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#### Interp: Appropriation is lawful recognition of the right to put to beneficial use

Erickson 95 [Justice ERICKSON delivered the Opinion of the Court. Matter of Bd. of Cty. Com'rs, 891 P.2d 952 (Colo. 1995).] TDI

We disagree with the water court's analysis. A conditional water right is, "a right to perfect a water right with a certain priority upon the completion with reasonable diligence of the appropriation upon which such water right is to be based." § 37-92-103(6), 15 C.R.S. (1990). Appropriation is defined as, "the application of a specified portion of the waters of the state to a beneficial use pursuant to the procedures prescribed by law...." § 37-92-103(3)(a). In Qualls, Inc. v. Berryman, 789 P.2d 1095, 1098 (Colo.1990), we said, " `A conditional water right is adjudicated by a judicial decree recognizing the existence of an uncompleted application.' ... Thus the holder of a conditional water right holds a vested right to obtain an absolute water right subject to completion of the appropriation with reasonable diligence." (citations omitted). The special concurrence in Qualls stated: Although a conditional water right has been termed vested, it is vested in the sense that if the appropriator diligently puts the water to beneficial use, the appropriator is entitled to a water right to the extent, and in the amount, actually put to beneficial use with a priority date of the original conditional decree. Id. at 1103 (Erickson, J. specially concurring) (citations omitted). A conditional water right decree does not reflect actual water usage. The extent to which a conditional decree will be perfected cannot be predicted with certainty and depends upon the completion of the requirements necessary to appropriate and put the water to a beneficial use. See, e.g., Upper Gunnison River Water Conservancy Dist. v. Board of County Comm'rs of Arapahoe, 841 P.2d 1061, 1064-65 (Colo.1992) (discussing the statutory requirement that owners or users of conditional water rights must file applications for a determination of reasonable diligence to maintain their conditional rights); Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy Dist. v. Twin Lakes Assocs., Inc., 770 P.2d 1231, 1237-38 (Colo.1989) (discussing abandonment of water rights in general); Talco, Ltd. v. Danielson, 769 P.2d 468, 472 (Colo.1989) (noting that in order to obtain a finding of diligence an applicant must prove "an intention to use the water, coupled with concrete action amounting to diligent efforts to finalize the intended appropriation.") (quoting Orchard Mesa Irrigation Dist. v. City & County of Denver, 182 Colo. 59, 65, 511 P.2d 25, 28 (1973)). The water court's interpretation of the "can and will" statute prohibits future appropriations based on unrealistically high assumptions of water utilization by holders of absolute and senior conditional water rights decrees. Applicants for new conditional water rights decrees are prevented from beneficially appropriating unused waters, and the policy of maximum beneficial use is undermined by the water court's analysis of the "can and will" statute. Although a conditional water rights decree may affect the calculation of the availability of water when the rights are exercised, it is 971\*971 difficult to predict whether, and to what extent, the appropriation will be completed. Rather than speculate about the extent to which conditional rights will be exercised, and without the assumption that conditional rights will be exercised to the decreed amount, river conditions existing at the time of the application for a conditional water rights decree should be considered to determine water availability. Present conditions provide a more accurate representation of what water is being beneficially used and what water is available for appropriation. Conditional water rights under which diversions have not been made or none are being made should not be considered in determining water availability.

#### Violation: they create a global commons which isn’t putting to beneficial use

#### Standards:

#### 1] Limits and ground: the aff interpretation explodes the topic to allow any aff about temporary use such as extraction, colonization, and exploration, which structurally alters the neg research burden because there’s a qualitative difference between appropriation of outer space and of temporary use. That alters neg ground because it means the aff can defend trivial middle grounds that go beyond just exclusive appropriation unbalancing the topic.

#### 2] Precision: court rulings say that appropriation means to purposeful use. Appropriation should not get confused with common definition because this is court ruling and is used in law which ow on precision

#### Topicality is a voting issue because topicality indicts the aff’s entire advocacy.

#### Competing interpretations: reasonability is arbitrary and causes a race to the bottom because the neg doesn’t know what constitutes a “reasonable” interp when doing prep. It also collapses to competing interps because you use offense defense to determine that reasonability is good.

#### No RVIs—T is an aff burden just like inherency. It also causes a chilling effect on legitimate topicality arguments which causes proliferation of questionably topical cases.

## 2

#### Space is an intrinsic part of India’s soft power expansion and they’re set to rapidly scale now

Sarthak Kathayat, Sarthak Kathayat is a student at Jamia Millia Islamia, India., NIICE NEPAL, 11-1-2020, "Soft Power and India’s Space Diplomacy," https://niice.org.np/archives/6420 TDI

In international relations, soft power is the ability of any country to persuade other countries to do what it wants without the use of force. According to Joseph Nye Jr., soft power is – getting others to want the outcomes that you want – co-opts people rather than coerces them. As compared to hard power, soft power takes relatively longer to built as its intangible resources develop over a long time. Soft power tends to change other party’s attitude to the end where she acts voluntarily in a way which is different to her usual behaviour. Several characteristics of the current world order like globalisation driven economic interdependence, rise of transnational actors, resurgence of nationalism in weak states, the spread of military technology and the changed nature of international political problems have significantly reduced the effectiveness of hard power strategies. The most noteworthy example of a foreign policy misadventure based solely on hard power strategies is the 2003 US invasion of Iraq. Soft power also has its own weakness. However, the ineffectiveness of soft power strategies is an exception. In longer-term, soft power strategies appear to be more effective in the contemporary world order than the hard power. One such tool of soft power is the space technology and space diplomacy. Space technology are increasingly viewed as a crucial instrument of soft power as states have now understood the direct relation between the technological feats and global prestige that follows. Expertise in rocket science puts a state on a higher pedestal than the countries who are still struggling in the domain. Moreover, expertise in rocket science ensues significant strategic implications. The output delivered has noteworthy social and economic relevance with a massive growth potential. In a broadening concept of security that encompasses other dimensions such as economic, environmental and political, Indian space programme has been distinctive and lucid in the way it simultaneously addresses the requirements of the Indian citizenry and the state collectively in all the dimensions. Despite being challenged by numerous embargoes and technology denial regimes during Cold War, Indian space programme has emerged as the most cost-effective and successful space programme in the world. India’s space programme has been a tremendous achievement for a developing country which despite being faced with many challenges used space as a crucial mechanism to lift its people out of poverty through education, social and economic programmes. With the course of time, India’s space policy has become an intrinsic part of India’s foreign policy to strengthen India’s position as a dominant power in South Asia. Indian Space Programme India’s space programme has been seen making efforts in projecting soft power which is especially evident through its new commitment to planetary exploration and human spaceflight. The Chandrayaan-1 and Mangalyaan-1 mission cleared the fact that India now looks at space as a standard of global standing. India’s soft power has witnessed a progression with an increasingly successful participation in global space economy through ISRO’s commercial arm, Antrix Corporation. India’s growing influence on the global space economy has been an indication of its changing stature in international arena. India has also been involved in capacity building initiatives. It has successfully established itself as a leader in terms of healthcare provisions through satellite-based telemedicine. India hosts the largest telemedicine network in South Asia which has also expanded to the African continent. A non-profit Indian organisation named Apollo Telemedicine Networking Foundation has been involved in telemedicine services with dedicated centres in Iraq, Yemen, Kazakhstan and Myanmar. India’s Space Diplomacy Further using space for diplomacy in order to project its soft power across the globe, India has assisted countries like Colombia in launching its satellite which boosted India-Colombia relations. Many Latin American countries are often dependent on the US for space and military matters. However, after the launch, many countries like Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Mexico, Nicaragua and Venezuela have reached out to ISRO for launching or developing satellites. Similarly, India’s PSLV also launched Israel’s TecSar satellite in 2008 for remote sensing purposes. The launch boosted the political and strategic relations with Israel. Once a recipient of space technology from developed countries, India has demonstrated the robustness of its own space programmes by setting up joint projects and even providing assistance at the time of disaster to a number of countries. ISRO’s Oceansat-2 satellite played a pertinent role in monitoring Hurricane Sandy and helping the authorities to implement timely disaster mitigation and rescue strategies. Adding more feathers to its hat, ISRO has also launched dozens of satellites for US, Europe and Britain based companies. The recent launches of British reconnaissance satellites, NovaSAR and S1-4 are a sign of what could come next. Britain is one of the EU’s biggest spender in space sector. After Brexit, the dispute over Britain’s continued access to the European Union’s Galileo satellite navigation project will inevitably lead Britain look for alternatives and India’s space ambitions could offer a tempting proposition within the ambit of wider bilateral cooperation. As a part of India’s efforts in space diplomacy, ISRO undertook another capacity building initiative ‘Unispace Nanosatellite Assembly and Training (UNNATI)’. Under UNNATI, ISRO planned to train 45 countries in making Nano-satellites. Closer to home, India proposed a SAARC satellite in 2014 for the overall development of the region. The proposal was welcomed by SAARC nations but unfortunately the proposal couldn’t materialise as envisioned initially due to Pakistan’s backing out from the project. However, three years later, in 2017, ISRO launched the South Asia satellite or GSAT-9 to help India’s neighbouring countries in space communication. The idea of South Asia satellite ensured no political impediment as with the case of SAARC satellite. The positive spill over effect of the satellite’s launch on India’s “neighbourhood first” diplomacy was well demonstrated by the warm responses given by the leaders of South Asian countries. India’s space diplomacy with neighbours also extends on a bilateral basis. For instance, in Afghanistan, India included remote sensing satellite transmitters for acquiring space-based data in a USD 1.2 billion aid package. It is evident that soft power strategies are more relevant than the hard power strategies, especially in the contemporary world order. The rise of China as an emerging superpower is backed with its economic and military might leave less avenues for other developing nations such as India to contest China. However, soft power strategies open up another dimension for the interaction of the nations. India has utilised space as a tool of its soft power effectively in order to expand its clout. That space being an intrinsic part of India’s foreign policy has brought numerous achievements to the country, and is expected to remain an essential element for future course of India’s foreign policy.

