### Water Shortage DA

#### Climate change makes water shortages inevitable – that causes hydro-political conflict escalation which goes nuclear

Harvey 8/17 [(Fiona, the Guardian's environment correspondent, won the Foreign Press Association award for Environment Story of the Year and the British Environment and Media Awards journalist of the year) “Global water crisis will intensify with climate breakdown, says report,” The Guardian, 8/17/2021] JL

Mark’s words should be a call to attention, and a call to action. The plight of farmers in Australia illustrates a larger reality: As planetary temperatures continue to increase and rainfall patterns shift due to human-caused climate disruption, our ability to grow crops and have enough drinking water will become increasingly challenged, and the outlook is only going to worsen.

The most recent United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report warned of increasingly intense droughts and mass water shortages around large swaths of the globe.

But even more conservative organizations have been sounding the alarm. “Water insecurity could multiply the risk of conflict,” warns one of the World Bank’s reports on the issue. “Food price spikes caused by droughts can inflame latent conflicts and drive migration. Where economic growth is impacted by rainfall, episodes of droughts and floods have generated waves of migration and spikes in violence within countries.”

Meanwhile, a study published in the journal Global Environmental Change, looked at how “hydro-political issues” — including tensions and potential conflicts — could play out in countries expected to experience water shortages coupled with high populations and pre-existing geopolitical tensions.

The study warned that these factors could combine to increase the likelihood of water-related tensions — potentially escalating into armed conflict in cross-boundary river basins in places around the world by 74.9 to 95 percent. This means that in some places conflict is practically guaranteed.

These areas include regions situated around primary rivers in Asia and North Africa. Noted rivers include the Tigris and Euphrates, the Indus, the Nile, and the Ganges-Brahmaputra.

Consider the fact that 11 countries share the Nile River basin: Egypt, Burundi, Kenya, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Uganda, Rwanda, Sudan, South Sudan, Tanzania and the Democratic Republic of Congo. All told, more than 300 million people already live in these countries, — a number that is projected to double in the coming decades, while the amount of available water will continue to shrink due to climate change.

For those in the US thinking these potential conflicts will only occur in distant lands — think again. The study also warned of a very high chance of these “hydro-political interactions” in portions of the southwestern US and northern Mexico, around the Colorado River.

Potential tensions are particularly worrisome in India and Pakistan, which are already rivals when it comes to water resources. For now, these two countries have an agreement, albeit a strained one, over the Indus River and the sharing of its water, by way of the 1960 Indus Water Treaty.

However, water claims have been central to their ongoing, burning dispute over the Kashmir region, a flashpoint area there for more than 60 years and counting.

The aforementioned treaty is now more strained than ever, as Pakistan accuses India of limiting its water supply and violating the treaty by placing dams over various rivers that flow from Kashmir into Pakistan.

In fact, a 2018 report from the International Monetary Fund ranked Pakistan third among countries facing severe water shortages. This is largely due to the rapid melting of glaciers in the Himalaya that are the source of much of the water for the Indus.

To provide an idea of how quickly water resources are diminishing in both countries, statistics from Pakistan’s Islamabad Chamber of Commerce and Industry from 2018 show that water availability (per capita in cubic meters per year) shrank from 5,260 in 1951, to 940 in 2015, and are projected to shrink to 860 by just 2025.

In India, the crisis is hardly better. According to that country’s Ministry of Statistics (2016) and the Indian Ministry of Water Resources (2010), the per capita available water in cubic meters per year was 5,177 in 1951, and 1,474 in 2015, and is projected to shrink to 1,341 in 2025.

Both of these countries are nuclear powers. Given the dire projections of water availability as climate change progresses, nightmare scenarios of water wars that could spark nuclear exchanges are now becoming possible.

#### Asteroid mining solves water access – only NEOs are sufficiently proximate and hydrated – independently, storing launch fuel on asteroids reduces space debris – turns case

Tillman 19 [(Nola Taylor, has been published in Astronomy, Sky & Telescope, Scientific American, New Scientist, Science News (AAS), Space.com, and Astrobiology magazine, BA in Astrophysics) “Tons of Water in Asteroids Could Fuel Satellites, Space Exploration,” Space, 9/29/2019] JL

When it comes to mining space for water, the best target may not be the moon: Entrepreneurs' richest options are likely to be asteroids that are larger and closer to Earth.

A recent study suggested that roughly 1,000 water-rich, or hydrated, asteroids near our planet are easier to reach than the lunar surface is. While most of these space rocks are only a few feet in size, more than 25 of them should be large enough to each provide significant water. Altogether, the water locked in these asteroids should be enough to fill somewhere around 320,000 Olympics-size swimming pools — significantly more than the amount of water locked up at the lunar poles, the new research suggested.

Because asteroids are small, they have less gravity than Earth or the moon do, which makes them easier destinations to land on and lift off from. If engineers can figure out how to mine water from these space rocks, they could produce a source of ready fuel in space that would allow spacecraft designers to build refuelable models for the next generation of satellites. Asteroid mining could also fuel human exploration, saving the expense of launching fuel from Earth. In both cases, would-be space-rock miners will need to figure out how to free the water trapped in hydrated minerals on these asteroids.

"Most of the hydrated material in the near-Earth population is contained in the largest few hydrated objects," Andrew Rivkin, an asteroid researcher at Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Research Laboratory in Maryland, told Space.com. Rivkin is the lead author on the paper, which estimated that near Earth asteroids could contain more easily accessible water than the lunar poles.

