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## 1

#### Interpretation: Lunar Heritage sites are not appropriation

1AC Harrington 19 Andrea J. Harrington, USAF Air Command and Staff College, 2019, “Preserving Humanity ving Humanity’s Heritage in Space: Fifty Y s Heritage in Space: Fifty Years After Apollo ears After Apollo 11 and Beyond”, Journal of Air Law and Commerce Vol 84 Issue 3 Article 2, <https://scholar.smu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4126&context=jalc> // ella

Article 12 of the Moon Agreement also clarifies that the placement of stations or facilities does not create a right of ownership with regard to the surface of the Moon; therefore, extended or indefinite occupation of an area of the surface is explicitly permissible and would not constitute an appropriation.134 Despite the limited ratification of the Moon Agreement,135 this provision appears to accurately reflect the intention of the non-appropriation provision of the Outer Space Treaty, particularly when the views of prominent jurists are taken into consideration.136 In sum, the in situ preservation of space heritage should not run afoul of the space law principle of non-appropriation.

#### Negate –

#### 1] Limits and ground – they justify banning practices that straight up aren’t appropriation but are just in space like throwing a rock, flying a plane, parachute, helicopter, mining, exploration, all the planets on the first shell, and infinite permutations of these make the case-list too big which

#### 2] Precision - Pre-round prep is centered around DAs against formal sovereignty and case responses to it, their interp means the only basis for predictability becomes the wiki, which moots all pre-topic prep. Err towards common interpretation of international law spanning decades.

#### Use competing interps – can’t be reasonably topical

#### DTD – T indicts the whole aff

No RVIs – 1] illogical – shouldn’t win for being fair

## 2

#### Interp: The AFF must defend policy action in a plan text in the 1AC.

#### "Resolved:" the appropriation of outer space by private entities is "unjust" entails policy action:

#### 1---Resolved.

Parcher 1 [Jeff; former debate coach at Georgetown; Feb 26, 2001; <https://web.archive.org/web/20020929065555/http://www.ndtceda.com/archives/200102/0790.html>] brett

(1) Pardon me if I turn to a source besides Bill. American Heritage Dictionary: Resolve: 1. To make a firm decision about. 2. To decide or express by formal vote. 3. To separate something into constiutent parts See Syns at \*analyze\* (emphasis in orginal) 4. Find a solution to. See Syns at \*Solve\* (emphasis in original) 5. To dispel: resolve a doubt. - n 1. Frimness of purpose; resolution. 2. A determination or decision.

(2) The very nature of the word "resolution" makes it a question. American Heritage: A course of action determined or decided on. A formal statemnt of a deciion, as by a legislature.

(3) The resolution is obviously a question. Any other conclusion is utterly inconcievable. Why? Context. The debate community empowers a topic committee to write a topic for ALTERNATE side debating. The committee is not a random group of people coming together to "reserve" themselves about some issue. There is context - they are empowered by a community to do something. In their deliberations, the topic community attempts to craft a resolution which can be ANSWERED in either direction. They focus on issues like ground and fairness because they know the resolution will serve as the basis for debate which will be resolved by determining the policy desireablility of that resolution. That's not only what they do, but it's what we REQUIRE them to do. We don't just send the topic committtee somewhere to adopt their own group resolution. It's not the end point of a resolution adopted by a body - it's the prelimanary wording of a resolution sent to others to be answered or decided upon.

(4) Further context: the word resolved is used to emphasis the fact that it's policy debate. Resolved comes from the adoption of resolutions by legislative bodies. A resolution is either adopted or it is not. It's a question before a legislative body. Should this statement be adopted or not.

#### 2---Unjust.

Black’s Law [The Law Dictionary Featuring Black's Law Dictionary Free Online Legal Dictionary 2nd Ed. No Date. <https://thelawdictionary.org/unjust/>] brett

What is UNJUST?

Contrary to right and justice, or to the enjoyment of his rights by another, or to the standards of conduct furnished by the laws.

#### Violation: There’s no plan, they fiat private actors stop themselves

#### 1---Ground---absent meeting precise words in the res, we lose all the pre-round prep we did around the resolution like CPs PTX treaty disads and more, killing neg ground.

#### 2- Vagueness- lack of a solvency advocate and the unrealistic nature of the aff’s implementation means lack of clash- there’s no ev in the literature specific to private entities stopping themselves

#### TVA- this aff with a policy to ban appropriation of lunar heritage sites

#### CA Paradigms

## 3

#### The Role of the Judge is to decide the virtue of Empire- with Apocalypse on the horizon, the question we must ask was whether it was all worth it.

**Grove 19** [Jarius, PoliSci at the University of Hawai’i. 2019. “Savage Ecology: War and Geopolitics in the Anthropocene.”] brackets for bad words // pat //rc sosa– ask me for the PDF

Because I wanted this book to inspire curiosity beyond the boundaries of international relations (ir), I considered ignoring the field altogether, removing all mentions of ir or ir theory. However, upon closer reflection, I have decided to keep these references as I think they are relevant for those outside the discipline and for those who, like myself, often feel alienated within its disciplinary boundaries. In the former case, it is important to know that, unlike some more humble fields, ir has always held itself to be a kind of royal science. Scholarship in ir, particularly in the United States, is half research, and half biding time until you have the prince’s ear. The hallowed names in the mainstream of the field are still known because they somehow changed the behavior of their intended clients—those being states, militaries, and international organizations. Therefore, some attention to ir is necessary because it has an all-too-casual relationship with institutional power that directly impacts the lives of real people, and ir is all too often lethal theory. As an American discipline, the political economy of the field is impossible without Department of Defense money, and its semiotic economy would be equally dwarfed without contributory figures like Woodrow Wilson, Henry Kissinger, and Samuel Huntington. The ubiquity of Huntington’s “clash of civilizations” thesis and Kissinger’s particular brand of realpolitik are undeniable throughout the field, as well as the world. Each, in their own way, has saturated the watchwords and nomenclature of geopolitics from an American perspective so thoroughly that both political parties in the United States fight over who gets to claim the heritage of each. Although many other fields such as anthropology and even comparative literature have found themselves in the gravitational pull of geopolitics, international relations is meant to be scholarship as statecraft by other means. That is, ir was meant to improve the global order and ensure the place of its guarantor, the United States of America. Having spent the better part of a decade listening to national security analysts and diplomats from the United States, South Korea, Japan, Europe, China, Brazil, and Russia, as well as military strategists around the planet, I found their vocabulary and worldview strikingly homogeneous.

If this seems too general a claim, one should take a peek at John Mearsheimer’s essay “Benign Hegemony,” which defends the Americanness of the ir field. What is most telling in this essay is not a defense of the U.S. as a benign hegemonic power, which Mearsheimer has done at length elsewhere. Rather, it is his vigorous defense that as a field, ir theory has done well by the world in setting the intellectual agenda for global challenges, and for creating useful theoretical approaches to addressing those problems. For Mearsheimer, the proof that American scholarly hegemony has been benign is that there is nothing important that has been left out. A quick scan of the last ten or twenty International Studies Association conferences would suggest otherwise.

That issues like rape as a weapon of war, postcolonial violence, global racism, and climate change are not squarely in the main of ir demonstrates just how benign American scholarly hegemony is not. As one prominent anthropologist said to me at dinner after touring the isa conference in 2014, “it was surreal, like a tour through the Cold War. People were giving papers and arguing as if nothing had ever changed.” These same provincial scholars aspire and succeed at filling the advisory roles of each successive American presidency. One cannot help but see a connection between the history of the ir field, and the catastrophes of U.S. foreign policy during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. One could repeat the words of the anthropologist I mentioned to describe the 2016 presidential campaign debates over the future of U.S. foreign policy: it is as if “nothing had ever changed.” And yet these old white men still strut around the halls of America’s “best” institutions as if they saved us from the Cold War, even as the planet crumbles under the weight of their failed imperial dreams.

If international relations was meant to be the science of making the world something other than what it would be if we were all left to our own worst devices, then it has failed monumentally. The United States is once again in fierce nuclear competition with Russia. We are no closer to any significant action on climate change. We have not met any of the Millennium Development Goals determined by the United Nations on eradicating poverty. War and security are the most significant financial, creative, social, cultural, technological, and political investments of almost every nation-state on Earth. The general intellect is a martial intellect.

Despite all this failure, pessimism does not exist in international relations, at least not on paper. The seething doom of our current predicament thrives at the conference bar and in hushed office conversations but not in our research. In public, the darkness disavowed possesses and inflames the petty cynicisms and hatreds that are often turned outward at tired and predictable scapegoats.

After the fury of three decades of critique, most ir scholars still camp out either on the hill of liberal internationalism or in the dark woods of political realism. Neither offers much that is new by way of answers or even explanations, and each dominant school has failed to account for our current apocalyptic condition. One is left wondering what it is exactly that they think they do. Despite the seeming opposition between the two, one idealistic about the future of international order (liberals) and the other self-satisfied with the tragedy of cycles of war and dominance (realists), both positions are optimists of the positivist variety.

For both warring parties, ir optimism is expressed through a romantic empiricism. For all those who toil away looking for the next theory of international politics, order is out there somewhere, and dutifully recording reality will find it—or at least bring us closer to its discovery. For liberal internationalism, this will bring the long-heralded maturity of Immanuel Kant’s perpetual peace. For second-order sociopaths known as offensive realists, crumbs of “useful strategic insight” and the endless details that amplify their epistemophilia for force projection and violence capability represent a potential “advantage,” that is, the possibility to move one step forward on the global political board game of snakes and ladders. Still, the cynicism of ir always creeps back in because the world never quite lives up to the empirical findings it is commanded to obey. Disappointment here is not without reason, but we cynically continue to make the same policy recommendations, catastrophe after catastrophe.

I have an idea about where ir’s recent malaise comes from. I think it is a moment, just before the awareness of the Anthropocene, after the Cold War and before September 11, when the end of everything was only a hypothetical problem for those of a certain coddled and privileged modern form of life. The catastrophe of the human predicament was that there was no catastrophe, no reason, no generation-defining challenge or war. Now the fate of this form of life is actually imperiled, and it is too much to bear. The weird denial of sexism, racism, climate change, the sixth extinction, and loose nukes, all by a field of scholars tasked with studying geopolitics, is more than irrationalism or ignorance. This animosity toward reality is a deep and corrosive nihilism, a denial of the world. Thus ir as a strategic field is demonstrative of a civilization with nothing left to do, nothing left to destroy. All that is left is to make meaning out of being incapable of undoing the world that Euro-American geopolitics created. Emo geopolitics is not pretty, but it is real. The letdown, the failure, the apocalypse-that-was-not finally arrived, and we are too late.