#### Private sector key to Indian space efforts

Raghu Krishnan, Raghu Krishnan is the technology editor for the Economic Times. In the over two decades of reporting and managing teams, he has seen the Indian IT industry grow from $ 1 billion to nearly $ 191 billion. He has a deep understanding of the shifts the Indian IT industry has undergone over the years. He has also covered science and India's aerospace R&D industry., 12-7-2020, "New space policy may take local companies global: Sivan," Economic Times, https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/science/new-space-policy-may-take-local-companies-global-sivan/articleshow/79599874.cms?from=mdr TDI

Bengaluru: India will draft a new space policy aimed at increasing private investments in the country’s space sector to build companies that are global in scale, Indian Space Research Organisation (Isro) chairman K Sivan told ET. The proposed regulations will be in addition to specific policies planned for launch vehicles, satellite navigation, human space mission and deep space exploration. “We want to create competition and get multiple companies in the space sector that can grow as global leaders,” Sivan said. Over 23 Indian and overseas companies have approached Isro since August seeking to harness assets built over six decades including rockets, satellites, ground stations and satellite imagery. The nodal agency is looking to transfer critical technologies through its commercial arm — New Space India Ltd (NSIL NSE -0.45 %) — to these companies at lower costs. “Space technology is costly. We want to make it viable for Indian industries and help them commercialise these technologies,” said Sivan. “We want to make the technology transfer a very simple and low-cost affair.” Last week, NSIL signed a pact to share technology as well as to allow testing facilities with Chennai-based startup Agnikul Cosmos to build a small rocket that can hurl 100 kg satellites to low-earth orbit. Bengaluru-based Pixxel, which is building India’s first private fleet of earth observation satellites, will launch its first satellite atop the homegrown polar satellite launch vehicle (PSLV) in 2021. So far, the department of space has released drafts of technology transfer policy, remote sensing and satellite communication policy for public comments. These draft policies state that Indian companies can now own and operate satellites, build rockets and launch them from Indian soil and offer satellite-based applications to consumers. The policies also define how sensitive dual-use technologies are to be utilised and stresses on the need for adherence to national and international laws. “The industry players are able to see the sea change (in our policies). They are asking for clarifications on some of them,” said Sivan. He added the policies will be notified after consultations. India is adopting the model of the US space agency National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), which allowed private firms such as SpaceX to get access to its technology and facilities to build reusable rockets that have carried humans to space this year. NASA also allows startups to compete and build vehicles and solutions for its programmes, including deep space missions. The policies are also designed to make India a global hub for satellite manufacturing and launches and providing satellite-based services for global customers. Hyderabad-based Aerospace firm Ananth Technologies is setting up a joint venture with US satellite operator Saturn Satellites, through which it will first build two communication satellites and launch them locally on an Indian rocket. Ananth is the first Indian private company to tap the global market after India opened up its space sector, which allows private firms to build satellites and rockets and offer space services from the country. “Earlier, when IITs produced aero-space engineers, there was not a strong domestic industrial ecosystem to employ them. Today, with our historic reforms in the space sector, the last frontier before humanity has opened up to Indian talent,” Prime Minister Narendra Modi told a Pan IIT conference on Friday. India has nearly 50 space startups in the sector and over 1,000 companies — both small and medium enterprises (SMEs) and large enterprises such as Larsen & Toubro, Godrej Aerospace, Tata Advanced Systems and Hindustan Aeronautics, which have been vendors to Isro, building systems and subsystems for the space programme. After opening the space sector to private firms in August, the department of space formed Indian National Space Promotion and Authorisation Centre (IN-SPACe), a new body that will act as a regulator whose rulings would apply to the space agency as well as private firms in the country. Sivan said an independent board is being set up and an approval is expected from the government by the end of December.

#### Indian soft power and international leadership key to global cooperation and tolerance through cultural diplomacy

**Gupta 20** [(Arunima, Arunima Gupta is Principal at Network of Indian Cultural Enterprises (NICE). She holds a Master’s in International Relations from Leiden University), “Celebrating Indian Soft Power”, USC Center on Public Diplomacy, <https://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/blog/celebrating-indian-soft-power>] KZ

India is a culture-driven soft power. One example is availability and appreciation of Indian cinema as a source of recreation in the conflict-ridden Afghanistan. Another major cultural export is Indian gastronomy, be it turmeric latte sold in cafés, jackfruits used in gourmet preparations or the Australian PM Scott Morison’s display of Samosa diplomacy. Arts, fashion and handicrafts, literary works, and performing arts and tourism are other key aspects of Indian soft power. To realize and maximize the potential of such traditions and practices, it is important to develop a robust cultural creative economy, giving more and more opportunities for creative entrepreneurs to take Indian culture across the globe. This can also lead to cross-cultural cooperation and mutual learnings between cultural experts, entrepreneurs and enthusiasts from across the world. Dinesh Patnaik, the Director-General of ICCR speaking at Namaste 2020 [observed that](https://www.softpowermag.com/inaugural-session-namaste-2020/) “the soft power of a country is when its cultural assets become a subject of aspiration and admiration by the global community. India is blessed with immense cultural assets, be it Yoga, Ayurveda, literature, arts, heritage, culinary practices, sports and much more, along with being the largest democracy and, having strong institutions and leaders. When the propagation of soft power is done with the idea of fostering mutual respect, shared understanding and joint collaborations for cultural advancements between countries, it becomes the essence of cultural diplomacy.” Beyond cultural and civilizational heritage, India has been recognized for its role in addressing global challenges and being at the forefront of various development-related initiatives. Though India’s international engagement is guided by its security and strategic interests, it is also underpinned by the values of inclusivity, plurality and welfare for all. The establishing of International Solar Alliance, for example, demonstrated India’s commitment towards mitigating environmental risks through multilateral cooperation. Similarly, Indian offers humanitarian aid to smaller mainland and island economies in times of calamity, while its contributions to the UN Peacekeeping forces are amongst the highest in the world. The country’s cooperation at bilateral and multilateral forums for fighting COVID-19 through supplying hydro-chloroquine to the world as well as directing R&D efforts towards vaccine development highlight India’s contribution in the global pharmaceutical and wellness sector. Owing to these and many other contributions towards the greater good for all, India is ranked 44th out of 160 countries in the [Good Country Index](https://www.goodcountry.org/) (GCI). According to Anholt, the creator of GCI, the underlying idea is that in the ongoing contest for soft power in the world where countries increasingly seek to lead and steer conversations around power dynamics, there is an increasing desire and necessity to connect with each other’s culture and communities. Speaking on the theme India’s Global Connect at Namaste 2020, Anholt [explained that](https://www.softpowermag.com/event/indias-global-connect/) the ‘goodness’ of a country is determined by its multilateral engagement and cooperation in addressing common global challenges. Higher levels of involvement build positive perceptions about the country that in turn invite greater foreign investment and visitors, thus contributing to the country’s soft power and reputation in the eyes of common citizens.

#### International cooperation key to solving bioterror and health crises

**Roffey et al 02** [(Roger, Swedish Defence Research Agency, Division of NBC-Defense, Umeå. Kurt Lantorp, Department of Infectious Disease Control, Jönköping. Anders Tegnell, Center for Microbiological Preparedness, Swedish Institute for Infectious Disease Control (SMI), Solna. Frederik Elgh, Swedish Defence Research Agency, Division of NBC-Defense, Umeå.) “Biological weapons and bioterrorism preparedness: importance of public-health awareness and international cooperation”, ScienceDirect, 8/2002 [https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1198743X14626410#](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1198743X14626410)!] KZ

Coordination and communication also need to be strengthened, to minimize response times. If a bioterrorist event is suspected, established communication must be among hospital personnel, local and central healthcare departments, specialized laboratories, central and regional authorities for disease surveillance, and police and rescue services. A biological attack will also require of preservation evidence (at the scene of a crime), a unified command system, and the need to protect emergency responders against possible secondary devices intentionally placed to maim or injure them [19,20]. The management of the disease might not follow normal procedures, since diagnostic laboratory confirmation might take too long. Instead, it will be necessary to initiate a response based on the recognition of high-risk syndromes. Epidemiologic principles must be used to assess whether a patient’s presentation is typical of an endemic disease or is an unusual event that should raise concern [21]. There should also be specialist teams on standby that can rapidly analyze any potential threat and give recommendations to responsible authorities. After an incideSic. xnt, there might be a need for decontamination of the affected area, depending on the type of agent and the quantity released; this is also an area for international cooperation, as expertise is not always available in the country under attack. From a European perspective, it can be questioned whether each country can afford or be motivated to set up qualified rapid response teams that could, at short notice, be deployed to the scene of a bioterrorist attack. Perhaps this could be one area for cooperation between countries. What could be a realistic goal for such teams in a European context? In the area of research and development, to enhance our knowledge of agents of concern and to develop rapid methods for identification and detection of agents, international cooperation is vital, given today’s scarce economic resources. Another area for cooperation across borders is the training of personnel in handling situations involving the threat or use of biological warfare agents.