According to the United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs, more than 5,200 of the objects launched into space are still in orbit today. While some continue to function, the bulk of them buzz uselessly over our heads every day. They carry fuel on board, and when they run out, they are either lowered into destructive orbits or left to become space junk, useless debris with the potential to cause enormous problems for working satellites. Refueling satellites in space could change that model, replacing it with long-lived, productive orbiters.

"It's easier to bring fuel from asteroids to geosynchronous orbit than from the surface of the Earth," Rivkin said. "If such a supply line could be established, it could make asteroid mining very profitable."

Hunting for space water from the surface of the Earth is challenging because the planet's atmosphere blocks the wavelength of light where water can be observed. The asteroid warming as it draws closer to the sun can also complicate measurements.

Instead, Rivkin and his colleagues turned to a class of space rocks called Ch asteroids. Although these asteroids don't directly exhibit a watery fingerprint, they carry the telltale signal of oxidized iron seen only on asteroids with signatures of water-rich minerals, which means the authors felt confident assuming that all Ch asteroids carry this rocky water.

Based on meteorite falls, a previous study estimated that Ch asteroids could make up nearly 10% of the near-Earth objects (NEOs). With this information, the researchers determined that there are between 26 and 80 such objects that are hydrated and larger than 0.62 miles (1 km) across.

Right now, only three NEOs have been classified as Ch asteroids, although others have been spotted in the asteroid belt. Most NEOs are discovered and observed at wavelengths too short to reveal the iron band that marks the class. Carbon-rich asteroids, which include Ch asteroids and other flavors, are also darker than the more common stony asteroids, making them more challenging to observe.

Although Ch asteroids definitely contain water-rich minerals, that doesn’t necessarily mean that they will always be the best bet for space mining. It comes down to risk. Would an asteroid-mining company rather visit a smaller asteroid that definitely has a moderate amount of water, or a larger one that could yield a larger payday but could also come up dry?

"Whether getting sure things with no false positives, like the Ch asteroids, is more important or if a greater range of possibilities is acceptable with the understanding that some asteroids will be duds is something the miners will have to decide," Rivkin said.

In addition to estimating the number of large, water-rich asteroids might be available, the study also found that as many as 1,050 smaller objects, roughly 300 feet (100 meters) across, may also linger near Earth. Their small bulk will make them easier to mine because their low gravity will require less fuel to escape from, but they will produce less water overall, and Rivkin expects that the handful of larger space rocks will be the first targets.

"It seems likely that the plan for these companies will be to find the largest accessible asteroid with mineable material with the expectation that it will be more cost-effective than chasing down a large number of smaller objects," Rivkin said. "How 'accessible' and 'mineable material' and 'cost-effective' are defined by each company is to be seen."

## Solar DA

#### Space based solar power is coming now – but it depends on private actors, and the aff

Kaplan 21 [Spencer Kaplan, 7-26-2021, "Op-ed," SpaceNews, <https://spacenews.com/op-ed-its-time-to-seriously-consider-space-based-solar-power/> [accessed 2-7-22] lydia

Although space-based solar power (SBSP) sounds like science fiction, scientists and engineers have explored developing the futuristic technology for decades but repeatedly came to the same [conclusion](https://www.nasa.gov/pdf/716070main_Mankins_2011_PhI_SPS_Alpha.pdf): SBSP is likely technologically possible but for it to be feasible, launch costs will have to come down considerably. Now that companies like SpaceX, Blue Origin, and Rocket Lab have demonstrated re-use capabilities and launch costs are plummeting, it is time to think seriously and boldly about the development of SBSP. It is difficult to overstate the benefits of SBSP. For one, it could eventually provide inexhaustible clean energy to civilians because SBSP produces no harmful byproducts and uses solar radiation as its fuel. The United States could also use SBSP to create a dynamic national energy system modeled after the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. If the United States had a national SBSP constellation when Texas experienced widespread outages in February, the federal government could have supplied emergency power to civilians instantly. Scientists and engineers have even [proposed](https://www.nasa.gov/pdf/716070main_Mankins_2011_PhI_SPS_Alpha.pdf) using SBSP to power lunar exploration and resource extraction operations in the moon’s permanently shaded regions (PSRs), where traditional solar power would be impossible to utilize. SBSP has enormous military uses as well. The military [could use](https://www.nasa.gov/pdf/716070main_Mankins_2011_PhI_SPS_Alpha.pdf) SBSP to power remote bases instead of using dangerous fuel convoys that cost up to hundreds of dollars per gallon. SBSP could also theoretically be used to power unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), allowing them to stay in the air until their components fail. Removing energy as a limiting factor in military operations stands to radically change conventional military doctrine. In recognition of the vast potential of SBSP, nations around the world have begun heavily investing in the potentially transformative technology. Japan [enacted](https://www.nasa.gov/pdf/716070main_Mankins_2011_PhI_SPS_Alpha.pdf) legislation in 2009 that requires its government to research SBSP and plans to build a 1 GW system in the 2030s. The European Union and India have also [begun](https://www.esa.int/Enabling_Support/Preparing_for_the_Future/Discovery_and_Preparation/Space-based_solar_power_seeking_ideas_to_make_it_a_reality) [considering](https://www.newindianexpress.com/states/karnataka/2018/jul/08/india-needs-to-create-solar-power-satellite-indian-space-research-organisation-1840117.html) SBSP as a potential power system for the future. No country, though, has approached China’s interest and level of investment. China has[built](https://www.uscc.gov/sites/default/files/Namrata%20Goswami%20USCC%2025%20April.pdf) the world’s first SBSP base plant and plans to build a 100 kW satellite in LEO by 2025, a 1 mW satellite in GEO by 2035, and a full, commercial satellite in 2050. Since SBSP could be a transformative technology, it is reasonable to ask why the United States is not investing heavily in SBSP. In fairness, the United States has launched a few research projects like the Naval Research Laboratory’s (NRL)[Lectenna](https://www.nrl.navy.mil/Careers/STEM/LEctenna-Challenge/), [Photovoltaic Radio-frequency Antenna Module](https://www.nrl.navy.mil/Careers/STEM/LEctenna-Challenge/) (PRAM), and [Power Transmitted Over Laser](https://www.nrl.navy.mil/Media/News/Article/2504007/researchers-transmit-energy-with-laser-in-historic-power-beaming-demonstration/) (PTROL) experiments. The Department of Defense also launched a 100 million dollar partnership with Northrop Grumman on [Space Solar Power Incremental Demonstrations and Research](https://afresearchlab.com/technology/successstories/space-power-beaming/) (SSPIDR), which aims to launch an SBSP demonstration spacecraft called Arachne in 2024. Still, though, the United States lacks a clear plan for SBSP and is dangerously at risk of falling behind its competitors. To position itself well for the future, the United States should begin treating space-based solar power like the groundbreaking technology that it could be. The government could start by naming a point organization to coordinate and lead SBSP research. Naming a lead organization will give SBSP a congressional “cheerleader” to attract federal funding while also clarifying domestic and international regulatory responsibilities. The United States should also engage the private sector by subsidizing research and development of SBSP. As it stands, SBSP is likely viewed as too risky for robust private investment, but if the government shouldered some of the cost, as it does with other forms of green energy, the private sector might be more willing to develop SBSP capabilities.

