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#### Text: Outer space ought to be recognized as a global commons as per the Goehring card in the 1AC, except for the development of space-based solar power stations.

#### Greater regulation of private space companies leads to less innovation and entrepreneurship

Lamine et al 21 (Wadid Lamine1 Alistair Anderson2 Sarah Jack3 Alain Fayolle4 1 Telfer School of Management, University of Ottawa 2 Lancaster University Management School, Lancaster University 3 House of Innovation, Stockholm School of Economics 4 Center for Innovation and Entrepreneurship Activities, University of Cagliari ), “New article examines entrepreneurship in the space industry”, Stockholm School of Economics, 2-24-21, <https://www.hhs.se/en/about-us/news/hoi-news/2021/new-article-examines-entrepreneurship-in-the-space-industry/> NT

The space industry is generally perceived as very innovative. Normally, one might expect innovative environments to be conducive to entrepreneurship. **However, the space industry seems to be an exception owing to the highly regulative impact of institutions operating within it.** Generally, institutions influence entrepreneurship and set out the “rules of the game” that shape enterprise or even prevent it. Currently, within academia, there is little research examining how institutions impact on entrepreneurship at an industry level. Studying entrepreneurship in the context of the space industry offers the opportunity to deepen academia’s understanding of industry-specific conditions that form the rules of the game for innovation. New research, conducted in part at the House of Innovation, seeks to understand how **entrepreneurship in the space industry is enabled and constrained by institutions**, and what this implies for the freedom to be entrepreneurial. The research findings suggest that the institutional framework has a profoundly negative effect on start-ups and growth. **Formal institutional factors in the space industry discourage entrepreneurial initiatives and stymie the growth of small firms.** This institutional context favors the established firms that dominate the sector, challenging entrepreneurship. To counteract this negative environment, the researchers recommend that policymakers: (1) strengthen private-public-partnership arrangements; (2) implement policies to attract venture capitalists to transform and reinvigorate the upstream segment; and (3) design specific incubation mechanisms for space start-ups. With these changes in place, the researchers remain confident that the space context could evolve into a wonderful launchpad from which entrepreneurship can take off. **These findings are based on a ten-year study** originating in an extended case study of a smaller entrepreneurial space industry firm. The case study was eventually extended to include other start-up founders and CEOs of existing businesses. Researchers then tapped into the perceptions of business angels and incubator managers and interviewed key influencers in large space companies and space agencies. These case studies and interviews combined yielded an appreciation of how different space industry stakeholders make sense of and inform their organizations’ entrepreneurial role and practices.

#### Space-based solar power (SBSP) stations are key to improving energy efficiency in the green transition to renewables.

Hughes and Soldini 20 (Amanda Jane Hughes is an engineer, qualified teacher and passionate science communicator. She have a BSc in Astrophysics and PhD in Solar Energy Engineering, and currently is a lecturer at the University of Liverpool. Dr. Stefania Soldini, Lecturer in Aerospace Engineering, in the Department of Mechanical, Materials and Aerospace Engineering, University of Liverpool, UK since 2019. ), “Solar power stations in space could be the answer to our energy needs”, The Conversation, 11-19-20, <https://theconversation.com/solar-power-stations-in-space-could-be-the-answer-to-our-energy-needs-150007> NT

It sounds like science fiction: **giant solar power stations floating in space that beam down enormous amounts of energy to Earth.** And for a long time, the concept – first developed by the Russian scientist, Konstantin Tsiolkovsky, in the 1920s – was mainly an inspiration for writers. A century later, however, scientists are making huge strides in turning the concept into reality. The European Space Agency has realised the potential of these efforts and is now looking to fund such projects, predicting that **the first industrial resource we will get from space is “beamed power”.** **Climate change is the greatest challenge of our time**, so there’s a lot at stake. From rising global temperatures to shifting weather patterns, the impacts of climate change are already being felt around the globe. Overcoming this challenge will require radical changes to how we generate and consume energy. Renewable energy technologies have developed drastically in recent years, with improved efficiency and lower cost. But one major barrier to their uptake is the fact that they don’t provide a constant supply of energy. Wind and solar farms only produce energy when the wind is blowing or the sun is shining – but we need electricity around the clock, every day. Ultimately, we need a way to store energy on a large scale before we can make the switch to renewable sources. Benefits of space **A possible way around this would be to generate solar energy in space.** There are many advantages to this. **A space-based solar power station could orbit to face the Sun 24 hours a day. The Earth’s atmosphere also absorbs and reflects some of the Sun’s light, so solar cells above the atmosphere will receive more sunlight and produce more energy.** But one of the key challenges to overcome is how to assemble, launch and deploy such large structures. A single solar power station may have to be as much as 10 kilometres squared in area – equivalent to 1,400 football pitches. Using lightweight materials will also be critical, as the biggest expense will be the cost of launching the station into space on a rocket. One proposed solution is to develop a swarm of thousands of smaller satellites that will come together and configure to form a single, large solar generator. In 2017, researchers at the California Institute of Technology outlined designs for a modular power station, consisting of thousands of ultralight solar cell tiles. They also demonstrated a prototype tile weighing just 280 grams per square metre, similar to the weight of card. Recently, developments in manufacturing, such as 3D printing, are also being looked at for this application. At the University of Liverpool, we are exploring new manufacturing techniques for printing ultralight solar cells on to solar sails. **A solar sail is a foldable, lightweight and highly reflective membrane capable of harnessing the effect of the Sun’s radiation pressure to propel a spacecraft forward without fuel.** We are exploring how to embed solar cells on solar sail structures to create large, fuel-free solar power stations. These methods would enable us to construct the power stations in space. Indeed, it could one day be possible to manufacture and deploy units in space from the International Space Station or the future lunar gateway station that will orbit the Moon. Such devices could in fact help provide power on the Moon. The possibilities don’t end there. While we are currently reliant on materials from Earth to build power stations, scientists are also considering using resources from space for manufacturing, such as materials found on the Moon. Another major challenge will be getting the power transmitted back to Earth. The plan is to convert electricity from the solar cells into energy waves and use electromagnetic fields to transfer them down to an antenna on the Earth’s surface. The antenna would then convert the waves back into electricity. Researchers led by the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency have already developed designs and demonstrated an orbiter system which should be able to do this. There is still a lot of work to be done in this field, but the aim is that solar power stations in space will become a reality in the coming decades. **Researchers in China have designed a system called Omega, which they aim to have operational by 2050. This system should be capable of supplying 2GW of power into Earth’s grid at peak performance, which is a huge amount.** To produce that much power with solar panels on Earth, you would need more than six million of them. Smaller solar power satellites, like those designed to power lunar rovers, could be operational even sooner. Across the globe, the scientific community is committing time and effort to the development of solar power stations in space. Our hope is that they could one day be a vital tool in our fight against climate change.

#### Private innovation on reusable rockets is key to SBSP

Chi 20 (Joanna Chi, independent writer at Medium), “Space-Based Solar Power: The Future of Renewable Energy”, Medium, 11-22-20, <https://medium.com/swlh/space-based-solar-power-804e301c8af2> NT

Requirements for SBSP To make space-based solar power feasible on a global scale, there are two main technologies that we need. **First, the launch vehicles to get materials into space need to be low-cost and eco-friendly.** Most of the rockets that are currently used to deliver payloads are expendable, and they are extremely expensive and prone to causing pollution. As such, reusable rockets are vital to a sustainable SBSP model**.** Several private companies, including SpaceX, **are in the process of developing cheaper, reusable rockets.** Once we have the means to launch parts into space, the second facet of building satellite solar panels centers around the in-orbit construction of solar satellites. To collect the amount of energy that we need, satellite solar panels will need to be much larger than even the ISS, making them the largest spacecraft ever built. Luckily, satellite solar panels will also be much simpler to build than the ISS, as they would be built from many identical parts. Solar panels on the ISS cover about 2.5 square km — some SBSP satellites would be over twice this size. **In the long term, investments into space infrastructures such as asteroid mining may allow the construction of spacecraft to be completely removed from Earth**, which would require only the energy receiving centers of SBSP to be built on Earth. For now, though, the main technologies needed to build satellite solar panels can be found on Earth, and they are reasonably attainable within the next few decades.

#### Solving warming is not all-or-nothing – every additional fraction of a degree is irreversible and costs millions of lives—prefer IPCC assessments that are the gold standard for warming consensus

David Wallace-Wells 19 [National Fellow at New America. He is deputy editor of New York Magazine, where he also writes frequently about climate and the near future of science and technology, including his widely read and debated 2017 cover story on worst-case scenarios for global warming], *The Uninhabitable Earth: A Story of the Future* (Kindle Edition: Allen Lane, 2019), pg. 8-30, beckert

* Every degree key – each bit 🡪 hundreds of millions of lives
* IPCC🡪best ev b/c conservative estimate + still really big impact
* Now key – not reversible, feedback loops 🡪 speeds up later

