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#### T – Appropriation:

#### Interpretation: Appropriation means use, exploitation, or occupation that is permanent and to the exclusion of others

Babcock 19 Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Cente. Babcock, Hope M. "The Public Trust Doctrine, Outer Space, and the Global Commons: Time to Call Home ET." Syracuse L. Rev. 69 (2019): 191.

Article II is one of those succeeding provisions that curtails “the freedom of use outlined in Article [I] by declaring that outer space, including the [m]oon and other celestial bodies, is not subject to national appropriation.”147 It flatly prohibits national appropriation of any celestial body in outer space “by means of use or occupation, or by any other means.”148 However, “many types of ‘use’ or ‘exploitation’. . . are inconceivable without appropriation of some degree at least of any materials taken,” like ore or water.149 If this view of Article II’s prohibitory language is correct, then “it is not at all farfetched to say that the OST actually installs a blanket prohibition on many beneficial forms of development.”150 However, the OST only prohibits an appropriation that constitutes a “long-term use and permanent occupation, to the exclusion of all others.”151

#### Violation: Constellations do not appropriate – reject non-legal interpretations

Johnson 20 [Chris Johnson is the Space Law Advisor for Secure World Foundation and has nine years of professional experience in international space law and policy. He has authored and co-authored publications on international space law, national space legislation, international cooperation in space, human-robotic cooperative space exploration, and on the societal benefits of space technology for Africa. "The Legal Status of MegaLEO Constellations and Concerns About Appropriation of Large Swaths of Earth Orbit." https://swfound.org/media/206951/johnson2020\_referenceworkentry\_thelegalstatusofmegaleoconstel.pdf]

No, This Is Not Impermissible Appropriation

An opposite conclusion can also be reasonably arrived at when approached along the following lines. The counter argument would assert that the deployment and operation of these global constellations, such as SpaceX’s Starlink, OneWeb, Kepler, etc., are aligned with and in full conformity with the laws applicable to outer space. These constellations are merely the exercise and enjoyment of the freedom of exploration and use of outer space and do not constitute any impermissible appropriation of the orbits that they transit.

Freedom of Access and Use Permits Constellations

Rather than being a violation of other’s rights to access and explore outer space, the deployment of these constellations is more correctly viewed as the exercise and enjoyment of the right to access and use outer space. Article I of the Outer Space Treaty establishes a right to access and use space without discrimination.

Not allowing an actor to deploy spacecraft, regardless of their number or destination, would be infringing with the exercise of their freedom. It would be discriminatory. Additionally, actors do not need permission from any other State, or group of States, to access and explore outer space.

Aligned with the Intentions of the Outer Space Treaty

This use of outer space by constellations in LEO, while not explicitly mentioned by the drafters of the Outer Space Treaty or other space law, actually is the fulfillment of their visions for the use of outer space. The preamble to the Outer Space Treaty (which contains the subject matter and purpose of the treaty and can be used for interpreting the operative articles of the treaty) speaks of the aspirations of humanity in exploring and using outer space. It is easy to see constellations that will provide Internet access to the world as fulfilling the visions of the drafters:

The States Parties to this Treaty,

Inspired by the great prospects opening up before mankind as a result of man’s entry into outer space,

Recognizing the common interest of all mankind in the progress of the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes,

Believing that the exploration and use of outer space should be carried on for the benefit of all peoples irrespective of the degree of their economic or scientific development,

Desiring to contribute to broad international cooperation in the scientific as well as the legal aspects of the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes,

Believing that such cooperation will contribute to the development of mutual understanding and to the strengthening of friendly relations between States and peoples,

As such, subsequent article of the Outer Space Treaty should be read in a permissive light, as permitting constellations, rather than a restrictive light which only sees potential negative aspects of constellations.

Due Regard and Harmful Contamination Will be Addressed

Operators in LEO are well aware of the challenges to space sustainability that their constellations will pose and will be taking efforts to mitigate the creation of debris. OneWeb is keenly focused on space sustainability and has even argued that the current norm, whereby spacecraft are not in space for longer than 25 years and are deorbited from lower orbits at the end of their lifetime (aka post mission disposal), is not sufficient to keep outer space clean and that shorter lifespan limits should be imposed on operators, especially operators in LEO, and operators of small satellites.

Additionally, these systems will be able to cooperate with emerging space safety and space traffic management plans and can operate in ways that do not restrict or impinge on other users of the space domain. Because due regard is therefore displayed for the space domain, and to the interests of others, these constellations do not prejudice or infringe upon the freedoms of use and exploration of the space domain and are therefore not occupation, or possession, much less appropriation.

This Does Not Constitute Possession, or Ownership, or Occupation

The use of LEO by satellite constellations is substantially similar to the use of GSO, and therefore permissible. In each region, individual actors are given permission - either from a national administrator or from an international governing body (the ITU) via a national administer–to use precoordinated subsections of space. In a way that is overwhelmingly similar to the use of orbital slots in GSO, the placement of spacecraft into orbits in LEO or higher orbits does not constitute possession, ownership, or occupation of those orbits. This is because States (and their companies) have been occupying orbital slots in GSO for decades, and these uses of GSO have never been accused of “appropriating” GSO. The users have never claimed to be appropriating GSO, and their exercising of rights to use GSO is respected by other actors in the space domain. This is the same situation for other orbits, including LEO and other non-Geostationary orbits.

And while GSO locations are relatively stable (subject to space weather and other perturbations, and require stationkeeping), spacecraft in LEO are actually moving through space and are not stationary, so it is even more difficult to see this use by constellations as occupation, much less appropriation. Moreover, Space Situational Awareness (SSA) and Space Traffic Management (STM) will allow other uses to use these orbits, and nothing about the use of any one user necessarily precludes others. Lastly, there is no intention by operators of constellations to exclusively occupy, must less possess or appropriate, these orbits. Would not the appropriation of outer space be an intentional, volutional act? No such intention can be found in the operators of global constellations.