Still, the United States of America continues to follow the advice of “the best and the brightest,” testing the imperial waters, not quite ready to commit out loud to empire but completely unwilling to abandon it. Stuck in between, contemporary geopolitics—as curated by the United States—is in a permanent beta phase. Neuro-torture, algorithmic warfare, drone strikes, and cybernetic nation-building are not means or ends but rather are tests. Can a polis be engineered? Can the human operating system be reformatted? Can violence be modulated until legally invisible while all the more lethal? Each incursion, each new actor or actant, and new terrains from brains to transatlantic cables—all find themselves part of a grand experiment to see if a benign or at least sustainable empire is possible. There is no seeming regard for the fact that each experiment directly competes with Thomas Jefferson’s democratic experiment. One wonders if freedom can even exist anywhere other than temporarily on the fringe of some neglected order. Is this some metaphysical condition of freedom, or is the world so supersaturated with martial orders that the ragged edges between imperial orders are all that we have left? It feels like freedom’s remains persist only in the ruins of everything else. No space is left that can be truly indifferent to the law, security, or economy. Such is the new life of a human in debt. The social contract has been refinanced as what is owed and nothing more: politics without equity. Inequity without equality.

What about the impending collapse of the post–World War II order, the self-destruction of the United States, the rise of China and a new world order? If humanity lasts long enough for China to put its stamp on the human apocalypse, I will write a new introduction. Until then, we live in the death rattle of Pax Americana. While I think the totality of this claim is true, I do not want to rule out that many of us throughout the world still make lives otherwise. Many of us even thrive in spite of it all. And yet, no form of life can be made that escapes the fact that everything can come to a sudden and arbitrary end thanks to the whim of an American drone operator, nuclear catastrophe, or macroeconomic manipulation like sanctions. There are other ways to die and other organized forms of killing outside the control of the United States; however, no other single apparatus can make everyone or anyone die irrespective of citizenship or geographic location. For me, this is the most inescapable philosophical provocation of our moment in time.

The haphazard and seemingly limitless nature of U.S. violence means that even the core principles of the great political realist concepts like order and national interest are being displaced by subterranean violence entrepreneurs that populate transversal battlefields, security corridors, and border zones. Mercenaries, drug lords, chief executive officers, presidents, and sports commissioners are more alike than ever. Doomsayers like Paul Virilio, Lewis Mumford, and Martin Heidegger foretold a kind of terminal and self-annihilating velocity for geopolitics’ technological saturation, but even their lack of imagination appears optimistic. American geopolitics does not know totality or finality; it bleeds, mutates, and reforms. Furthermore, the peril of biopolitics seems now almost romantic. To make life live? Perchance to dream. The care and concern for life’s productivity is increasingly subsumed by plasticity—forming and reforming without regard to the telos of productivity, division, or normative order.

There are, of course, still orders in our geoplastic age, but they are almost unrecognizable as such. When so many citizens and states are directly invested in sabotaging publicly stated strategic ends, then concepts like national interest seem equally quaint. We are witnessing creative and horrifying experiments in the affirmative production of dying, which also deprive those targeted and in some cases whole populations from the relief of death. To follow Rucker, I want to try to see the world for what it is. We can only say that tragedy is no longer a genre of geopolitics. Tragedy redeems. The occluded character of contemporary geopolitics shoehorned into experience produces the feeling that there is no relief, no reason, no victory, no defeats, and no exit within the confines of national security’s constricted world. This is not tragedy: it is horror. We live in an age of horror that, like the victims of gore movies who never quite die so that they can be tortured more, furthers our practice of collective violence and goes on for decades as a kind of sustainable warfare.

Why would I bother with the “night side” of ir theory? In part, I wish to move away from the rationalist fallacy among both defenders and critics of empire. There is a shared belief in the strategic competence of nations like the United States. Even those most vocally critical often see in the covert operations and vast military occupations a kind of purpose or conspiracy. The debate about empire then becomes about its moral virtue rather than the factual question of the strategic competence of imperial states. However, the lives of millions annihilated in Iraq, Yemen, Afghanistan, and now increasngly throughout the continent of Africa do not reflect an amoral strategic competence. The mass murder in pursuit of the war on terrorism and its vision of nation-building is the result of lethal ~~stupidity~~  [silliness].48 In some sense, the investigative journalism of Jeremy Scahill and Glen Greenwald attributes too much reason and order to the catastrophic floundering of the American empire.49 To see even a dark vision of order in the last thirty years of U.S. policy is itself a form of optimism. No one is in control, there is no conspiracy, and yet the killing continues. A pessimistic reading of U.S. empire and the geopolitical history that precedes it is neither tragedy nor farce. It is a catastrophic banality lacking in any and all history, a pile of nonevents so suffocating that we often hope for a conspiracy, punctuating event, or villain worthy of the Introduction—25 scale of violence.50 For those of us who continually rewatch the reruns of The Walking Dead and Jericho on our laptops in bed, we are waiting for relief in our privileged but increasingly fragile bubble. I know I am not the only one who finds respite from the weight of politics’ “cruel optimism” by watching fantasies of cruel pessimism. A pessimistic understanding of global politics helps explain how we could come to a place where there is a sense of relief in watching everything come to an end.5

#### The 1AC’s framing of surveillance being the bastion of deterrence reifies insecurity, reinforcing conformation bias and a global pursuit of violence.

Masco, 12 (Joseph, Prof. of Anthropology @ U. of Chicago, “The End of Ends” *Anthropological Quarterly*, Vol. 85, No. 4 (Fall 2012), pp. 1107-1124) ask for PDF // sosa