There is almost no chance we will avoid that scenario. The Kyoto Protocol achieved, practically, nothing; in the twenty years since, despite all of our climate advocacy and legislation and progress on green energy, we have produced more emissions than in the twenty years before. In 2016, the Paris accords established two degrees as a global goal, and, to read our newspapers, that level of warming remains something like the scariest scenario it is responsible to consider; just a few years later, with no single industrial nation on track to meet its Paris commitments, two degrees looks more like a best-case outcome, at present hard to credit, with an entire bell curve of more horrific possibilities extending beyond it and yet shrouded, delicately, from public view.28 For those telling stories about climate, such horrific possibilities—and the fact that we had squandered our chance of landing anywhere on the better half of that curve—had become somehow unseemly to consider. The reasons are almost too many to count, and so half-formed they might better be called impulses. We chose not to discuss a world warmed beyond two degrees out of decency, perhaps; or simple fear; or fear of fearmongering; or technocratic faith, which is really market faith; or deference to partisan debates or even partisan priorities; or skepticism about the environmental Left of the kind I’d always had; or disinterest in the fates of distant ecosystems like I’d also always had. We felt confusion about the science and its many technical terms and hard-to-parse numbers, or at least an intuition that others would be easily confused about the science and its many technical terms and hard-to-parse numbers. We suffered from slowness apprehending the speed of change, or semi-conspiratorial confidence in the responsibility of global elites and their institutions, or obeisance toward those elites and their institutions, whatever we thought of them. Perhaps we felt unable to really trust scarier projections because we’d only just heard about warming, we thought, and things couldn’t possibly have gotten that much worse just since the first Inconvenient Truth; or because we liked driving our cars and eating our beef and living as we did in every other way and didn’t want to think too hard about that; or because we felt so “postindustrial” we couldn’t believe we were still drawing material breaths from fossil fuel furnaces. Perhaps it was because we were so sociopathically good at collating bad news into a sickening evolving sense of what constituted “normal,” or because we looked outside and things seemed still okay. Because we were bored with writing, or reading, the same story again and again, because climate was so global and therefore nontribal it suggested only the corniest politics, because we didn’t yet appreciate how fully it would ravage our lives, and because, selfishly, we didn’t mind destroying the planet for others living elsewhere on it or those not yet born who would inherit it from us, outraged. Because we had too much faith in the teleological shape of history and the arrow of human progress to countenance the idea that the arc of history would bend toward anything but environmental justice, too. Because when we were being really honest with ourselves we already thought of the world as a zero-sum resource competition and believed that whatever happened we were probably going to continue to be the victors, relatively speaking anyway, advantages of class being what they are and our own luck in the natalist lottery being what it was. Perhaps we were too panicked about our own jobs and industries to fret about the future of jobs and industry; or perhaps we were also really afraid of robots or were too busy looking at our new phones; or perhaps, however easy we found the apocalypse reflex in our culture and the path of panic in our politics, we truly had a good-news bias when it came to the big picture; or, really, who knows why—there are so many aspects to the climate kaleidoscope that transforms our intuitions about environmental devastation into an uncanny complacency that it can be hard to pull the whole picture of climate distortion into focus. But we simply wouldn’t, or couldn’t, or anyway didn’t look squarely in the face ﻿of the science. This is not a book about the science of warming; it is about what warming means to the way we live on this planet. But what does that science say? It is complicated research, because it is built on two layers of uncertainty: what humans will do, mostly in terms of emitting greenhouse gases, and how the climate will respond, both through straightforward heating and a variety of more complicated, and sometimes contradictory, feedback loops. But even shaded by those uncertainty bars it is also very clear research, in fact terrifyingly clear. The United Nations’ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) offers the gold-standard assessments of the state of the planet and the likely trajectory for climate change—gold-standard, in part, because it is conservative, integrating only new research that passes the threshold of inarguability. A new report is expected in 2022, but the most recent one says that if we take action on emissions soon, instituting immediately all of the commitments made in the Paris accords but nowhere yet actually implemented, we are likely to get about 3.2 degrees of warming, or about three times as much warming as the planet has seen since the beginning of industrialization—bringing the unthinkable collapse of the planet’s ice sheets not just into the realm of the real but into the present.29, 30 That would eventually flood not just Miami and Dhaka but Shanghai and Hong Kong and a hundred other cities around the world.31 The tipping point for that collapse is said to be around two degrees; according to several recent studies, even a rapid cessation of carbon emissions could bring us that amount of warming by the end of the century.32 The assaults of climate change do not end at 2100 just because most modeling, by convention, sunsets at that point. This is why some studying global warming call the hundred years to follow the “century of hell.”33 Climate change is fast, much faster than it seems we have the capacity to recognize and acknowledge; but it is also long, almost longer than we can truly imagine. In reading about warming, you will often come across analogies from the planetary record: the last time the planet was this much warmer, the logic runs, sea levels were here. These conditions are not coincidences. The sea level was there largely because the planet was that much warmer, and the geologic record is the best model we have for understanding the very complicated climate system and gauging just how much damage will come from turning up the temperature by two or four or six degrees. Which is why it is especially concerning that recent research into the deep history of the planet suggests that our current climate models may be underestimating the amount of warming we are due for in 2100 by as much as half.34 In other words, temperatures could rise, ultimately, by as much as double what the IPCC predicts. Hit our Paris emissions targets and we may still get four degrees of warming, meaning a green Sahara and the planet’s tropical forests transformed into fire-dominated savanna.35 The authors of one recent paper suggested the warming could be more dramatic still—slashing our emissions could still bring us to four or five degrees Celsius, a scenario they said would pose severe risks to the habitability of the entire planet. “Hothouse Earth,” they called it.36 Because these numbers are so small, we tend to trivialize the differences between them—one, two, four, five. Human experience and memory offer no good analogy for how we should think of those thresholds, but, as with world wars or recurrences of cancer, you don’t want to see even one. At two degrees, the ice sheets will begin their collapse, 400 million more people will suffer from water scarcity, major cities in the equatorial band of the planet will become unlivable, and even in the northern latitudes heat waves will kill thousands each summer.37, 38 There would be thirty-two times as many extreme heat waves in India, and each would last five times as long, exposing ninety-three times more people.39 This is our best-case scenario. At three degrees, southern Europe would be in permanent drought, and the average drought in Central America would last nineteen months longer and in the Caribbean twenty-one months longer. In northern Africa, the figure is sixty months longer—five years. The areas burned each year by wildfires would double in the Mediterranean and sextuple, or more, in the United States. At four degrees, there would be eight million more cases of dengue fever each year in Latin America alone and close to annual global food crises.41 There could be 9 percent more heat-related deaths.40 Damages from river flooding would grow thirtyfold in Bangladesh, twentyfold in India, and as much as sixtyfold in the United Kingdom. In certain places, six climate-driven natural disasters could strike simultaneously, and, globally, damages could pass $600 trillion—more than twice the wealth as exists in the world today. Conflict and warfare could double. Even if we pull the planet up short of two degrees by 2100, we will be left with an atmosphere that contains 500 parts per million of carbon—perhaps more. The last time that was the case, sixteen million years ago, the planet was not two degrees warmer; it was somewhere between five and eight, giving the planet about 130 feet of sea-level rise, enough to draw a new American coastline as far west as I-95.42 Some of these processes take thousands of years to unfold, but they are also irreversible, and therefore effectively permanent. You might hope to simply reverse climate change; you can’t. It will outrun all of us. This is part of what makes climate change what the theorist Timothy Morton calls a “hyperobject”—a conceptual fact so large and complex that, like the internet, it can never be properly comprehended.43 There are many features of climate change—its size, its scope, its brutality—that, alone, satisfy this definition; together they might elevate it into a higher and more incomprehensible conceptual ﻿category yet. But time is perhaps the most mind-bending feature, the worst outcomes arriving so long from now that we reflexively discount their reality. Yet those outcomes promise to mock us and our own sense of the real in return. The ecological dramas we have unleashed through our land use and by burning fossil fuels—slowly for about a century and very rapidly for only a few decades—will play out over many millennia, in fact over a longer span of time than humans have even been around, performed in part by creatures and in environments we do not yet even know, ushered onto the world stage by the force of warming. And so, in a convenient cognitive bargain, we have chosen to consider climate change only as it will present itself this century. By 2100, the United Nations says, we are due for about 4.5 degrees of warming, following the path we are on today.44 That is, farther from the Paris track than the Paris track is from the two-degree threshold of catastrophe, which it more than doubles. As Naomi Oreskes has noted, there are far too many uncertainties in our models to take their predictions as gospel.45 Just running those models many times, as Gernot Wagner and Martin Weitzman do in their book Climate Shock, yields an 11 percent chance we overshoot six degrees.46 Recent work by the Nobel laureate William Nordhaus suggests that better-than-anticipated economic growth means better than one-in-three odds that our emissions will exceed the U.47N.’s worst-case “business as usual” scenario. In other words, a temperature rise of five degrees or possibly more. The upper end of the probability curve put forward by the U.N. to estimate the end-of-the-century, business-as-usual scenario—the worst-case outcome of a worst-case emissions path—puts us at eight degrees. At that temperature, humans at the equator and in the tropics would not be able to move around outside without dying.48 In that world, eight degrees warmer, direct heat effects would be the least of it: the oceans would eventually swell two hundred feet higher, flooding what are now two-thirds of the world’s major cities; hardly any land on the planet would be capable of efficiently producing any of the food we now eat; forests would be roiled by rolling storms of fire, and coasts would be punished by more and more intense hurricanes; the suffocating hood of tropical disease would reach northward to enclose parts of what we now call the Arctic; probably about a third of the planet would be made unlivable by direct heat; and what are today literally unprecedented and intolerable droughts and heat waves would be the quotidian condition of whatever human life was able to endure.49, 50, 51, 52 We will, almost certainly, avoid eight degrees of warming; in fact, several recent papers have suggested the climate is actually less sensitive to emissions than we’d thought, and that even the upper bound of a business-as-usual path would bring us to about five degrees, with a likely destination around four.53 But five degrees is nearly as unthinkable as eight, and four degrees not much better: the world in a permanent food deficit, the Alps as arid as the Atlas Mountains.54 Between that scenario and the world we live in now lies only the open question of human response. Some amount of further warming is already baked in, thanks to the protracted processes by which the planet adapts to greenhouse gas. But all of those paths projected from the present—to two degrees, to three, to four, five, or even eight—will be carved overwhelmingly by what we choose to do now. There is nothing stopping us from four degrees other than our own will to change course, which we have yet to display. Because the planet is as big as it is, and as ecologically diverse; because humans have proven themselves an adaptable species, and will likely continue to adapt to outmaneuver a lethal threat; and because the devastating effects of warming will soon become too extreme to ignore, or deny, if they haven’t already; because of all that, it is unlikely that climate change will render the planet truly uninhabitable. But if we do nothing about carbon emissions, if the next thirty years of industrial activity trace the same arc upward as the last thirty years have, whole regions will become unlivable by any standard we have today as soon as the end of this century. ﻿A few years ago, E. O. Wilson proposed a term, “Half-Earth,” to help us think through how we might adapt to the pressures of a changing climate, letting nature run its rehabilitative course on half the planet and sequestering humanity in the remaining, habitable half of the world.55 The fraction may be smaller than that, possibly considerably, and not by choice; the subtitle of his book was Our Planet’s Fight for Life. On longer timescales, the even-bleaker outcome is possible, too—the livable planet darkening as it approaches a human dusk. It would take a spectacular coincidence of bad choices and bad luck to make that kind of zero earth possible within our lifetime. But the fact that we have brought that nightmare eventuality into play at all is perhaps the overwhelming cultural and historical fact of the modern era—what historians of the future will likely study about us, and what we’d have hoped the generations before ours would have had the foresight to focus on, too. Whatever we do to stop warming, and however aggressively we act to protect ourselves from its ravages, we will have pulled