#### It solves warming

Ravisetti 21 [Monisha Ravisetti, 11-8-2021, "Harvesting energy with space solar panels could power the Earth 24/7," CNET, <https://www.cnet.com/news/harvesting-energy-with-space-solar-panels-could-power-the-earth-247/> [accessed 2-8-22] lydia

But there's a caveat to this wonderful power source. Solar panels can't collect energy at night. To work at peak efficiency, they need as much sunlight as possible. So to maximize these sun catchers' performance, researchers are toying with a plan to send them to a place where the sun never sets: outer space.

Theoretically, if a bunch of solar panels were blasted into orbit, they'd soak up the sun even on the foggiest days and the darkest nights, storing an enormous amount of power. If that power were wirelessly beamed down to Earth, our planet could breathe in renewable clean energy, 24/7. That would significantly reduce our carbon footprint. Against the backdrop of a worsening climate crisis, the success of space-based solar power could be more important than ever. The state of the climate is in the spotlight right now as world leaders gather in Glasgow, Scotland, for the COP26 summit, which has been called [the "world's best last chance" to get the crisis under control](https://www.cnet.com/news/cop26-kicks-off-what-is-it-and-why-is-it-the-worlds-best-last-chance-for-climate-action-glasgow-climate-change/). [CNET Science](https://www.cnet.com/topics/science/) is highlighting a few futuristic strategies intended to aid countries in cutting back on human-generated carbon emissions. Next-generation tech like space-based solar power can't solve our climate problems -- we still need to rapidly decarbonize our energy systems -- but green innovation could help achieve the goals of the Paris Agreement: Limit global warming to well below 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit) by the end of the century.  An unlimited supply of renewable energy from the sun might help us do that. From science fiction to fact For decades, space solar power has lived in the minds of science fiction lovers and scientists alike. In the early 1900s, [Russian scientist-mathematician Konstantin Tsiolkovsky](https://www.esa.int/Science_Exploration/Human_and_Robotic_Exploration/Exploration/Konstantin_Tsiolkovsky) was steadily churning out a stream of futuristic designs envisioning human tech beyond Earth. He's responsible for conjuring things like space elevators, steerable rockets and, you guessed it, [space solar power](https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA62793333&sid=googleScholar&v=2.1&it=r&linkaccess=abs&issn=03623416&p=AONE&sw=w&userGroupName=anon%7Ed5adf45d). Since Bell Labs invented the [first concrete "solar panel" in the '50s](https://www.smithsonianmag.com/sponsored/brief-history-solar-panels-180972006/), international scientists have been working to make  Tsiolkovsky's sci-fi fantasy a reality. They include [Japanese researchers](https://nextrendsasia.org/japan-pioneer-of-transferring-solar-energy-from-space-to-earth/#:~:text=Konstantin%20Tsiolkovsky%2C%20commonly%20known%20to,the%20%E2%80%9Cconquest%20of%20planets%E2%80%9D.), the [US military](https://www.space.com/x-37b-space-plane-solar-power-beaming) and a team from the California Institute of Technology [spearheading the Space Solar Power Project](https://www.spacesolar.caltech.edu/).  Space solar power "was investigated extensively in the late 1960s and the 1970s, sort of in the heyday of the Apollo program," said Michael Kelzenberg, senior research scientist on the project.  Unfortunately, due to the materials' weight and bulk, the era's technology wasn't advanced enough to cost-effectively achieve the feat. It would've been exceptionally difficult to send classic solar panels to space via a rocket without breaking the bank. "The distinctively unique and defining feature of the Caltech approach is a focus on reducing the component mass by 10 to 100 times," said Harry Atwater, the project's principal investigator. "This is essential to reducing both the manufacturing and the launch costs to make space solar power economical."