#### 1] Precision – if we win definitions the aff doesn’t defend a shift from the squo or solve their advantages – so at best vote negative on presumption. The resolution is the only predictable stasis point for dividing ground—any deviation justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 2] Predictable limits—including satellite slots offers huge explosion in the topic since they get permutations of different satellite systems – LEO MEO and HEO, plus different companies, plus sizes of constellations, et cetera. Letting temporary occupation be appropriation is a limits diaster - any aff about a single space ship, satellite, or weapon would be T because they temporarily occupy space. Limits explodes neg prep burden and draws un-reciprocal lines of debate, where the aff is always ahead, turns their pragmatics offense

#### Topicality is a voting issue that should be evaluated through competing interpretations – it tells the negative what they do and do not have to prepare for—there’s no way for the negative to know what constitutes a “reasonable interpretation” when we do prep – reasonability is arbitrary and causes a race to the bottom, proliferating abuse

#### No RVIs—it’s your burden to be topical.
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#### Counterplan: Investment into the appropriation of Outer Space through large satellite constellations in Low Earth Orbit by private companies in Asia for the purposes of emergency communications in the event of disaster relief or external shocks is just.

#### Private LEO constellations are economically viable in the long term, but require upfront investment – those uniquely solve disaster response because of satellite internet’s connectivity options for island countries

Garrity and Husar 21 Garrity, John, and Arndt Husar. John Garrity is an economist, policy advisor, and project manager focusing on digital inclusion, universal internet access policy, and last-mile connectivity. He has coauthored numerous reports on technology and development and has presented around the world on efforts to close the digital divide. Arndt Husar facilitates the effective use of digital technology, advising ADB clients, regional departments, as well as sector and thematic groups on digital transformation. " Digital Connectivity and Low Earth Orbit Satellite Constellations: Opportunities for Asia and the Pacific." (2021).