#### Bioterror causes extinction

Krstić '17 [Marko; January 2017; assistant professor of microelectronics and physics at the University of Belgrade, PhD in Electrical Engineering and Computer Science from the University of Belgrade; "Tendency of using chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons for terrorist purposes," Military Technical Courier, Vol. 65, No. 2, p. 481-498] SD

The studies of a few cases of earlier CBRN actions have led experts to identify the key characteristicsof terrorist groupsthat could potentially have an interest to use theseweapons. It is thought that conservatism is inherent in terrorist organizations, but it must not be forgotten that some terrorists are inclined toinnovationsin weapons and tactics**,** as well as to taking risksin actions or in the choice of weapons**.** Many experts agree that most terrorist organizations want to use proven methods to achieve desired effects. Innovations, especially in the field of CBRN weapons, often indicate terrorists are likely to be led by other factors rather than by pure curiosity and desire to experiment. For some individuals, repression and democratic and strong rule of law are positive determinants of the emergence of CBRN actions which points to a new and more complex global security environment with an increasing risk of terrorists trying to perform a CBRN attack. It is a frightening fact that a single terrorist or isolated terrorist group could improvise a biological weaponor use other ways to spread anthrax, smallpoxor other biological agents and thereby cause mass casualties and destroy the health care system of a state. CBRN weapons are secretly shipped to terrorists or hostile governments and represent a significant and growing threat to many countries. Although the threat of CBRN attacks is widely recognized as the central issue of national security, most analysts assume that the primary danger is a threat of the military use of these weapons in conventional wars with traditional military means while the threat of covert attacks, which include terrorism**,** is rashly and unfairly neglected. Covert attacks are difficult to deter or prevent and CBRN weapons suitable for this type of attack are available to a growing number of enemy states and groups. At the same time, restrictions on their use appear to be diminishing, and so-called new terrorists do not always escalate and become apparent only by using unconventional weapons. These weapons are easily spread or transmitted from person to person, have a high mortality rateand a potential impact on public health, causing mass casualties that can crush health systems and cause public panic and social disruption, thus requiring special efforts to suppress them. When assessing the threat of CBRN weapons, we should take into account the change in capacity to carry out terrorist attacks that are on the rise among countries and non-government elements. Analysts believe that the fear of chemical and biological terrorist attacks is excessive, they point out that, in the past, very few attacks involved these weapons, and even those few attempts that have occurred were mostly thwarted by the authorities. A relative ease with which biological weapons can be obtained, along with other current changes and turbulences in the world, sets the stage for another type of warfare in the 21st century. The potential for CBRN terrorism has widely grown since 11 September, when some of these materials were used. The danger of terrorist use of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction represents a very serious threat for many countries; if a terrorist group could gain access to this weapon, it is highly likely it would use it, or threaten to use it. Although there is very little information on terrorists and their ability to come into possession of nuclear weapons or on their intentions to get them, the risk of CBRN weapons has certainly increased since the terrorists started to become more familiar with these agents and their harmful consequences. Discovering the nature of the threat of biological weapons, as well as the appropriate response to them requires an emphasis on the biological characteristics of these instruments of war and terror. Preparing for a terrorist attack may seem daunting and there are a small number of people with practical experience and a good knowledge of CBRN weapons, because until recently there was no need to own them. In the past, most of the planning regarding emergency response to terrorism concentrated on the concerns of open attacks (bombing). However, the threats of CBRN weapons are taken seriously, especially in the USA, where media, fascinated by new weapons of mass destruction, encourage a growing fear for public safety. Terrorists who have significant human and material resources are much more likely to realize their intentions than lone perpetrators or small terrorist groups. A CBRN terrorism threat is certainly a matter of concern; however, terrorists will face many obstacles in the implementation of an attack of this kind. This includes the acquisition of materials and preparation for spreading them as well as a selection and a survey of a chosen objective and a correct dose required to achieve a desired effect. The growing threat of CBRN terrorism Terrorism can be defined as a deliberate act of violence intended to cause damage, but also to create an appropriate political and ideological situation, so that the use of these non-traditional weapons of terror outside the context is obvious, and the goals will not be military, but civilian ones (Bioterrorism, chemical weapons, and radiation terrorism, nd). Toxic substances, regardless of whether they are of animal, vegetable or mineral origin, were used throughout the history for political assassinations and sabotage; despite the risk of severe penalties, the prospects for success favoured the use of toxic substances. Such use has always been reduced, however, since only a small number of people had access to substances and possessed the ability of learn how to use them (Pascal, 1999). CBRN weapons are rightly viewed with a special sense of horror, their effects can be devastating and indiscriminating, and they take the most stringent toll among the most vulnerable population, non-combatants (e.g. a biological attack cannot be detected sufficiently fast after the disease spreads through the population). Moreover, chemical and biological weapons are a particularly attractive alternative for groups that do not have the ability to produce nuclear weapons, and this risk raises complex but important ethical issues (London, 2003). The common name for CBRN terrorism which causes the death of a large number of people, large scale damage and a strong echo worldwide is post-industrial or hyper-terrorism. This means that non-state elements possess and dispose of assets that were previously held only by states, but unlike them, which often fear reprisals after WMD attacks, terrorists, having no geographical location, are ready to use WMD with much less scrupulousness and fear (Kurmnik, Ribnikar, 2003). Some authors have described the factors that make chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear terrorist attacks in many ways unique and demanding, such as an element of surprise, invisible agents, ordnance, the risk of repetition and new types of risks (Ruggiero, Voss, 2015). In the past 30 years, the use of CBRN weapons has become a major concern for many nations around the world. The public has become insensitive to traditional terrorist attacks that seem to be a less efficient way for terrorist organizations to achieve their goals. What causes shock and fear is actually presenting the properties of weapons which can be used by terrorist organizations to enhance their efforts and the effectiveness of attacks. CBRN terrorism is often a synonym for weapons of mass destruction, although this form of terrorism and related incidents do not require attacks and inflicting harm to large numbers of people they do not even require deadly attacks at all. The number of studies on this type of terrorism is limited due to the lack of available data on this terrorism type. There is a very small number of databases of CBRN incidents, and even the existing ones have relatively little to do with them and they are compared to conventional terrorism (Jesse, 2012). Some experts emphasize the factors that promote such attacks and these factors include the availability of information and expertise, increased frustration of terrorists, demonization of the target population, as well as a millennial, apocalyptic or messianic vision. Experts also differ in opinion when it comes to possible perpetrators of CBRN incidents, and include religious fundamentalists and cults1 as possible perpetrators of such attacks, especially when these groups address to ethereal audience, emphasizing the hatred of unbelievers (Ivanova, Sandler, 2007). Concerns about super terrorism which involves the use of CBRN weapons are mainly focused on what terrorists can do in the context of our social reality, with an emphasis on terrorist motivations, initiatives and limitations. When considering which terrorist groups may be inclined to commit CBRN terrorism, it is important to recognize the spectrum of these acts, as well as to analyze the following categorization: (a) massive casualty events produced by conventional weapons; (b) CBRN scams; (c) conventional attack on a nuclear facility; (d) limited-scale chemical or biological attack or a radiological dispersion; (e) large scale chemical or biological attack or a radiological dispersion; and (f) CBRN strikes (super terrorism) that can lead to thousands of victims. In addition to the motivation and willingness to inflict mass casualties in any way, terrorists must have technical and financial capabilities to come into possession of material and acquire skills for these types of weapons and materials and carry out a successful attack. Chemical and biological weapons can pose a risk to terrorists thus deterring them from using such weapons (Post, 2005, pp.148-151). The possibility that terrorists use chemical or biological substances may increase over the next decade, according to US intelligence agencies. According to CIA2, an interest among non-state actors, including terrorists, for biological and chemical materials is real and growing, and the number of potential perpetrators is increasing. The agency also noted that many of these groups had developed an international network and did not need to rely on state sponsors for financial and technical support. However, it is believed that it is less likely that terrorists would choose chemical and biological weapons over conventional explosives, because these weapons are difficult to control and their results are unpredictable (Condesman, Burke, 2001). The risk of CBRN weapons is growing since terrorists are better acquainted with these agents and their potential for causing harm3. These agents possess desirable characteristics as **weapons** of terror; they are biologically invisible to the naked eye, odorless and potentially lethal in the form of particles; natural organisms are so readily available, and can be "camouflaged" in natural disasters and used to spread fear and various diseases. Chemical agents quickly attack the critical physiological centers of the body, disabling or killing the victim. Biological and chemical weapons require the application of huge amounts of resources and result in different effects, causing fear and panic in the contaminated areas. Often referred to as "weapons of mass destruction", but, in medical terms, they are weapons of potential mass casualties because they can lead to massive death toll in the absence of preventive measures and timely response (Meyer, Spinella, 2014, pp.645-656). "Bioterrorism is the intentional use of microorganisms or toxins derived from living organisms used for hostile purposes intended to cause disease or death in man, animals and plants, on which they depend". The threat of bioterrorist attacks is real, and each individual is a potential terrorist, when terrorists are "invisible" prior to an attack which also can be "invisible" in the form of causing infectious diseases or epidemics. Citizens who are not aware they are infected are potential safety hazard and so-called dangerous bodies (Mijalković, 2011). In the last ten years, the issue of CBRN weapons has attracted the attention of experts, but a list of priorities by the heads of states has never been established. Biological weapons almost became forgotten after they had been banned by the 1972 Convention on Biological Weapons. A significant attention was paid to them during the 90s of the last century. The important thing is that biological weapons attract much less attention than other similar weapons, but probably represent the greatest danger, and in addition to their use in war, they are available as instruments of terror in peace. Some countries showed willingness to use such weapons against defenseless populations to achieve strategic objectives, and in this regard, some analysts believe that those who attacked the World Trade Center in 1993 applied cyanide on their bombs (this was not confirmed, but a large amount of cyanide was found in possession of the perpetrators). Such a group will prove to be less inefficient, because if terrorists decide to shock and surprise the government by inflicting enormous damage, CBRN weapons will become more attractive and more accessible (Bettis, 1998). Motives and forms of behavior of individuals and groups who acquired or used CBRN weapons have existed since long ago and there is no doubt that modern society is vulnerable to such attacks (Tucker, 2000). Fear of biological terrorism is certainly greater than the fear of the conventional forms of terrorism; some of these fears are justified and some are often exaggerated. Some agents are really very contagious and deadly, and if used properly, have a potential to result in casualties similar to those in a nuclear attack. Perhaps the scariest aspect of biological weapons is that the body is attacked without warning, people are afraid of the threat as it is invisible, and cannot be heard or felt. The history of warfare, terrorism and crime involving biological agents in the last century is considerably less dangerous and more deadly than the history of conventional warfare (Parachini, 2001). Today, some states and some terrorist groups can more easily overcome technological barriers due to the increased flow of information and access to previously unavailable technologies. Along with nuclear and chemical weapons, biological weapons are part of an unholy trinity of weapons of mass destruction (Davis, Johnson-Winegar, 2000, pp.15-28). The society is now faced with the threat of anapocalyptic and asymmetric war **scenario** in which kamikaze attackers are able to arm themselves with WMD4 without even having to have a "physical" weapon to create fear; they probably still prefer simple, proven methods: a stampede in an enclosed place, or just an explosive device, which will kill many people5 (Palmer, 2004, pp.3-9). Early detection and response to biological or chemical terrorism are crucial to solving this problem (U.S. Congress House, 2003, p.117).