### Innovation DA

#### Space Commercialization drives Technological Innovation in the Status Quo, temper foam used in pillows and analytical tools such as emergency response gear proves it provides a unique impetus

Hampson 17 Joshua Hampson 1-25-2017 “The Future of Space Commercialization” <https://republicans-science.house.gov/sites/republicans.science.house.gov/files/documents/TheFutureofSpaceCommercializationFinal.pdf> (Security Studies Fellow at the Niskanen Center)//Elmer

The size of the space economy is far larger than many may think. In 2015 alone, the global market amounted to $323 billion. Commercial infrastructure and systems accounted for 76 percent of that 9 total, with satellite television the largest subsection at $95 billion. The global space launch market’s 10 11 share of that total came in at $6 billion dollars. It can be hard to disaggregate how space benefits 12 particular national economies, but in 2009 (the last available report), the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) estimated that commercial space transportation and enabled industries generated $208.3 billion in economic activity in the United States alone. Space is not just about 13 satellite television and global transportation; while not commercial, GPS satellites also underpin personal navigation, such as smartphone GPS use, and timing data used for Internet coordination.14 Without that data, there could be problems for a range of Internet and cloud-based services.15 There is also room for growth. The FAA has noted that while the commercial launch sector has not grown dramatically in the last decade, there are indications that there is latent demand. This 16 demand may catalyze an increase in launches and growth of the wider space economy in the next decade. The Satellite Industry Association’s 2015 report highlighted that their section of the space economy outgrew both the American and global economies. The FAA anticipates that growth to 17 continue, with expectations that small payload launch will be a particular industry driver.18 In the future, emerging space industries may contribute even more the American economy. Space tourism and resource recovery—e.g., mining on planets, moons , and asteroids—in particular may become large parts of that industry. Of course, their viability rests on a range of factors, including costs, future regulation, international problems, and assumptions about technological development. However, there is increasing optimism in these areas of economic production. But the space economy is not just about what happens in orbit, or how that alters life on the ground. The growth of this economy can also contribute to new innovations across all walks of life. Technological Innovation Innovation is generally hard to predict; some new technologies seem to come out of nowhere and others only take off when paired with a new application. It is difficult to predict the future, but it is reasonable to expect that a growing space economy would open opportunities for technological and organizational innovation. In terms of technology, the difficult environment of outer space helps incentivize progress along the margins. Because each object launched into orbit costs a significant amount of money—at the moment between $27,000 and $43,000 per pound, though that will likely drop in the future —each 19 reduction in payload size saves money or means more can be launched. At the same time, the ability to fit more capability into a smaller satellite opens outer space to actors that previously were priced out of the market. This is one of the reasons why small, affordable satellites are increasingly pursued by companies or organizations that cannot afford to launch larger traditional satellites. These small 20 satellites also provide non-traditional launchers, such as engineering students or prototypers, the opportunity to learn about satellite production and test new technologies before working on a full-sized satellite. That expansion of developers, experimenters, and testers cannot but help increase innovation opportunities. Technological developments from outer space have been applied to terrestrial life since the earliest days of space exploration. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) maintains a website that lists technologies that have spun off from such research projects. Lightweight 21 nanotubes, useful in protecting astronauts during space exploration, are now being tested for applications in emergency response gear and electrical insulation. The need for certainty about the resiliency of materials used in space led to the development of an analytics tool useful across a range of industries. Temper foam, the material used in memory-foam pillows, was developed for NASA for seat covers. As more companies pursue their own space goals, more innovations will likely come from the commercial sector. Outer space is not just a catalyst for technological development. Satellite constellations and their unique line-of-sight vantage point can provide new perspectives to old industries. Deploying satellites into low-Earth orbit, as Facebook wants to do, can connect large, previously-unreached swathes of 22 humanity to the Internet. Remote sensing technology could change how whole industries operate, such as crop monitoring, herd management, crisis response, and land evaluation, among others. 23 While satellites cannot provide all essential information for some of these industries, they can fill in some useful gaps and work as part of a wider system of tools. Space infrastructure, in helping to change how people connect and perceive Earth, could help spark innovations on the ground as well. These innovations, changes to global networks, and new opportunities could lead to wider economic growth.

#### Strong Innovation is needed to solve a multitude of societal issues

Matthews 18 Dylan Matthews 10-26-2018 “How to help people millions of years from now” <https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/26/18023366/far-future-effective-altruism-existential-risk-doing-good> (Co-founder of Vox, citing Nick Beckstead @ Rutgers University)//Re-cut by Elmer