In an extreme age, we might well ask: what are the possibilities for a productive shock, an experience or insight that would allow us to rethink the terms of everyday life? In the discipline of biology, the recent discov- ery of microbial extremophiles in deep-sea volcanic vents has fundamen- tally challenged longstanding scientific definitions of life (Helmreich 2008). Living under conditions of extreme heat and pressure, these methane- eating beings have redefined the very limits of life on planet Earth and beyond. What could produce a similar effect in the domain of security? Opportunities for such a critique are ever present, an endless stream of moments in fact, yet constantly **subsumed by the normalizing effects** of a national security culture committed to a **constant state of emergency**. A return to basic questions of how to define profit, loss, and sustainability is a key concern today in the US and this paper asks what kind of analy- sis could begin to redefine the limits of a collective security? What kind of **de-familiarization** and/or **productive shock** might allow insight into the cultural terms of expert judgment today in the US, allowing us to **rethink** the logics and practices that have simultaneously produced a **global war on terror**, a global **financial meltdown**, **and a planetary climate crisis**? How can Americans- extremophiles of the national sort- assess their own his- tory within a national-cultural formation devoted to the **normalization of violence (as war, as boom and bust capitalism, as environmental ruin**) as the basis for everyday life? This short paper does not provide an answer to these questions (would that it could!), but rather seeks to offer a provocation and a meditation on paths constantly not taken in US national security culture. It asks: how can we read against the normalizing processes of the security state to assess **alternative futures,** alternative visions rendered invisible by the complex **logistics of military science, economic rationality**, and **global governance**? To do so is to break from the normalizing force of everyday national security/capitalism, and interrogate the assumed structures of security and risk that support a global American military deployment and permanent war posture. To accomplish this kind of critical maneuver, however, one needs to be able to recognize the **alternative futures rendered void** by the **specific configurations of politics and threat** empowering **military industrial action** at a given moment. An extreme critique requires the ability to assess the alternative costs and benefits that remain suspended within the spaces of an everyday American life constantly rehearsing (via media, political culture, and military action) terror as normality. What follows then is both an examination and a performance of extremity- pushing a critical history and theory well beyond the usual scholarly comfort level. It seeks less to settle and explain than to agitate and provoke. To engage an extreme point of view on crisis, both exterior and ob- jective, let's turn to a spectacular new technology that seemed to offer just such a perspective on US security culture in 1960- that of an exterior gaze on planet Earth. **The first satellite imagery** was not only a techno- logical revolution of profound importance to the military (and ultimately the earth and information sciences), it also **constituted a rare moment of ob- jective critique to** American Cold War fantasies at their most virulent and violent. Covert and extremely fragile, the first Corona satellite was secretly launched into outer space in August of 1 960, offering a new optics on Cold War military technologies and fantasies. Imagine, if you will, a rocket carrying not a warhead but a giant panoramic camera (see Figures 1 and 2), slung into a low orbit over Europe, running a long reel of 70mm film, spe- cially designed by Kodak to function in outer space. The satellite makes a series of orbits exposing its film over designated areas, and then ejects a fire-proof capsule carrying the film, sending it back into Earth's atmosphere (see Figure 3). As the capsule descends via a series of parachutes, it emits a homing signal, allowing a specially equipped plane to detect the signal and swoop in, capturing the now charred film canister in mid-air via a gi- ant hook (see Figure 4). On August 18, 1960 the Corona Project became the first space based reconnaissance system, providing the CIA with the first satellite photographs of Soviet military installations (see Figures 5 and 6; as well as Day, Logsdon, and Latell 1998; and Peebles 1997). Corona provided the most accurate images of Soviet military capabilities to date, offering concrete photographic evidence of Soviet missile capabilities at a time of near hysterical speculation about imminent Soviet attack. Soon US officials knew via photo- graphic documentation of commu- nist military bases that the Soviets did not have a vast and growing ICBM superiority capable of over- whelming US defenses. In fact, the US had something on the order of a ten to one advantage in missiles, and even more in nuclear devices. At this moment in the Cold War, **outer space provided the only clear view of nuclear threat- providing a series of photographs that dramatically changed how US officials viewed the immediacy of nuclear war** (Richelson 2006). Over the next decade, **the race to the moon became the public face of a covert enterprise to extend and expand space surveillance**. Plans for manned photographic studios in space with Hubble telescope- sized lenses pointed toward Earth, soon were enhanced by digital communications that allowed in- stant data transmission (see Willis and Bamford 2007). The Corona cameras evolved quickly, moving from the 40-foot resolution offered in 1960 to five-foot resolution by 1967, a revolution in optics that was soon followed by digital satellite systems capable of three-inch resolution, in- frared imaging, and the near instantaneous transfer of information. These remote sensing technologies have since revolutionized everything from geography, to climate sciences, to the now ubiquitous GPS systems and Google Earth. The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) has long considered the Corona satellite one of its most im- portant achievements, a pure suc- cess story. As Director of the CIA, Richard Helms held a ceremony in honor of the Corona Program's re- tirement in 1 972 (in favor of the next generation digital satellite system). He presented a documentary film, entitled "A Point in Time" to CIA personnel detailing the crucial his- tory of the top-secret program, its technological achievements, and its central role in Cold War geopolitics. litics. A Corona capsule and an exten- sive photographic display of Corona satellite imagery was then centrally installed at CIA Headquarters in Langley to document its success for all future employees. On display there through the end of the Cold War, com- ponents of this exhibit can now be seen at the Smithsonian Air and Space Museum. The extensive Corona photographic archive became available Corona as a fantastically successful covert spy system and others today value its photographic record for non-military scientific research, a basic lesson of the Corona achievement remains unrecognized: the first satellite system not only offered a new optic on Soviet technology, it also revealed how fantastical American assessments of Soviet capabilities were in the 1 950s. It offered a new remote viewing photography but also new insight into the American national security imaginary. The first Corona images have as much to say about the ferocious US commitment to nuclear weapons and a global nuclear war machine already set on a minute-to-minute trig- ger by 1960, as about Soviet weapons. The first Corona images contra- dicted expert US judgments of Soviet capabilities and desires, providing a powerful counterweight against arguments for a preemptive US attack on the Soviet Union. The slightly blurry satellite photographs thus held the potential for a radical critique of American perceptions of the Soviet Union, showing that US officials were as much at war with their own apocalyptic projections in 1 960 as with Soviet plans for territorial expansion. An anthropology of extremes requires a non-normative reading of cul- ture and history, an effort to push past consensus logics to interrogate what alternative visions, projects, and futures are left unexplored at a given historical moment. The rapidly evolving historical archive provides one op- portunity for this kind of critique: our understanding of the 20th century American security state is changing with each newly declassified program and document, dramatically reshaping what we know about US policy, mil- itary science, and threat assessments since World War II. The Corona pho- tographs are a compelling illustration of the power of the evolving national security archive. As the enormous military state apparatus that constitutes the core of the American political and economic machine is grudgingly opened to new kinds of conceptual interrogation, Americans should seize the opportunity to learn about their own commitments, political processes, and security imaginaries. Indeed, the national security archive is one place where we can formally consider how the 20th century "balance of terror" has been remade in the 21st century as a "war on terror"- following the affective politics, technological fetishisms, and geopolitical ambitions that have come to structure US security culture. The declassified Cold War ar- chive allows us to pursue an extreme reading of US security culture, one committed to pushing past official policy logics at moments of heightened emergency to consider how threat, historical contingency, technological revolution, propaganda, and geopolitical ambition combine in a specific moment of extreme risk. The first Corona images, for example, constitute a moment when administrators of the national security state had their own logics and fears negated in the form of direct photographic evidence, opening a potential conceptual space for radical reassessment of their own ambitions, perceptions, and drives, powerfully revealed in black and white photos as fantasy. We might well ask why the Corona imagery (and any number of similar moments when existential threat has objectively dissolved into mere projection**- most** recently, the missing weapons of mass destruction used to justify the US invasion of Iraq in 2003)- did not pro- duce a radical self-critique **in the US**. The Cold War nuclear standoff installed **existential threat as a core structure of everyday American life**, making nuclear fear the coordinat- ing principle of US geo-policy and a **new psychosocial reality** for citizens increasingly connected via images of their own imminent death. Indeed, few societies have prepared so meticulously for collective death as did Cold War America while simultaneously denying the possibility of an ac- tual ending. From large scale civil defense drills in which the destruction of the nation-state became a kind of public theater, to the articulation of a Cold War militarism that understood all global political events as condi- tioning everyday American life, the height of the Cold War worked in novel ways both to enable and deny the possibility of a collective death (Masco 2008). **The early history of the Corona Satellite System offers a compel- ling story about the technological achievement of a total ending, and the Cold War hysteria of the years 1957-1962 in the US**. This is a moment of maximal danger but also of new perspectives- crucially those derived from outer space- that momentarily opened up multiple contingent and radically different security futures. For an anthropology of extremes, this period of Cold War can be approached as an ur-moment; foundational in terms of the technology, theory, politics, and ambitions supporting the American security state. Interrogating this first period of global nuclear danger via recently declassified materials allows us to ask: how does one end the possibility of a total ending? How does a society pursuing war as a normalized condition of everyday life pause and reflect on its own intel- lectual and psychosocial processes? Within modern political theory the means to an end has been embed- ded within the very concept of rationality, making ends and means syn- onymous with progress, a perpetual engine of improving the infrastruc- tures of everyday life as well as the morality of those living within it. Within this modernity- glossed here as the application of reason to nature as progress- we have few efforts to theorize the reality or implication of con- ceptual blockages or blindnesses within the very notion of security. The assumption that instrumental reason is not only a means to an end but an essential good structures a Euro-American modernity in which supersti- tion is set against the possibility of an unending technological progress (Horkheimer and Adorno 2002:1). Benjamin (1969) offers perhaps the most powerful critique of "progress" by showing how the promise of the "new" can be the vehicle of social mystification and entrenchment. His call to "brush history against the grain" and establish a critical method that can "seize hold of a memory as it flashes up at a moment of danger" is ultimately a call to resist the normalization (and naturalization) of violence in everyday life. But how, and under what terms, can this be accomplished in a national security state that is premised on the total ending of nuclear war? Having built the war machine as a global system, how can a society turn towards an alternative notion of security, one not grounded in the technological possibility of total nuclear war? How, indeed, does thinking about an absolute ending work to install a new set of fantasies and short circuits that prevent reflexive critique? How do rational modes of planning work not to eliminate the possibility of collective death but rather, through self-mystification, to install its pos- sibility ever deeper into an expert state system? Kant (1986) articulated one central area where reason is installed as a compensation for a lack of understanding in his notion of the sublime. Sublime experience, in his view, overwhelms the human sensorium providing that strange mix of pleasure and terror involved in surpassing one's cognitive limit. For Kant, the experi- ence of incomprehensibility is then managed by an act of categorizing- by a naming of the event- rather than through understanding. Compensation rather than comprehension is thus achieved, installing at the very center of his notion of reason an irreducible problem about means, ends, and the ability of human beings in extreme moments to comprehend both. "Terror" has an inherent sublimity, one that has been multiplied across contempo- rary crisis- war, economy, environment- to create a new complex con- figuration of planetary risk that exceeds the power of the national security state (Masco 201 0). Nuclear terror, as a permanent state system, however, is not a momentary experience (as Kant's sublime requires) but is instead a global infrastructure- one that coordinates American military power as well as its domestic politics. This infrastructure requires constant affective as well as technological support, merging complex social and technologi- cal processes that become fused in perceptions of global risk. Put differently, instrumental reason has orchestrated our globalized, economized, technologized modernity but it has also installed a set of compensations for those events, desires, and biological facts that dis- rupt specific calculations of progress/profit. By the mid-20th century, the products of instrumental reason- the very means to an end- produced new forms of war that ultimately challenged the survival of the species. The atomic bomb stands as both a rational technology- produced via the combined work of physicists, engineers, chemists, industrialists, military planners, defense intellectuals, and civilian policy makers- and as a limit case to that instrumental reason (see Edwards 1996, Oakes 1994). In the early days of the nuclear age, some Manhattan Project scientists hoped this new technology would be so terrible that it would simply end the pos- sibility of war (e.g., Federation of American Scientists 1946). Instead, US war planners built a global system for nuclear war that could end life itself within a few minutes of actual conflict. Each new nuclear system- bomb- er, submarine, and missile- was both a technological achievement of the first order and an accelerating progression towards the end of modernity in the form of nuclear war. What these technical experts were attempting to negotiate through engineering is a basic relationship to death, a perverse project of build- ing ever more destructive machines in the name of producing "security." Indeed, **displacing** the threat of **one machine** (the bomb) with another (the bomb) became the basis for **deterrence theory, a way of organizing and containing the thought of death by expanding technological systems**. Freud (1991) saw this contradiction in militarism early on, and in his remarkable 1915 essay "Thoughts for the Times on War and Death" he is definitive that it is impossible to comprehend- to actually believe in- one's own death. Thus, he notes, even as the human organism moves closer to death with each tick of the clock, the ego pursues a program of immortality and works **to relocate the** onrushing **reality of death to exterior locations**- to novels, to foreign populations, to distant wars, **to a radical outside**. Thus, the thought of an "ending" here literally pro- duces a new set of means- fantasies, projections, displacements, and amnesias all mobilized to suture together an idea of an eternal self. In American national-culture, the Cold War performed this task through a series of circuits: the communist threat was simultaneously everywhere and nowhere, and the immanent threat of nuclear war was mitigated by a fetishistic focus on technological detail. Cold War planners managed the threat of nuclear war through constant proliferation- of weapons, deliv- ery systems, images, theories, and calculations. Through this prolifera- tion, Cold War planners pursued a program of intellectual compensation for the confrontation with a new kind of death. They did so by mobilizing all national resources (changing the very temporal horizon of war from days, to hours, to minutes in the process), as well as by pursuing proxy wars and covert actions around the world. In the process, Americans learned how to be committed to total war as a precondition for everyday life while locating death as exterior to the nation, even as the war machine grew ferociously in its technological capacities. This represents a distinc- tive national-cultural achievement: a notion of security that brings collective death ever closer in an attempt to fix its location with ever more precision. By the time of the first Corona photograph, the US nuclear system was on constant and permanent alert, managing a global war machine on a minute-by-minute temporal scale- one that imagined a Soviet nuclear strike coming with less than seven minutes warning (Keeney 201 1 :1 86).

The 1AC’s focus on space sustainability is driven by the desire to prevent the collapse of the international- restrictions are self-imposed in an attempt to preserve the system

Shammas and Holen 19—Victor Shammas and Tomas B Holen, Oslo Metropolitan University, Work Research Institute (AFI), Oslo, Norway and Independent scholar, Oslo, Norway. (“One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space” Palgrave Communications volume 5, Article number: 10 (2019)) // sosa

The spatial fix of outer space

No longer terra nullius, space is now the new terra firma of capitalistkind: its naturalized terroir, its next necessary terrain. The logic of capitalism dictates that capital should seek to expand outwards into the vastness of space, a point recognized by a recent ethnography of NewSpace actors (Valentine, 2016, p. 1050). The operations of capitalistkind serve to resolve a series of (potential) crises of capitalism, revolving around the slow, steady decline of spatial fixes (see e.g., Harvey, 1985, p. 51–66) as they come crashing up against the quickly vanishing blank spaces remaining on earthly maps and declining (terrestrial) opportunities for profitable investment of surplus capital (Dickens and Ormrod, 2007a, p. 49–78).

