

Climate change-induced species extinction is one major concern with warming of such large magnitudes (>5 °C). The current rate of loss of species is ∼1,000-fold the historical rate, due largely to habitat destruction. At this rate, about 25% of species are in danger of extinction in the coming decades (56). Global warming of 6 °C or more (accompanied by increase in ocean acidity due to increased CO2) can act as a major force multiplier and expose as much as 90% of species to the dangers of extinction (57).

The bodily harms combined with climate change-forced species destruction, biodiversity loss, and threats to water and food security, as summarized recently (58), motivated us to categorize warming beyond 5 °C as unknown??, implying the possibility of existential threats. Fig. 2 displays these three risk categorizations (vertical dashed lines).

### Space Wars

#### Turn – aff grows the public sector and space wars are more likely when governments are the only ones with vested interest in space, because they’re the ones with military interests.

#### Commercial Space Race favors American Companies that cements space dominance – shift away endangers our lead – losing green-lights Chinese Dominance across the board.

Autry and Kwast 19 Greg Autry and Steve Kwast 8-22-2019 "America Is Losing the Second Space Race to China" (Greg Autry, a clinical professor of space leadership, policy, and business at Arizona State University’s Thunderbird School of Global Management, and Steve Kwast)//Elmer

America Is Losing the Second Space Race to China The private sector can give the United States a much-needed rocket boost. The current U.S. space defense strategy is inadequate and on a path to failure. President Donald Trump’s vision for a Space Force is big enough. As he said on June 18, “It is not enough to merely have an American presence in space. We must have American dominance in space.” But the Air Force is not matching this vision. Instead, the leadership is currently focused on incremental improvements to existing equipment and organizational structures. Dominating the vast and dynamic environment of space will require revolutionary capabilities and resources far deeper than traditional Department of Defense thinking can fund, manage, or even conceive of. Success depends on a much more active partnership with the commercial space industry— and its disruptive capabilities. U.S. military space planners are preparing to repeat a conflict they imagined back in the 1980s, which never actually occurred, against a vanished Soviet empire. Meanwhile, China is executing a winning strategy in the world of today. It is burning hard toward domination of the future space markets that will define the next century. They are planning infrastructure in space that will control 21st-century telecommunications, energy, transportation, and manufacturing. In doing so, they will acquire trillion-dollar revenues as well as the deep capabilities that come from continuous operational experience in space. This will deliver space dominance and global hegemony to China’s authoritarian rulers. Despite the fact that many in the policy and intelligence communities understand exactly what China is doing and have been trying to alert leadership, Air Force leadership has convinced the White House to fund only a slightly better satellite command with the same leadership, while sticking a new label onto their outmoded thinking. A U.S. Space Force or Corps with a satellite command will never fulfill Trump’s call to dominate space. Air Force leadership is demonstrating the same hubris that Gen. George Custer used in convincing Congress, over President Ulysses S. Grant’s better experience intuition, that he could overtake the Black Hills with repeating rifles and artillery. That strategy of technological overconfidence inflamed conflict rather than subduing it, and the 7th Cavalry were wiped out at the Battle of the Little Bighorn. The West was actually won by the settlers, ranchers, miners, and railroad barons who were able to convert the wealth of the territory itself into the means of holding it. They laid the groundwork that made the 20th century the American Century and delivered freedom to millions of people in Europe and Asia. Of course, they also trampled the indigenous people of the American West in their wake—but empty space comes with no such bloody cost. The very emptiness and wealth of this new, if not quite final, frontier, however, means that competition for resources and strategic locations in cislunar space (between the Earth and moon) will be intense over the next two decades. The outcome of this competition will determine the fate of humanity in the next century. China’s impending dominance will neutralize U.S. geopolitical power by allowing Beijing to control global information flows from the high ground of space. Imagine a school in Bolivia or a farmer in Kenya choosing between paying for a U.S. satellite internet or image provider or receiving those services for free as a “gift of the Chinese people.” It will be of little concern to global consumers that the news they receive is slanted or that searches for “free speech” link to articles about corruption in Western democracies. Nor will they care if concentration camps in Tibet and the Uighur areas of western China are obscured, or if U.S. military action is presented as tyranny and Chinese expansion is described as peacekeeping or liberation. China’s aggressive investment in space solar power will allow it to provide cheap, clean power to the world, displacing U.S. energy firms while placing a second yoke around the developing world. Significantly, such orbital power stations have dual use potential and, if properly designed, could serve as powerful offensive weapons platforms. China’s first step in this process is to conquer the growing small space launch market. Beijing is providing nominally commercial firms with government-manufactured, mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles they can use to dump launch services on the market below cost. These start-ups are already undercutting U.S. pricing by 80 percent. Based on its previous success in using dumping to take out U.S. developed industries such as solar power modules and drones, China will quickly move upstream to attack the leading U.S. launch providers and secure a global commercial monopoly. Owning the launch market will give them an unsurmountable advantage against U.S. competitors in satellite internet, imaging, and power. The United States can still build a strategy to win. At this moment, it holds the competitive advantage in every critical space technology and has the finest set of commercial space firms in the world. It has pockets of innovative military thinkers within groups like the Defense Innovation Unit, under Mike Griffin, the Pentagon’s top research and development official. If the United States simply protects the intellectual property its creative minds unleash and defend its truly free markets from strategic mercantilist attack, it will not lose this new space race. The United States has done this before. It beat Germany to the nuclear bomb, it beat the Soviet Union to the nuclear triad, and it won the first space race. None of those victories was achieved by embracing the existing bureaucracy. Each of them depended on the president of the day following the only proven path to victory in a technological domain: establish a small team with a positively disruptive mindset and empower that team to investigate a wide range of new concepts, work with emerging technologies, and test innovative strategies. Today that means giving a dedicated Space Force the freedom to easily partner with commercial firms and leverage the private capital in building sustainable infrastructure that actually reduces the likelihood of conflict while securing a better economic future for the nation and the world.