Satellite communication plays a necessary role in the global connectivity ecosystem, connecting rural and remote populations, providing backhaul connectivity to mobile cellular networks, and rapidly establishing communication in emergency and disaster response scenarios. This Asian Development Bank (ADB) Sustainable Development Working Paper, the first in a series reviewing emerging innovations in connectivity technologies, focuses on low Earth orbit (LEO) satellites, which have been in deployment for decades and are again a subject of intensive investment as new large constellations are in early stages of deployment. These new LEO constellations, such as those being deployed by Starlink by SpaceX, Project Kuiper by Amazon, OneWeb, Lightspeed by Telesat, among others, may prove to be transformational to the connectivity landscape based on their global coverage and their suitability for areas not served by fiber optic cable networks. ADB’s developing member countries are well placed to leverage and benefit from this expansion of internet connectivity, particularly for underserved geographies and countries with limited international internet bandwidth, such as landlocked developing countries and small island developing states. With their global reach and coverage, LEO constellations are expected to dramatically expand the availability of high-speed broadband internet access with levels of service that rival fiber optic cables in terms of speed and latency, and at significantly reduced price levels compared to traditional geostationary satellites. A proactive engagement with LEO solutions is likely to yield benefits as the relevant business models are still evolving. Well-informed early action by regulators and investors can ensure that developing member countries prepare for opportunities presented by the anticipated expansion of connectivity bandwidth. I. IntRoDUCtIon This Emerging Connectivity Innovations Case Study on SpaceX Starlink and low Earth orbit (LEO) satellite constellations is intended to provide readers, particularly in developing countries in Asia and the Pacific, with a background understanding of the role of satellite communications in global internet connectivity and an exploration of the potential impact of the next generation of LEO constellation systems. While the adoption of internet connectivity across the world has generally increased incrementally, some innovations have been transformational, dramatically expanding the geographic reach of connectivity and bandwidth capacity. For example, the introduction of basic mobile phones in the late 1990s and early 2000s led to rapid adoption of mobile telephony across low- and middle-income countries (a phenomenon known as the “mobile miracle”). Similarly, public and private investment in undersea fiber optic cables circling sub-Saharan Africa in the 2000s significantly reduced the cost of bandwidth in many countries in the region. Satellites have used low Earth orbits since the beginning of space exploration; however, private investment in LEO constellations, consisting of hundreds or thousands of satellites, has been limited because significant up-front capital expenditure is required. While it remains to be seen how the next generation of LEO satellite constellations will evolve, LEOs are forecasted to significantly increase the available internet bandwidth in remote and rural geographies not currently served by fiber optic cables. This increased bandwidth could be leveraged to increase economic and social development opportunities for individuals, organizations, businesses, and government facilities (including public schools) located in these areas, provided that the private sector satellite companies investing in LEO constellations see market opportunities to extend service to these areas. This case study is intended to introduce to Asian Development Bank developing member countries how to start preparing for the expansion of LEO satellite communication services. II. BACKGRoUnD: sAteLLIte ConneCtIVItY As A MeAns FoR BRoADBAnD InteRnet Internet connectivity has become a necessary component of every country’s critical infrastructure given the reliance of all aspects of economic activity, governance, and social development on internet communications. The coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic dramatically increased the importance of internet communications infrastructure. Trade, employment, learning, leisure, and communications quickly shifted into the digital sphere and countries with robust internet infrastructure and high adoption rates of internet-enabled devices were better able to adjust and adapt to the shift to digital activity. The United Nations estimates that 1.6 billion learners were affected by school closures in 2020, affecting 94% of the world’s student population and up to 99% in low and lower middle-income countries.1 1 United Nations. 2020. Policy Brief: Education during COVID-10 and beyond. 2 ADB Sustainable Development Working Paper Series No. 76 Access to distance learning opportunities varies greatly by country and income groups, with estimates of less than half of students in low-income countries able to access distance learning.2 Internet access and adoption in the developing member countries (DMCs) of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) continues to grow, particularly as a result of public and private investment in telecommunications infrastructure, increased competition, and allocation of shared resources, such as spectrum auctions and assignment. Despite these efforts, large access gaps remain in Asia, where the most remote, difficult to reach, or sparsely populated districts remain disconnected, leaving more than half of the population without access to the internet. This lack of digital infrastructure represents a missed opportunity to accelerate economic and social development. Despite the rapid expansion of internet connectivity infrastructure across the world, significant gaps in internet adoption and infrastructure access remain. This highlights the importance of satellite communications that can bridge gaps, swiftly expand network coverage, and enhance existing infrastructure. The latest estimates from the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) show that 3.7 billion people are still not participating online (49% of the global population), and 63% of rural households are without internet access (Figure 1).3 Also, 1.5 billion people reside in areas without high-speed mobile data coverage (fourth generation long-term evolution or 4G LTE), while 607 million people reside in areas with no mobile data coverage at all (at least 4G or third generation [3G] coverage). Furthermore, 313 million people reside in areas with only basic voice and short messaging service (SMS) coverage (second generation [2G]), and 220 million people reside in areas with no cellular coverage. The ITU estimates that nearly $428 billion is required to achieve universal access to broadband globally, $251 billion of which is required for Asia, with approximately 75% coming from the private sector and the remainder with support from the public sector.4 The majority of the world’s population, over 5 billion people, live more than 10 kilometers (km) away from any fiber optic cable infrastructure (3.6 billion reside more than 25 km away).5 Other issues, such as affordability, digital literacy, and the lack of relevant or local language content, have resulted in 2.4 billion people who live within 4G coverage not subscribing to 4G data services. [FIGURE 1 OMITTED] Satellite connectivity is predominantly used for backhaul connectivity for remote cellular base stations and as a last-mile connection for individual subscribers and enterprises. Figure 2 provides an overview of the internet infrastructure network components, from international connectivity to the last mile. Because of the higher relative cost of bandwidth transmitted via satellite versus terrestrial technologies, satellite is currently primarily used in situations where fiber optic cables and other high-capacity technologies are not financially viable due to low population densities and large distances between high-capacity networks and last-mile networks.6 However, in a few cases, satellite connectivity is relied upon for international internet gateway traffic or as part of a country’s core network. For landlocked developing countries that are dependent on terrestrial fiber connectivity, in some cases, satellite connectivity serves as a substitute to complex bilateral and multilateral negotiations to extend costly fiber connectivity to their country. [FIGURE 2 OMITTED] Satellite connectivity is predominantly used for backhaul connectivity for remote cellular base stations and as a last-mile connection for individual subscribers and enterprises. Figure 2 provides an overview of the internet infrastructure network components, from international connectivity to the last mile. Because of the higher relative cost of bandwidth transmitted via satellite versus terrestrial technologies, satellite is currently primarily used in situations where fiber optic cables and other high-capacity technologies are not financially viable due to low population densities and large distances between high-capacity networks and last-mile networks.6 However, in a few cases, satellite connectivity is relied upon for international internet gateway traffic or as part of a country’s core network. For landlocked developing countries that are dependent on terrestrial fiber connectivity, in some cases, satellite connectivity serves as a substitute to complex bilateral and multilateral negotiations to extend costly fiber connectivity to their country. Particularly in situations where a high degree of data throughput is required per site, such as satellite backhaul for broadband cellular networks, the data volumes as well as the distance to the nearest backbone node play a significant role in cost comparisons between satellite connectivity versus terrestrial network deployments (microwave backhaul, in particular). Figure 4 illustrates how higher data bandwidth requirements are more cost-effectively supplied by terrestrial ground networks; however, a crossover point occurs where satellite capacity may end up being more cost-competitive, depending on different price points of satellite bandwidth and total traffic demand per month.12 Satellite connectivity is also well- suited to deploy in emergency situations, such as in response to natural disasters or other external shocks, that require expeditious deployment of network connectivity where terrestrial infrastructure is either nonexistent or destroyed. For many rural and remote communities, satellites are the only connectivity option. For geographies without direct access to fiber optic cable infrastructure or at great distances from high- capacity bandwidth capacity, satellite connectivity is the only option available. Even where terrestrial network infrastructure that could be used for backhaul connectivity is available, satellite deployments may still be preferred because satellite terminals require only electrical power and a clear line of sight to the sky. However, an expansion of terrestrial infrastructure usually requires extensive civil works (underground fiber ducts, pole attachments, or tower construction for cellular base stations), which comes with challenges such as securing the rights-of-way, permits, and having to pay the related fees. Satellite broadband is poised to become an even more important technology for addressing the growing digital divide. As information and communication technologies play an increasingly important role in commerce, government services, health care, education, and other sectors, satellite connectivity allows communities to get connected swiftly, bypassing the infrastructure deployment challenges that come with terrestrial infrastructure deployments. The role of satellite connectivity in emergency telecommunications has also been vital where the communications satellites are heavily relied upon in disaster recovery efforts.13 Satellite technology may also be complementary with traditional wired and mobile broadband, which are better suited for densely populated areas. Satellite service could become a default solution for remote areas, allowing terrestrial services to focus on improving access in their current coverage areas. Satellite connectivity is already being used for network redundancy at national levels for international internet capacity, as well as for backup in core and backhaul networks.14 The recent $50 million loan to Kacific by ADB for the deployment of a broadband satellite, which covers large parts of Southeast Asia and the Pacific, demonstrates the relevance of satellite connectivity for unserved and underserved regions.15 By deploying new satellite technology (in the Ka-band16), Kacific’s service offering is commercially viable despite the existing presence of other major competitors in Asia and the Pacific, including global entities such as Intelsat, SES, and Eutelsat, as well as more regional players such as AsiaSat, Thaicom, MEASAT, and SKY Perfect JSAT.

#### The Asia-Pacific is the most disaster-prone region in the world – the next catastrophe is a question of when, not if

Thomas Bickford et al 15, Ph.D., senior research scientist in CNA Corporation’s China Studies division, “The Role of the U.S. Army in Asia,” May, https://www.cna.org/CNA\_files/PDF/CRM-2015-U-010431-Final.pdf

Natural disasters As Typhoon Haiyan amply demonstrated when it hit the Philippines in November 2013, natural disasters can represent a significant threat to human security. In 2012, the Asia-Pacific region experienced 93 natural disasters, which affected some 75 million people.206 It is one of the most disaster-prone regions in the world:207 it is prone to typhoons and cyclones; it contains some of the world’s most active faults and volcanos; and many areas experience massive flooding. As former USARPAC commander Lieutenant General Wiercinski has noted, the only questions are when and where the next big disaster will occur. Admiral Locklear, Commander, USPACOM has noted that climate change is one of the region’s most pressing security challenges.209 While the ability to respond to natural disasters varies widely among countries in the region, even advanced countries can require international assistance, as Japan did after the March 2011 earthquake and tsunami.