## 3

#### U.S. leads innovation globally but it’s on the brink

Khan 19 [Dr. Mehmood Khan, chair of the U.S. Council on Competitiveness and Vice Chairman and Chief Scientific Officer for Global Research & Development, PepsiCo. “Maintaining U.S. Leadership in Science and Technology.” 3/18/19. https://insight.ieeeusa.org/articles/maintaining-u-s-leadership-in-science-and-technology/]

Can the U.S. Compete?

We are seeing changes in technology, competition and the global economy, historic in terms of their size, speed and scope. The U.S. faces hyper competition, a potential new global superpower competitor in China, and the prospect of economic and social disruption brought about by the unrelenting and accelerating march of technology. Nevertheless, in a global economy ever more driven by technology and innovation, an enabling environment for innovation remains the advantage of only a few economies, with the United States in a position of significant strength:

The U.S. remains the world’s epicenter for disruptive innovation, thanks to its exceptional research infrastructure and low barriers to entrepreneurs and start-ups.

The U.S. remains the world leader in high-tech manufacturing. It has a 31-percent global share and its output is growing. China is closing the gap with a 24-percent share and its output is also growing, surpassing Japan and the EU.

The U.S. remains the world’s largest investor in R&D for 28 percent of global R&D spending. It now invests half a trillion in R&D per year and has built up a globally unparalleled national stock of science and technology.

Because the U.S. is by far the world’s largest innovator in basic research, it dominates patenting, sowing the seeds of future innovation, representing about one quarter of all international patent applications filed in 2016.

The U.S. has distinctive assets – its national laboratories and top research universities.

In the U.S. innovation ecosystem, industry, start-ups, national labs and universities collaborate on R&D across the spectrum of science and technology.

Vast amount of venture capital is pouring in to commercialize advanced technologies.

The U.S. is seen as the global technology leader. A recent survey asked researchers across the world which country they considered to be the global leader in 12 advanced industries. The U.S. was named most often in 11 of the 12 industries.

Despite these significant U.S. strengths, the competitiveness of a wide range of nations – not to mention economic and technological change – is dynamic and ever transforming. A country’s comparative position can change rapidly.

Conclusion

The United States is at a critical moment in time in national innovation systems research and action. New, transformational models driven by the democratization and self-organization of innovation are emerging and taking root across the nation. But, at the same time, U.S. leadership is under threat. The United States faces now what are perhaps existential challenges to its global leadership in innovation. America’s role in technology advancement is diminishing globally—now accounting for only one-quarter of global research & development investments, down from two-thirds in 1960. Competitors are increasing their capacity for innovation. And rapid technological change and disruption have impacted the workforce and communities.

When the U.S. controlled the direction of technology, we were positioned to control our economic destiny. That is no longer guaranteed. The United States must take stock. We must assess if our innovation ecosystems and investments are enough to maintain our global economic and technological leadership. And, as technology seeps into nearly every aspect of American life, our national leaders and our government at every level must bolster their knowledge and response capabilities to match the strengthening competition, technological change and disruptions that are coming.

#### Strong commercial space catalyzes tech innovation – progress at the margins and spinoff tech change global information networks

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

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.

#### Short innovation cycles mean every contract counts

John J. Klein 19, Senior Fellow and Strategist at Falcon Research Inc. and adjunct professor at the George Washington University Space Policy Institute, 1-15-2019, "Rethinking Requirements and Risk in the New Space Age," Center for a New American Security, https://www.cnas.org/publications/reports/rethinking-requirements-and-risk-in-the-new-space-age

Unfortunately, these variances in models between the MDAP’s lengthy development cycle and the commercial space sector’s 18-month innovation cycle are a result of stark differences in thinking about requirements and risk. Requirements and risk for MDAPs commonly focus on ensuring critical mission capabilities at a given cost. In contrast, the commercial space sector tends to focus more on providing innovation quickly using economies of scale. The commercial sector understands that time dynamically shapes decisions related to requirements and risk because of the relatively short innovation cycle. In a highly competitive space sector with tight profit margins, those unable to innovate quickly will likely be out of business soon. Alternatively, space systems with mission assurance requirements – where failures are detrimental to national security and military operations – often drive DoD’s timelines. Program managers of critical national security space systems commonly require additional time to test and verify that satellites can perform missions with a very low probability of failure.

#### Tech innovation solves every existential threat – cumulative extinction events outweigh the aff

Dylan **Matthews 18**. Co-founder of Vox, citing Nick Beckstead @ Rutgers University. 10-26-2018. "How to help people millions of years from now." Vox. https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/26/18023366/far-future-effective-altruism-existential-risk-doing-good

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.\*

## 4

#### Russia’s international ambitions are low now due to space sector failures. AFP 19

AFP 5/28/19 (Agence France-Presse - international news agency headquartered in Paris, “Moscow, we have a problem: theft plagues Russia’s space sector,” https://www.scmp.com/news/world/russia-central-asia/article/3012088/moscow-we-have-problem-theft-plagues-russias-space)