#### No space wars --- dependence on space creates a de facto taboo

Triezenberg, 17

Bonnie Triezenberg, Senior engineer at RAND. Previously, she was the senior technical fellow at the Boeing Company, specializing in agile systems and software development. “Deterring Space War: An Exploratory Analysis Incorporating Prospect Theory into a Game Theoretic Model of Space Warfare,” RAND Corporation. 2017. <https://www.rand.org/pubs/rgs_dissertations/RGSD400.html>

The above discussion suggests that a likely means to achieve deterrence of acts of war in outer space is to increase civilian dependence on space to support day-to-day life—if everyone on earth is equally dependent on space, no one has an incentive to destroy space. Largely by accident, this dependence appears to have, in fact, occurred. The space age was born in an age of affluence and rapid economic expansion; space quickly became a domain of international commerce as well as a domain of national military use. Space assets and the systems they enable have transformed social, infrastructure and information uses perhaps more visibly than they have transformed military uses. In fact, in the current satellite database published by the Union of Concerned Scientists, of the 1461 satellites in orbit 40% support purely commercial ventures, while only 16% have a strictly military use.46 The first commercial broadcast by a satellite in geo-synchronous orbit was of international news between Europe and the United States.47 The first telephony uniting the far flung islands of Indonesia was enabled by satellite48. Those of us who are old enough remember the 1960s “magic” of intercontinental phone calls and international “breaking news” delivered by satellite. Today, most social and infrastructure uses of space are taken for granted – even in remote locales of Africa, people expect to be able to monitor the weather, communicate seamlessly with colleagues and to find their way to new and unfamiliar locations using the GPS in their phones. All of us use space every day.49 These unrestricted economic and social uses of space may be the best deterrent, making everyone on all sides of combat equally dependent on space and heightening the taboo against weaponizing space or threatening space assets with weapons.

#### Transparency inevitable ---Nothing slips by in space

--Surprise attacks either fail bc they’re ragged, or are detected bc the enemy has to load a ton of stuff into space

--Launch capacity is international – would have to ask to do it

--Monitoring satellites is easy – as early as 50s elementary school classes saw stuff – remote sensing means we see everything in space or on the ground

--International nonproliferation agreements democratized site monitoring – we can see states interior regions

--Even if no guarantee, uncertainy means no state would risk it

Handberg, 17 – Faculty and Research, School of Politics, Security, and International Affairs, UCF

Roger Handberg, “Is space war imminent? Exploring the possibility,” Comparative Strategy. 2017. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/01495933.2017.1379832?needAccess=true>