If you care about improving human lives, you should overwhelmingly care about those quadrillions of lives rather than the comparatively small number of people alive today. The 7.6 billion people now living, after all, amount to less than 0.003 percent of the population that will live in the future. It’s reasonable to suggest that those quadrillions of future people have, accordingly, hundreds of thousands of times more moral weight than those of us living here today do. That’s the basic argument behind Nick Beckstead’s 2013 Rutgers philosophy dissertation, “On the overwhelming importance of shaping the far future.” It’s a glorious mindfuck of a thesis, not least because Beckstead shows very convincingly that this is a conclusion any plausible moral view would reach. It’s not just something that weird utilitarians have to deal with. And Beckstead, to his considerable credit, walks the walk on this. He works at the Open Philanthropy Project on grants relating to the far future and runs a charitable fund for donors who want to prioritize the far future. And arguments from him and others have turned “long-termism” into a very vibrant, important strand of the effective altruism community. But what does prioritizing the far future even mean? The most literal thing it could mean is preventing human extinction, to ensure that the species persists as long as possible. For the long-term-focused effective altruists I know, that typically means identifying concrete threats to humanity’s continued existence — like unfriendly artificial intelligence, or a pandemic, or global warming/out of control geoengineering — and engaging in activities to prevent that specific eventuality. But in a set of slides he made in 2013, Beckstead makes a compelling case that while that’s certainly part of what caring about the far future entails, approaches that address specific threats to humanity (which he calls “targeted” approaches to the far future) have to complement “broad” approaches, where instead of trying to predict what’s going to kill us all, you just generally try to keep civilization running as best it can, so that it is, as a whole, well-equipped to deal with potential extinction events in the future, not just in 2030 or 2040 but in 3500 or 95000 or even 37 million. In other words, caring about the far future doesn’t mean just paying attention to low-probability risks of total annihilation; it also means acting on pressing needs now. For example: We’re going to be better prepared to prevent extinction from AI or a supervirus or global warming if society as a whole makes a lot of scientific progress. And a significant bottleneck there is that the vast majority of humanity doesn’t get high-enough-quality education to engage in scientific research, if they want to, which reduces the **odds that we have enough trained scientists to come up with the breakthroughs** we need as a civilization to survive and thrive. So maybe one of the best things we can do for the far future is to improve school systems — here and now — to harness the group economist Raj Chetty calls “lost Einsteins” (potential innovators who are thwarted by poverty and inequality in rich countries) and, more importantly, the hundreds of millions of kids in developing countries dealing with even worse education systems than those in depressed communities in the rich world. What if living ethically for the far future means living ethically now? Beckstead mentions some other broad, or very broad, ideas (these are all his descriptions): Help make computers faster so that people everywhere can work more efficiently Change intellectual property law so that technological innovation can happen more quickly Advocate for open borders so that people from poorly governed countries can move to better-governed countries and be more productive Meta-research: improve incentives and norms in academic work to better advance human knowledge Improve education Advocate for political party X to make future people have values more like political party X ”If you look at these areas (economic growth and technological progress, access to information, individual capability, social coordination, motives) a lot of everyday good works contribute,” Beckstead writes. “An implication of this is that a lot of everyday good works are good from a broad perspective, even though hardly anyone thinks explicitly in terms of far future standards.” Look at those examples again: It’s just a list of what normal altruistically motivated people, not effective altruism folks, generally do. Charities in the US love talking about the lost opportunities for innovation that poverty creates. Lots of smart people who want to make a difference become scientists, or try to work as teachers or on improving education policy, and lord knows there are plenty of people who become political party operatives out of a conviction that the moral consequences of the party’s platform are good. All of which is to say: Maybe effective altruists aren’t that special, or at least maybe we don’t have access to that many specific and weird conclusions about how best to help the world. If the far future is what matters, and generally trying to make the world work better is among the best ways to help the far future, then effective altruism just becomes plain ol’ do-goodery.

# Case

### AT: Debris

#### 1] No Kessler syndrome.

**Mosher ’19** [Dave; September 3rd; Journalist with more than a decade of experience reporting and writing stories about space, science, and technology; Business Insider, “Satellite collisions may trigger a space-junk disaster that could end human access to orbit. Here’s How,”<https://www.usafa.edu/app/uploads/Space_and_Defense_2_3.pdf>; GR]

The Kessler syndrome plays center-stage in the movie "Gravity," in which an accidental space collision endangers a crew aboard a large space station. But Gossner said that type of a runaway space-junk catastrophe is unlikely. "Right now I don't think we're close to that," he said. "I'm not saying we couldn't get there, and I'm not saying we don't need to be smart and manage the problem. But I don't see it ever becoming, anytime soon, an unmanageable problem." There is no current system to remove old satellites or sweep up bits of debris in order to prevent a Kessler event. Instead, space debris is monitored from Earth, and new rules require satellites in low-Earth orbit be deorbited after 25 years so they don't wind up adding more space junk. "Our current plan is to manage the problem and not let it get that far," Gossner said. "I don't think that we're even close to needing to actively remove stuff. There's lots of research being done on that, and maybe some day that will happen, but I think that — at this point, and in my humble opinion — an unnecessary expense." A major part of the effort to prevent a Kessler event is the Space Surveillance Network (SSN). The project, led by the US military, uses 30 different systems around the world to identify, track, and share information about objects in space. Many objects are tracked day and night via a networkof radar observatories around the globe. Optical telescopes on the ground also keep an eye out, but they aren't always run by the government. "The commercial sector is actually putting up lots and lots of telescopes," Gossner said. The government pays for their debris-tracking services. Gossner said one major debris-tracking company is called Exoanalytic. It uses about 150 small telescopes set up around the globe to detect, track, and report space debris to the SSN. Telescopes in space track debris, too. Far less is known about them because they're likely top-secret military satellites. Objects detected by the government and companies get added to a catalog of space debris and checked against the orbits of other known bits of space junk. New orbits are calculated with supercomputers to see if there's a chance of any collisions. Diana McKissock, a flight lead with the US Air Force's 18th Space Control Squadron, helps track space debris for the SSN. She said the surveillance network issues warnings to NASA, satellite companies, and other groups with spacecraft, based on two levels of emergency: basic and advanced. The SSN issues a basic emergency report to the public three days ahead of a 1-in-10,000 chance of a collision. It then provides multiple updates per day until the risk of a collision passes. To qualify for such reporting, a rogue object must come within a certain distance of another object. In low-Earth orbit, that distance must be less than 1 kilometer (0.62 mile); farther out in deep space, where the precision of orbits is less reliable, the distance is less than 5 kilometers (3.1 miles). Advanced emergency reports help satellite providers see possible collisions much more than three days ahead. "In 2017, we provided data for 308,984 events, of which only 655 were emergency-reportable," McKissock told Business Insider in an email. Of those, 579 events were in low-Earth orbit (where it's relatively crowded with satellites).