#### Disasters are an existential threat---it’s try or die for response and coordination.

Frederick Tipson 13, adviser to the USIP Center of Innovation on Science, Technology, and Peacebuilding whose career has included positions in the UN Development Programme, Microsoft, Hongkong Telecom, AT&T, the Markle Foundation, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the University of Virginia Law School, BA in History from Stanford, MA in IR from Yale, PhD and JD from UVA, “Natural Disasters as Threats to Peace”, 2013, United States Institute of Peace, <https://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/resources/Natural%20Disasters%20as%20Threats%20to%20Peace%20SR324.pdf> //hhb

As the three spheres of our habitat evolve and erupt, human beings frequently get in the way. Natural hazards become humanitarian disasters when they expose and exacerbate human vulnerabilities—those characteristics of societies that limit their ability to avoid major damage and recover quickly.3 Such vulnerabilities range from very concrete weaknesses in infrastructure or the exposed locations of large populated areas to more intangible dimensions of economic fragility, social cohesion, and political capacity, which affect both preparedness and recovery. Although the recent historical pattern of major storms, droughts, and earthquakes can be traced (see map 1 at the end of this report), the extent of human vulnerabilities is a complex and subjective matter, often evident only after the fact. Mortality figures are typically used as indicators of the severity of disasters. By that measure, the three worst disasters in the world since 1950 were the earthquake in Tangshan, China, in 1976 (250,000 dead), the earthquake and tsunami in the Indian Ocean in 2004 (240,000 dead), and the earthquake in Haiti in 2010 (316,000 dead).4 These three earthquakes were by no means the largest in that sixty-year time frame, but they occurred where large numbers of people were exposed and unable to protect themselves. Severity also can be measured by other direct effects: destruction, dislocation, and disease. The 2010 earthquake in Haiti not only killed more than 300,000 people but injured an additional 300,000, affected 3.7 million (30 percent of the total population), caused $8 billion in damage, and was followed by 470,000 cases of cholera with 6,631 attributable deaths. The death rate from an earthquake, hurricane, or epidemic is generally much higher in poorer societies than in richer ones, where economic damage is usually the more numerically impressive consequence. Because their constituents have come to recognize how much the damage from “acts of God” can be affected by the actions, or inactions, of human beings, political leaders are increasingly being held accountable for minimizing the foreseeable risks of extreme events. “Natural Hazards, UnNatural Disasters: The Economics of Effective Prevention” is the indicative title of one important report by the United Nations and the World Bank. Reducing the risks begins with the recognition of how vulnerable many people have become. Throughout the world, in both wealthy and poor countries, ever-larger concentrations of people live in exposed locations under fragile or unprotected conditions. Infrastructure is often inadequate or deteriorating, and there is little or no awareness or preparation even for likely natural events. Those most exposed include millions in low-lying shorelines or coastal wetlands, marginal urban slums, and huge “temporary” settlements of internally displaced persons or refugees. Many of these populations depend on international humanitarian agencies to provide food and medicine and to assist local authorities in assuring adequate water, sanitation, health services, and shelter. As urban populations grow and conditions deteriorate further, reliable access to these necessities is becoming increasingly problematic for more and more people. Demographic trends best convey the scale of the challenges. In less than twenty years, the global population will rise from 7.1 billion to more than 8 billion. Key countries will grow even more rapidly. Between 2010 and 2025, Egypt is projected to grow from 81 million people to 106 million, Pakistan from 174 million to 234 million, and Nigeria from 159 million to 258 million.5 Many more people around the world will attain middle-class incomes, but a large percentage in many countries will be young and unemployed. Half the world’s population is already twenty-five years old or younger. Projections suggest that, by 2030, the world will need to provide fifty percent more food and additional fresh water equivalent to twenty new Nile Rivers.6 In that time frame, the needs of many countries, including India and China, will begin to exceed foreseeable water supplies for consumption and irrigation. The growth of earthquake-prone megacities is perhaps most telling of all. In just over a decade, metropolitan Jakarta will go from 9.6 million to 12.8 million people, Mexico City from 20 million to 24.6 million, Delhi from 22 million to 32.9 million, and Tokyo from 37 million to nearly 40 million—and these are just four of the thirty-seven cities that will then have populations greater than 10 million.7 There were only twenty-three in 2011. One of every seven or eight people in the world will be living in one of these massive metropolises, many in huge urban slums that have few, if any, services or infrastructure. Such concentrated population centers are extremely vulnerable to even normal patterns of earthquakes, storms, drought, and disease (see map 2). Epidemics that spread within such populations are especially difficult to contain. Climate volatility adds a further dimension of growing risk. Current changes in the climate of key regions portend severe near-term effects, whether or not the consequences of global warming match the worst predictions for the longer term. Since the 1980s the number of recorded natural disasters related to weather and climate has roughly doubled. According to the above-mentioned United Nations-World Bank report, “If there is no conscious change in adaptation policies to extreme events, baseline damages [even] without climate change are expected to triple to $185 billion a year from economic and population growth alone”8 (emphasis added). Nor are these risks confined to poor or middle-income countries. The world’s largest reinsurance companies, Munich Re and Swiss Re, warn of major increases in weather-related damage in both North America and Europe over the next decade.9 Contrary to critiques from global warming skeptics, the scientific and intelligence communities actually have been cautious in predicting the human effects of climate change. The April 2012 report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is relatively conservative in forecasting future climate-induced disasters.10 Likewise, the National Intelligence Council handles climate change and natural disasters in a largely conventional and understated manner.11 However, an increasing number of authoritative reports have begun to highlight the dire risks of current climate trends and the need to begin assessing the potential for plausible adverse scenarios. Both the World Bank and the UN Environment Programme warned recently that the likely rise in global mean temperatures will exceed key thresholds sooner than previously expected, with implications for both severe weather and ocean surges.12 Security specialists are beginning to take these trends to heart. The Defense Science Board warned in its 2011 report that climate changes in key regions will interact with other vulnerabilities to become serious “threat multipliers.”13 The World Economic Forum highlights the interactive implications of climate changes with governance, fiscal, population, and technology vulnerabilities.14 A recent report of the National Research Council called on foreign policy experts to consider more systematically the political and security implications of foreseeable climate changes, suggesting that “it is prudent for security analysts to expect climate surprises in the coming decade, including unexpected and potentially disruptive single events as well as conjunctions of events occurring simultaneously or in sequence, and for them to become progressively more serious and more frequent thereafter, most likely at an accelerating rate.”15 Despite the pervasive dysfunction of most governments in addressing “climate surprises” and other disaster vulnerabilities, we will no doubt see environmental risks beginning to shape the political expectations of senior officials and thought leaders. As in the Cold War or the current ”war on terror,” responsible policymakers must look not only to the familiar and most imminent threats but also to less likely but higher-impact scenarios that could be truly catastrophic for national security, particularly if sudden and unanticipated.16 Not unlike other threats to peace and security, the inability to predict with certainty the location and timing of future natural disasters should not obscure a nation’s vital interest in assessing their likelihood and potential aftereffects.