A ‘spatial fix' involves the geographic modulation of capital accumulation, consisting in the outward expansion of capital onto new geographic terrains, or into new spaces, with the aim of filling a gap in the home terrains of capital. Jessop (2006, p. 149) notes that spatial fixes may involve a number of strategies, including the creation of new markets within the capitalist world, engaging in trade with non-capitalist economies, and exporting surplus capital to undeveloped or underdeveloped regions. The first two address the problem of insufficient demand and the latter option creates a productive (or valorizing) outlet for excess capital. Capitalism must regularly discover, develop, and appropriate such new spaces because of its inherent tendency to generate surplus capital, i.e., capital bereft of profitable purpose. In Harvey’s (2006, p. xviii) terms, a spatial fix revolves around ‘geographical expansions and restructuring…as a temporary solution to crises understood…in terms of the overaccumulation of capital'. It is a temporary solution because these newly appropriated spaces will in turn become exhausted of profitable potential and are likely to produce their own stocks of surplus capital; while ‘capital surpluses that otherwise stood to be devalued, could be absorbed through geographical expansions and spatio-temporal displacements' (Harvey, 2006, p. xviii), this outwards drive of capitalism is inherently limitless: there is no end point or final destination for capitalism. Instead, capitalism must continuously propel itself onwards in search of pristine sites of renewed capital accumulation. In this way, Harvey writes, society constantly ‘creates fresh productive powers elsewhere to absorb its overaccumulated capital' (Harvey, 1981, p. 8).

Historically, spatial fixes have played an important role in conserving the capitalist system. As Jessop (2006, p. 149) points out, ‘The export of surplus money capital, surplus commodities, and/or surplus labour-power outside the space(s) where they originate enabled capital to avoid, at least for a period, the threat of devaluation'. But these new spaces for capital are not necessarily limited to physical terrains, as with colonial expansion in the nineteenth century; as Greene and Joseph (2015) note, various digital spaces, such as the Internet, can also be considered as spatial fixes: the Web absorbs overaccumulated capital, heightens consumption of virtual and physical goods, and makes inexpensive, flexible sources of labor available to employers. Greene and Joseph offer the example of online high-speed frequency trading as a digital spatial fix that furthers the ‘annihilation of space by time' first noted by Marx in his Grundrisse (see Marx, 1973, p. 524).

Outer space serves at least two purposes in this regard. In the short-to medium-term, it allows for the export of surplus capital into emerging industries, such as satellite imaging and communication. These are significant sites of capital accumulation: global revenues in the worldwide satellite market in 2016 amounted to $260 billion (SIA, 2017, p. 4). Clearly, much of this activity is taking place ‘on the ground'; it is occurring in the ‘terrestrial economy'. But all that capital would have to find some other meaningful or productive outlet were it not for the expansion of capital into space. Second, outer space serves as an arena of technological innovation, which feeds back into the terrestrial economy, helping to avert crisis by pushing capital out of technological stagnation and innovation shortfalls.

In short, outer space serves as a spatial fix. It swallows up surplus capital, promising to deliver valuable resources, technological innovations, and communication services to capitalists back on Earth. This places outer space on the same level as traditional colonization, analyzed in Hegel’s Philosophy of Right, which Hegel thought of as a product of the ‘inner dialectic of civil society', which drives the market to ‘push beyond its own limits and seek markets, and so its necessary means of subsistence, in other lands which are either deficient in the goods it has overproduced, or else generally backward in creative industry, etc.' (Hegel, 2008, p. 222). In this regard, SpaceX and related ventures are not so very different from maritime colonialists and the trader-exploiters of the British East India Company. But there is something new at stake. As the Silicon Valley entrepreneur Peter Diamandis has gleefully noted: ‘There are twenty-trillion-dollar checks up there, waiting to be cashed!' (Seaney and Glendenning, 2016). Capitalistkind consists in the naturalization of capitalist consciousness and practice, the (false) universalization of a particular mode of political economy as inherent to the human condition, followed by the projection of this naturalized universality into space—capitalist humanity as a Fukuyamite ‘end of history', the end-point of (earthly) historical unfolding, but the starting point of humanity’s first serious advances in space.

What role, then, for the state? The frontiersmen of NewSpace tend to think of themselves as libertarians, pioneers beyond the domain of state bureaucracy (see Nelson and Block, 2018). ‘The government should leave the design work and ownership of the product to the private sector', the author of a 2017 report, Capitalism in Space, advocates. ‘The private companies know best how to build their own products to maximize performance while lowering cost' (Zimmerman, 2017, p. 27). One ethnographer notes that ‘politically, right-libertarianism prevails' amongst NewSpace entrepreneurs (Valentine, 2016, p. 1047–1048). Just as Donald Rumsfeld dismissed the opponents to the Iraq War as ‘Old Europe', so too are state entities’ interests in space exploration shrugged off as symptoms of ‘Old Space'. Elon Musk, we are told in a recent biography, unlike the sluggish Big State actors of yore, ‘would apply some of the start-up techniques he’d learned in Silicon Valley to run SpaceX lean and fast…As a private company, SpaceX would also avoid the waste and cost overruns associated with government contractors' (Vance, 2015, p. 114). This libertarianism-in-space has found a willing chorus of academic supporters. The legal scholar Virgiliu Pop introduces the notion of the frontier paradigm (combining laissez-faire economics, market competition, and an individualist ethic) into the domain of space law, claiming that this paradigm has ‘proven its worth on our planet' and will ‘most likely…do so in the extraterrestrial realms' as well (Pop, 2009, p. vi). This frontier paradigm is not entirely new: a ‘Columbus mythology', centering on the ‘noble explorer', was continuously evoked in the United States during the Cold War space race (Dickens and Ormrod, 2016, pp. 79, 162–164).

But the entrepreneurial libertarianism of capitalistkind is undermined by the reliance of the entire NewSpace complex on extensive support from the state, ‘a public-private financing model underpinning long-shot start-ups' that in the case of Musk’s three main companies (SpaceX, SolarCity Corp., and Tesla) has been underpinned by $4.9 billion dollars in government subsidies (Hirsch, 2015). In the nascent field of space tourism, Cohen (2017) argues that what began as an almost entirely private venture quickly ground to a halt in the face of insurmountable technical and financial obstacles, only solved by piggybacking on large state-run projects, such as selling trips to the International Space Station, against the objections of NASA scientists. The business model of NewSpace depends on the taxpayer’s dollar while making pretensions to individual selfreliance. The vast majority of present-day clients of private aerospace corporations are government clients, usually military in origin. Furthermore, the bulk of rocket launches in the United States take place on government property, usually operated by the US Air Force or NASA.13

This inward tension between state dependency and capitalist autonomy is itself a product of neoliberalism’s contradictory demand for a minimal, “slim” state, while simultaneously (and in fact) relying on a state reengineered and retooled for the purposes of capital accumulation (Wacquant, 2012). As Lazzarato writes, ‘To be able to be “laissez-faire”, it is necessary to intervene a great deal' (2017, p. 7). Space libertarianism is libertarian in name only: behind every NewSpace venture looms a thick web of government spending programs, regulatory agencies, public infrastructure, and universities bolstered by research grants from the state. SpaceX would not exist were it not for state-sponsored contracts of satellite launches. Similarly, in 2018, the US Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA)—the famed origin of the World Wide Web—announced that it would launch a ‘responsive launch competition', meaning essentially the reuse of launch vehicles, representing an attempt by the state to ‘harness growing commercial capabilities' and place them in the service of the state’s interest in ensuring ‘national security' (Foust, 2018b).

This libertarianism has been steadily growing in the nexus between Silicon Valley, Stanford University, Wall Street, and the Washington political establishment, which tend to place a high value on Randian ‘objectivism' and participate in a long American intellectual heritage of individualistic ‘bootstrapping' and (allegedly) gritty self-reliance. But as Nelson and Block (2018, p. 189–197) recognize, one of the central symbolic operations of capitalistkind resides in concealing its reliance on the state by mobilizing the charm of its entrepreneurial constituents and the spectacle of space. There is a case to be made for the idea that SpaceX and its ilk resemble semi-private corporations like the British East India Company. The latter, “incorporated by royal charter from Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth I in 1600 to trade in silk and spices, and other profitable Indian commodities,” recruited soldiers and built a ‘commercial business [that] quickly became a business of conquest' (Tharoor, 2017). SpaceX, too, is increasingly imbricated with an attempt on the part of a particular state, the United States, to colonize and appropriate resources derived from a particular area, that of outer space; it, too, depends on the infrastructure, contracts, and regulatory environment that thus far only a state seems able to provide. Its private character, like that of the East India Company, is troubled by being deeply embedded in the state. As one commentator has observed of SpaceX, ‘If there’s a consistent charge against Elon Musk and his high-flying companies…it’s that they’re not really examples of independent, innovative market capitalism. Rather, they’re government contractors, dependent on taxpayer money to stay afloat' (cit. Nelson and Block, 2018, p. 189).

Perhaps this should not come as a surprise. As Bourdieu (2005, p. 12) observed, ‘The economic field is, more than any other, inhabited by the state, which contributes at every moment to its existence and persistence, and also to the structure of the relations of force that characterize it'. The state lays out the preconditions for market exchanges. Under neoliberalism, the state is the preeminent facilitator of markets. The neoliberal state is not so much a Minimalstaat, night watchman state, or slim state as it is the prima causa of market society (see, e.g., Wacquant, 2012). Similarly, in the political theory of Deleuze and Guattari, any economic development presupposes the political differentiation caused by the state (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004a, p. 237–238). Even in the global environment of contemporary capitalism, the market cannot operate without the state becoming integrated with capitalism itself, as ‘it is the modern state that gives capitalism its models of realization' (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004b, p. 480). For capitalism to survive in outer space, the state must create a regulatory environment, subsidize infrastructure, and hand down contracts – in short, assemble outer space as a domain made accessible in legal, technical, and economic ways.

#### Voting negative adopts failed IR for a healthy dose of pessimism – at the end of the world, all we can do is be buried alive together.

Grove ‘19

[Jarius, PoliSci at the University of Hawai’i. 2019. “Savage Ecology: War and Geopolitics in the Anthropocene.”] pat // rc sosa– ask for pdf

Failed ir affirms the power of this kind of negative thinking as an alternative to the endless rehearsing of moralizing insights and strategic foresight. The negative is not “against” or reacting to something. Rather, it is the affirmation of a freedom beyond the limits of life and death. That is, it is making a life by continuing to think about the world, even if that thinking is not recuperative, and even if nothing we think can save us. In the face of it all, one celebrates useless thinking, useless scholarship, and useless forms of life at the very moment we are told to throw them all under the bus in the name of survival at all costs. This is a logic referred to lately as hope and it is as cruel as it is anxiety inducing. Hope is a form of extortion. We are told that it is our obligation to bear the weight of making things better while being chided that the failure of our efforts is the result of not believing in the possibility of real change. In such an environment, pessimism is often treated as a form of treason, as if only neoliberals and moral degenerates give up—or so goes the op-ed’s insisting upon the renewed possibility of redemption.