#### 2] Alt causes to debris – small sats, meteoroids, EMPs.

Kelley, Electrical and Computer Engineering @ Cornell, et al. 12

[Michael C.; Stephanie Pancoast, Electrical and Computer Engineering @ Cornell; Sigrid Close, Aeronautics and Astronautics @ Stanford; Zhenzhen Wang, Physics and Astronomy @ UIowa: “Analysis of electromagnetic and electrostatic effects of particle impacts on spacecraft.” Elsevier Ltd. doi:10.1016/j.asr.2011.12.023]//AD

\*Hypervelocity means over 11km/s

Spacecraft are continually subject to impacts by meteoroids and space junk. The space shuttle and the International Space Station have been repeatedly hit and a space tether was severed by such an event. Such impacts can clearly have mechanical effects on spacecraft, but in recent years, evidence has arisen that electrical effects may be more important. Two types of effects are possible (Close et al., 2010). High-velocity impacts result in vaporization/ionization of the incoming particle and spacecraft material as well. This material is thought to be ejected as energetic ions that subsequently draw out electrons (Krueger, 1996; Ratcliff et al., 1997a,b). The result is that the vehicle potential initially drops sharply, rises again as the electron emission overcompensates positively, and then returns to its prior state by ambient plasma collection. These events may be intense enough to create an Electrostatic Discharge (ESD), which could damage spacecraft electronics. The expanding ions can separate from the electrons by a Debye length, after which an electric field builds up to draw out the electrons. The two plasma constituents then oscillate about each other at the plasma frequency while, at the same time, the plasma expands at the ambipolar diffusion rate. This continues until electron ion collisions are sufficient to slow the expansion process to the collisional diffusion rate. As the expansion proceeds, the plasma frequency decreases, as does the frequency of the radiation generated. This electrostatic oscillation will act as an antenna and radiate electromagnetic waves, which propagate in and around the spacecraft in a phenomenon we call an Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP..We have compared observations of high-velocity impacts on the Cassini spacecraft with the theory of Close et al. (2010). We find excellent agreement with both the vehicle potential changes and the plasma oscillations for large, low-velocity particle impacts and for small, hypervelocity particles. When applied to particle impacts on earth-orbiting satellites, our first conclusion is that very high vehicle potential changes are possible for hyper-velocity metallic impacts on spacecraft ground, which could lead to ESD failures. We also find that an Electromagnetic Pulse will be generated and radiated by such impacts.

**3] No impact to debris---the risk to spacecraft is miniscule compared to normal mission hazards**

Lawrence M. **Wein 9**, Professor & Senior Fellow at Stanford’s Center for International Security and Cooperation, “Space debris: Assessing risk and responsibility,” *Advances in Space Research*, Volume 43, 2009, pp. 1372-1390

[Translated scientific notation to % probability in brackets]

More importantly, while our numerical results mimic earlier results (Liou and Johnson, 2005; Walker and Martin, 2004) that stressed the importance of postmission deorbiting, we do not necessarily agree with the claim that the only way to prevent future problems is to remove existing large intacts from space (Liou and Johnson, 2006, 2008). The divergence between our views and those in Liou and Johnson (2006, 2008) is perhaps due to the different performance metrics used. The root causes for alarm in Liou and Johnson (2006, 2008) appear to be the growth rate of fragments and the small increase in the rate of catastrophic collisions over the next 200 years (Liou and Johnson, 2008, Fig. 2). However, the great majority of catastrophic collisions in the SOI do not involve operational spacecraft, and are hazardous only in the sense that the fragments generated from such a collision could subsequently damage or destroy operational spacecraft. Therefore, we introduced the notion of the lifetime risk of an operational spacecraft as the primary performance metric. Our model predicts that the lifetime risk is <5x10^-4 [less than .0005%] over the next two centuries, and always stays <10^-3 [less than .001%] than if there is very high (>98%) spacecraft deorbiting compliance. These risks appear to be low relative to the immense cost and considerable technological uncertainty involved in removing large objects from space, are dwarfed by the ~20% historical mission-impacting (but not necessarily mission-ending) failure rate of spacecraft (Frost and Sullivan, 2004), and could be overestimated if improved traffic management techniques lower future collision risks (Johnson, 2004). Hence, the need to bring large objects down from space does not appear to be as clear cut as suggested in Liou and Johnson (2006, 2008). Nonetheless, our model does not incorporate the possibility of intentional catastrophic collisions (ASAT tests, space wars) that could conceivably occur in the future. In addition, Fig. 5 considers only catastrophic collisions, whereas noncatastrophic intact-fragment collisions could easily disable an operational spacecraft. If the operational lifetime risk is modified to include noncatastrophic collisions with fragments >= 10cm, then the sustainable risk rises by ~50%: it increases from 2.19x10^-2 [.0219%] to 3.09x10^-2 in the base case, and increases from 4.91x10^-4 [.000491%] to 7.94x10^-4 in the full compliance case. Moreover, if fragments >= 1 cm (rather than >= 10 cm) are harmful to spacecraft (Johnson, 2004), then we (as well as other researchers) could be underestimating the risk.