Local Catastrophes and Global Repercussions

The challenge is to envision plausible threats and sequential patterns of potential danger—not to scare people but to anticipate potential consequences and devise strategies to prevent or reduce economic, political, and social damage. The National Research Council suggests using analytical “stress” tests of particular countries or regions to envision the effects of major disasters, or clusters of disasters, even if some of them should be considered unlikely. History offers examples of catastrophes that illustrate the possible ripple effects from otherwise local disasters. The Lisbon earthquake, tsunami, and fire of 1755 destroyed that city and decisively degraded Portugal’s role as an imperial power.17 The Spanish flu epidemic of 1918–20 killed an estimated fifty million to one hundred million people worldwide and was particularly lethal among young adults, compounding the immense losses to that generation from World War I. More recently, the destruction from Hurricane Katrina on the U.S. Gulf Coast in 2005; the earthquake, tsunami, and nuclear shutdown in Fukushima, Japan in 2011; and Tropical Storm Sandy on the U.S East Coast in 2012 exposed the interconnected vulnerabilities of coastal settlements, energy infrastructures, health-care facilities, and large-scale relief and recovery operations—a complex combination for which neither the United States nor Japan was adequately prepared. Major localized disasters do not always result in irreversible setbacks. The Chicago Fire of 1871, the Boston Fire of 1872, and the San Francisco Earthquake of 1906 resulted in the major reconstruction of all three cities, making each of them more economically vibrant and resilient.18 New York will undoubtedly be better prepared after Sandy, as New Orleans was after Katrina when it faced Hurricane Isaac in August 2012. Yet both disaster specialists and mainstream media too often treat natural disasters as limited and local matters. Media focus has typically been more on immediate suffering than larger implications, direct effects than long-term consequences, and infrastructure repair than major institutional reforms. Nevertheless, as the number and scale of natural disasters increases, we are likely to witness growing public awareness and anxiety about the vulnerability of certain areas, which will become a strong political factor adding to the wider and longer-term consequences of disasters. Internet technologies will facilitate not only the rapid dissemination of distressing information about natural disasters and severe environmental conditions but also the potential for exaggerated predictions, political incitement, conspiracy theories, or even popular panic. Worst-case scenarios may then become urgent political focal points, especially those that illustrate the fragility of economic necessities, social cohesion, or public safety.19 Economic Cascades The most troubling scenarios of natural disasters involve those with simultaneous effects on major essentials: food, water, land, medicine, energy, or subsistence income. An overlapping series of earthquakes, floods, and food shortages affecting a megacity could overwhelm the capacity of national and international agencies to respond adequately. Other consequences could follow: The Fukushima nuclear meltdown, for example, led both the Japanese and German governments to announce the phasing out of their nuclear power industries—a major blow to any prospect of curbing global carbon emissions.20 Disruptive disasters in major food-producing regions could have dire global consequences. Corn, wheat, and rice crop failures would lead to price hikes and shortages in far-flung locations. The worldwide collapse of one of these major staples—for example, from a new fungal infestation in one region and a drought in another—could lead to famines, export cutoffs, stockpiling and hoarding, or cartelized supply arrangements. Such developments could create new zones of instability, hostility, and populist pretexts for aggressive steps to secure new supplies or assure future access. The drive to guarantee food sources has already prompted the governments of China, Korea, Saudi Arabia, and others to buy land in Africa and Latin America for growing food that could be diverted from global markets during shortages. Water shortages could be another cause of future conflicts. Recent intelligence analyses suggest that countries are unlikely to go to war over water,21 but the larger patterns of depletion and diversion—glacial melts in South Asia and the Andes; upstream dams in the Middle East, East Africa, and Southeast Asia; widening drought in sub-Saharan Africa—suggest that peacefully resolving some disputes over severe water shortages could be very difficult. The genocides in Rwanda and Darfur owed much to the pressures of land, food, and water competition in fomenting ethnic conflicts.22 Medicine can be another life-and-death necessity in times of emergency. It is not difficult to imagine that the government of a state facing the prospect of a deadly epidemic would take steps to seize or intercept supplies of essential medicines. After European and U.S. laboratories cloned the lethal H5N1 virus, Indonesia demanded access to the vaccine formulas to assure adequate supplies for its huge population at reasonable cost. A global pandemic from that virus or a similar microorganism could lead to travel restrictions, news blackouts, and other isolationist reactions, but also to more aggressive measures to obtain lifesaving medicine. Massive casualties could undermine the standard protocols of global cooperation among international and national agencies, reducing global effectiveness in containing disease.23 Natural disasters can also sever transportation and communication links and global supply chains—life lines for necessities—compounding the catastrophe where the disaster occurs and affecting employment even in distant locations. In 2011 both the Thai floods and the Japanese earthquake and tsunami disasters affected hard-disk and auto suppliers, causing factory shutdowns and end-product shortages on other continents. The volcanic dust cloud from Iceland in 2010 halted European air traffic for only a week or so but even then had significant effects on both business and tourism. Compare this with the massive 1883 eruption of Krakatoa and the 1815 eruption of Mount Tambora, both in Indonesia, which created longer-lasting effects around the world. The Tambora event led to what was then called “The Year Without a Summer,” because of the adverse effects on U.S. and European weather patterns.24 Social Collapse Major disasters can have social consequences when the intense stress of damage and recovery causes breaks along ethnic, religious, class, or geographic fault lines. A major earthquake in a megacity could produce violent confrontations among groups competing for scarce relief supplies and recovery assistance. Or the disaster might create reverse-urbanization pressures for millions of homeless and jobless people in suddenly uninhabitable slums. Once again, the purpose of discussing such scenarios is not to suggest that social chaos following a disaster is a given but rather to consider ways to prevent, or at least reduce, that possibility. The major quake that struck Mexico City in 1985 produced not widespread strife but inspiring solidarity in local relief and recovery operations, even among the poorest citizens.25 That city is now a prime candidate for even bigger quakes, affecting an even larger population. Joint planning for such a crisis by the United States and Mexico could reduce the possibility of greater casualties and infrastructure losses that might impel hundreds of thousands to seek entry into the United States. Sudden large-scale migrations are an increasing prospect among the effects of climate change. Low-lying islands, flood-prone coastal areas, large refugee camps, and regions of prolonged drought could provoke major population movements. The possibility of Bangladeshis pouring into India to escape delta flooding has already led the Indian government to construct a 4,000-kilometer fence to forestall such influxes. Mass migration from Africa to Europe could also result from the droughts and floods affecting an increasing number of areas. Within the continent, such forced movement could compound urbanization trends. Such cataclysms are unlikely to occur without violence.