With millions of dollars missing and officials in prison or fleeing the country, Russia’s space sector is at the heart of a staggering embezzlement scheme that has dampened ambitions of recovering its Soviet-era greatness. For years, Moscow has tried to fix the industry that was a source of immense pride in the USSR. While it has bounced back from its post-Soviet collapse and once again become a major world player, the Russian space sector has recently suffered a series of humiliating failures. And now, massive corruption scandals at state space agency Roscosmos have eclipsed its plans to launch new rockets and lunar stations. “Billions (of roubles) are being stolen there, billions,” Alexander Bastrykin, the powerful head of Russia’s Investigative Committee – Russia’s equivalent of the FBI – said in mid-May. Investigations into corruption at Roscosmos have been ongoing “for around five years and there is no end in sight,” he added. In the latest controversy, a senior space official appears to have fled Russia during an audit of the research centre he headed. Yury Yaskin, the director of the Research Institute of Space Instrumentation, left Russia for a European country in April where he announced his resignation, the Kommersant paper reported. He feared the discovery of malpractice during an inspection of the institute, according to the newspaper’s sources. Roscosmos confirmed that Yaskin had resigned but did not clarify why. His Moscow institute is involved in developing the Russian satellite navigation system GLONASS designed to compete with the American GPS system. Corruption has particularly affected Russia’s two most important space projects of the decade: GLONASS and the construction of the country’s showpiece cosmodrome Vostochny, built to relieve Moscow’s dependence on Baikonur in ex-Soviet Kazakhstan. Almost all major companies in the sector, including rocket builders Khrunichev and Progress, have been hit by financial scandals that have sometimes led to prison sentences for large-scale fraud. Russia’s Audit Chamber, a parliamentary body of financial control, estimated that 760 billion roubles (around US$11.7 million) was misappropriated from Roscosmos in 2017, or nearly 40 per cent of the total misappropriated from the entire economy that year. Roscosmos said that “eradicating corruption” is one of its “primary goals”, adding that it regularly cooperates with investigations by the authorities. In mid-April, President Vladimir Putin stressed the need to “progressively resolve the obvious problems that slow down the development of the rocket-space sector.” “The time and financial frameworks to realise space projects are often unjustified,” the Russian leader Rebooting the space sector is a matter of prestige for the Kremlin. It symbolises its renewed pride and ability to be a major global power, especially in the context of increased tensions with the United States.

#### Space cooperation with the U.S. boosts Russia’s diplomatic leverage and international prestige

Juul 19 (Peter - senior policy analyst at the Center for American Progress, “Trump’s Space Force Gets the Final Frontier All Wrong,” 3/20/19, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/03/20/trumps-space-force-gets-the-final-frontier-all-wrong/>)

But funding isn’t everything, and in the new geopolitical context, democracy must be seen to work effectively. When it comes to space exploration, that means ratcheting back U.S. space cooperation with Russia as well as forgoing any equally intimate cooperation with China and its secretive space agency. The fact that the head of Russia’s space agency remains under U.S. sanctions for his role in Moscow’s military intervention in Ukraine illustrates the hazards involved in working with autocracies in space. Deep cooperation with autocratic powers in space gives autocracies a major point of diplomatic leverage over the United States, and more generally allows them to poach unearned international prestige by working on goals set and largely carried out by the United States. In today’s world, there’s no reason for the United States to give Russia or China this sort of standing by association.

#### Increased international prestige lays the foundation for Russian territorial expansion and foreign policy aggression

Gurganus 19 (Julia - nonresident scholar with the Russia and Eurasia Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace & Eugene Rumer - senior fellow and the director of Carnegie’s Russia and Eurasia Program, “Russia’s Global Ambitions in Perspective,” 2/20/19, https://carnegieendowment.org/2019/02/20/russia-s-global-ambitions-in-perspective-pub-78067)

. Elsewhere, long-term conflicts, such as those in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Libya, or the unfinished business of post-conflict reconstruction, such as in the Balkans, have presented Russia with opportunities to insert itself and create new facts on the ground. In the United States and Europe, growing political divisions, the proliferation of information providers, and popular frustration with governing elites in the wake of the 2008 global financial crisis have exposed targets for Russian interference. Russian agents did not cause these long-term conflicts or cleavages inside Western societies, but they have used them to advance their goals, which vary depending on the circumstances. In many instances, the Kremlin has relied on a diverse toolkit that creates the appearance of operating one step removed from the Russian government (through a range of actors including state-owned corporations such as Rosatom and Rosneft, private security companies such as the Wagner Group, organized crime syndicates, hackers, and information operation organizations such as the Internet Research Agency). Western perceptions of post-Soviet Russia have been heavily affected by the country’s economic and political implosion and foreign policy retreat during the 1990s. Against that backdrop, the ambition and dynamism of Russian foreign policy since Putin’s 2012 return to the presidency appears to be a relatively new phenomenon. It isn’t. Moscow’s post-2012 foreign policy fits comfortably in the long-standing historical and intellectual tradition of Soviet and even pre-Soviet Russian foreign policy. THE TROIKA OF RUSSIAN FOREIGN POLICY Contemporary Russian foreign policy displays the unmistakable presence of three centuries-old drivers of Moscow’s posture on the world stage. Chief among these drivers is Russia’s quest for strategic depth and secure buffers against external threats, which, considering the country’s geography and absence of natural protective barriers between it and neighboring powers, has guided its geographic expansion. Along with physical insecurity and expansion, the second key driver of Russian foreign policy has been its ambition for recognition as a great power, which the Kremlin has long seen as necessary for legitimizing its geographic conquests and geopolitical ambitions. The third driver, related to the first two, is Russia’s complicated relationship with the West, which combines rivalry with the need for cooperation. These recurrent themes are important. They highlight the degree to which Russian foreign policy in the Putin era is a continuation of many pursuits that are, by turns, decades- and centuries-old and were embraced by previous Russian governments regardless of their political persuasion. The historical record also performs an important legitimizing function for the citizens of the Russian state, which is less than three decades old, cementing the state’s claim to be the heir to a long, illustrious tradition dating back centuries. References to this tradition thus legitimize the Putin government’s ambitious overseas pursuits and present them as a matter of historical continuity and as an integral part of what Russia is. GEOGRAPHY AND STRATEGIC DEPTH It is hard to overestimate the role of geography as a driver behind Russia’s foreign policy. The Russian state and its security policy have been shaped by the absence of natural geographic barriers—oceans, rivers, or mountains.2 Geography has shaped Russian identity and its rulers’ understanding of security throughout the entire existence of the Russian state. Throughout the centuries, contemporary Russia, the Soviet Union, imperial Russia, and the principality of Muscovy have all faced the challenge of securing a vast stretch of territory from neighbors perceived to be hostile to the west, south, and east. To secure its territory, the Russian state acquired more territory, which, in turn, had to be secured from ever-present external threats of one kind or another. In the words of historian Stephen Kotkin, “Whatever the original causes behind early Russian expansionism—much of which was unplanned—many in the country’s political class came to believe over time that only further expansion could secure the earlier acquisitions. Russian security has thus traditionally been partly predicated on moving outward, in the name of preempting external attack.”3 The loss of territory, as was the case after the two great dislocations Russia experienced in the twentieth century—first after the 1917 revolution and the 1918 Brest-Litovsk Treaty, and later after the 1991 breakup of the Soviet Union—resulted in a profound sense of Russian insecurity and a renewed quest to regain strategic depth. Regaining that depth was the key task of the Soviet government as soon as the country began to recover from the trauma of the revolution and the civil war, and again after Moscow regained a measure of strength after the collapse of the 1990s. GREAT POWER AMBITIONS The quest for recognition as a great power has been both the result of Russia’s geographic expansion and its driver. Geographic expanse was and is, in the eyes of Russian leaders, central to their claim to recognition as a great power. Such recognition, in turn, has been needed to lend a veneer of legitimacy to territorial conquests. Perhaps precisely because they have had to struggle repeatedly for such recognition, Russia’s rulers have been particularly sensitive to any suggestion that Russia does not belong in the ranks of major powers. In the mid-nineteenth century, Russian historian and writer Nikolay Danilevsky complained about Russia’s unfair treatment by Europe, which had turned a blind eye to Prussian and Austrian aggression against Denmark following the annexation of two Danish provinces yet criticized Russia’s efforts to protect the rights of its coreligionists in “barbaric” Turkey.4 Danilevsky’s complaint was, in effect, a precursor of Putin’s lament about the West’s double standards in dealing with Russia’s annexation of Crimea and the severing of Kosovo from Serbia.5 For the leaders of the independent Russia that emerged from the Soviet collapse, the Soviet and Russian imperial legacy appeared to serve as both an inspiration and a justification for their claim to great power status. They found ample philosophical rationales for their claim. In the words of noted Russian political philosopher Nikolai Berdyaev, empire and great power status constitute the essence of Russian identity even when the country is experiencing challenges and setbacks, in large part because of its spiritual and material wealth.6 As early as 1993, the official Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation included, among other foreign policy priorities, the objectives of “furthering integration of the Commonwealth of Independent States” and ensuring Russia’s active role on the world stage as a “great power.”7 With Primakov’s rise to the helm of the Russian foreign policy establishment in 1996, great power ambitions again became the Kremlin’s driving force. In his first news conference as foreign minister, Primakov said, “Despite the present difficulties, Russia was and is a great power and its foreign policy should correspond with that.”8 Putin embraced this vision when he became president in 2000, and it has served as a cornerstone of his leadership ever since. Of particular importance to the Putin government has been the military record of the Russian state and its numerous conquests. Putin issued a presidential order in 2012 reconstituting the Russian Military-Historical Society.9 Long-serving Russian Culture Minister Vladimir Medinsky has been an active patron of the society as well. The expansion of the Russian state by force of arms—including numerous victories over Poland, Sweden, the Ottoman Empire, and Central Asia—make up an integral part of the foundational narrative of the contemporary Russian state. This narrative is reinforced by a sprawling state propaganda apparatus, official government activities, and educational curricula. Several historical events are featured prominently in this narrative. Russia’s defeat of Napoleon has been treated as a uniquely important event because of its significance to the European order in the nineteenth century, as well as for being an accomplishment that cemented Russia’s status as a great power. The victory over Nazi Germany in World War II is treated as the crowning achievement of the Soviet state, which saved not just the Soviet Union and Europe but the whole world from fascism. This triumph presently makes up the most important part of Russia’s national narrative. As a whole, this legacy provides both the justification and the motivation for Russia to pursue its ambitions not just around its vast periphery but well beyond its shores. UNEASY RELATIONS WITH THE WEST Moscow’s uneasy relationship with the West for centuries has been one of the most prominent features of its foreign policy. On the one hand—from Peter the Great’s founding of the new Russian capital on the Baltic shores to Catherine the Great’s engagement with leading European Enlightenment thinkers of the day, Czar Alexander I’s securing Russia’s place in the circle of major European powers to Joseph Stalin’s consolidation of the Soviet Union’s hold on Eastern Europe—Russia long has been an integral part of Europe and its political and security fabric. On the other hand, throughout Russian history since the time of Peter the Great, Russian elites, political thinkers, and cultural figures have questioned Russia’s European choice and relationship with Europe. In a more recent and very telling sign of that ambivalence, Foreign Minister Lavrov wrote in 2016 that, over the centuries, Russia has seen itself as part of Europe and the West, as better than the West, as different and unique from the West, and as representing a crucial link between the East and the West.10 The biggest obstacle that has kept Russia from having a closer and more stable relationship with Europe, according to Lavrov, has been Europe’s inability or unwillingness to simply let Russia be Russia, and its insistence on having Moscow conform to European norms—something that no Russian leader or the people of Russia would ever accept. Moscow’s claim to great power status has derived from its victories in the West, against Napoleon and Hitler. But Russia’s biggest setbacks too have been delivered by the West—in the Crimean War and in the Cold War—and these setbacks remain the biggest drivers of Moscow’s security and defense policy.11 As was the case during the Cold War, Russian policy toward the West has long had an important ideological dimension. During the Soviet era, the ideological competition was between Soviet communism and democratic capitalism. After a relatively brief period when Russia attempted to join the West, Moscow has embraced an overtly anti-Western ideology. Communism has been replaced by a mix of nationalist, authoritarian, and state-capitalist ideas as an alternative to the West’s notion of liberal democratic capitalism. The concept of Russia as a besieged fortress facing hostile Western designs and influences is a key tool the regime uses to mobilize the political support of Russian elites and ordinary citizens alike. OLD HABITS DON’T DIE In addition to a legacy of complicated geopolitics, great power ambitions, and a difficult relationship with the West, the new Russian state has inherited from its Soviet predecessor a time-tested foreign policy toolkit. While some elements of this toolkit fell into disuse early in the post-Soviet period when Russia was struggling with a series of domestic crises, these tools have been taken up again by the country’s foreign policy and national security establishment as Moscow has returned to the world stage as an increasingly assertive actor. George Kennan wrote in “The Sources of Soviet Conduct”: . . . the Kremlin is under no ideological compulsion to accomplish its purposes in a hurry . . . and it can afford to be patient. These precepts are fortified by the lessons of Russian history: of centuries of obscure battles between nomadic forces over the stretches of a vast unfortified plain. Here caution, circumspection, flexibility and deception are the valuable qualities . . . Its [the Soviet Union’s] political action is a fluid stream which moves constantly, wherever it is permitted to move, toward a given goal. . . . The main thing is that there should always be pressure, unceasing constant pressure, toward the desired goal. There is no trace of any feeling in Soviet psychology that that goal must be reached at any given time.12 Russian foreign policy in the Putin era fits Kennan’s description from more than half a century ago. The Kremlin’s approach has involved the relatively low-cost, limited use of military force in combination with other nonmilitary instruments of national power. Information operations, propaganda and disinformation, cyber operations, trade embargoes, and a vast array of other tools have been integrated into what has become commonly known as hybrid warfare. The current policy discussions in Western capitals often create the impression that Moscow has come up with a fundamentally new toolkit. In reality, an extensive reliance on such tools has long been a feature of Russian domestic politics and foreign policy.