the devastation of human life on Earth into view—close enough that we can see clearly what it would look like and know, with some degree of precision, how it will punish our children and grandchildren. Close enough, in fact, that we are already beginning to feel its effects ourselves, when we do not turn away. ﻿It is almost hard to believe just how much has happened and how quickly. In the late summer of 2017, three major hurricanes arose in the Atlantic at once, proceeding at first along the same route as though they were battalions of an army on the march.56 Hurricane Harvey, when it struck Houston, delivered such epic rainfall it was described in some areas as a “500,000-year event”—meaning that we should expect that amount of rain to hit that area once every five hundred millennia.57 Sophisticated consumers of environmental news have already learned how meaningless climate change has rendered such terms, which were meant to describe storms that had a 1-in-500,000 chance of striking in any given year. But the figures do help in this way: to remind us just how far global warming has already taken us from any natural-disaster benchmark our grandparents would have recognized. To dwell on the more common 500-year figure just for a moment, it would mean a storm that struck once during the entire history of the Roman Empire. Five hundred years ago, there were no English settlements across the Atlantic, so we are talking about a storm that should hit just once as Europeans arrived and established colonies, as colonists fought a revolution and Americans a civil war and two world wars, as their descendants established an empire of cotton on the backs of slaves, freed them, and then brutalized their descendants, industrialized and postindustrialized, triumphed in the Cold War, ushered in the “end of history,” and witnessed, just a decade later, its dramatic return. One storm in all that time, is what the meteorological record has taught us to expect. Just one. Harvey was the third such flood to hit Houston since 2015.58 And the storm struck, in places, with an intensity that was supposed to be a thousand times rarer still. That same season, an Atlantic hurricane hit Ireland, 45 million were flooded from their homes in South Asia, and unprecedented wildfires tilled much of California into ash.59, 60 And then there was the new category of quotidian nightmare, climate change inventing the once-unimaginable category of obscure natural disasters—crises so large they would once have been inscribed in folklore for centuries today passing across our horizons ignored, overlooked, or forgotten. In 2016, a “thousand-year flood” drowned small-town Ellicott City, Maryland, to take but one example almost at random; it was followed, two years later, in the same small town, by another.61 One week that summer of 2018, dozens of places all over the world were hit with record heat waves, from Denver to Burlington to Ottawa; from Glasgow to Shannon to Belfast; from Tbilisi, in Georgia, and Yerevan, in Armenia, to whole swaths of southern Russia.62 The previous month, the daytime temperature of one city in Oman reached above 121 degrees Fahrenheit, and did not drop below 108 all night, and in Quebec, Canada, fifty-four died from the heat.63 That same week, one hundred major wildfires burned in the American West, including one in California that grew 4,000 acres in one day, and another, in Colorado, that produced a volcano-like 300-foot eruption of flames, swallowing an entire subdivision and inventing a new term, “fire tsunami,” along the way.64, 65, 66 On the other side of the planet, biblical rains flooded Japan, where 1.2 million were evacuated from their homes.67 Later that summer, Typhoon Mangkhut forced the evacuation of 2.45 million from mainland China, the same week that Hurricane Florence struck the Carolinas, turning the port city of Wilmington briefly into an island and flooding large parts of the state with hog manure and coal ash.68, 69, 70 Along the way, the winds of Florence produced dozens of tornadoes across the region.71 The previous month, in India, the state of Kerala was hit with its worst floods in almost a hundred years.72 That October, a hurricane in the Pacific wiped Hawaii’s East Island entirely off the map.73 And in November, which has traditionally marked the beginning of the rainy season in California, the state was hit instead with the deadliest fire in its history—the Camp Fire, which scorched several hundred square miles outside of Chico, killing dozens and leaving many more missing in a place called, proverbially, Paradise.74 The devastation was so complete, you could almost forget the Woolsey Fire, closer to Los Angeles, which burned at the same time and forced the sudden evacuation of 170,000. It is tempting to look at these strings of disasters and think, Climate change is here. And one response to seeing things long predicted actually come to pass is to feel that we have settled into a new era, with everything transformed. In fact, that is how California governor Jerry Brown described the state of things in the midst of the state’s wildfire disaster: “a new normal.”75 The truth is actually much scarier. That is, the end of normal; never normal again. We have already exited the state of environmental conditions that allowed the human animal to evolve in the first place, in an unsure and unplanned bet on just what that animal can endure. The climate system that raised us, and raised everything we now know as human culture and civilization, is now, like a parent, dead. And the climate system we have been observing for the last several years, the one that has battered the planet again and again, is not our bleak future in preview. It would be more precise to say that it is a product of our recent climate past, already passing behind us into a dustbin of environmental nostalgia. There is no longer any such thing as a “natural disaster,” but not only will things get worse; technically speaking, they have already gotten worse. Even if, miraculously, humans immediately ceased emitting carbon, we’d still be due for some additional warming from just the stuff we’ve put into the air already. And of course, with global emissions still increasing, we’re very far from zeroing out on carbon, and therefore very far from stalling climate change. The devastation we are now seeing all around us is a beyond-best-case scenario for the future of warming and all the climate disasters it will bring. ﻿What that means is that we have not, at all, arrived at a new equilibrium. It is more like we’ve taken one step out on the plank off a pirate ship. Perhaps because of the exhausting false debate about whether climate change is “real,” too many of us have developed a misleading impression that its effects are binary. But global warming is not “yes” or “no,” nor is it “today’s weather forever” or “doomsday tomorrow.” It is a function that gets worse over time as long as we continue to produce greenhouse gas. And so the experience of life in a climate transformed by human activity is not just a matter of stepping from one stable ecosystem into another, somewhat worse one, no matter how degraded or destructive the transformed climate is. The effects will grow and build as the planet continues to warm: from 1 degree to 1.5 to almost certainly 2 degrees and beyond. The last few years of climate disasters may look like about as much as the planet can take. In fact, we are only just entering our brave new world, one that collapses below us as soon as we set foot on it. Many of these new disasters arrived accompanied by debate about their cause—about how much of what they have done to us comes from what we have done to the planet. For those hoping to better understand precisely how a monstrous hurricane arises out of a placid ocean, these inquiries are worthwhile, but for all practical purposes the debate yields no real meaning or insight. A particular hurricane may owe 40 percent of its force to anthropogenic global warming, the evolving models might suggest, and a particular drought may be half again as bad as it might have been in the seventeenth century. But climate change is not a discrete clue we can find at the scene of a local crime—one hurricane, one heat wave, one famine, one war. Global warming isn’t a perpetrator; it’s a conspiracy. We all live within climate and within all the changes we have produced in it, which enclose us all and everything we do. If hurricanes of a certain force are now five times as likely as in the pre-Columbian Caribbean, it is parsimonious to the point of triviality to argue over whether this one or that one was “climate-caused.” All hurricanes now unfold in the weather systems we have wrecked on their behalf, which is why there are more of them, and why they are stronger. The same is true for wildfires: this one or that one may be “caused” by a cookout or a downed power line, but each is burning faster, bigger, and longer because of global warming, which gives no reprieve to fire season. Climate change isn’t something happening here or there but everywhere, and all at once. And unless we choose to halt it, it will never stop. Over the past few decades, the term “Anthropocene” has climbed out of academic discourse and into the popular imagination—a name given to the geologic era we live in now, and a way to signal that it is a new era, defined on the wall chart of deep history by human intervention. One problem with the term is that it implies a conquest of nature, even echoing the biblical “dominion.” But however sanguine you might be about the proposition that we have already ravaged the natural world, which we surely have, it is another thing entirely to consider the possibility that we have only provoked it, engineering first in ignorance and then in denial a climate system that will now go to war with us for many centuries, perhaps until it destroys us. That is what Wally Broecker, the avuncular oceanographer, means when he calls the planet an “angry beast.”76 You could also go with “war machine.” Each day we arm it more. The assaults will not be discrete—this is another climate delusion. Instead, they will produce a new kind of cascading violence, waterfalls and avalanches of devastation, the planet pummeled again and again, with increasing intensity and in ways that build on each other and undermine our ability to respond, uprooting much of the landscape we have taken for granted, for centuries, as the stable foundation on which we walk, build homes and highways, shepherd our children through schools and into adulthood under the promise of safety—and subverting the promise that the world we have engineered and built for ourselves, out of nature, will also protect us against it, rather than conspiring with disaster against its makers. Consider those California wildfires. In March 2018, Santa Barbara County issued mandatory evacuation orders for those living in Montecito, Goleta, Santa Barbara, Summerland, and Carpinteria—where the previous December’s fires had hit hardest. It was the fourth evacuation order precipitated by a climate event in the county in just three months, but only the first had been for fire.77 The others were for mudslides ushered into possibility by that fire, one of the toniest communities in the most glamorous state of the world’s preeminently powerful country upended by fear that their toy vineyards and hobby stables, their world-class beaches and lavishly funded public schools, would be inundated by rivers of mud, the community as thoroughly ravaged as the sprawling camps of temporary shacks housing Rohingya refugees from Myanmar in the monsoon region of Bangladesh.78 It was. More than a dozen died, including a toddler swept away by mud and carried miles down the mountainslope to the sea; schools closed and highways flooded, foreclosing the routes of emergency vehicles and making the community an inland island, as if behind a blockade, choked off by a mud noose.79 Some climate cascades will unfold at the global level—cascades so large their effects will seem, by the curious legerdemain of environmental change, imperceptible. A warming planet leads to melting Arctic ice, which means less sunlight reflected back to the sun and more absorbed by a planet warming faster still, which means an ocean less able to absorb atmospheric carbon and so a planet warming faster still. A warming planet will also melt Arctic permafrost, which contains 1.8 trillion tons of carbon, more than twice as much as is currently suspended in the earth’s atmosphere, and some of which, when it thaws and is released, may evaporate as methane, which is thirty-four times as powerful a greenhouse-gas warming blanket as carbon dioxide when judged on the timescale of a century; when﻿ judged on the timescale of two decades, it is eighty-six times as powerful.80, 81 A hotter planet is, on net, bad for plant life, which means what is called “forest dieback”—the decline and retreat of jungle basins as big as countries and woods that sprawl for so many miles they used to contain whole folklores—which means a dramatic stripping-back of the planet’s natural ability to absorb carbon and turn it into oxygen, which means still hotter temperatures, which means more dieback, and so on. Higher temperatures means more forest fires means fewer trees means less carbon absorption, means more carbon in the atmosphere, means a hotter planet still—and so on. A warmer planet means more water vapor in the atmosphere, and, water vapor being a greenhouse gas, this brings higher temperatures still—and so on. Warmer oceans can absorb less heat, which means more stays in the air, and contain less oxygen, which is doom for phytoplankton—which does for the ocean what plants do on land, eating carbon and producing oxygen—which leaves us with more carbon, which heats the planet further. And so on. These are the systems climate scientists call “feedbacks”; there are more.82 Some work in the other direction, moderating climate change. But many more point toward an acceleration of warming, should we trigger them. And just how these complicated, countervailing systems will interact—what effects will be exaggerated and what undermined by feedbacks—is unknown, which pulls a dark cloud of uncertainty over any effort to plan ahead for the climate future. We know what a best-case outcome for climate change looks like, however unrealistic, because it quite closely resembles the world as we live on it today. But we have not yet begun to contemplate those cascades that may bring us to the infernal range of the bell curve. Other cascades are regional, collapsing on human communities and buckling them where they fall. These can be literal cascades—human-triggered avalanches are on the rise, with 50,000 people killed by avalanches globally between 2004 and 2016.83 In Switzerland, climate change has unleashed a whole new kind, thanks to what are called “rain-on-snow” events, which also caused the overflow of the Oroville Dam in Northern California and the 2013 flood of Alberta, Canada, with damages approaching $5 billion.84 But there are other kinds of cascade, too. Climate-driven water shortages or crop failures push climate refugees into nearby regions already struggling with resource scarcity. Sea-level rise inundates cropland with more and more saltwater flooding, transforming agricultural areas into brackish sponges no longer able to adequately feed those living off them; flooding power plants, knocking regions offline just as electricity may be needed most; and crippling chemical and nuclear plants, which, malfunctioning, breathe out their toxic plumes. The rains that followed the Camp Fire flooded the tent cities hastily assembled for the first