Political Catalysts

Natural disasters can dramatically expose deep social inequities and government indifference or incompetence, fomenting opposition movements. In 1970, the government in western Pakistan responded so poorly to the cyclone that struck eastern Pakistan that it strongly contributed to the secession of what became Bangladesh. The Nicaraguan earthquake in 1972 fatally discredited the Somoza regime. The Myanmar government’s heartless response to Cyclone Nargis in 2008 was likely a further factor in the military regime’s political vulnerability and may have accelerated the recent transition there. An unprecedented drought in Syria from 2006 to 2010 disrupted agriculture in regions that then became strong supporters of the armed resistance.26 The rise in global food prices that began with a severe drought in Russia in the summer of 2010 was a key factor in provoking popular uprisings in various Arab states the following year.27 An earthquake and tsunami near Jakarta—40 percent of which is below sea level and frequently inundated by heavy rains—could render much of that city uninhabitable and set back Indonesia’s economic growth and democratic development for years. It could also reduce the country’s ability to cooperate on global issues, such as deforestation or pandemic prevention, on which its involvement has been crucial.28 An earthquake in Karachi or Delhi or a major flood in Mumbai or Lagos could cripple the economies of their respective countries and further degrade the effectiveness of government authorities to avoid serious ethnic, sectarian, or even international conflicts. Major deterioration of any one of these cities could undermine the stability of their respective regions, with direct economic and possibly military consequences for the United States. Weak governments or failed states lack the capacity to prevent even moderate disasters from becoming severe crises. For any of the above scenarios, it is insufficient for only government agencies to be aware or prepared. As the extent of global fragility in the face of natural disasters becomes more widely felt, the public may sense the start of a regional or even global slide toward scarcities of various kinds, leading to political pressures for more secure sources of necessities. Such pressures increase the risk of international confrontation and present opportunities for exploitation by terrorists, criminals, or fanatics who see increased mayhem as in their interest.29

Defensive Measures and Strategic Adjustments

Efforts to reduce the severity of natural disasters and contain their larger consequences will require three kinds of initiatives: stoic, heroic, and “ecozoic.”