In response to these exhortations, pessimism offers a historical atheism, both methodologically and morally. The universe does not bend toward justice. Sometimes the universe bends toward the indifference of gravity wells and black holes. Affirming negativity, inspired by Achille Mbembe, is grounds for freedom, even if that freedom or relief is only fleeting and always insecure. I am not arrogant enough to think a book can attain freedom of this sort, but this book is inspired by refusals of critique as redemption in favor of useless critique and critique for its own sake.

That the pursuit of knowledge without immediate application is so thoroughly useless, even profane, is a diagnosis of our current moment. The neoliberal assault on the university is evidence of this condition, as is the current pitch of American politics. Our indifference as intellectuals to maximizing value has not gone unnoticed. We are still dangerous, worthy of vilification, of attack, sabotage, and derision because we fail so decadently. We are parasites according to Scott Walker, Donald Trump, and the rest. So be it. We are and shall remain irascible irritants to a worldwide assault on thinking that is well underway and facing few obstacles in other jurisdictions.

What would failed scholarship do? Learn to die, learn to live, learn to listen, learn to be together, and learn to be generous. These virtues are useless in that they do not prevent or manage things. They do not translate into learning objectives or metrics. Virtues of this order are selfsame, nontransferable experiences. They are meaningful but not useful. These are luxurious virtues. Like grieving or joy, they are ends unto themselves. But how will these ideas seek extramural grants, contribute to an outcomes-based education system, or become a policy recommendation? They will not, and that is part of their virtue.

Even if there is no straight line to where we are and where we ought to be, I think we should get over the idea that somehow the U.S. project of liberal empire is conflicted, or “more right than it is wrong,” or pragmatically preferable to the alternatives. I hope this book can contribute to the urgent necessity to get out of the way by reveling in the catastrophic failure that should inspire humility but instead seems to embolden too many to seek global control yet again. Demolition may be an affirmative act if it means insurgents and others can be better heard. And yet this may fail too. If we can accomplish nothing at all, we can at least, as Ta-Nehisi Coates and other pessimists have said, refuse to suborn the lie of America any longer. Telling the truth, even if it cannot change the outcome of history, is a certain kind of solace. In Coates’s words, there is a kind of rapture “when you can no longer be lied to, when you have rejected the dream.” Saying the truth out loud brings with it the relief that we are not crazy. Things really are as bad as we think.

If there are those of us who want to break from this one-hundred-year-old race to be the next Henry Kissinger, then why do we continue to seek respect in the form of recognizable standards of excellence? I am not sure where the answer finally lies, but I do know that professionalization will not save us. To appear as normal and recognizably rigorous will not be enough to stave off the neoliberal drive to monetize scholarship, or to demand of us strategically useful insights. The least we can do in the face of such a battle is to find comfort in meaningful ideas and the friendships they build rather than try to perform for those we know are the problem. Some will ask, who is this “we” or is that “they”—where is your evidence? More will know exactly what I am talking about.

The virtues I seek are oriented toward an academy of refuge, a place we can still live, no matter how dire the conditions of the university and the classroom. It is not the think tank, boardroom, or command center. We are, those of us who wish to be included, the last of the philosophers, the last of the lovers of knowledge, the deviants who should revel in what Harney and Moten have called the undercommons.

In one of his final lectures, Bataille speaks of the remnants of a different human species, something not quite so doomed, something that wasted its newly discovered consciousness and tool-being on the art that still marks the walls of prehistoric caves. This lingering minor or vestigial heritage is philosophy’s beginning. Philosophy survives war, atrocity, famine, and crusades. Thinking matters in a very unusual way. Thinking is not power or emancipation. Thinking matters for a sense of belonging to the world, and for believing in the fecundity of the world despite evidence to the contrary.

How do you get all this from pessimism, from failure? Because willing failure is a temptation, a lure to think otherwise, to think dangerous thoughts. Pessimism is a threat to indifferentism and nihilism in the sense of the phenomenon of Donald Trump. Pessimism is a provocation and an enemy of skepticism, particularly of the metaphysical variety. It is not redemption from these afflictions, but in pessimism there is solace in the real. To put it another way, to study the world as it is means to care for it.

The exhortation that our care or interest should be contingent on how useful the world is and how much of it conforms to our designs is as much opposed to care as it is to empiricism. We can study airports, poetry, endurance races, borders, bombs, plastic, and warfare, and find them all in the world. To consider the depth of their existence can be an invitation to the world rather than a prelude to another policy report. One cannot make a successful political career out of such pursuits, but you might be able to make a life out of it, a life worth repeating even if nothing else happens.

At the end of Jack Halberstam’s The Queer Art of Failure, we are presented with the Fantastic Mr. Fox’s toast as an exemple of something meaningful in these dark times of ours.

They say all foxes are slightly allergic to linoleum, but it’s cool to the paw—try it. They say my tail needs to be dry cleaned twice a month, but now it’s fully detachable—see? They say our tree may never grow back, but one day, something will. Yes, these crackles are made of synthetic goose and these giblets come from artificial squab and even these apples look fake—but at least they’ve got stars on them. I guess my point is, we’ll eat tonight, and we’ll eat together. And even in this not particularly flattering light, you are without a doubt the five and a half most wonderful wild animals I’ve ever met in my life. So let’s raise our boxes—to our survival.

Halberstam says of this queer moment:

Not quite a credo, something short of a toast, a little less than a speech, but Mr. Fox gives here one of the best and most moving—both emotionally and in stop-motion terms—addresses in the history of cinema. Unlike Coraline, where survival is predicated upon a rejection of the theatrical, the queer, and the improvised, and like Where the Wild Things Are, where the disappointment of deliverance must be leavened with the pragmatism of possibility, Fantastic Mr. Fox is a queerly animated classic in that it teaches us, as Finding Nemo, Chicken Run, and so many other revolting animations before it, to believe in detachable tails, fake apples, eating together, adapting to the lighting, risk, sissy sons, and the sheer importance of survival for all those wild souls that the farmers, the teachers, the preachers, and the politicians would like to bury alive.

Although not as much fun as Halberstam’s monument to low theory, Savage Ecology is for all the other wild animals out there studying global politics. May we be buried alive together.

## 4

#### CP: The Supreme Court of the United States should request and accept an appeal for the case LAURA MURRAY CICCO, v. NATIONAL AERONAUTICS & SPACE ADMINISTRATION, and rule in favor of Cicco, on the basis of the ban on national appropriation in the Outer Space Treaty and the common law property rights regime. Relevant Courts should uphold this precedent.

#### Except for the appropriation of one vial of moon dust by Laura Murray Cicco, private entities should not appropriate lunar heritage sites.

#### Ruling in favor of Cicco realigns the US with the OST.

Chow 18 “Woman says Neil Armstrong gave her moon dust. She's suing NASA to keep it.” June 14, 2018 Denise Chow <https://www.nbcnews.com/mach/science/woman-says-neil-armstrong-gave-her-moon-dust-she-s-ncna883116> SM

In a case that mixes nostalgia with serious questions about who is allowed to own materials brought back from space, a Tennessee woman is suing NASA to maintain possession of what she says is a vial of moon dust that astronaut Neil Armstrong gave her when she was 10 years old.

In her lawsuit filed in federal court last week, Laura Cicco says Armstrong, the first human to walk on the moon, gave her the vial in the 1970s along with a handwritten note: “To Laura Ann Murray — Best of Luck — Neil Armstrong Apollo 11.”

Moondust

Cicco, then named Laura Murray, claims she received the memento while living with her family in Cincinnati. She maintains that Armstrong, who taught aerospace engineering at the University of Cincinnati at the time, had been a friend of her late father. Armstrong died in 2012.

A handwriting expert authenticated the signature on the note, said Cicco’s lawyer, Christopher McHugh of Kansas City, Missouri. Tests of the vial's contents found that "there is no evidence to rule out a lunar origin," according to the court documents, but terrestrial materials from Earth's crust were also identified in the sample.

Cicco told the Washington Post that she had lost track of the vial until five years ago, when she rediscovered it in her father’s belongings after his death, and that she had filed the suit in an effort to block NASA from trying to seize the moon dust.

The space agency declined a request by MACH to comment on the case, but it has a reputation for aggressiveness in its efforts to take possession of lunar samples held by private citizens. In one highly publicized case from 2011, NASA conducted a sting operation in Lake Elsinore, California, to seize paperweights containing slivers of moon rock that a 74-year-old woman was trying to sell.

“Lunar samples that have been collected by U.S. government missions are considered unique and limited natural resources,” said Michelle Hanlon, co-founder of For All Moonkind, a nonprofit dedicated to preserving the Apollo lunar landing sites. “NASA retains all lunar samples collected through U.S. government missions as NASA property.” Hanlon is not involved in the case.

McHugh said there is no law against private ownership of moon dust. “The law is silent on this — it’s still an open question,” he said. “NASA bases its position on the assumption that no lunar material ever left NASA unless it was stolen, but there is no law that says you can’t own lunar material.”

The outcome of Cicco's case will hinge on whether Armstrong or the government owned the dust at the time it was given, according to Christopher Johnson, a professor of law at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C. and a space law expert. “If it’s the property of the U.S. government, he could not have passed it along to somebody else — he didn’t have the correct chain of custody or title for that,” said Johnson, who is not involved in the case.

McHugh said the handwritten note from Armstrong gives Cicco a strong claim of ownership. “We get past that hurdle because we have proof that Laura was given it directly by Neil Armstrong,” he said. “Unless you call Neil Armstrong a thief,” he added, “he had the authority to own it and give it to people. I don’t think Neil Armstrong was a thief.”

If there are no federal statutes against private ownership of materials from space, other experts say international law may provide some guidance. The Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, signed in 1967 and commonly called the Outer Space Treaty, prohibits governments from claiming territory on the moon and other celestial bodies. It is recognized by 107 countries, including the U.S. and Russia.

“In international law, nobody can appropriate anything in space. That is very clear,” said Ram Jakhu, an associate professor of space law at McGill University in Montreal, Canada. But, he added, “There are some exceptions and tolerance of violations. Countries like the U.S. and Russia have been collecting these moon samples and have been keeping it, so there’s some kind of tolerance of violation of international law.”

#### Lunar basing isn’t prohibited under this interpretation of the OST and isn’t seen as appropriation as long as it doesn’t constitute sovereign control – means credible OST encourages peaceful collaboration for lunar research which turns the aff

OST, "Outer Space Treaty," United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs, <https://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/spacelaw/treaties/outerspacetreaty.html> mvp mvp

The exploration and use of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries, irrespective of their degree of economic or scientific development, and shall be the province of all mankind.

Outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, shall be free for exploration and use by all States without discrimination of any kind, on a basis of equality and in accordance with international law, and there shall be free access to all areas of celestial bodies.

There shall be freedom of scientific investigation in outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, and States shall facilitate and encourage international co-operation in such investigation.

#### Exemptions from the OST endangers the credibility of the entire treaty.

Hickman and Dolman 2 John Hickman and Everett Dolman Volume 21 Number 1 2002 “Resurrecting the Space Age: A State–Centered Commentary on the Outer Space Regime” (associate professor in the Department of Government and International Studies at Berry College in Mt. Berry)//Elmer

Thus a state party need merely announce its intention to withdraw and then wait one year. Withdrawal of a single state party to the treaty, however, would not necessarily terminate the treaty between the other state parties. Yet, the decision of an important state not to be bound by a regime–creating treaty obviously endangers the entire treaty. The decision of the United States or China to withdraw from the OST would have far greater implications for the survival of the international space regime than the same decision by Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, or Papua New Guinea—the equality of states under international law remains nothing more than a useful fiction. For the OST to remain good international law, it must be accepted as such by the major space faring states of the 21st Century: the United States, Russia, the European Union, Japan, and China. One defection from the regime by a member of this group would no doubt lead to its effective collapse, as the remaining space faring states are unlikely to use the kind of coercion necessary to enforce the regime. A more likely response to such a defection is a scramble to make similar claims to sovereignty, based on historical precedent and effective occupation. Similar rushes to stake claims for territory sovereignty in other celestial bodies might follow.

#### Violations cause credibility spirals.

Jha 17 “US lawmakers seek review of Outer Space Treaty amid competition from India, China” May 26, 2017 Lalit K. Jha <https://www.livemint.com/Science/6uxgbhcNcRfBtbWyq63wTO/US-lawmakers-seek-review-of-Outer-Space-Treaty-amid-competit.html> SM

Outer Space Treaty which entered into force in 1967 forms the basis of international space law. While the treaty has been successful so far, lawmakers said some of the provisions have not been tested. For instance the treaty does not prohibit the placement of conventional weapons in orbit. It also states that the exploration of outer space shall be done to benefit all countries and that space shall be free for exploration and use by all the states.

Matthew Schaefer, co-director, Space, Cyber and Telecommunications Law Programme, University of Nebraska College of Law, said there is going to be some countries that oppose US interpretations of various OST provisions for matters of national interest regardless.

“But I think when we comply with Article 6 the OST, we increase the number of countries that we have credibility to lead towards the US inspired to the commercially friendly inspired interpretations of the treaty," he said.

“And when we don’t comply with Article 6 of the OST, what we do is we send some countries, China and Russia is—though China actually has been noticeably pretty quiet when it comes to asteroid mining and property rights. But as a general matter, we send countries their way and we also have less credibility to insist those countries when, again, a US company is a first mover," Schaefer said.

“If we don’t have as part of our criteria for authorising commercial companies looking at whether we’re doing harmful interference with a pre-existing activity with them, we won’t have the credibility to them, insist on them doing the same for us," Schaefer said.

#### Credible OST solves Space War.

Johnson 17 Christopher Johnson 1-23-2017 “The Outer Space Treaty at 50” , <http://thespacereview.com/article/3155/1> (graduate of Leiden University’s International Institute of Air and Space Law and the International Space University)//Elmer

As mentioned, many of the provisions of the Outer Space Treaty were borrowed from previous UN General Assembly resolutions. But as resolutions alone, these documents were non-binding and did not require states to alter their behavior. And while UN General Assembly resolutions are not normally law-making exercises, they do record the commonly-held expression of intentions by the states in the General Assembly, and make political recommendations to UNGA Members (or to the UN Security Council). UNGA Resolutions can also set priorities and mold opinion for inclusion in subsequent treaties. The prohibition on the placement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in outer space or their installation on celestial bodies was taken from UNGA Resolution 1884 of 1963. The resolution: [s]olemnly calls upon all States… [t]o refrain from placing in orbit around the earth any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction, installing such weapons on celestial bodies, or stationing such weapons in outer space in any other manner. This prohibition was transferred to the Outer Space Treaty, and thereby remade into international treaty law. As President Johnson pointed out in his recommendation to Congress to ratify the Outer Space Treaty, “the realms of space should forever remain realms of peace.”5 He continued: We know the gains of cooperation. We know the losses of the failure to cooperate. If we fail now to apply the lessons we have learned, or even if we delay their application, we know that the advances into space may only mean adding a new dimension to warfare. If, however, we proceed along the orderly course of full cooperation we shall, by the very fact of cooperation, make the most substantial contribution toward perfecting peace.6 The agreement contained in Article IV of the Outer Space Treaty reflects an agreement between the US and the USSR, as obligations restricting their freedom of action. Why would a state intentionally place a restriction on itself? Isn’t it better to merely keep outer space as unregulated as possible? Since there were only two states then capable of venturing into outer space, why did either state agree to rules governing its actions? It may seem counterintuitive, but the deeper rationale behind security arrangements like this is that the parties actually benefit in the long-term from placing mutual restrictions on their behavior. Agreeing to restrict your freedom of action has deep links to the usefulness or utility of law itself. Consider driving a car: in order to get a license, you agree to observe certain rules, and the license signals your obligation to obey these rules. However, sometimes adhering to those rules is not only inconvenient (such as stopping at stop signs when there’s nobody else at the intersection), it is also against your short term-interests (you have an appointment or will otherwise suffer from observing the rules.) However, agreeing to operate within a system where your freedoms are sometimes restricted can have the effect of actually increasing your freedom over the long term. Wouldn’t you rather live in a state where traffic laws exist, and other drivers agree to observe them? Isn’t that system preferable to living in a state without traffic rules? Indeed, a system with traffic rules increases not just freedom in general, but overall safety and orderliness. Consequently, because the system with rules is preferable to the system without rules, your willingness to use the roads allows you to travel with greater security and ease. You are better assured of the likelihood that you will get to your intended destination without some other driver crashing into you. Knowing that safe travel is likely, you are more willing to take trips more often, and to farther destinations. Your freedom is actually increased over the long term because you are willing to suffer temporary, short-term restrictions such as inconvenient red lights. Long-term rationality warrants adherence to efficient systems of law. Correctly-balanced rules help increase long-term benefits (like safety and security) that would otherwise be unattainable without a system of rules. It is this rationale that also underpins international treaty-making. Today, the current absence of nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction in outer space attests to the bargain struck in the Outer Space Treaty being a successful one, where security (and the liberty and freedom possible with security) were furthered by the mutual exchange of restrictions that states placed upon themselves. The more than 50 years of peaceful uses of outer space, including cooperation between states who remain rivals elsewhere, are the rich long-term gains resulting from the Outer Space Treaty.

#### Space war goes nuclear.

Johnson-Freese 17 Joan Johnson-Freese, Professor and chair of space science and technology @ Naval War College, 17, Space Warfare in the 21st Century, Routledge, ISBN 978131552917, p 18-20.

Space warfare runs two untenable risks: the creation of destructive debris and escalation to terrestrial, even nuclear, warfare. Kinetic warfare in space creates debris traveling at a speed of more than 17,000 miles per hour, which then in itself becomes a destructive weapon if it hits another object—even potentially triggering the so-called Kessler Syndrome,86 exaggerated for dramatic effect in the movie Gravity. Ironically, both China and the United States learned the negative lessons of debris creation the hard way. In 1985, the United States tested a miniature homing vehicle (MHV) ASAT launched from an F-15 aircraft. The MHV intercepted and destroyed a defunct US satellite at an altitude of approximately 250 miles. It took almost 17 years for the debris resulting from that test to be fully eliminated by conflagration re-entering the Earth’s atmosphere or being consumed by frictional forces, though no fragment had any adverse consequences to another satellite—in particular, no collisions. China irresponsibly tested a direct-ascent ASAT in 2007, destroying one if its defunct satellites. That test was at an altitude almost twice that of the 1985 US test. The debris created by the impact added 25 percent to the debris total in low Earth orbit87 and will dissipate through the low Earth orbit, heavily populated with satellites, for decades, perhaps centuries, to come. Perhaps most ironically, because of superior US debris-tracking capabilities, the United States—even though not required to do so—has on more than one occasion warned China that it needed to maneuver one of its satellites to avoid a collision with debris China itself had likely created.88 In 2013, a piece of Chinese space junk from the 2007 ASAT test collided with a Russian laser ranging nanosatellite called BLITS, creating still more debris.89 The broader point is that all nations have a compelling common interest in avoiding the massive increase in space debris that would be created by a substantial ASAT conflict. Gen. Hyten has said that not creating debris is “the one limiting factor” to space war. “Whatever you do,” he warns, “don’t create debris.”90 While that might appear an obvious “limiting factor,” preparing to fight its way through a debris cloud had been a Pentagon consideration in the past. Now, however, sustaining the space environment has been incorporated into Pentagon space goals. Beyond debris creation, MacDonald points out that as China becomes more militarily capable in space and there is more symmetry between the countries, other risks are created – specifically, escalation. That is, the United States could threaten to attack not just Chinese space assets, but also ground-based assets, including ASAT command-and-control centers and other military capabilities. But such actions, which would involve attacking Chinese soil and likely causing substantial direct casualties, would politically weigh much heavier than the U.S. loss of space hardware, and thus might climb the escalatory ladder to a more damaging war that both sides would probably want to avoid.91 MacDonald isn’t alone in concerns about escalation. Secure World Foundation analyst Victoria Samson has also voiced apprehension regarding US rhetoric that does not distinguish between actions against unclassified and classified US satellites, stating that “things can escalate pretty quickly should we come into a time of hostility.”92 Theresa Hitchens explained the most frightening, but not implausible, risk of space war escalation in a 2012 Time magazine interview. Say you have a crisis between two nuclear-armed, space-faring countries, Nation A and Nation B, which have a long-standing border dispute. Nation A, with its satellite capability, sees that Nation B is mobilizing troops and opening up military depots in a region where things are very tense already, on the tipping point. Nation A thinks: “That’s it, they’re going to attack.” So it might decide to pre-emptively strike the communications satellite used by Nation B to slow down its ability to move toward the border and give itself time to fortify. Say this happens and Nation B has no use of satellites for 12 hours, the time it takes it to get another satellite into position. What does Nation B do? It’s blind, it’s deaf, it’s thinking all this time that it’s about to be overwhelmed by an invasion or even nuked. This is possibly a real crisis escalation situation; something similar has been played out in U.S. Air Force war games, a scenario-planning exercise practiced by the U.S. military. The first game involving anti-satellite weapons stopped in five minutes because it went nuclear – bam. Nation B nuked Nation A. This is not a far-out, “The sky’s falling in!” concern, it is something that has been played out over and over again in the gaming of these things, and I have real fears about it.93 While escalation to a nuclear exchange may seem unthinkable, in war games conducted by the military, nuclear weapons are treated as just another warfighting weapon. Morgan also voiced concerns about escalation generally and nuclear escalation specifically in the 2010 RAND report, stating: The adversary would also likely be deterred from damaging U.S. satellite early-warning system (SEWS) assets to avoid risking inadvertent escalation to the nuclear threshold, but that firebreak would almost certainly collapse with the conclusion that such escalation is inevitable and that it is in the adversary’s interest to launch a preemptive nuclear strike.94