#### 4] Less debris and existing guidelines solve

Lewis 15 (Hugh, Senior Lecturer in Aerospace Engineering at the University of Southampton, “Space debris, Kessler Syndrome, and the unreasonable expectation of certainty.” Room, <https://room.eu.com/article/Space_debris_Kessler_Syndrome_and_the_unreasonable_expectation_of_certainty>, Accessed 8/10/19, JMoore)

There is now widespread awareness of the space debris problem amongst policymakers, scientists, engineers and the public. Thanks to pivotal work by J.C. Liou and Nicholas Johnson in 2006 we now understand that the continued growth of the debris population is likely in the future even if all launch activity is halted. The reason for this sustained growth, and for the concern of many satellite operators who are forced to act to protect their assets, are collisions that are expected to occur between objects – satellites and rocket stages – already in orbit. In spite of several commentators warning that these collisions are just the start of a collision cascade that will render access to low Earth orbit all but impossible – a process commonly referred to as the ‘Kessler Syndrome’ after the debris scientist Donald Kessler – the reality is not likely to be on the scale of these predictions or the events depicted in the film Gravity. Indeed, results presented by the Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Committee (IADC) at the Sixth European Conference on Space Debris show an expected increase in the debris population of only 30% after 200 years with continued launch activity. Collisions are still predicted to occur, but this is far from the catastrophic scenario feared by some. Constraining the population increase to a modest level can be achieved, the IADC suggested, through widespread and good compliance with existing space debris mitigation guidelines, especially those relating to passivation (whereby all sources of stored energy on a satellite are depleted at the end of its mission) and post-mission disposal, such as de-orbiting the satellite or re-orbiting it to a graveyard orbit. Nevertheless, the anticipated growth of the debris population in spite of these robust efforts merits the investigation of additional measures to address the debris threat, according to the IADC.

#### 5] Global ADR development already exists – solves.

Zachary Keck, Wohlstetter Public Affairs Fellow at the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center, 6-17-2018, "Space Is Truly the Final Frontier (For the Next Great War)," National Interest, https://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/space-truly-the-final-frontier-the-next-great-war-26284

The first type of dual-use spacecraft—called active debris removal (ADR)—are designed to deal with the rapidly growing problem of space debris. One preliminary ADR example came from China in June 2016 when it launched the "Aolong-1" spacecraft, which was a demonstrator device. These ADR spacecraft—which are also being developed by the United States, European Union, and Russia— can retrieve debris floating in space. Then, the ADR spacecraft bring the debris down to re-enter the atmosphere, destroying it by the intense frictional heat. Alternatively, they can also instead place the debris in graveyard orbits to reduce the probability of colliding with operational satellites.

ADR spacecraft are unavoidable given the growing nature of the space debris problem. Previous estimates have suggested that starting in 2020 the world would need to remove an average of five massive objects (such as decommissioned satellites and derelict rockets) from low earth orbit (LEO) each year to deal with the problem. Others have estimated that the number is closer to ten that will need removal. However, as Chow points out, these estimates fail to consider the massive expansion in the number of LEO satellites entering space. As of August 31, 2017, only 1,071 LEO satellites were orbiting the earth. Over the next decade, however, between 14,000 and 16,000 additional LEOs are expected to be launched. This makes the space debris problem more difficult, and debris removal spacecraft that much more important.

The problem is that the same spacecraft that can remove debris can also be used as “space stalkers.” Space stalkers, as Chow previously described them, "could be placed on orbit in peacetime and maneuvered to tailgate U.S. satellites during a crisis. At a moment's notice, they could simultaneously attack multiple critical satellites from such close proximity that the United States would not have time to prevent damage." Since ADR spacecraft are designed to get close to and remove debris, they necessarily have the capability to get close to and snatch essential satellites that U.S. military relies on.

Additionally, ADR spacecraft are not the only dual-use problem. Many of the same countries developing ADR capabilities are also building maintenance spacecraft. These spacecraft—called on-orbit servicing (OOS)—also maneuver themselves to be in physical contact with satellites to perform any number of maintenance tasks. These tasks include, "high-resolution inspection; correction of some types of mechanical anomalies, such as solar array and antenna deployment malfunctions; relocation and other orbital maneuvers; installation of attachable payloads to enable upgrades or new capabilities; and refueling to extend the service life of satellites."

Once again, the issue is that these OOS spacecraft can be quickly repurposed to take out critical satellites during a crisis or conflict. In fact, these OOS spacecraft are even better space stalkers than ADR ones because they have more advanced rendezvous and robotic capabilities.

This is not some distant problem. Chow notes that the first ADR and OOS spacecraft are likely to become operational sometime in the early part of the next decade. “In effect,” he writes, “weaponization of space will happen by default in the early 2020s and beyond and will be unavoidable and irreversible.” It will only grow worse with time as more countries launch ADR and OOS spacecraft and their capabilities for rendezvous and proximity operations improve.