Stoic Resilience

Humans continue to cope with natural disasters largely as they always have, by “weathering” them: riding out storms, putting out fires, waiting out droughts, and helping out their neighbors. The capacity of societies to withstand catastrophes is generally referred to as resilience. Such resilience depends on physical, economic, cultural, and political factors that determine a society’s ability to plan for and recover from disasters without creating major social and economic fallout. These capabilities are almost entirely the “stoic” achievements of local people—namely, doing what is necessary to survive and prosper in the places they inhabit. As with all preventive efforts, the benefits of investing in resilient infrastructure and sensible preparedness far outweigh the costs of coping with the consequences after disasters strike. Strong and enforced building codes; zoning restrictions in coastal areas; prepositioned shelters and supplies; accessible hospitals, clinics, and health workers; wellpublicized evacuation routes; and other aspects of public awareness all make a substantial difference in reducing casualties and damage. Media coverage can sometimes give the impression that those most affected by disasters depend mainly on responses from outsiders, but the reality in most cases is otherwise. People in the path of a natural event are almost always most effective in helping each other, comprising the overwhelming proportion of first and subsequent responders.30 However, the United States is neglecting a range of major domestic vulnerabilities to natural hazards that could have catastrophic consequences.31 Stephen Flynn has most ably summarized these and other ominous features of what he calls our “brittle nation.”32 The vulnerability of coastal developments along the Eastern seaboard, so tragically demonstrated during Tropical Storm Sandy, is one continuing danger. On the opposite side of the country, earthquakes present the more ominous threat. As Flynn recounts, the deteriorating earthen levees that currently protect the massive farmlands of California’s Central Valley are vulnerable to seismic effects. If seawater were to breach the levees after a major earthquake, it would contaminate one of the country’s most important food and employment sources for years to come. Prolonged heat waves and drought in the Midwest, even worse than those in 2012, could permanently devastate croplands and damage the country’s strained and outdated electrical grid. As the U.S. public health infrastructure continues to degrade, deadly epidemics could severely reduce national economic performance and shake citizens’ confidence in the competence and reliability of government at all levels. The current economic stress and political paralysis in the United States complicate the country’s physical vulnerabilities. Debt levels and ongoing deficits substantially reduce the capacity of government agencies at all levels to address infrastructure and preparedness investments that reduce disaster risks. In 2012, even normally routine federal appropriations for disaster relief after Sandy became a political football.33 While most investments in community resilience, as well as in industrial and agricultural facilities, are state and local matters, congressional gridlock on many major issues indicates the difficulty that new assertions of federal authority or leadership would face in directing infrastructure changes or restricting flood zone settlements. The domestic vulnerabilities of the United States are further compounded by the global risks to vital U.S. interests resulting from the vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure and large populations around the world. While national development strategies increasingly emphasize “disaster risk reduction” and “sustainable economies”34 and certain countries, such as Bangladesh, Vietnam, and Mozambique, have successfully lowered their casualty rates from recurrent flooding through better preparedness and infrastructure changes, their examples are not widely imitated. Even their successes may be overwhelmed eventually by the expected scale of storms and ocean surges. Ethiopia and Rwanda have implemented food security policies that have increased their ability to cope with drought and other environmental challenges. But despite initiatives such as the U.S. Agency for International Development’s (USAID) Feed the Future program, the global prospects for substantial increases in food production are uncertain at best. Worldwide expenditures on health care, including infrastructure and training, experienced an exceptional increase over the last decade, especially from the U.S. government. However, both health and agricultural improvements depend on continued donor assistance, which has already fallen significantly since the global recession.35 Most fundamental to stoic readiness is the political capacity of societies to mobilize in the face of crises. Such capacity includes the ability to make decisions quickly and cohesively, to redirect funding rapidly without corruption, and to deliver supplies and support efficiently. Even effective democratic governments, such as those of Turkey or Indonesia, might find regional, ethnic, or religious diversity becoming a source of conflict in the wake of a massive natural disaster. More troubled federal polities, such as Pakistan or Nigeria, could unravel, although Pakistan has handled three successive seasons of massive flooding with remarkable resilience. In failed or failing states, government capabilities are especially lacking, and such political capacity is the most difficult set of skills and institutions to improve, even with major development assistance from outsiders.36 International organizations and financial institutions increasingly promote disaster risk reduction. Both the World Bank and the agencies of the UN system, led by the United Nations Development Programme, advocate investments that increase resilience to environmental challenges. But the resources to back up these recommendations are not commensurate. For example, under the impetus of the 1997 Kyoto Protocol on climate change, an adaptation fund to assist with risk reductions was initiated in 2001. But that fund was not actually launched until 2007, and despite the creation of a similar green climate fund at the Copenhagen climate change summit in 2009, both initiatives remain woefully underfunded—as highlighted in the latest global gathering on climate change in Doha.37 With a huge imbalance between growing global risks to large populations and declining investments in resilience, U.S. leaders will be forced to make difficult choices. U.S. policies on development assistance will likely have to adopt a form of preventive triage, placing scarce assistance dollars where they will have the most enduring effects on resilience and adjustment, rather than where the needs of poverty reduction and other objectives of the UN’s Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) might otherwise seem greatest. Already the efforts to set a new agenda for development after the deadline for the MDGs in 2015 include some recognition of the need for a more pragmatic view of sustainability. But as with the MDGs, the political dimensions of resilience continue to receive little emphasis in current drafts of these global manifestos.