disaster’s refugees. In the case of the Santa Barbara mudslides, drought produced a state full of dry brush ripe for a spark; then a year of anomalously monsoonish rain produced only more growth, and wildfires tore through the landscape, leaving a mountainside without much plant life to hold in place the millions of tons of loose earth that make up the towering coastal range where the clouds tend to gather and the rain first falls. Some of those watching from afar wondered, incredulously, how a mudslide could kill so many. The answer is, the same way as hurricanes or tornadoes—by weaponizing the environment, whether “man-made” or “natural.” Wind disasters do not kill by wind, however brutal it gets, but by tugging trees out of earth and transforming them into clubs, making power lines into loose whips and electrified nooses, collapsing homes on cowering residents, and turning cars into tumbling boulders. And they kill slowly, too, by cutting off food delivery and medical supplies, making roads impassable even to first responders, knocking out phone lines and cell towers so that the ill and elderly must suffer, and hope to endure, in silence and without aid. Most of the world is not Santa Barbara, with its Mission-style impasto of infinite-seeming wealth, and in the coming decades many of the most punishing climate horrors will indeed hit those least able to respond and recover. This is what is often called the problem of environmental justice; a sharper, less gauzy phrase would be “climate caste system.” The problem is acute within countries, even wealthy ones, where the poorest are those who live in the marshes, the swamps, the floodplains, the inadequately irrigated places with the most vulnerable infrastructure—altogether an unwitting environmental apartheid. Just in Texas, 500,000 poor Latinos live in shantytowns called “colonias” with no drainage systems to deal with increased flooding.85 The cleavage is even sharper globally, where the poorest countries will suffer more in our hot new world. In fact, with one exception—Australia—countries with lower GDPs will warm the most.86 That is notwithstanding the fact that much of the global south has not, to this point, defiled the atmosphere of the planet all that much. This is one of the many historical ironies of climate change that would better be called cruelties, so merciless is the suffering they will inflict. But disproportionately as it will fall on the world’s least, the devastation of global warming cannot be easily quarantined in the developing world, as much as those in the Northern Hemisphere would probably, and not to our credit, prefer it. Climate disaster is too indiscriminate for that. In fact, the belief that climate could be plausibly governed, or managed, by any institution or human instrument presently at hand is another wide-eyed climate delusion. The planet survived many millennia without anything approaching a world government, in fact endured nearly the entire span of human civilization that way, organized into competitive tribes and fiefdoms and kingdoms and nation-states, and only began to build something resembling a cooperative blueprint, very piecemeal, after brutal world wars—in the ﻿form of the League of Nations and United Nations and European Union and even the market fabric of globalization, whatever its flaws still a vision of cross-national participation, imbued with the neoliberal ethos that life on Earth was a positive-sum game. If you had to invent a threat grand enough, and global enough, to plausibly conjure into being a system of true international cooperation, climate change would be it—the threat everywhere, and overwhelming, and total. And yet now, just as the need for that kind of cooperation is paramount, indeed necessary for anything like the world we know to survive, we are only unbuilding those alliances—recoiling into nationalistic corners and retreating from collective responsibility and from each other. That collapse of trust is a cascade, too. ﻿Just how completely the world below our feet will become unknown to us is not yet clear, and how we register its transformation remains an open question. One legacy of the environmentalist creed that long prized the natural world as an otherworldly retreat is that we see its degradation as a sequestered story, unfolding separately from our own modern lives—so separately that the degradation acquires the comfortable contours of parable, like pages from Aesop, aestheticized even when we know the losses as tragedy. Climate change could soon mean that, in the fall, trees may simply turn brown, and so we will look differently at entire schools of painting, which stretched for generations, devoted to best capturing the oranges and reds we can no longer see ourselves out the windows of our cars as we drive along our highways.87 The coffee plants of Latin America will no longer produce fruit; beach homes will be built on higher and higher stilts and still be drowned.88 In many cases, it is better to use the present tense. In just the last forty years, according to the World Wildlife Fund, more than half of the world’s vertebrate animals have died; in just the last twenty-five, one study of German nature preserves found, the flying insect population declined by three-quarters.89, 90 The delicate dance of flowers and their pollinators has been disrupted, as have the migration patterns of cod, which have fled up the Eastern Seaboard toward the Arctic, evading the communities of fishermen that fed on them for centuries; as have the hibernation patterns of black bears, many of which now stay awake all winter.91, 92, 93 Species individuated over millions of years of evolution but forced together by climate change have begun to mate with one another for the first time, producing a whole new class of hybrid species: the pizzly bear, the coy-wolf.94 The zoos are already natural history museums, the children’s books already out of date. Older fables, too, will be remade: the story of Atlantis, having endured and enchanted for several millennia, will compete with the real-time sagas of the Marshall Islands and Miami Beach, each sinking over time into snorkelers’ paradises; the strange fantasy of Santa and his polar workshop will grow eerier still in an Arctic of ice-free summers; and there is a terrible poignancy in contemplating how desertification of the entire Mediterranean Basin will change our reading of the Odyssey, or how it will discolor the shine of Greek islands for dust from the Sahara to permanently blanket their skies, or how it will recast the meaning of the Pyramids for the Nile to be dramatically drained.95, 96, 97 We will think of the border with Mexico differently, presumably, when the Rio Grande is a line traced through a dry riverbed—the Rio Sand, it’s already been called.98 The imperious West has spent five centuries looking down its nose at the plight of those living within the pale of tropical disease, and one wonders how that will change when mosquitoes carrying malaria and dengue are flying through the streets of Copenhagen and Chicago, too. But we have for so long understood stories about nature as allegories that we seem unable to recognize that the meaning of climate change is not sequestered in parable. It encompasses us; in a very real way it governs us—our crop yields, our pandemics, our migration patterns and civil wars, crime waves and domestic assaults, hurricanes and heat waves and rain bombs and megadroughts, the shape of our economic growth and everything that flows downstream from it, which today means nearly everything. Eight hundred million in South Asia alone, the World Bank says, would see their living conditions sharply diminish by 2050 on the current emissions track, and perhaps a climate slowdown will even reveal the bounty of what Andreas Malm calls fossil capitalism to be an illusion, sustained over just a few centuries by the arithmetic of adding the energy value of burned fossil fuels to what had been, before wood and coal and oil, an eternal Malthusian trap.99, 100 In which case, we would have to retire the intuition that history will inevitably extract material progress from the planet, at least in any reliable or global pattern, and come to terms, somehow, with just how pervasively that intuition ruled even our inner lives, often tyrannically. Adaptation to climate change is often viewed in terms of market trade-offs, but in the coming decades the trade will work in the opposite direction, with relative prosperity a benefit of more aggressive action. Every degree of warming, it’s been estimated, costs a temperate country like the United States about one percentage point of GDP, and according to one recent paper, at 1.5 degrees the world would be $20 trillion richer than at 2 degrees.101, 102 Turn the dial up another degree or two, and the costs balloon—the compound interest of environmental catastrophe. 3.7 degrees of warming would produce $551 trillion in damages, research suggests; total worldwide wealth is today about $280 trillion.103, 104 Our current emissions trajectory takes us over 4 degrees by 2100; multiply that by that 1 percent of GDP and you have almost entirely wiped out the very possibility of economic growth, which has not topped 5 percent globally in over forty years.105 A fringe group of alarmed academics call this prospect “steady-state economics,” but it ultimately suggests a more ﻿complete retreat from economics as an orienting beacon, and from growth as the lingua franca through which modern life launders all of its aspirations.106 “Steady-state” also gives a name to the creeping panic that history may be less progressive, as we’ve come to believe really only over the last several centuries, than cyclical, as we were sure it was for the many millennia before. More than that: in the vision steady-state economics projects of a state-of-nature competitive scramble, everything from politics to trade and war seems brutally zero-sum. For centuries we have looked to nature as a mirror onto which to first project, then observe, ourselves. But what is the moral? There is nothing to learn from global warming, because we do not have the time, or the distance, to contemplate its lessons; we are after all not merely telling the story but living it. That is, trying to; the threat is immense. How immense? One 2018 paper sketches the math in horrifying detail. In the journal Nature Climate Change, a team led by Drew Shindell tried to quantify the suffering that would be avoided if warming was kept to 1.5 degrees, rather than 2 degrees—in other words, how much additional suffering would result from just that additional half-degree of warming. Their answer: 150 million more people would die from air pollution alone in a 2-degree warmer world than in a 1.1075-degree warmer one. Later that year, the IPCC raised the stakes further: in the gap between 1.1085 degrees and 2, it said, hundreds of millions of lives were at stake. Numbers that large can be hard to grasp, but 150 million is the equivalent of twenty-five Holocausts. It is three times the size of the death toll of the Great Leap Forward—the largest nonmilitary death toll humanity has ever produced. It is more than twice the greatest death toll of any kind, World War II. The numbers don’t begin to climb only when we hit 1.5 degrees, of course. As should not surprise you, they are already accumulating, at a rate of at least seven million deaths, from air pollution alone, each year—an annual Holocaust, pursued and prosecuted by what brand of nihilism? This is what is meant when climate change is called an “existential crisis”—a drama we are now haphazardly improvising between two hellish poles, in which our best-case outcome is death and suffering at the scale of twenty-five Holocausts, and the worst-case outcome puts us on the brink of extinction.109 Rhetoric often fails us on climate because the only factually appropriate language is of a kind we’ve been trained, by a buoyant culture of sunny-side-up optimism, to dismiss, categorically, as hyperbole. Here, the facts are hysterical, and the dimensions of the drama that will play out between those poles incomprehensibly large—large enough to enclose not just all of present-day humanity but all of our possible futures, as well. Global warming has improbably compressed into two generations the entire story of human civilization. First, the project of remaking the planet so that it is undeniably ours, a project whose exhaust, the poison of emissions, now casually works its way through millennia of ice so quickly you can see the melt with a naked eye, destroying the environmental conditions that have held stable and steadily governed for literally all of human history. That has been the work of a single generation. The second generation faces a very different task: the project of preserving our collective future, forestalling that devastation and engineering an alternate path. There is simply no analogy to draw on, outside of mythology and theology—and perhaps the Cold War prospect of mutually assured destruction. Few feel like gods in the face of warming, but that the totality of climate change should make us feel so passive—that is another of its delusions. In folklore and comic books and church pews and movie theaters, stories about the fate of the earth often perversely counsel passivity in their audiences, and perhaps it should not surprise us that the threat of climate change is no different. By the end of the Cold War, the prospect of nuclear winter had clouded every corner of our pop culture and psychology, a pervasive nightmare that the human experiment might be brought to an end by two jousting sets of proud, rivalrous tacticians, just a few sets of twitchy hands hovering over the planet’s self-destruct buttons. The threat of climate change is more dramatic still, and ultimately more democratic, with responsibility shared by each of us even as we shiver in fear of it; and yet we have processed that threat only in parts, typically not concretely or explicitly, displacing certain anxieties and inventing others, choosing to ignore the bleakest features of our possible future and letting our political fatalism and technological faith blur, as though we’d gone cross-eyed, into a remarkably familiar consumer fantasy: that someone else will fix the problem for us, at no cost. Those more panicked are often hardly less complacent, living instead through climate fatalism as though it were climate optimism. Over the last few years, as the planet’s own environmental rhythms have seemed to grow more fatalistic, skeptics have found themselves arguing not that climate change isn’t happening, since extreme weather has made that undeniable, but that its causes are unclear—suggesting that the changes we are seeing are the result of natural cycles rather than human activities and interventions. It is a very strange argument; if the planet is warming at a terrifying pace and on a horrifying scale, it should transparently concern us more, rather than less, that the warming is beyond our control, possibly even our comprehension. That we know global warming is our doing should be a comfort, not a cause for despair, however incomprehensively large and complicated we find the processes that have brought it into being; that we know we are, ourselves, responsible for all of its punishing effects ﻿should be empowering, and not just perversely. Global warming is, after all, a human invention. And the flip side of our real-time guilt is that we remain in command. No matter how out-of-control the climate system seems—with its roiling typhoons, unprecedented famines and heat waves, refugee crises and climate conflicts—we are all its authors. And still writing.