#### Russian territorial expansion causes nuclear war with the U.S. and NATO

O’Hanlon 19 (Michael – PhD from Princeton in Public and International Affairs and currently a senior fellow at the Brookings Institute, “The Senkaku Paradox: Risking Great Power War Over Small Stakes,” p. 34-37, 4/30/19, Dartmouth Libraries)

As such, the United States and NATO partners would undoubtedly feel intense pressure, at the first sign of visible preparations for attack by Russia, to disable Russia’s surveillance and command and control capabilities and to preempt any missiles or aircraft or submarines before they could get within range of the target. That could, of course, entail direct attacks against airfields, ports, and other facilities on Russian soil, not just those that happened to be directly involved in the Baltic state occupation. In other words, NATO might strike first, rather than leave itself vulnerable to ambush. In light of the alliance’s consensus decision-making procedures, that possibility seems unlikely—but it must also be remembered that this scenario is premised on a situation in which Russian forces occupy at least a small swath of NATO territory, so certain thresholds would already have been crossed by enemy action. Regardless, the stage would be set for an extremely dangerous dynamic. If any initial conventional engagements went against its interests, Russia might also consider limited nuclear employment options. Indeed, some of its strategists currently entertain an “escalate to de-escalate” concept that would attempt to intimidate NATO allies into reversing their plans. Russia might detonate a nuclear weapon high in the atmosphere to create a powerful nuclear-induced electromagnetic pulse (EMP) that could prove lethal to air defense radars, military communications systems, and much civilian infrastructure over a region many hundreds of kilometers in radius. A Russian EMP burst using a high-altitude nuclear weapon would be an extremely provocative and risky move, to be sure.57 But some Russian leaders could argue that it was not strictly speaking a nuclear attack, since no humans would be killed by the direct explosive effects of such a weapon—and thus might delude themselves into thinking it was a relatively low-risk option. In fact, the risks could be very high. Some types of EMP attacks (or even cyberattacks) by Russia could disable large chunks of the U.S. or European electricity grids for many months.58 A severe attack of this type might even lead to a U.S. nuclear response, in light of the new nuclear doctrine of the Trump administration.59 Beyond the EMP option, Russia could use nuclear weapons directly against ships that carried military equipment, missile defense radars, or other capabilities. Indeed, it threatened to target nuclear missiles at any Danish ships joining the U.S.-led missile defense effort in 2015. Again, the provocation would be enormous—but the direct human stakes might be fairly limited, since only dozens of sailors, or at most a couple hundred, might be on a given naval vessel.60 Moscow might, perhaps delusionally, think the risks were acceptable. Of course, there would be enormous significance and risk to crossing the nuclear threshold in any way. But if weapons were used against isolated military targets (as both sides contemplated in various ways during the Cold War), Moscow again might convince itself, rightly or wrongly, that escalation risks could be tolerated and managed. That might be particularly true for attacks limited to the kinds of target sets that posed disproportionate vulnerability and dependence for NATO. These could include cargo ships at sea, rail marshaling yards where train tracks change gauge (necessitating unloading and reloading) at the Poland-Lithuania border, or particularly weak bridges without nearby alternative routes.61 If Russia could limit NATO fatalities to hundreds of sailors and not itself present any target sets that were characterized by a similar combination of relatively high military importance and relatively great separation from vulnerable civilian populations, NATO might not have a good recourse. Moscow might hope as much, at least—and so elect to roll the dice. Such a decision would be reckless and foolish, but perhaps not beyond the pale of how human beings have behaved historically in wars they felt they were otherwise likely to lose. The Outcome of the Scenario: Toward a Net Assessment With all these factors in motion, how would this kind of conflict likely play out? A NATO military response to the postulated Russian aggression seems very likely. Perhaps evidence of its preparations to move forces into position to defend its ally and liberate its territory from Russian occupation would be enough to catalyze a diplomatic resolution of the crisis. If not, however, the stage would be set for the possible eruption of World War III. Russia might try to impede a deployment through cyber-, space, and other such attacks, which would likely only slow the deployment, not stop it. Thus escalation could easily result.62 Once shots were fired, NATO would be unlikely to back down. Not every nation would necessarily send significant military forces, to be sure, but some key countries would probably remain resolute. Much more likely than acceptance of defeat would be a redoubled commitment to complete the mission—and, if Russian nuclear weapons had been used by that point, even in a limited attack, to respond in kind. Put differently, if Russia did choose to try to physically prevent the deployment of large forces into eastern NATO territory in likely preparation for a counterattack, there would be two possibilities. If that attempt failed, a showdown in the east on land would still loom. If it succeeded, NATO would then face a momentous decision: accept defeat, or reinforce dramatically with conventional forces (perhaps after a period of repairing damage and building more equipment and weaponry, depending on how many losses it had already suffered), or escalate to the nuclear level. In situations of this sort, the parties to the conflict might find themselves living scenarios like those that nuclear theorists pondered throughout the Cold War. They could be engaged in behavior that Thomas Schelling might have described as “the threat that leaves something to chance” or that Herman Kahn might have placed on the lower rungs of a nuclear escalation ladder that reached potentially to all-out war.63 American planners saw these kinds of escalatory ladders and options as ideas that might serve U.S. interests; thus it would not be too surprising to see Russian planners invoke them now.64 And whatever the dangers during the deployment phase, they would snowball during any actual maneuver warfare in eastern Europe. For example, it is entirely imaginable that an operation designed to liberate a Baltic state from a Russian occupation would trespass onto Russian territory to cut off supply lines and possible reinforcements.65 Moscow may or may not simply take NATO’s word that it has no designs on the country’s government. In other words, it might even fear that NATO’s counteroffensive could aspire to regime change in Russia. It may or may not have a clear picture of the kind of attack it is experiencing, as command and control systems would be compromised in the course of conventional battle, quite possibly including those systems commonly used for nuclear weapons.66 I conclude that, for a hypothetical conflict occurring sometime in the near future, enough uncertainties exist to make the outcome of the war somewhat unpredictable. One cannot simply assert that NATO’s numerous advantages guarantee a victory. The Baltics’ exposed geographic location, NATO’s limited means of deploying reinforcements to the region reliably, Russia’s options in domains ranging from cyberspace to outer space, and the possible use of nuclear weapons even in just a limited, tactical role make it uncertain that NATO could confidently expect victory despite collectively outspending Russia by more than ten to one in the military arena. For example, it is not clear that the United States could safely send most of its major ocean transport vessels to ports of debarkation and unload supplies there in the face of a conventional military threat. And if it lost a substantial fraction of its top-line supplies and ships to Russian attacks in its first attempt, the United States might need time to prepare for a second effort, which might then have to begin further west in Europe where disembarking and marshaling of forces could be carried out more safely, before those forces gradually made their way eastward. NATO would probably win such a conventional war, but it could take many months or even years. And even then, the deep uncertainties associated with possible nuclear escalation make it unclear whether victory could even be meaningful. Few would say that a few thousand square kilometers of Baltic territory logically warrant nuclear risks. But human beings are not always logical. Nuclear brinkmanship over a limited-war scenario in eastern Europe would not be unthinkable, based on what we know of history and human nature. And if nuclear weapons were ever used, even in small numbers at first, all bets are off as to where and how the conflict would end.