# Case

### 1NC---AT: Solvency

#### The activity that happens on lunar heritage sites is tourism – that isn’t appropriation.

#### Appropriation means permanent control over a region of space.

Trapp 13, Timothy Justin. "Taking up Space by Any Other Means: Coming to Terms with Nonappropriation Article of the Outer Space Treaty." U. Ill. L. Rev. (2013): 1681. (JD Candidate at UIUC Law School)//Re-cut by Elmer

The issues presented in relation to the nonappropriation article of the Outer Space Treaty should be clear.214 The ITU has, quite blatantly, created something akin to “property interests in outer space.”215 It allows nations to exclude others from their orbital slots, even when the nation is not currently using that slot.216 This is directly in line with at least one definition of outer-space appropriation.217

[\*\*Start Footnote 217\*\*Id. at 236 (“Appropriation of outer space, therefore, is ‘the exercise of exclusive control or exclusive use’ with a sense of permanence, which limits other nations’ access to it.”) (quoting Milton L. Smith, The Role of the ITU in the Development of Space Law, 17 ANNALS AIR & SPACE L. 157, 165 (1992)). \*\*End Footnote 217\*\*]

The ITU even allows nations with unused slots to devise them to other entities, creating a market for the property rights set up by this regulation.218 In some aspects, this seems to effect exactly what those signatory nations of the Bogotá Declaration were try3ing to accomplish, albeit through different means.219

#### Space Tourism is explicitly temporary.

Hall et Al 15, Colin Michael, Stefan Gössling, and Daniel Scott, eds. The Routledge handbook of tourism and sustainability. Vol. 922. Abingdon: Routledge, 2015. (C. Michael Hall is currently Professor (Ahurei) in Marketing and Tourism in the Department of Management, Marketing & Entrepreneurship, School of Business, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand, having joined the department in 2007. He is also currently Visiting Professor and Docent in Geography, University of Oulu, Finland; Visiting Professor in tourism, School of Business & Economics, Linneaus University, Kalmar, Sweden)//Elmer

Space tourism is the temporary movement of people for non-military and scientific reasons beyond the Earth’s atmosphere. The Kármán line, at an altitude of 100 km (62 miles) above sea level, is conventionally used as the start of outer space for regulatory purposes, such as the 1967 UN Outer Space Treaty.

### AT Fessl

#### Their own ev concedes tons of alt causes – we read blue

Fessl 19 Sophie Fessl 7-10-2019 “Should the Moon Landing Site Be a National Historic Landmark?” <https://daily.jstor.org/should-the-moon-landing-site-be-a-national-historic-landmark/> (PhD King’s College London, BA Oxford)//Elmer

When Neil Armstrong set foot on the moon on July 20, 1969, the pictures sent to Earth captured a historical moment: It was the first time that any human set foot on another body in our solar system. Fifty years later, experts are debating how to preserve humankind’s first steps beyond Earth. Could a National Park on the moon be the solution to saving Armstrong’s bootprints for future archaeologists? Flags, rovers, laser-reflecting mirrors, footprint—these are just a few of the dozens of artifacts and features that bear witness to our exploration of the moon. Archaeologists argue that these objects are a record to trace the development of humans in space. “Surely, those footprints are as important as those left by hominids at Laetoli, Tanzania, in the story of human development,” the anthropologist P.J. Capelotti wrote in Archaeology. While the oldest then known examples of hominins walking on two feet were cemented in ash 3.6 million years ago, “those at Tranquility Base could be swept away with a casual brush of a space tourist’s hand.” Fragile Traces Just how fragile humankind’s lunar traces are was seen already during Apollo 12. On November 19, 1969, Charles “Pete” Conrad and Alan Bean manually landed their lunar module in the moon’s Ocean of Storms, 200 meters from the unmanned probe Surveyor 3, which was left sitting on the moon’s surface two years earlier, in 1967. The next day, Conrad and Bean hopped to Surveyor 3. As they approached the spacecraft, they were surprised: The spacecraft, originally bright white, had turned light brown. It was covered in a fine layer of moon dust, likely kicked up by their landing. Harsh ultraviolet light has likely bleached the U.S. flag bright white. Without Apollo 12 upsetting the moon dust, Surveyor 3 would likely have remained stark white. Unlike Earth, the moon has no wind that carries away the dust, no rain to corrode materials, and no plate tectonic activity to pull sites on the surface back into the moon. But the moon’s thin atmosphere also means that solar wind particles bombard the lunar surface, and harsh ultraviolet light has likely bleached the U.S. flag bright white. The astronauts’ first bootprints will likely be on the moon for a long time, and will almost certainly still be there when humans next visit—unless, by tragic coincidence, a meteorite hits them first. Had LunaCorp not abandoned the idea in the early 2000s, the company’s plan to send a robot to visit the most famous sites of moon exploration could have done a lot of damage. And with Jeff Bezos’ recent unveiling of a mock-up of the lunar lander Blue Moon, it is only a matter of time before corporate adventurers and space tourists reach the moon. Historians and archaeologists are keen to avoid lunar looting. Roger Launius, senior curator of space history at the National Air and Space Museum in Washington, D.C., warned: “What we don’t want to happen is what happened in Antarctica at Scott’s hut. People took souvenirs, and nothing was done to try to preserve those until fairly late in the game.” On the other hand, there is a legitimate scientific interest in investigating how the equipment that’s on the moon was affected by a decades-long stay there.

### AT Warming

#### No impact – species adaptation and resilience

Hart 15 – emeritus professor of international affairs at the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs at Carleton University in Ottawa, Canada

(Michael, former official in Canada’s Department of Foreign Affairs, former Fulbright-Woodrow Wilson Center Visiting Research, former Scholar-in-Residence in the School of International Service and a Senior Fellow in the Center for North American Studies at American University in Washington, MA from the University of Toronto, author, editor, or co-editor of more than a dozen books, “Hubris: The Troubling Science, Economics, and Politics of Climate Change”, google books)//cmr

As already noted, the IPCC scenarios themselves **are wildly alarmist**, not only on the basic science but also on the **underlying** economic **assumptions**, which in turn drive the alarmist impacts. The result **cannot withstand critical analysis**. Economists Ian Castles and David Henderson, for example, show the extent to which the analysis is driven by the desire to reach predetermined outcomes.50 Other economists have similarly wondered what purpose was served by pursuing such unrealistic scenarios. It is hard to credit the defense put forward by Mike Hulme, one of the creators of the scenarios, that the IPCC is not engaged in forecasting the future but in creating “plausible” story lines of what might happen under various scenarios.51 Each **scare scenario** is based on linear projections without **any reference to technological developments or adaptation**. If, on a similar linear basis, our Victorian ancestors in the UK, worried about rapid urbanization and population growth in London, had made similar projections, they would have pointed to the looming crisis arising from reliance on horse-drawn carriages and omnibuses; they would have concluded that by the middle of the 20th century, London would be knee-deep in horse manure, and all of the southern counties would be required to grow the oats and hay to feed and bed the required number of horses. Technology progressed and London adapted. **Why should the rest of humanity not be able to do likewise** in the face of a trivial rise in temperature over the course of **more than a century**? The work on physical impacts is **equally over the top**. All the scenarios assume **only negative impacts**, ignore the reality of **adaptation**, and attribute **any and all things bad** to global warming. Assuming the GHG theory to be correct means that its impact would be most evident at night and during the winter in reducing atmospheric heat loss to outer space.52 It would have greater impact in increasing minimum temperatures than in increasing maximum temperatures. Secondary studies, however, generally **ignore this facet** of the hypothesis. The IPCC believes that a warmer world will harm human health due, for example, to increased disease, malnutrition, heat-waves, floods, storms, and cardiovascular incidents. As already noted **there is no basis for the claim about severe-weather-related threats or malnutrition**. The claim about heat-related deaths gained a boost during the summer of 2003 because of the tragedy of some 15,000 alleged heat-related deaths in France as elderly people stayed behind in city apartments without air conditioning while their children enjoyed the heat at the sea shore during the August vacation. Epidemiological studies of so-called "excess" deaths resulting from heat waves are abused to get the desired results. Similar studies of the impact of cold spells show that they are far more lethal than heat waves and that it is much easier to adapt to heat than to cold.53 More fundamentally, this, like most of the alarmist literature, ignores the basics of the AGW hypothesis: the world will not see an exponential increase in summer, daytime heat (and thus more heat waves), but a decrease in night-time and winter cooling, particularly at higher latitudes and altitudes. Based on the AGW hypothesis, Canada, China, Korea, Northern Europe, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Chile, and Argentina will see warmer winters and warmer nights. There are clear benefits to such a development, even if there may also be problems, but the AGW industry tends to ignore the positive aspects of their alarmist scenarios. The feared spread of malaria, a much repeated claim, is largely unrelated to climate. Malaria’s worst recorded outbreak **was in Siberia long before there was any discussion of AGW**. Similarly, the building of the Rideau Canal in Ottawa in the 1820s was severely hampered by outbreaks of malaria due to the proximity of mosquito-infested wetlands in the area. Malaria remains widespread in tropical countries today in part because of the UN’s lengthy embargo on the use of DDT, the legacy of an earlier alarmist disaster. Temperature is but one factor, and a minor one at that, in the multiple factors that affect the rise or decline in the presence of disease-spreading mosquitoes. Wealthier western countries have pursued public health strategies that have reduced the incidence of the dis- ease in their countries. Entomologist Paul Reiter, widely recognized as the leading specialist on malaria vectors and a contributor to some of the early work of the IPCC, was aghast to learn how his careful and systematic analysis of the potential impacts had been twisted in ways that he could not endorse. In a recent paper, he concludes: “Simplistic reasoning on the future prevalence of malaria is ill-founded; malaria is not limited by climate in most temperate regions, nor in the tropics, and in nearly all cases, ’new' malaria at high altitudes is well below the maximum altitudinal limits for transmission. Future changes in climate may alter the prevalence and incidence of the disease, but obsessive emphasis on ’global warming' as a dominant parameter is indefensible; the principal determinants are linked to ecological and societal change, politics and economics.”54 **Catastrophic species loss** similarly has **little foundation in past experience**.55 Even if the GHG hypothesis were to be correct, **its impact would be slow**, **providing significant scope and opportunity for adaptation**, including by ﬂora and fauna. One of the more irresponsible claims was made by a group of UK modelers who fed wildly improbable scenarios and data into their computers and produced the much-touted claim of massive species loss by the end of the century. There are literally **thousands of websites** **devoted to spreading alarm about species loss** and biodiversity. Global warming is **but one of many claimed human threats to the planet’s biodiversity**. The claims, fortunately, are largely hype, based on computer models and the estimate by Harvard naturalist Edward O. Wilson that 27,000 to 100,000 species are lost annually - a figure he advanced purely hypothetically but which has become one of the most persistent of environmental urban myths. The fact is that scientists **have no idea of the extent of the world's ﬂora and fauna**, with estimates ranging from five million to 100 million species, and that there are no reliable data about the rate of loss. By some estimates, 95 percent of the species that ever existed have been lost over the eons, most before humans became major players in altering their environment. A much more credible estimate of recent species loss comes from a surprising source, the UN Environmental Program. It reports that known **species loss is slowing reaching its lowest level in 500 years** in the last three decades of the 20th century, with some 20 reported extinctions despite increasing pressure on the biosphere from growing human population and industrialization.57 The alarmist community has also introduced the scientifically unknown concept of "locally extinct,” often meaning little more than that a species of plant or animal has responded to adverse conditions by moving to more hospitable circumstances, e.g., birds or butterflies becoming more numerous north of their range and disappearing at its extreme southern extent. Idso et al. conclude: “Many species have shown the ability to **adapt rapidly to changes in climate**. Claims that global warming threatens large numbers of species with **extinction** typically rest on a false definition of extinction (the loss of a particular population rather than en- tire species) and **speculation rather than real-world evidence**. The world’s species have proven **very resilient**, having survived past natural climate cycles that involved much greater warming and higher C02 concentrations than exist today or are likely to exist in the coming centuries?”