## 2

#### India’s private sector is key to their space programme.

**Rajagopalan 20**, Rajeswari. [Dr Rajeswari (Raji) Pillai Rajagopalan is the Director of the Centre for Security, Strategy and Technology (CSST) at the Observer Research Foundation, New Delhi. Dr Rajagopalan was the Technical Advisor to the United Nations Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Prevention of Arms Race in Outer Space (PAROS) (July 2018-July 2019). She was also a Non-Resident Indo-Pacific Fellow at the Perth USAsia Centre from April-December 2020. As a senior Asia defence writer for The Diplomat, she writes a weekly column on Asian strategic issues.] “India’s Space Programme: A Role for the Private Sector, Finally?” *Observer Research Foundation*, 24 May 2020, <https://www.orfonline.org/research/indias-space-programme-a-role-for-the-private-sector-finally-66661/>. [GHS-AA]

India’s finance minister Nirmala Sitharaman announced last week that India’s private sector will play a key role in augmenting India’s space programme, and that the government intends to share the facilities of the Indian Space Research Organisation (ISRO) with the private sector. This announcement was part of the Narendra Modi government’s call for new and bold reforms in an effort to promote its ‘self-reliant India’ mission. It is the fourth segment of the Rs 20 lakh crore Aatma Nirbhar Bharat Abhiyan special economic stimulus. Sitharaman’s announcement entails a role for the private sector, possibly with the goal of greater investments in technology development and acquisition, capacity-building and space exploration, including planetary exploration. The minister, while announcing these reforms, appeared to understand that the private sector can help augment India’s space capability. While praising the work done by ISRO, she also pointed out that the private sector is also doing a lot of work in developing space technology. She also acknowledged that the existing regulations prevent private entities from using or even testing their products. Therefore, to level the playing field, the government “will make a provision for the private sector to benefit from the assets which are available to ISRO and for India (in general) to benefit from.” The minister also said the new reforms would allow the private sector to play an active role in “satellites, launches and space-based services”. But as always, implementation is key. Properly executing these reforms will require enabling policies and appropriate regulatory frameworks. That the new reforms will allow private sector players to use ISRO facilities is a big deal. This indeed must be music to the ears of commercial players who have been seeking to get a fair share of the pie in terms of manufacturing of satellites and propellant technologies, among other areas. It should not be too difficult for India’s private space sector because there is a sizeable talent pool available outside ISRO. More importantly, the entry of the private sector, as in the telecom sector, can bring several advantages in terms of cost and access. Following the announcement, ISRO tweeted that it will follow the government’s guidelines to allow the private sector to undertake space activities in the country. Though this did not seem particularly welcoming of the government’s initiative, ISRO’s support is critical to making it a success. ISRO has in the last few years been opening up to the Indian private space sector in a gradual manner – mostly as a matter of compulsion because ISRO simply does not have the in-house capacity to address India’s growing requirements. Today, the Indian space programme is not just about civilian applications for remote-sensing, meteorology and communication, as in the early decades. India’s space sector and its requirements have grown enormously in the last decade to include television and broadband services, space science and exploration, space-based navigation and, of course, defence and security applications. Among others, Ambassador Rakesh Sood has articulated the need for legislation to facilitate ISRO’s partnership with industries and entrepreneurs. Narayan Prasad and Prateep Basu, two prominent faces in the Indian space start-up segment, have argued that despite ISRO’s successes, “India’s space competitiveness has suffered from the absence of a globally reputed, private space industry.” The private sector, especially the NewSpace industry and start-ups, have an advantage in terms of low-cost operations, which itself should be a big incentive for the government to make it an active stakeholder. A certain amount of democratisation of space technology with the participation of the private sector can ensure costs are kept low. And expanding the number of stakeholders will also ensure more transparency and better accountability and regulatory practices. This has been missing in India’s space sector. The same agency has undertaken promotion, commercialisation and regulatory functions – which is not healthy.

#### India’s Space program is key to primacy and winning the space race against China.

**Hickert 17**, Cameron. [Cameron Hickert is a former Research Assistant at Harvard Kennedy School’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, where he focused on China’s artificial intelligence initiatives, U.S.-China relations, and security issues in East Asia. Prior to joining the Belfer Center, Cameron studied as a member of the inaugural class of Schwarzman Scholars. Previously, he was a researcher at the Wilson Center’s China Environment Forum and interned for the U.S. State Department in Vienna, where he provided on-site support at the P5+1 nuclear negotiations with Iran. He holds a B.S. in physics and a B.A. in international studies from the University of Denver.] “Space Rivals: Power and Strategy in the China-India Space Race.” *Schwarzman Scholars*, 14 Aug. 2017, <https://www.schwarzmanscholars.org/events-and-news/space-rivals-power-strategy-china-india-space-race/>. [GHS-AA]

The regional rivalry between India and China has long simmered, and the next frontier increasingly appears to be space. Although officials on both sides of the border have denied the existence of a space race between the two nations, this claim is increasingly dubious. Recent events present the first counter: in response to China’s 2007 anti-satellite test, the ISRO formed the Integrated Space Cell to manage its future military space assets, and pledged to develop ground-based anti-satellite weapons. Days after China announced it would send a human into orbit in 2003, then- Prime Minister of India Atal Vajpayee publicly urged his nation’s scientists to land a man on the moon. It is also in this intensified climate that India’s space budget has increased by double-digit percentages. Economic rationale provides another reason to believe a competition is afoot. China has offered its global satellite-navigation services to countries participating in its One Belt, One Road (OBOR) infrastructure plan; India, which has been skeptical about OBOR, is developing a satellite system which could compete with the Chinese offerings. And as a greater number of private companies seek entry into space-related operations, the two nations will be vying against each other to attract the same paying customers. Both sides increasingly are adopting rhetoric tied to a space race. Wu Yanhua, vice administrator of the China National Space Administration (CNSA), in the first half of 2016 stated his organization aimed “to rank among the world’s top three (alongside the U.S. and Russia) by around 2030”. Evident within this statement is a competition in which India falls short of China’s achievements. More explicitly, the Global Times – a nationalist and populist outlet for the Communist Party of China (CCP) – in February described a successful Indian satellite launch with the title, “India’s satellite launch ramps up space race.” The article then describes Sino-Indian competition in both military and commercial spheres. India, meanwhile, has been heralding space achievements in such a manner that the subcontinent’s press, believing the Indian mission to Mars was meant to show China it was a worthy rival, reacted with forthright nationalism in the event’s wake. The government’s decision to use the Mars orbiter as the new design for the 2,000 rupee note lends further support to patriotic conceptions of a space competition between the Asian neighbors. Whether or not either nation’s top leadership declares a space race, the tit-for-tat timing of space-related developments, economic competition, and the rhetoric present at other levels of government and society indicate a race is indeed occurring. From a fundamental ‘hard power’ perspective, the appeal of outer space is clear. Satellites are crucial to modern day capabilities in the realm referred to as ‘C4ISR’ – command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance. And while there are currently international prohibitions on the deployment of nuclear weapons, conventional weapons do not yet have these limits, although there is a precedent against deploying them to space. Indeed, the theories of deterrence that have long applied to terrestrial combat are now inextricably linked in a complex web with space, nuclear weapons, and conventional weapons. The value of crossover technologies is another important reality for China and India. Experts estimate that upwards of 90% of technologies developed during a space program have applications elsewhere. These cross-applications of the research and development fueling the space race is a means by which nations can improve domestic quality of life, produce technologies more suited to compete in a global environment, sharpen military capabilities, and improve domestic innovation.

#### India Primacy key to US efforts to counter China Rise

**Heijmans**, Philip, **and** Iain **Marlow 21**. [Philip Heijmans is a journalist based in Prague. Iain Marlow is a former Asia-Pacific correspondent for The Globe and Mail. Based in Vancouver, he was responsible for covering Canada’s business ties with the booming economies of Asia, as well as important economic and political developments in the region. Iain has reported from across China, India, Southeast Asia, West Africa and the United States. He joined the Globe in early 2010 as the telecom reporter for Report on Business and in late 2011 began focusing on BlackBerry and its global rivals. In 2012, Iain’s work in Report on Business Magazine was nominated for three National Magazine Awards. His reporting on BlackBerry from Nigeria won a Best in Business award from the Society of American Business Editors and Writers in International Features, and in 2013 he was part of a team of Globe reporters that won a National Newspaper Award in Business. Before joining The Globe, Iain studied journalism and human rights at Carleton University and earned an MSc in International Politics (Distinction) from London’s School of Oriental and African Studies, where he studied on a Chevening Scholarship. He also founded TorontoReview.ca, an international-affairs website, and spent half of 2013 working for Journalists for Human Rights – a Canadian media development organization – in Ghana, where he also did media training for the United Nations Development Programme.] “India to Emerge as Key Military Partner in US’ Plan to Counter China’s Rise.” *Business Standard*, 13 Jan. 2021, <https://www.business-standard.com/article/current-affairs/india-to-emerge-as-key-military-partner-in-us-plan-to-counter-china-s-rise-121011300370_1.html>. [GHS-AA]