#### 6] --No miscalc from satellite disruptions or space dust -- empirically denied.

Mazur 12 (Jonathan Mazur, Manager Engineering at Northrop Grumman, writing in Space & Defense, from the Eisenhower Center for Space and Defense Studies. Past U.S. Actions: Redlines in Space. Space & Defense, Volume 6, Number 1, Fall 2012. https://inss.ndu.edu/Portals/97/Space\_and\_Defense\_6\_1.pdf?ver=2018-09-06-135424-147)

U.S. Reactions To Foreign Disruption Of U.S. Capabilities

In the 1970s, it was suspected that a U.S. maritime communications satellite was turned off by the Soviets when it was outside of the range of U.S. tracking stations.25 There does not appear to be any documented U.S. reaction, and I suspect there was none. In the mid-1990s, satellite hackers in Brazil began hijacking U.S. military communication satellite signals to broadcast their own information, though it took until 2009 for Brazil to crack down on the illegal activity with the support of the DoD.26 In 1998, a U.S.-German satellite known as ROSAT was rendered useless after it turned suddenly toward the sun. NASA investigators later determined the accident was possibly linked to a cyber-intrusion by Russia.

The fallout? Though there was an ongoing criminal investigation as of 2008; NASA security officials have seemed determined to publicly minimize the seriousness of the threat.27 In 2003, a signal originating from Cuba—later determined to be coming from Iranian embassy property— was jamming a U.S. communications satellite that was transmitting Voice of America programming over Iran, which was publicly referred to as an “act of war” by a U.S. official. 28 Press reporting indicates the U.S. administration was [frozen]“paralyzed” about how to cope with the jamming that continued for at least a month, even after U.S. diplomatic protests to Cuba.29 In 2005, U.S. diplomats protested to the Libyan government after two international satellites were illegally jammed disrupting American diplomatic, military, and FBI communications.30 In 2006, press reporting indicates that China hit a U.S. spy satellite with a ground-based laser. This action was acknowledged by the then director of the NRO, though the DoD remained tight lipped about the incident.31

“We’re at a point where the technology’s out there, and the capability for people to do things to our satellites is there. I’m focused on it beyond any single event.” – Air Force Space Command Commander, General Chilton, 2006 32

In 2009, a U.S. commercial Iridium communications satellite—extensively used by the DoD—was accidently destroyed by a collision with a dead Russian satellite.33 The U.S. company, Iridium, was able to minimize any loss of service by implementing a network solution within a few days.34 As of early 2011, no legal action had been taken by the company either because it is not clear who was at fault or because it might be politically problematic for the United States, which is trying to enter into bi-lateral transparency and confidence-building measures (TCBM) with Russia regarding space activities.35 Since August of 2010, North Korea has been intermittently using GPS jamming equipment, which reportedly has been interfering with U.S. and South Korean military operations and civilian use south of the North Korean border.36 Reportedly, only South Korea and the United Nations International Telecommunications Union—at the request of South Korea—have issued letters to Pyongyang demanding the cessation of disruptive communications signals in South Korea.37

It appears that the only time the U.S. military has responded with force to a disruption in U.S. space capabilities was in 2003, a few days after the start of the Iraq war.38 According to U.S. officials, Iraq was using multiple GPS jammers—which supposedly did not affect military GPS functionality. However, the U.S. military bombed the jammers anyway after a diplomatic complaint to Russia.39 The use of military force against the GPS jamming threat was possibly because the United States was already intervening in Iraq, and the bombing probably would not have occurred if the United States was not at war.

At space war

#### 1] A space race is good for ppl and encourages positive competition and innovation

#### 2] entire evidence is reliant on spacex developing weapons for pub companies – no evidence of this happening or proof it will happen – just theoretical

#### 3] You don’t solve – none of the evidence in this adv ev even talks abt what the aff does – banning private entities in space doesn’t just mean there are no weapons in space (ie things like public app as that’s how wars start bc of miliaries) – no link

#### No space war—interdependence checks AND commercial entanglement reduces the risk.

Bragg et al 18 [Principle research scientist at NSI, Inc. Lecturer in polisci @ Texas A&M, July 2018. Allison Astorino-Courtois. Robert Elder. Belinda Bragg. “Contested Space Operations, Space Defense, Deterrence, and Warfighting: Summary Findings and Integration Report,” NSI, <https://nsiteam.com/social/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Space-SMA-Integration-Report-Space-FINAL.pdf>] brett

Everyone needs space While the US may be relatively more dependent on space for national security than are other states, it is far from alone in relying on space. Nuclear armed states are dependent on space for important command and control functions, and major powers are increasingly using space for battlefield situational awareness and communications. China and Russia were identified as having significant (and fairly equal) levels of strategic risk in space (ViTTa Q16), although their regional security priorities and (to date) less spacedependent economies place them at an advantage to the US. They may, therefore, see the strategic risk of conflict is space as lower than does the US. Still, space capabilities remain a source of economic expansion and national pride for both, and their calculations of the cost of conflict involving space may include consideration of these factors. Even now, there is a general consensus that the US and other actors have more to gain from space than they have from the loss of space-based capabilities (ViTTa Q3). This suggests that, although the US is more vulnerable in the space domain than are other states, the likelihood that aggressive action against an adversary’s space assets would be reciprocated may provide a degree of security. It also creates another incentive for actors to use diplomacy and international law to reduce risk and increase transparency in the space domain.