Second, surprise requires that sufficient offensive space assets be placed in orbit without triggering a response by other states—the scale of such technology deployment is in itself possibly self-defeating given high costs and a likely lack of launch capacity. In addition, much launch capacity is now international rather than national, so maintaining secrecy becomes even more difficult. Space as an operational environment suffers from excessive transparency, meaning any launches can be monitored and tracked by others with strong evidence as to what is being deployed. One must remember that the original satellite launches in the 1950s were accurately tracked by a British grade-school class as a science project. In addition, at least since the early 1960s, remote sensing has increased exponentially the global capability to detect buildup of military assets of differing types, whether in space or on the ground. Commercial remote-sensing capabilities further enhance the capacity to detect militarily relevant actions. For example, commercial imagery is accessed by private parties to monitor the North Korean missile and nuclear weapons programs, in effect expanding the capacity of the world to look in on various states’ interior regions, scanning for relevant information, including weapons buildup and launch capabilities. Even construction of physical facilities for production of space assets or for other weaponry can be monitored, making surprise more difficult but not impossible, as demonstrated in earlier monitoring of North Korea and, in 1998, the nuclear tests by both Pakistan and India. That means if the ASAT weapons come from ground locations, there is a high probability that they can be detected but no guarantee exists that detection will in fact occur. The uncertainty will impact calculations of attack success.

#### Space Wars are not that dangerous—they’ll be robotized and end as soon as communication satellites are taken out. Corporations are specifically key to this peaceful outcome

--space wars have no terrorist groups or failed states

--mostly robotized means few lives lost

--brief because destroying communication satellites ends conflict, also incentivizes states to innovate in a way that reduces casualties

Szoic et al 17-- Szocik, Konrad [Department of Philosophy and Cognitive Science, University of Information Technology and Management in Rzeszow], Tomasz Wójtowicz [Institute of Security and Civic Education, Pedagogical University in Cracow, Podchorążych 2 Street, 30-084 Kraków, Poland], and Leszek Baran [Chair of Internal Security, University of Information Technology and Management in Rzeszow, Poland]. "War or peace? The possible scenarios of colonising Mars." Space Policy 42 (2017): 31-36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spacepol.2017.10.002>. (AG DebateDrills)

Contrary to fourth and fifth generation warfare, space wars will be dominated by nation states and international corporations. Elon Musk, Managing Director of SpaceX, a company dealing with the manufacture of jet engines, carrier rockets, and spaceships, claimed that within the nearest 40–100 years over 1 million people might be sent to Mars. He estimated the cost of one person's reaching the Red Planet at USD 200 million [16]. According to the authors of the Mars one initiative, a sum of USD 6 billion will be needed to send the first four astronauts to Mars [6]. The need to secure such exorbitant funds virtually excludes any entities other than states and international corporations (terrorist groups, criminal organisations or failed states) from participating in space wars. It should be expected that the future space wars will entail an advanced process of conflict robotisation and dehumanisation. The prospective Mars colonisation war may proceed by means of robots – unmanned aerial vehicles. Ender's Game, an American science fiction film dating back to 2013, based on a novel by Orson Scott Card pub- lished under the same title, features scenes presenting such kind of a conflict. The film is set in 2070. The main hero, ten-year-old Andrew Wiggin, is elected leader of the invading fleet, intended to destroy the native world of a foreign life form threatening the Earth. Andrew Wiggin, believing that he is taking part in training, leads the invading fleet and defeats the enemy. The invading forces comprise only un- manned space drones controlled from a secure place [11]. The pro- gressing robotisation and dehumanisation of war will also be influenced by the strategic culture of western countries (the United States) whose societies show limited tolerance to human loss during military conflicts. As stressed by Adrian Lewis in his book The American Culture of War, abolishing the obligatory military service was the most significant change introduced in the 20th century to the U.S. war-fighting model. It triggered the professionalization of armed forces, with a mass army being replaced by mobile troops limited in numbers [14]. Along with the robotisation and dehumanisation, the future space wars should also be expected to be brief. Unless the dispute escalating between the global powers evolves into military activities located in the Earth, the conflict may end soon after the communication satellites of one of the parties are destroyed, or its space station is damaged. Considering the above, the technological arms race between the competing States, aimed at designing, as fast as possible, a weapon which will enable defeating the enemy in the first attack, without any possibility of re- taliation, will prove crucial.