The Trump administration declassified its strategy to ensure continued dominance over China, which focuses on accelerating India’s rise as a counterweight to Beijing and the ability to defend Taiwan against an attack. National Security Advisor Robert O’Brien on Tuesday announced the publication of the document, titled “United States Strategic Framework for the Indo-Pacific.” Approved by President Donald Trump in February 2018, it provided the “overarching strategic guidance” for U.S. actions the past three years and was released to show the U.S. commitment to “keeping the Indo-Pacific region free and open long into the future,” O’Brien said in a statement. “Beijing is increasingly pressuring Indo-Pacific nations to subordinate their freedom and sovereignty to a ‘common destiny’ envisioned by the Chinese Communist Party,” O’Brien said in an expanded statement. “The U.S. approach is different. We seek to ensure that our allies and partners – all who share the values and aspirations of a free and open Indo-Pacific -- can preserve and protect their sovereignty.” The document lays out a vision for the region in which North Korea no longer poses a threat, India is predominant in South Asia and the U.S. works with partners around the world to resist Chinese activities to undermine sovereignty through coercion. It assumed that China will take “increasingly assertive” steps to compel unification with Taiwan and warns that its dominance of cutting-edge technologies like artificial intelligence will “pose profound challenges to free societies.” While the timing of the release just a week before President-elect Joe Biden takes office raises questions about the motive, the Trump administration’s actions to counter China in Asia have largely enjoyed bipartisan support. Incoming Biden officials have talked about the need to work more with allies and partners against China, which also forms a key part of the strategy -- particularly in strengthening security ties with Australia, Japan and India. Rory Medcalf, a professor and head of the National Security College at the Australian National University, said that the document shows U.S. policy in Asia was driven by efforts to “bolster allies and counter China.” But he noted that the strategy was so ambitious that “failure was almost assured” on issues such as disarming North Korea, sustaining “primacy” in the region and finding international consensus against harmful Chinese economic practices. “The declassified framework will have enduring value as the beginning of a whole-of-government blueprint for handling strategic rivalry with China,” Medcalf wrote in a post for the Australian Strategic Policy Institute research group. “If the U.S. is serious about that long-term contest, it will not be able to choose between getting its house in order domestically and projecting power in the Indo-Pacific. It will need to do both at once.”

#### China leadership causes prolif --- empirics prove transition wars.

Joshi 15, fellow at the Takshashila Institution, focusing on Indian strategic affairs and foreign policy towards Afghanistan (Rohan Joshi, 2/15/15, “China, Pakistan, and Nuclear Non-Proliferation”, The Diplomat. [http://thediplomat.com/2015/02/china-pakistan-and-nuclear-non-proliferation](http://thediplomat.com/2015/02/china-pakistan-and-nuclear-non-proliferation/)) KD

**China’s appetite for prolif**eration **remained undiminished** **even after it acceded to the NPT**. In 1995, it allegedly sold Pakistan 5,000 ring magnets needed for high-speed gas centrifuges, while a U.S. intelligence report in 1997 held that “China was the single most important supplier of equipment and technology for weapons of mass destruction” in the world. China’s civil nuclear trade commitments with Pakistan have gained considerable momentum since Pakistan’s nuclear tests in May 1998. The China-Pakistan Power Plant Corporation’s Chashma-1 and Chashma-2 power reactors, which were under item-specific IAEA safeguards, were held not to be in violation of NSG guidelines as they were pre-existing commitments and thus “grandfathered” in at the time of China’s induction into the NSG in 2004. However, China then entered into agreements in 2009 for the construction of two new 340 MW power plants (Chashma-3 and Chashma-4). There have since been reports of undertakings for the construction of additional plants in Chashma and Karachi. Some in Pakistan have argued that these commitments date back to a 1986 agreement with China on cooperation in construction and operation of nuclear reactors for an initial period of 30 years, and thus not in violation of NSG guidelines. This spurious argument, if accepted, implies that China can continue to commit to any number of additional nuclear projects in Pakistan without any repercussions. It is another matter that the actual text of the so-called 1986 agreement remains unreleased and shrouded in mystery, thereby preventing the international community from validating Chinese and Pakistani representations. China has demonstrated remarkable consistency over four decades in acting in ways that undermine with impunity the global non-proliferation regime. Its nuclear deals with Pakistan – both military and civilian – were conceived and executed in secrecy. The recent news articles now confirm that China remains committed to a long-term nuclear relationship with Pakistan under its own terms. This is a pattern of behavior that is **unlikely to change without the application of sustained international pressure to bring China into compliance with the commitments it has undertaken**.

#### US-China war causes extinction.

**Sharman 17** [Citing professor of Chinese studies and director of King's College London's Lau China Institute & Professor of Politics at the University of Warwick], Jon. “War between China and America ‘Could End Life as We Know It on Earth.’” *The Independent*, 5 Feb. 2017, http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-china-war-be-end-of-life-earth-nuclear-weapons-apocalypse-steve-bannon-donald-trump-white-house-a7561821.html.

While the prospect remains relatively remote, experts have told The Independent they believe such a conflict would be catastrophic, throwing the entire globe into turmoil and potentially ending "life as we know it on Earth". The United States would likely win because sending China's untested forces against the might of America's military would be like pitching farmers against Achilles and his warriors, said one, but even a conventional military victory would be a strategic disaster. It would set off a global economic crisis and create a potential power vacuum inside defeated China "the like of which we can't imagine". Mr Bannon said war would erupt in the South China Sea in "five to 10 years". He said: "They’re taking their sandbars and making basically stationary aircraft carriers and putting missiles on those. They come here to the United States in front of our face—and you understand how important face is—and say it’s an ancient territorial sea." The US and China have been engaged in a back-and-forth dispute over military build-up and territorial claims in the region for some years. In December the US said it would base its deadliest fighter jets in Australia, and days later China seized an unmanned US Navy drone. It followed a diplomatic spat around then-President-elect Trump's congratulatory phone call with Taiwan's Prime Minister Tsai Ing-wen, which broke with decades of US policy. Mr Trump has been forthright about China's influence, blaming it for the loss of American jobs. The war of words recently heated up when a Chinese military official was quoted as saying talk of war with the US under Mr Trump "are not just slogans, they are becoming a practical reality". Trevor McCrisken, associate professor of politics and international studies at the University of Warwick, said that if war broke out "we would be looking, I would imagine, at World War Three". He said: "I really do think that would be the end of life as we know it on Earth. "From a global strategic risk level I would say the last thing you want is war between the United States and any of the major powers because of the risks of escalation, obviously the potential for nuclear weapons to be used. The likelihood of nuclear exchange between the two principals involved is high." But, he added, the "overwhelming view of most policy-makers in Washington since at least the late 1970s" favours a form of "cooperative, if competitive" relationship with China. Dr Peter Roberts, director of military sciences at the Royal United Services Institute, said: "America would take military losses. They would lose thousands and thousands [of personnel]. But China would be utterly defeated. If America goes to war, it wages war in its totality. They would go to this with unparalleled violence and energy." The US has an "overall competitive edge" partly due to technological superiority, Dr Roberts said, but also because the four branches of its military—Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force—are trained to work closely together. "It's demonstrated how it can use all those arms to deliver military victory," he said. In contrast, China's services operate "individually" and also have less, and less recent, combat experience compared to their American counterparts. "There's a huge difference between someone who's been in combat before, and someone who hasn't," Dr Roberts said, comparing the potential confrontation to one between Greek hero Achilles and farmers recruited from the fields. Kerry Brown, professor of Chinese studies and director of King's College London's Lau China Institute, said: "US naval superiority is massive. And if we are talking just military, then for sure, a conflict right beside China would hurt China more than the US. "It would, of course, totally upend supply routes, however, and probably cause a global recession. So it would, no matter who won in terms of military outcomes, be lose-lose and cut against the logic of self interest of both the US and China." Professor Brown added: "We have to expect this war of words to simply get worse. The best outcome is that the two sides ultimately compromise—China acts more responsibly, and stops its adventurism, and the US concedes it more space. The worst outcome would be a misunderstanding that would lead to real conflict."

## 3

#### States ought to

#### implement an orbital use fee on all current and future orbiting satellites

#### implement cooperative active debris removal measures aimed at mitigating debris

#### Orbital use fees reduce risk of collisions, because satellite operators would have to pay the price, while still encouraging space exploration and increasing the value of the space industry.

**Vergoth 20**, Karin. [Writer for the Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences] “Solving the Space Junk Problem.” *CU Boulder Today*, 26 May 2020, <https://www.colorado.edu/today/2020/05/26/solving-space-junk-problem>. [GHS-AA]

A better approach to the space debris problem, Rao and his colleagues found, is to implement an orbital-use fee—a tax on orbiting satellites. “That’s not the same as a launch fee,” Rao said, “Launch fees by themselves can’t induce operators to deorbit their satellites when necessary, and it's not the launch but the orbiting satellite that causes the damage.” Orbital-use fees could be straight-up fees or tradeable permits, and they could also be orbit-specific, since satellites in different orbits produce varying collision risks. Most important, the fee for each satellite would be calculated to reflect the cost to the industry of putting another satellite into orbit, including projected current and future costs of additional collision risk and space debris production—costs operators don’t currently factor into their launches. “In our model, what matters is that satellite operators are paying the cost of the collision risk imposed on other operators,” said Daniel Kaffine, professor of economics and RASEI Fellow at CU Boulder and co-author on the paper. And those fees would increase over time, to account for the rising value of cleaner orbits. In the researchers’ model, the optimal fee would rise at a rate of 14 percent per year, reaching roughly $235,000 per satellite-year by 2040. For an orbital-use fee approach to work, the researchers found, all countries launching satellites would need to participate—that's about a dozen that launch satellites on their own launch vehicles and more than 30 that own satellites. In addition, each country would need to charge the same fee per unit of collision risk for each satellite that goes into orbit, although each country could collect revenue separately. Countries use similar approaches already in carbon taxes and fisheries management. In this study, Rao and his colleagues compared orbital-use fees to business as usual (that is, open access to space) and to technological fixes such as removing space debris. They found that orbital use fees forced operators to directly weigh the expected lifetime value of their satellites against the cost to industry of putting another satellite into orbit and creating additional risk. In other scenarios, operators still had incentive to race into space, hoping to extract some value before it got too crowded. With orbital-use fees, the long-run value of the satellite industry would increase from around $600 billion under the business-as-usual scenario to around $3 trillion, researchers found. The increase in value comes from reducing collisions and collision-related costs, such as launching replacement satellites. Orbital-use fees could also help satellite operators get ahead of the space junk problem. “In other sectors, addressing the tragedy of the commons has often been a game of catch-up with substantial social costs. But the relatively young space industry can avoid these costs before they escalate,” Burgess said.