#### Data not key to solve warming – and it’s not used anwyays

Starr 14 - psychologist, journalist, and professor emeritus at the City University of New York, Brooklyn College (Bernard, “Our Oceans Are Dying: Mobilizing an Indifferent Public to Confront This Crisis,” Huffington Post, 6-27-14, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/bernard-starr/our-oceans-are-dying\_b\_5533322.html)

After an eighteen-month investigation, the Commission, made up of former heads of state, government officials, and prominent business leaders concluded that our oceans are dying from climate change, pollution, and over-fishing. The Commission proposes an eight point program to rescue the oceans over the next five years. Why should we be concerned? José María Figueres, Co-chair of the Commission and former president of Costa Rica, has summed up the dire situation with these words: "The ocean provides 50 percent of our oxygen and fixes 25 percent of global carbon emissions. Our food chain begins in that 70 percent of the planet." He added that "a healthy ocean is key to our well-being, and we need to reverse its degradation." He warned: "Unless we turn the tide on ocean decline within five years, the international community should consider turning the high seas into an off-limits regeneration zone until its condition is restored." A Commission video states the crisis even more starkly: "No ocean, no us!" In his brief talk at the reception, David Miliband, also co-chair of the Ocean Commission and former UK Foreign Secretary, urged politicians, scientists, journalists, and ordinary citizens to rally behind the salvation of our oceans and the planet -- and to get the message out to others. Will getting the message out turn the tide in the battle to save the planet? I doubt it. **We are swimming in information and messages**. Earlier the this year leading scientists declared that we are fast approaching the critical point of no return for climate change -- a point with predictable devastating consequences. But **who is listening?** The public continues to be **frighteningly indifferent**. Who among the public is willing to place the salvation of the planet over immediate personal concerns? That question was dramatically called to my attention recently when I presented a list of critical issues to a group of seniors enrolled in a life-long learning program and asked them which one they would place first. The list included: terrorism and national defense, global warming, jobs, vanishing icebergs, protecting Social Security, income inequality, ocean pollution, sustaining Medicare, protecting the Amazon rain forests, reducing fossil fuel emissions, regulating Wall Street and the banks, stopping fracking (shale gas drilling), protecting wildlife (elephants, lions, whales, etc.), eliminating genetically modified foods (GMOs), campaign finance reform, free college education for all, national healthcare (Medicare for all). I was particularly interested in the seniors' answers since popular wisdom says that seniors are more concerned than other age groups with the welfare of children, grandchildren, and future generations. And no issue is more vital for the well-being of future generations than the viability of life on the planet. Psychologist Erik Erikson called this concern of older adults "generativity." But the seniors defied conventional wisdom. Jobs, Social Security, and income inequality topped their listings. Only one person, toward the end of the discussion, cited climate change -- and his response seemed almost gratuitous in recognition that we were about to screen a documentary on the melting of icebergs. Perhaps I should not have been surprised. Politicians avoid talking about environmental issues for fear of losing favor with their constituents, who are clamoring for jobs, mortgage relief, and financial security. During the 2012 presidential debates between Barack Obama and Mitt Romney environmental issues took a far **back** seat; in fact, they were barely mentioned. Both candidates knew instinctively that in the throes of an economic crisis placing the salvation of the planet high on the national agenda would not generate votes. It might even take away votes from people who feared the candidate would be indifferent to their personal struggles. So where does this leave us? If more environmental studies and more alarming news will not mobilize leaders and the public for an all-out commitment to the preservation of our small vulnerable corner of the universe, what will? Perhaps we need to shift our focus from information to changing human behavior. Let's enlist leading behavioral scientists and psychological associations to address how to awaken the public to the urgency of protecting the planet. Let's launch a campaign to make this the number-one priority. And let's adopt these mantras: No planet, no jobs; no planet, no Social Security; no planet, no mortgages; no planet, no corporate bonus packages. No planet, no us.

### Prolif

#### No impact to prolif

--aggression is rare, only in states with severe territorial threats

--most likely is expansion of existing disputes, but that has modest empirical effect

--accidents are disproven by seven decades of previous proliferation

--examples of accidents are all correlated with compellance, not prolif

--terrorism hasn’t happened, despite predictions

--no state would share weapons with non-state actors given obvious attribution

Dr. Jonas **Schneider 20**, Senior Researcher at the Center for Security Studies, Former Post-​Doctoral Fellowship at the German Institute for International and Security Affairs, PhD in Political Science from the University of Kiel, Former Research Associate at the Institute for Security Policy at the University of Kiel, “Nuclear Proliferation and International Stability”, in Understanding Global Politics: Actors And Themes In International Affairs, Ed. Larres and Wittlinger, p. 418-419

Subsequent research has detailed the conditions under which new nuclear powers adopt these courses of action. Bell (2016) has argued that only those **few** new nuclear states who face **severe territorial threats**, such as Pakistan, opt for **aggress**ion, using their nuclear weapons as shields to deter nuclear and extensive conventional retaliation. Similarly drawing on Pakistan’s increased conflict propensity following its nuclear acquisition, Kapur’s (2007) research suggests that it is the **rare** combination of revisionist ambitions and conventional inferiority that leads new nuclear powers to pursue aggressive military policies toward their rivals. Importantly, while they offer different explanations, the two **studies concur** that aggression is a **fairly unlikely** effect of nuclear acquisition.

Meanwhile, according to Bell (2016), new nuclear states undertake an expansion of their foreign policy interests if their territory is not threatened and their relative material power is rising. Historically, such **expansions** have been **more** common than **aggression**: upon acquiring nuclear weapons, the US, South Africa, Israel and the Soviet Union all initiated several militarised disputes targeting states with whom they had no previous conflict (Bell and Miller, 2015: online appendix). Despite the mostly **low intensity** of these disputes, such **expansive** conflict behaviour can hardly be considered stabilising. Overall, then, new nuclear states seem to have a **moderately** destabilising influence on world politics: they initiate new disputes and take greater risks. At the same time, however, acquiring nuclear weapons **rarely** facilitates **severe** aggression.

Reconsidering nuclear accidents and nuclear terrorism

The notion that the spread of nuclear weapons would someday lead to tragic nuclear **accidents** or even nuclear **terrorism** has long been among proliferation pessimists’ foremost concerns. However, as reliable datasets on all (attempted) nuclear terrorism plots and on nuclear safety incidents in all nuclear states and proliferators have proved elusive, **empirical** scholarship has **not kept pace** with **theoretical** work. Hence, research has been limited to deductive analyses, buttressed by empirical illustrations. Even so, the **more sophisticated** of those **studies** have called the **pessimists**’ claims into question.

For instance, Cohen (2016, pp. 432–434) revealed that the vast majority of the gravest nuclear accidents that Sagan (1993, p. 9) points to as support for his logic occurred during global crises in 19**62** or 19**73**, when leaders sought to leverage their nuclear arsenals for **coercive bargaining**. It was, in other words, **not** organisational pathologies that raised the specter of accidental nuclear war, as Sagan holds, but rather the deliberate attempts at nuclear compellence. These accidents, then, represent the actual ‘effects’ of nuclear compellence: while the compellent threats did not affect the trajectory of either crises (Sechser and Fuhrmann, 2017, pp. 207, 220–224), they led to precarious nuclear safety incidents.

Other critics have rightly pointed out that, **seven decades** **in**to the nuclear age, the fact – however fortunate it is – that the world has **still no**t experienced a catastrophic fatal nuclear accident should **give proliferation pessimists pause** (Sechser, 2013, pp. 184–186). Obviously, the **bounded rationality** of such organisations alone does **not** make tragic nuclear accidents **nearly as likely** as the pessimists contend. Their fear, hence, seems to be **overstated**.

The **same** must probably be said about nuclear **terror**ism. Determinate predictions that a terrorist attack involving nuclear weapons was bound to occur **soon** (Allison, 2004, p. 15; Graham, 2008, p. VI) have **come and gone** without **anything** happening. Sceptical experts have argued that this outcome is **not surprising** at all, given the **formidable practical obstacles** such a terrorist scheme would encounter (Levi, 2009). Moreover, to the extent that fissile materials from nuclear weapons can now be **traced** back to specific state arsenals, the idea that a nuclear power could **willingly share** its arsenal with terrorists and hope to remain anonymous has been **challenged** as **lacking plausibility** (Lieber and Press, 2013).