## Case

1. They don’t solve the second advdantage – werlholf talks abt neolib leading to these htings writ large – alt causes to neeolib’s failures

#### Commercial mining solves extinction from scarcity, climate, terror, war, and disease.

Pelton 17—(Director Emeritus of the Space and Advanced Communications Research Institute at George Washington University, PHD in IR from Georgetown).. Pelton, Joseph N. 2017. The New Gold Rush: The Riches of Space Beckon! Springer. Accessed 8/30/19.

Are We Humans Doomed to Extinction? What will we do when Earth’s resources are used up by humanity? The world is now hugely over populated, with billions and billions crammed into our overcrowded cities. By 2050, we may be 9 billion strong, and by 2100 well over 11 billion people on Planet Earth. Some at the United Nations say we might even be an amazing 12 billion crawling around this small globe. And over 80 % of us will be living in congested cities. These cities will be ever more vulnerable to terrorist attack, natural disaster, and other plights that come with overcrowding and a dearth of jobs that will be fueled by rapid automation and the rise of artifi cial intelligence across the global economy. We are already rapidly running out of water and minerals. Climate change is threatening our very existence. Political leaders and even the Pope have cautioned us against inaction. Perhaps the naysayers are right. All humanity is at tremendous risk. Is there no hope for the future? This book is about hope. We think that there is literally heavenly hope for humanity. But we are not talking here about divine intervention. We are envisioning a new space economy that recognizes that there is more water in the skies that all our oceans. Th ere is a new wealth of natural resources and clean energy in the reaches of outer space—more than most of us could ever dream possible. There are those that say why waste money on outer space when we have severe problems here at home? Going into space is not a waste of money. It is our future. It is our hope for new jobs and resources. The great challenge of our times is to reverse public thinking to see space not as a resource drain but as the doorway to opportunity. The new space frontier can literally open up a “gold rush in the skies.” In brief, we think there is new hope for humanity. We see a new a pathway to the future via new ventures in space. For too long, space programs have been seen as a money pit. In the process, we have overlooked the great abundance available to us in the skies above. It is important to recognize there is already the beginning of a new gold rush in space—a pathway to astral abundance. “New Space” is a term increasingly used to describe radical new commercial space initiatives—many of which have come from Silicon Valley and often with backing from the group of entrepreneurs known popularly as the “space billionaires.” New space is revolutionizing the space industry with lower cost space transportation and space systems that represent significant cost savings and new technological breakthroughs. “New Commercial Space” and the “New Space Economy” represent more than a new way of looking at outer space. These new pathways to the stars could prove vital to human survival. If one does not believe in spending money to probe the mysteries of the universe then perhaps we can try what might be called “calibrated greed” on for size. One only needs to go to a cubesat workshop, or to Silicon Valley or one of many conferences like the “Disrupt Space” event in Bremen, Germany, held in April 2016 to recognize that entrepreneurial New Space initiatives are changing everything [ 1 ]. In fact, the very nature and dimensions of what outer space activities are today have changed forever. It is no longer your grandfather’s concept of outer space that was once dominated by the big national space agencies. The entrepreneurs are taking over. The hopeful statements in this book and the hard economic and technical data that backs them up are more than a minority opinion. It is a topic of growing interest at the World Economic Forum, where business and political heavyweights meet in Davos, Switzerland, to discuss how to stimulate new patterns of global economic growth. It is even the growing view of a group that call themselves “space ethicists.” Here is how Christopher J. Newman, at the University of Sunderland in the United Kingdom has put it: Space ethicists have offered the view that space exploration is not only desirable; it is a duty that we, as a species, must undertake in order to secure the survival of humanity over the longer term. Expanding both the resource base and, eventually, the habitats available for humanity means that any expenditure on space exploration, far from being viewed as frivolous, can legitimately be rationalized as an ethical investment choice. (Newman) On the other hand there are space ethicists and space exobiologists who argue that humans have created ecological ruin on the planet—and now space debris is starting to pollute space. Th ese countervailing thoughts by the “no growth” camp of space ethicists say we have no right to colonize other planets or to mine the Moon and asteroids—or at least no right to do so until we can prove we can sustain life here on Earth for the longer term. However, for most who are planning for the new space economy the opinion of space philosophers doesn’t really fl oat their boat. Legislators, bankers, and aspiring space entrepreneurs are far more interested in the views of the super-rich capitalists called the space billionaires. A number of these billionaires and space executives have already put some very serious money into enterprises intent on creating a new pathway to the stars. No less than five billionaires with established space ventures—Elon Musk, Paul Allen, Jeff Bezos, Sir Richard Branson, and Robert Bigelow—have invested millions if not billions of dollars into commercializing space. They are developing new technologies and establishing space enterprises that can bring the wealth of outer space down to Earth. This is not a pipe dream, but will increasingly be the economic reality of the 2020s. These wealthy space entrepreneurs see major new economic opportunities. To them space represents the last great frontier for enterprising pioneers. Th us they see an ever-expanding space frontier that offers opportunities in low-cost space transportation, satellite solar power satellites to produce clean energy 24h a day, space mining, space manufacturing and production, and eventually space habitats and colonies as a trajectory to a better human future. Some even more visionary thinkers envision the possibility of terraforming Mars, or creating new structures in space to protect our planet from cosmic hazards and even raising Earth’s orbit to escape the rising heat levels of the Sun in millennia to come. Some, of course, will say this is sci-fi hogwash. It can’t be done. We say that this is what people would have said in 1900 about airplanes, rocket ships, cell phones and nuclear devices. The skeptics laughed at Columbus and his plan to sail across the oceans to discover new worlds. When Thomas Jefferson bought the Louisiana Purchase from France or Seward bought Alaska, there were plenty of naysayers that said such investment in the unknown was an extravagant waste of money. A healthy skepticism is useful and can play a role in economic and business success. Before one dismisses the idea of an impending major new space economy and a new gold rush, it might useful to see what has already transpired in space development in just the past five decades. The world’s first geosynchronous communications satellite had a throughput capability of about 500 kb / s. In contrast, today’s state of the art Viasat 2 —a half century later— has an impressive throughput of some 140 Gb/s. Th is means that the relative throughput is nearly 300,000 greater, while its lifetime is some ten times longer (Figs. 1.1 and 1.2 ). Each new generation of communications satellite has had more power, better antenna systems, improved pointing and stabilization, and an extended lifetime. And the capabilities represented by remote sensing satellites , meteorological satellites , and navigation and timing satellites have also expanded their capabilities and performance in an impressive manner. When satellite applications first started, the market was measured in millions of dollars. Today commercial satellite services exceed a quarter of a billion dollars. Vital services such as the Internet, aircraft traffi c control and management, international banking, search and rescue and much, much more depend on application satellites. Th ose that would doubt the importance of satellites to the global economy might wish to view on You Tube the video “If Th ere Were a Day Without Satellites?” [ 2 ]. Let’s check in on what some of those very rich and smart guys think about the new space economy and its potential. (We are sorry to say that so far there are no female space billionaires, but surely this, too, will come someday soon.) Of course this twenty-fi rst century breakthrough that we call the New Space economy will not come just from new space commerce. It will also come from the amazing new technologies here on Earth. Vital new terrestrial technologies will accompany this cosmic journey into tomorrow. Information technology, robotics, artificial intelligence and commercial space travel systems have now set us on a course to allow us humans to harvest the amazing riches in the skies—new natural resources, new energy, and even totally new ways of looking at the purpose of human existence. If we pursue this course steadfastly, it can be the beginning of a New Space renaissance. But if we don’t seek to realize our ultimate destiny in space, Homo sapiens can end up in the dustbin of history—just like literally millions of already failed species. In each and every one of the five mass extinction events that have occurred over the last 1.5 billion years on Earth, some 50–80 % of all species have gone the way of the T. Rex, the woolly mammoth, and the Dodo bird along with extinct ferns, grasses and cacti. On the other hand, the best days of the human race could be just beginning. If we are smart about how we go about discovering and using these riches in the skies and applying the best of our new technologies, it could be the start of a new beginning for humanity. Konstantin Tsiokovsky, the Russian astronautics pioneer, who fi rst conceived of practical designs for spaceships, famously said: “A planet is the cradle of mankind, but one cannot live in a cradle forever.” Well before Tsiokovsky another genius, Leonardo da Vinci, said, quite poetically: “Once you have tasted flight, you will forever walk the earth with your eyes turned skyward, for there you have been, and there you will always long to return.” The founder of the X-Prize and of Planetary Resources, Inc., Dr. Peter Diamandis, has much more brashly said much the same thing in quite diff erent words when he said: “The meek shall inherit the Earth. The rest of us will go to Mars.” The New Space Billionaires Peter Diamandis is not alone in his thinking. From the list of “visionaries” quoted earlier, Elon Musk, the founder of SpaceX; Sir Richard Branson, the founder of Virgin Galactic; and Paul Allen, the co-founder of Microsoft and the man who financed SpaceShipOne, the world’s first successful spaceplane have all said the future will include a vibrant new space economy. Th ey, and others, have said that we can, we should and we soon shall go into space and realize the bounty that it can offer to us. Th e New Space enterprise is today indeed being led by those so-called space billionaires , who have an exciting vision of the future. They and others in the commercial space economy believe that the exploitation of outer space may open up a new golden age of astral abundance. They see outer space as a new frontier that can be a great source of new materials, energy and various forms of new wealth that might even save us from excesses of the past. Th is gold rush in the skies represents a new beginning. We are not talking about expensive new space ventures funded by NASA or other space agencies in Europe, Japan, China or India. No, these eff orts which we and others call New Space are today being forged by imaginative and resourceful commercial entrepreneurs. Th ese twenty-fi rst century visionaries have the fortitude and zeal to look to the abundance above. New breakthroughs in technology and New Space enterprises may be able to create an “astral life raft” for humanity. Just as Columbus and the Vikings had the imaginative drive that led them to discover the riches of a new world, we now have a cadre of space billionaires that are now leading us into this New Space era of tomorrow. These bold leaders, such as Paul Allen and Sir Richard Branson, plus other space entrepreneurs including Jeff Bezos of Amazon and Blue Origin, and Robert Bigelow, Chairman of Budget Suites and Bigelow Aerospace, not only dream of their future in the space industry but also have billions of dollars in assets. These are the bright stars of an entirely new industry that are leading us into the age of New Space commerce. These space billionaires, each in their own way, are proponents of a new age of astral abundance. Each of them is launching new commercial space industries. They are literally transforming our vision of tomorrow. These new types of entrepreneurial aerospace companies—the New Space enterprises—give new hope and new promise of transforming our world as we know it today. The New Space Frontier What happens in space in the next few decades, plus corresponding new information technologies and advanced robotics, will change our world forever. These changes will redefi ne wealth, change our views of work and employment and upend almost everything we think we know about economics, wealth, jobs, and politics. Th ese changes are about truly disruptive technologies of the most fundamental kinds. If you thought the Internet, smart phones, and spandex were disruptive technologies, just hang on. You have not seen anything yet. In short, if you want to understand a transition more fundamental than the changes brought to the twentieth century world by computers, communications and the Internet, then read this book. There are truly riches in the skies. Near-Earth asteroids largely composed of platinum and rare earth metals have an incredible value. Helium-3 isotopes accessible in outer space could provide clean and abundant energy. There is far more water in outer space than is in our oceans. In the pages that follow we will explain the potential for a cosmic shift in our global economy, our ecology, and our commercial and legal systems. These can take place by the end of this century. And if these changes do not take place we will be in trouble. Our conventional petro-chemical energy systems will fail us economically and eventually blanket us with a hydrocarbon haze of smog that will threaten our health and our very survival. Our rare precious metals that we need for modern electronic appliances will skyrocket in price, and the struggle between “haves” and “have nots” will grow increasingly ugly. A lack of affordable and readily available water, natural resources, food, health care and medical supplies, plus systematic threats to urban security and systemic warfare are the alternatives to astral abundance. The choices between astral abundance and a downward spiral in global standards of living are stark. Within the next few decades these problems will be increasingly real. By then the world may almost be begging for new, out of- the-box thinking. International peace and security will be an indispensable prerequisite for exploitation of astral abundance, as will good government for all. No one nation can be rich and secure when everyone else is poor and insecure. In short, global space security and strategic space defense, mediated by global space agreements, are part of this new pathway to the future.