#### Active debris removal solves space debris

ESA 17 ( April 14, 2017 “Active Debris Removal” https://www.esa.int/Our\_Activities/Space\_Safety/Space\_Debris/Active\_debris\_removal)

ESA, as a space technology and operations agency, has identified active removal technologies as a strategic goal. Active Debris Removal (ADR) is necessary to stabilise the growth of space debris, but even more important is that any newly launched objects comply with post-mission disposal guidelines – especially orbital decay in less than 25 years. If this were not the case, most of the required ADR effort would go to compensate for the non-compliance of new objects. Studies performed with long-term evolution models like DELTA have shown that a ‘business as usual’ scenario will lead to a progressive, uncontrolled increase of object numbers in LEO, with collisions becoming the primary debris source. The IADC mitigation measures will reduce the growth, but long-term proliferation is still expected, even with full mitigation compliance, and even if all launch activities are halted. This is an indication that the population of large and massive objects has reached a critical concentration in LEO. But even in a future scenario in which no further objects are added to the space environment (no launches, no debris release, no explosions), the results of simulations by ESA and NASA show that the number of debris objects would continue to grow even under these idealised conditions – under which a collision rate of once every 10 years can be assumed. Furthermore, an IADC study with six different models from 2013 show that in an almost perfect scenario with 90% compliance with the mitigation guidelines and with no explosions on orbit, the population suffers a steady increase, and a collision could be expected every 5–9 years. All these studies are a clear indicator that the population of large and massive objects has reached a critical density in LEO, and that mitigation alone is not sufficient. It is necessary to introduce a programme of remediation measures as well: active debris removal, in order to reduce the number of large and massive (mostly physically intact) objects . The current LEO environment contains about 3200 intact objects. An ESA analysis shows that the (lower) level of around 2500 intact objects (the status in the mid-1990s) would have a 50% probability of decreasing the overall debris population. If this is considered to be a desirable goal for remediation, the number of intact objects has to be reduced even while the world’s spaceflight activities continue. Averaged over the eight years 2004–12, about 72 objects were placed into LEO per year. However, since 2012, there has been a steep increase in the number of satellites placed in LEO, with the count now running at 125 objects per year (average over the four years 2013–16), mainly due to the increased use of small satellites. In addition, in 2015, several companies announced their intention to deploy large constellations of more than around 1000 satellites in LEO to provide fast Internet around the world. Limiting launch rates neither feasible nor helpful Therefore, limiting the launch rate or a further reduction of the allowed lifetime in orbit after the end of the mission (which would be two options to reduce the overall number of intact objects in space) do not seem feasible, because they cannot be mandated. For all new objects, strong compliance with post-mission mitigation measures would allow maintaining the number of intact objects at a level similar to the current one, and avoid having to deal with more objects in addition to those already in orbit. Therefore, in order to reduce the number of big objects in LEO, the only option is to actively remove large objects now in orbit and having a long remaining lifetime in space. This would provide several benefits: The most critical objects (those that would generate the most fragments in case of any collision, and that have a higher collision risk) could be removed from the environment first; Decommissioned objects could also be removed; A controlled deorbit could be performed (as large removal targets typically are also most critical in terms of on-­ground risk). Studies at ESA and NASA show that with a removal sequence planned according to a target selection based on mass, area, or cumulative collision risk, the environment can be stabilised when on the order of 5–10 objects are removed from LEO per year (although the effectiveness of each removal decreases as more objects are removed). Active removal is efficient Active removal can be more efficient in terms of the number of collisions prevented versus objects removed when the following principles are applied for the selection of removal targets, which can be used to generate a criticality index and the according list: The selected objects should have a high mass (they have the largest environmental impact in case of collision); Should have high collision probabilities (e.g. they should be in densely populated regions and have a large cross-sectional area); Should be in high altitudes (where the orbital lifetime of the resulting fragments is long). Long­-term environment simulations can be used to analyse orbital regions that are hotspots for collisions. The most densely populated region in LEO is around 800–1000 km altitude at high inclinations. The collision hotspots can be ranked by the number of collisions predicted to occur under a business as usual scenario. Polar Hotspots High-ranking hotspot regions are at around: 1000 km and 82º inclination; 800 km and 98º inclination; 850 km and 71º inclination. The concentration of critical-size objects in these narrow orbital bands could allow multi-target removal missions. Such missions could be specifically designed for one orbit type were a number of objects of the same type are contained While removal targets should be selected from a global perspective, legal constraints dealing with the ownership of space debris objects, and the validation thereof, cannot be neglected. Also, it should be kept in mind that legal responsibility for a coupled remover/target stack (i.e. when a removal spacecraft attaches itself to a inoperative body for deorbiting) is shared. While removal technology should be generic, i.e. applicable to a wide range of removal targets, which may also include non­ESA objects, special emphasis on firm agreements with the owners of the object is required.

#### Debris removal prevents collisions

**Khlystov 18**, Nikolai. [Lead, Space, and lead, Global Future Council on Space, World Economic Forum] “We Have a Space Debris Problem. Here’s How to Solve It.” *World Economic Forum*, 3 Apr. 2018, https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/04/we-have-a-space-debris-problem-heres-how-to-solve-it/. [GHS-AA]

First, we need to start removing the most volatile and biggest pieces from the most congested orbits. A number of companies, such as Astroscale and Saber Astronautics, are looking at this very complicated and technical solution already. The idea is essentially to grab a piece of debris with a special satellite and de-orbit both of them, in the process burning up both objects above the aforementioned ‘spacecraft cemetery’. Other technologies include moving objects with a powerful laser beam. It is important to start doing that soon – current scientific estimates predict that without active debris removal, certain orbits will become unusable over the coming decades. Though it is hard to capture objects that are moving as fast as this debris, it is certainly possible. After all, spacecraft dock with the ISS all the time. The bigger issues are financing and international cooperation. The question of who pays for these ‘garbage collection’ missions is a tricky one. Perhaps even trickier, is negotiating the international diplomatic space and persuading, for example Russia, that their old military satellite needs to be de-orbited by a technology company.

## Case

#### Toplevel framing – don’t let them get away with sweeping assumptions that their bans on private appropriation solve public space agency exploitation of outer space – that’s a terminal solvency deficit to both contentions because it means appropriation with satellites and colonization still happen

### AT Debris

#### 1] Even full-scale ASAT war can’t trigger Kessler – modelling

Drmola and Hubik 18 [Jakub Drmola, Division of Security and Strategic Studies, Department of Political Science at the Faculty of Social Sciences of Masaryk University. Tomas Hubik, Department of Theoretical Computer Science and Mathematical Logic, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University. Kessler Syndrome: System Dynamics Model. Space Policy Volumes 44–45, August 2018, Pages 29-39. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964617300966?via%3Dihub]

The probabilities and rates of collisions of objects from different groups were calculated using a coefficient converting the rate of collisions between objects from one group to the rate of collisions between objects from another group. The initial base rate was estimated using iterative simulations and comparison of the resulting runs with real data and outputs from other models. Detailed model built by a group of researchers from the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory was used as a base for the calibration [see 9]. As the major factor influencing collision probability is size, the probability increases with square of the diameter representing bigger area for possible impact. Speed would be another factor influencing the probability of impacts, but the speed depends on the distance from the Earth and is not influenced by debris size. It means that it will not vary between different debris groups and thus will not influence the collision probability conversion parameters in our model. One the most important limitations and simplifications of the model is the uncertainty of size, structure, and composition of the satellites—i.e. what debris the satellite will disintegrate into in case of a collision. Perhaps even more crucially, the rate of orbital decay changes significantly with the altitude and eccentricity of the trajectory. The lower the orbital altitude is or the more eccentric it is, the more drag the object experiences as it passes through the last vestiges of our atmosphere. Therefore, objects in the lower or more eccentric orbit will decay significantly faster. Thus, the actual lifetime of a piece of debris can easily vary from days to centuries. It also needs to be noted that while it may take many decades for a satellite to decay (especially from the popular orbits between 500 km and 800 km), we cannot assume the same about debris. That is because while satellite orbits typically have very low eccentricity, collisions result in fragments with velocities and trajectories that vary and differ from the original intact satellite (i.e. are more eccentric and decay faster). This makes estimating rate of orbital decay of debris quite difficult, especially when combined with the ongoing laudable efforts by Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Committee (IADC) to shorten the lifetime of satellites after they cease planned operations [14], [15]. Therefore, both the orbital and structural parameters used here are (and must be) overall averages designed to represent a “general LEO satellite” and are based on previous fragmentations, of which there are but few. Furthermore, this is getting increasingly more difficult as satellites are getting progressively more diverse, especially with the ongoing boom of the miniaturized CubeSats [16]. This leads to a relatively wide and heterogeneous population of real satellites being represented by a single, homogenized stock of simulated satellites in the model. It is also uncertain and difficult to predict how exactly is this going to evolve in the far future, what proportion of launched satellites will be of which size, and into which orbit they will be placed. Lacking precise information, we simply extrapolate current and expected trends. 5. Scenarios and simulation results 5.1. Business as usual and beyond The baseline scenario represents a continuation of the current trends, which are simply extended into the future. An average 1% growth rate of yearly launches of new satellites (starting at 89) is assumed, together with constant success rate in satellites’ ability to actively avoid collisions with debris and other satellites, constant lifetime, and failure rate. This basic model lacks any sudden events or major policy changes that would markedly influence the debris propagation. However, it serves both as a foundation for all the following scenarios and as a basis of comparison to see what the impact would be. Given high uncertainty regarding future state of the satellite industry (how many satellites will be launched per year, of what type and size, etc.), we elected to limit our simulations to 50 years. The model can certainly continue beyond this point, but the associated unknowns make the simulations progressively less useful. Running this model for its full 50 years (2016–2066) yields the expected result of perpetually growing amount of debris in the LEO. One can observe nearly 2-fold increase in the large debris (over 10 cm) and 3-fold increase in small debris (less than 1 cm) quantities (Fig. 5). The oscillations visible in the graph are caused by the aforementioned solar cycles which influence the rate of reentry for all simulated populations except the still active (i.e. powered) satellites. Also please note that throughout the article, the graphs use quite different scales for debris populations because of the considerable variations between scenarios. Using any single scale for all graphs would render some of them unintelligible. We can see that this increase in numbers still does not result in realization of the Kessler syndrome as most of the satellites being launched remain intact for their full expected service life. However, it comes with a considerable increase in risk to satellites, which is manifested by their higher yearly losses, making satellites operations riskier and more expensive for governments and private companies alike. This increased amount of debris in LEO combined with the larger number of active satellites makes it approximately twice as likely that an active satellite will suffer a disabling hit or a total disintegration during its lifetime. It should be noted that this risk might possibly be offset by future improvements in satellite reliability, debris tracking, and navigation [17]. This negative development of increasingly risky and costly operation of satellites can also be highlighted and visualized in a graph by comparing the number of satellites launched to the number of satellites lost (to collisions as well as malfunctions) in each given year (Fig. 6). This ratio shows diminishing efficiency of the system, where number of losses per launch increases. After fully acknowledging limitations stemming from inherent uncertainties, we can also try to “make things expectedly worse” by doubling the growth rate of yearly launches (to what it perhaps might end up being because of the boom in satellites industry because of increasing privatization of space, growing demand for communication satellites, etc.) and also extending the simulation timeframe to 200 years (Fig. 7). It must be stressed that the model was not designed with such long outlooks in mind, and many of the assumptions will certainly not hold over the next 200 years (such as static launch rate growth, size, and structure of the satellites, their lifetime, evasion rates, lack of mitigation, and many others). But in the overwhelmingly unlikely case that these assumptions stay true, the simulated outcome seems to suggest a collapse of sorts around the year 2163. However, it does not look like a suddenly triggered chain reaction leading to widespread fragmentation of the entire LEO but rather like a gradually reached point at which LEO is so full of debris, and the rate of active satellite fragmentation is so high (almost one every day) that the launches cannot keep up anymore. This is consistent with the findings reported by LaFleur and Finkelman, who found the debris system to be unconditionally stable [18], [19], [27]. 5.2. Antisatellite weapon system scenario Apart from the usual collisional risks that satellites face in the LEO, there has been growing concern regarding the development of antisatellite weapon systems (ASATs) by several world powers (namely China, Russian Federation, and the United States). These weapons are designed to intercept and destroy orbiting satellites and are, for the most part, descended from the antiballistic missile defense systems. While there are some alternative designs under development, the current generation mostly takes form of a boosted missile with a kinetic kill vehicle. This method of destruction (a collision of a missile with a satellite) leads to extensive fragmentation and creation of large debris clouds. A prime example of this was the Chinese 2007 ASAT test which destroyed China's own decommissioned weather satellite FengYun-1C. This hypervelocity collision created around 3000 pieces of medium to large debris and tens of thousands of smaller pieces, most of which will remain in orbit for decades, thus considerably contributing to overall risk of future orbital collisions [20]. As much as occasional tests of ASATs are increasing the amount of debris in the LEO, a greater danger by far is the possibility of a large-scale ASAT deployment during an armed conflict between two or more major, technologically advanced powers. Given the reliance of modern militaries on satellites for intelligence, communication, and navigation, it is generally presumed that the initial phase of any such conflict would involve mutual destruction of each other's satellites to blind the enemy and hinder their offensive operations [21], [22]. Such opening salvos could involve immediate destruction of dozens of satellites, thus creating massive clouds of debris threatening the remaining satellites and possibly leading to cascading disintegration across the entire orbit. This kind of hypothetical event is simulated in the second scenario, where an imaginary major military conflict erupts in the year 2040, during which roughly half of all military satellites are destroyed by intentional kinetic impacts using antisatellite weapons. With military and dual-use satellites generally representing a little over one-third of all satellites [23] (depending on criteria and the operating country), this results in some 200 satellites destroyed by ASATs in 2040 (Fig. 8). However, even this sudden event is not enough to trigger a chain reaction of satellites disintegrating in LEO, at least according to this model. Nevertheless, the number of collisions with active satellites ends up nearly twice as high at the end of the simulation (i.e. 25 years after the conflict and ASAT strikes) when compared to the previous run. This shows that the damage would be long-term and would negatively affect satellite operations (including commercial and scientific ones) for many years after any conflict involving ASATs.