### C3

#### This advantage is a joke. Scenario 1 rests upon Venus being colonized.

#### No ev

#### It can’t. Can’t believe I’m reading ev for this.

**Pultarova 21** (“Life on Venus Is Impossible because of Lack of Water, Study Suggests”. June 30, 2021.)

**The amount of water in the atmosphere of** [**Venus**](https://www.space.com/44-venus-second-planet-from-the-sun-brightest-planet-in-solar-system.html) **is so low that even the most drought-tolerant of Earth’s microbes wouldn’t be able to survive there**, a new study has found. The findings seem to wipe out the hope stirred by last year’s [discovery of molecules](https://www.space.com/venus-clouds-possible-life-chemical-discovery.html) potentially created by living organisms in the scorched planet’s atmosphere that were seen as an indication of the possible presence of life. The **new study** looked at measurements from [**probes that flew through the atmosphere of Venus**](https://www.space.com/venus-mission-success-history) and acquired data about temperature, humidity and pressure in the thick sulphuric acid clouds surrounding the planet. From these values, the scientists were able to calculate the so-called water activity, the water vapor pressure inside the individual molecules in the clouds, which is one of the limiting factors for the existence of life on [Earth](https://www.space.com/54-earth-history-composition-and-atmosphere.html). “When we looked at the effective concentration of water molecules in those clouds, we **found that it was a hundred times too low for even the most resilient Earth organisms to survive**.” John Hallsworth, a microbiologist at Queen’s University in Belfast, U.K., and lead author of the paper, said in a news conference on Thursday (June 24). “**That’s an unbridgeable distance**.”

#### Scenario 2 and 3

#### No colonization

**Creighton 18** (Jolene Creighton was the Founding Editor-in-Chief of the science news site Futurism. Creighton began her career as an instructor at the [University of Southern Mississippi](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/University_of_Southern_Mississippi), where she taught courses on English and writing. In 2012, she co-founded the science news site *From Quarks* to *Quasars*, which was acquired in 2015.[[](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jolene_Creighton#cite_note-10)  Creighton left academia and fully transitioned to journalism later in 2015, when she helped launch *Futurism*. “Neil deGrasse Tyson Says Humans Will Never Colonize Mars”. 2/20/18.)

**SpaceX**. **Mars One. NASA. These** three **organizations have bold plans to** be the first to **colonize Mars** in the next few decades. **To astrophysicist Neil deGrasse Tyson, those plans are**n’t just bold. They’re foolhardy and ill-advised. They may even be **impossible**. When I met with Tyson last month at the World Government Summit in Dubai, he made it clear that the plan to create a civilization on Mars is entirely absurd. **His reasoning is simple: Mars is entirely inhospitable to life as we know it.** First of all, that means **no one will *want* to live there**. **Humans** generally **like to live in places that aren’t** quite so, well, **deadly**. “We’d rather stay where it is warm and comfortable,” he said. This simple reasoning explains why we don’t find populated cities dotting the landscapes at Earth’s poles. Antarctica is both warmer and wetter than any place on Mars, and we don’t exactly see people lined up to live in the Arctic tundra. We won’t see cities flourishing on Mars for the same reason, Tyson says. Like the icy recesses of our own planet, Tyson says that some humans will venture to Mars for short visits, but they won’t remain for long. “Definitely, we’ll visit as a vacation spot. [But] I’m skeptical that you’ll find legions of people that will go there and want to stay,” he said. But **it’s not just that humans would find Mars** an **unappealing** home. **According to Tyson, humans *can’t* colonize Mars. The Red Planet has a notoriously thin atmosphere and no global magnetic field.** As a result, deadly **cosmic rays and UV radiation** shower the Martian surface, **transform**ing **the soil into a “toxic cocktail” of chemicals and caus**ing **temperatures to plunge to minus 62 degrees Celsius** (minus 80 degrees Fahrenheit). **To survive under these deadly conditions, humans would require “an entire infrastructure in which you live that mimics Earth,” Tyson says—and that’s pretty much impossible to create on a global scale.** Instead of setting our sights on generations of humans living on Mars, Tyson says we should hope for “just an Earth outpost” at best. So, will anyone actually colonize Mars? Tyson isn’t optimistic. “My read of history tells me, no. Not because I don’t want it to be so. I’m just a realist about this.” In a speech later that day, Tyson called for “a rational assessment” of our ability to settle space and railed against those who make predictions based on “deeply delusional premises.” To those at the helms of SpaceX, Mars One, and NASA, going to Mars probably doesn’t seem delusional. It just requires more preparation. But if **colonizing Mars isn’t possible because of humans’ *biology***, well, maybe they will have to reassess after all.

#### There’s no attempt to harness power from other stars so no risk of s-risks. They have read 0 uniqueness ev.

#### Non appropriation couldn’t solve it anyway because people can attempt to harness energy without ownership. Solar power companies that harness the Sun don’t own the Sun.

#### Non appropriation activities also deck scenario 2. There is a difference between use and appropriation. Merely presence is enough to trigger the impact