### No debris collisions

**1] Probability – 0.1% chance of a collision.**

**Salter 16** [(Alexander William, Economics Professor at Texas Tech) “SPACE DEBRIS: A LAW AND ECONOMICS ANALYSIS OF THE ORBITAL COMMONS” 19 STAN. TECH. L. REV. 221 \*numbers replaced with English words] TDI

The probability of a collision is currently low. Bradley and Wein estimate that the maximum probability in LEO of a collision over the lifetime of a spacecraft remains below one in one thousand, conditional on continued compliance with NASA’s deorbiting guidelines.3 However, the possibility of a future “snowballing” effect, whereby debris collides with other objects, further congesting orbit space, remains a significant concern.4 Levin and Carroll estimate the average immediate destruction of wealth created by a collision to be approximately $30 million, with an additional $200 million in damages to all currently existing space assets from the debris created by the initial collision.5 The expected value of destroyed wealth because of collisions, currently small because of the low probability of a collision, can quickly become significant if future collisions result in runaway debris growth.

#### 2] Public sector mining thumps - they’ll just continue after the Moon treaty is passed

NASA 19 [“NASA Invests in Tech Concepts Aimed at Exploring Lunar Craters, Mining Asteroids,” NASA, June 11, 2019, <https://www.nasa.gov/press-release/nasa-invests-in-tech-concepts-aimed-at-exploring-lunar-craters-mining-asteroids>] TDI

NASA Invests in Tech Concepts Aimed at Exploring Lunar Craters, Mining Asteroids Robotically surveying lunar craters in record time and mining resources in space could help NASA establish a sustained human presence at the Moon – part of the agency’s broader [Moon to Mars exploration](https://www.nasa.gov/specials/moon2mars/) approach. Two mission concepts to explore these capabilities have been selected as the first-ever Phase III studies within the [NASA Innovative Advanced Concepts](https://www.nasa.gov/niac) (NIAC) program. “We are pursuing new technologies across our development portfolio that could help make deep space exploration more Earth-independent by utilizing resources on the Moon and beyond,” said Jim Reuter, associate administrator of NASA’s Space Technology Mission Directorate. “These NIAC Phase III selections are a component of that forward-looking research and we hope new insights will help us achieve more firsts in space.” The Phase III proposals outline an aerospace architecture, including a mission concept, that is innovative and could change what’s possible in space. Each selection will receive as much as $2 million. Over the course of two years, researchers will refine the concept design and explore aspects of implementing the new technology. The inaugural Phase III selections are: Robotic Technologies Enabling the Exploration of Lunar Pits William Whittaker, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh This mission concept, called Skylight, proposes technologies to rapidly survey and model lunar craters. This mission would use high-resolution images to create 3D model of craters. The data would be used to determine whether a crater can be explored by human or robotic missions. The information could also be used to characterize ice on the Moon, a crucial capability for the sustained surface operations of NASA’s Artemis program. On Earth, the technology could be used to autonomously monitor mines and quarries. [Mini Bee Prototype to Demonstrate the Apis Mission Architecture and Optical Mining Technology](https://www.nasa.gov/directorates/spacetech/niac/2019_Phase_I_Phase_II/Mini_Bee_Prototype) Joel Sercel, TransAstra Corporation, Lake View Terrace, California This flight demonstration mission concept proposes a method of asteroid resource harvesting called optical mining. Optical mining is an approach for excavating an asteroid and extracting water and other volatiles into an inflatable bag. Called Mini Bee, the mission concept aims to prove optical mining, in conjunction with other innovative spacecraft systems, can be used to obtain propellant in space. Thse proposed architecture includes resource prospecting, extraction and delivery.