#### 2] No space war---attribution technology solves

Omar Lamrani 16, studied international relations at Clark University and holds a master's degree from the Diplomatic Academy of Vienna, where his thesis centered on Chinese military doctrine, 5/17/16, “Avoiding a War in Space”, https://worldview.stratfor.com/article/avoiding-war-space

If the United States wants to preserve its primacy in the face of increasing threats to its strength in space, Washington will need to invest in strategies to deter attacks on its orbital assets. The first step in strengthening space deterrence is to ensure proper attribution: The United States cannot hold its enemies accountable for attacks if it does not know who initiated them. But the vastness of space, along with the difficulty of obtaining physical evidence from attacked satellites, can make responsibility hard to prove.¶ To that end, the United States is investing in a second-generation surveillance system, known as Space Fence, to track satellites and orbital debris. Slated to begin operating in 2018, Space Fence uses ground-based radars that give it 10 times the detection capability of its predecessor, the Air Force Space Surveillance System.¶ In addition, the United States has been working with a classified satellite defense technology called the Self-Awareness Space Situational Awareness system, which reportedly will be able to pinpoint the source of a laser fired at a satellite.¶ Redundancy and shielding can also deter limited attacks against satellites. The innate redundancy of large satellite constellations could make attacking them too risky; such an assault would fail to significantly impair US space control while still inviting retaliation.¶ Meanwhile, more widespread use of resistant antenna designs, filters, surge arresters and fiber-optic components, which are less vulnerable to attack, is already being explored to further shield satellites from jamming, dazzling and blinding.

3] Several **barriers to use of space weapons**

Bohumil **Doboš**, scholar at the Institute of Political Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic, and a coordinator of the Geopolitical Studies Research Centre, **’19**, Geopolitics of the Outer Space, Chapter 3: Outer Space as a Military-Diplomatic Field, Pgs. 48-49)

Despite the theorized potential for the achievement of the terrestrial dominance throughout the utilization of the ultimate high ground and the ease of destruction of space-based assets by the potential space weaponry, the utilization of space weapons is with current technology and no effective means to protect them far from fulfilling this potential (Steinberg 2012, p. 255). **In current global international political and technological setting, the utility of space weapons is very limited**, even if we accept that the ultimate high ground presents the potential to get a decisive tangible military advantage (which is unclear). This stands among the reasons for the lack of their utilization so far. Last but not the least, it must be pointed out that the states also develop passive defense systems designed to protect the satellites on orbit or critical capabilities they provide. These **further decrease the utility of space weapons**. These systems include larger maneuvering capacities, launching of decoys, preparation of spare satellites that are ready for launch in case of ASAT attack on its twin on orbit, or attempts to decrease the visibility of satellites using paint or materials less visible from radars (Moltz 2014, p. 31). Finally, we must look at the main obstacles of connection of the outer space and warfare. The first set of barriers is comprised of **physical obstructions**. As has been presented in the previous chapter, the outer space is very challenging domain to operate in. Environmental factors still present the largest threat to any space military capabilities if compared to any man-made threats (Rendleman 2013, p. 79). A following issue that hinders military operations in the outer space is the predictability of orbital movement. If the reconnaissance satellite's orbit is known, the terrestrial actor might attempt to hide some critical capabilities-an option that is countered by new surveillance techniques (spectrometers, etc.) (Norris 2010, p. 196)-but the hide-and-seek game is on. This same principle is, however, in place for any other space asset-any nation with basic tracking capabilities may quickly detect whether the military asset or weapon is located above its territory or on the other side of the planet and thus mitigate the possible strategic impact of space weapons not aiming at mass destruction. Another possibility is to attempt to destroy the weapon in orbit. Given the level of development for the ASAT technology, it seems that they will prevail over any possible weapon system for the time to come. Next issue, directly connected to the first one, is the utilization of weak physical protection of space objects that need to be as light as possible to reach the orbit and to be able to withstand harsh conditions of the domain. This means that their protection against ASAT weapons is very limited, and, whereas some avoidance techniques are being discussed, they are of limited use in case of ASAT attack. We can thus add to the issue of predictability also the issue of easy destructibility of space weapons and other military hardware (Dolman 2005, p. 40; Anantatmula 2013, p. 137; Steinberg 2012, p. 255). Even if the high ground was effectively achieved and other nations could not attack the space assets directly, there is still a need for communication with those assets from Earth. There are also ground facilities that support and control such weapons located on the surface. Electromagnetic communication with satellites might be jammed or hacked and the ground facilities infiltrated or destroyed thus rendering the possible space weapons useless (Klein 2006, p. 105; Rendleman 2013, p. 81). This issue might be overcome by the establishment of a base controlling these assets outside the Earth-on Moon or lunar orbit, at lunar L-points, etc.-but this perspective remains, for now, unrealistic. Furthermore, **no contemporary actor will risk full space weaponization in the face of possible competition and the possibility of rendering the outer space useless.** No actor is dominant enough to prevent others to challenge any possible attempts to dominate the domain by military means. To quote 2016 Stratfor analysis, "(a) war in space would be devastating to all, and preventing it, rather than finding ways to fight it, will likely remain the goal" (Larnrani 20 16). This stands true unless some space actor finds a utility in disrupting the arena for others.

### AT Colonialism

#### 1] Be skeptical of 1AC claims that they sovle corporate colonialism – they reify neolib practices of collab between state and private sector – don’t grant them external r/c solvency claims

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

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

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

#### 3] Space colonization is key to ensure human survival – pursuing it as soon as possible is crucial
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Should humankind exist in the future? Should the future existence of humankind be as good as possible in as many ways as possible? If your answer to these two questions is Yes, then there is a topic that you should care about a lot: Space colonization. Why, you might wonder, does space colonization matter, possibly more than anything else, as the title of this article claims? Because the future of humankind directly and completely dependent on whether and how we manage to colonize space. Space colonization is a double-edged sword. On one hand, the creation of permanent and self-sustainable human habitats beyond Earth is unavoidable if humankind is to exist in the long-term future. On the other hand, however, space colonization could bring about a catastrophically bad future if we colonize space in a bad way. That future that might be worse than one in which humankind does not exist. Space or bust: Why we must reach for the stars Why should we pursue space colonization in the first place? Don’t we have more pressing problems today, on Earth? Yes, we do have many problems on Earth today, and we should try to solve them. But space colonization is just that: A strategy for dealing with certain problems. An the problems that space colonization would be dealing with are, arguably, among the greatest problems of them all: Existential risks; risks that might lead to the extinction of humankind [1]. Currently, all of our proverbial existential eggs are in the same basket. If a natural existential risk strikes (for example, a large asteroid colliding with Earth) or if a man-made existential risk results in a catastrophic outcome (for example, runaway global warming [2, 3]), all of humankind is at risk because humankind is currently limited to planet Earth. If, however, there are self-sustainable human habitats beyond Earth, then the probability of an irreversibly catastrophic outcome for all of humankind is drastically reduced. Investing in space colonization today could therefore have immense future benefits. Using resources today in order to make space colonization possible in the medium-term future is not a waste, but a very profitable investment. If humankind stays limited to Earth and if we go extinct as a consequence of doing so, then we will all the billions of life years and billions of humans who might have come to exist — and who would have experienced happiness and contributed to humankind’s continued epistemic and moral progress. Taking space colonization more seriously today does not, of course, mean that we should only pursue space colonization and ignore everything else that is bad in the world. We should continue dealing with current global problems and, at the same time, invest greater resources into space colonization. At this point in our history and our technological development, even modest amounts of resources directed at space colonization would go a long way, such as public funding of basic research. Additionally, it is very likely that technological advances in the domain of space colonization would improve our lives in other ways as well thanks to technology transfer [4] — investing in space colonization today would probably be a win-win situation. So the situation seems clear: We must pursue space colonization and try to spread beyond Earth as fast as possible. Unfortunately, there is a catch: Yes, we must colonize space if humankind is to survive, but space colonization itself is very risky. So much so that bad outcomes of space colonization might be even worse for humankind than “merely” going extinct.