Heroic Relief

Increased resilience must be matched with enhanced capabilities for effective relief. Improving the scale and effectiveness of assistance to the victims of disasters is an essential priority not only for limiting immediate effects but also for containing political fallout. In the United States, specialized national agencies, such as the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the American Red Cross, are the principal organizers of emergency support, supplemented by state-level agencies, the National Guard, and countless local and national non-governmental organizations (NGOs).38 Since Hurricane Katrina in 2005, all these actors have demonstrated improved capacities to deal with storms, even as available resources for future crises are in decline. Most other developed countries have similar, though mainly national, agencies to lead relief operations. In poorer countries, capacities are more variable, often either completely localized or highly dependent on national military agencies, as evidenced during the 2004 tsunami in the Indian Ocean. The National Disaster Management Authority of Pakistan, in its response to the massive floods of 2010 and 2011, has been one of the notable civilian exceptions. Assistance to the most at-risk countries to increase their own capacity for humanitarian relief should be a donor priority. Resources for humanitarian assistance from national donor agencies have seen major growth in the past twenty years. In the United States, funding for foreign disaster assistance has had strong bipartisan support in Congress for many years, and humanitarian relief resonates strongly with large portions of the U.S. electorate. The Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) within USAID has had a record of operational excellence and effectiveness. Other governments also have made international humanitarian assistance a high priority. Scandinavian ministries, the United Kingdom’s Department for International Development (DFID), and the European Commission’s Solidarity Fund have been especially generous contributors to relief operations in recent times, both directly and through UN agencies. The role of major international NGOs, corporate philanthropy, and foundations has also grown, with resources that sometimes exceed those from official sources. With the expansion of heroic generosity, the delivery of disaster assistance has become a major international industry. Large companies and suppliers sell their goods and services in the wake of each major event. NGOs similarly follow devastation and suffering from place to place. Many take advantage of public attention and sympathy for disaster victims to raise large amounts of money for relief. However, the effectiveness of relief operations, and especially the transition from relief to recovery, often has been less than optimal. Repeated proposals have been made to create a more centrally coordinated system, and UN agency leaders have made major advances over the past two decades in coordinating and funding major international relief operations. In 1991, the General Assembly created an Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) of UN agencies, a Central Emergency Revolving Fund (CERF), and an Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) within the UN secretariat. The latter evolved by the end of the 1990s into the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), headed by the ERC with the rank of under-secretary-general. In 2005, following the Indian Ocean tsunami, IASC members agreed on an intensified approach to collaboration, dubbed the “cluster system,” which divided relief operations into major functional components and designated lead agencies in each sector to coordinate the work of both international organizations and NGOs. The current ERC, Valerie Amos from the United Kingdom, has undertaken further efforts to improve the performance of the relief community, in the process raising billions of dollars through consolidated appeals, including urgent “flash appeals” to donors. The January 2010 earthquake in Haiti, which received huge publicity and donations, highlighted both the best and worst features of the international cluster system—and of heroic relief efforts in general.39 Assistance followed a familiar pattern of initial energy and compassion that dissipated once the atmosphere of emergency and improvisation shifted to the long-term demands for major reconstruction and local government control. The influx of supplies and aid workers during the first year of relief was overwhelming. One year later, agencies reluctantly faced the need to shift their promises from “building back better” (as former President Clinton likes to put it)40 to the harsher choices involved in satisfying donors that their resources were accomplishing more immediate concrete effects. Addressing short-term basic human needs for water, food, and shelter—often to people living in large tent cities—is a different task from that of rebuilding basic infrastructure, restarting large and small businesses, and forging political institutions that endure after agencies depart. As all too often happens, the initial humanitarian response to Haiti was overly romantic, inconsistent, and insufficiently attuned to the unique features of the local culture, economy, and political system.41 With intense economic pressures on virtually all major donors, disillusionment with relief operations may result in political pressures to reduce assistance. Popular support for even the most sympathetic causes may begin to wither, including among generous Americans, especially if foreign crises multiply, or if the U.S. homeland itself is struck by major natural disasters that divert attention and resources to domestic priorities. The multilateral institutional cushions needed to mitigate the social, economic, and political fallout from extreme events remain ad hoc and undeveloped. G-8 and G-20 summit agendas pay some attention to these issues but with little evident follow-through from national governments.42 The UN Security Council, despite one famous session to address the security implications of HIV/AIDs in early 2000, has been erratic and unfocused in dealing with the broader security challenges of disease and disasters. As the council is the principal global institution responsible for addressing international “threats to the peace,” such neglect will need to be remedied. International financial institutions have standard approaches for assisting with disaster recovery, such as the emergency response programs of regional development banks, as well as the World Bank’s Emergency Recovery Loan program, Hazard Management Unit, and Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR). The International Monetary Fund has an emergency assistance facility designed to ease the fiscal effects of major disasters.43 But these economic mechanisms are not scaled for the size of the challenges ahead, and the international diplomatic and intelligence channels needed to address urgent political and security risks are relatively undeveloped. Even the example of the successful global efforts led by the World Health Organization in responding to pandemic threats from the SARS and avian flu viruses may not prevent national budget cuts in preventive and public health capacity.44 The same budgetary fate could befall otherwise promising initiatives to reduce food insecurities, such as those which the G-20 governments have endorsed. The international community deserves great credit for its recent heroic efforts to aid societies affected by natural disasters. But it is highly unlikely that multilateral relief operations are prepared to work at the necessary scale when disaster incidents multiply. As with future investments in resilience, some form of priority setting or triage may become the imposed standard for major international relief as well. Ecozoic Relocation Even the most effective combination of stoic and heroic efforts will not sustain vulnerable populations indefinitely. As sea levels and storm surges continue to rise, as key fisheries are contaminated or extinguished, as certain regions become inhospitable to agriculture, or as earthquakes or epidemics degrade the capacity of megacities to provide for their citizens, some currently inhabited parts of the planet will have to be scaled back, or even abandoned, for large-scale settlement. Particularly if global warming trends fulfill some scientific projections, the planet may impose wholesale and dramatic adjustments to the locations, dimensions, and lifestyles of human settlements on a scale akin to the major migrations imposed by ancient ice ages. Anticipating future adaptations of this magnitude, some scientists and philosophers have begun to refer to a coming “ecozoic” age of human adaptation.45 In the United States, such speculation will likely surface initially as more intense versions of familiar controversies over development or rebuilding in coastal areas or floodplains. These issues involve decisions about zoning, taxes, subsidized flood insurance,46 and the various publicly funded programs that promote or sustain coastal growth, such as beach reclamation or the building of wave barriers and dikes.47 Developers and local politicians often downplay disaster risks and the pressures from local citizens are almost always to rebuild rather than to abandon or relocate. Yet even the most stoic impulses must confront difficult choices. New Orleans is a prominent case in point regarding resettlement and reconstruction in areas prone to further flooding, such as the lower Ninth Ward. Hurricane Isaac demonstrated that the huge post-Katrina investments in floodwalls and levies involved decisions to protect certain areas at the expense of others. Such choices now confront officials and citizens on the Jersey Shore, Staten Island, and Long Island in the wake of Tropical Storm Sandy. The same issues will be replicated around the world. Government subsidies for hazard insurance or expensive engineering for stopgap measures, such as dikes, imported water supplies, or beach reclamation, will at some point no longer protect exposed populations enough to justify the resources needed to maintain them. As media coverage and public discussion increasingly focus on the most exposed areas, many people will begin to vote with their feet and look to resettle their families and businesses in areas less exposed to the hazards they witness across the globe. Real estate prices and infrastructure investments will increasingly reflect the realities of that new marketplace. Obvious areas of special exposure already justify “exit strategies” or migratory transitions. The former president of the Maldives, Mohamed Nasheed, has become a prominent spokesman for the fundamental threats of sea level increases to small island states.48 In other exposed areas—such as low-lying estuaries of Bangladesh, Burma, and Vietnam, as well as large areas of Africa—desertification, erosion, or salinization could render agriculture or adequate supplies of potable water infeasible. Water shortages may make areas of Central Asia and the Middle East impractical for continued settlement. On an even larger scale, some experts suggest that the expected growth of certain megacities will reach practical ceilings because of the physical and economic limitations of distributing food and water.49 Major epidemics could accelerate these pressures to limit or reduce some urban populations. The political and social dimensions of massive shifts in environment and population are difficult to predict, but the likelihood is that over time large groups of people will become ecologically displaced persons or “environmental refugees,” forced from their historic homelands and needing relocation to more hospitable places within or beyond national boundaries.50 Such transitions will present large political and economic challenges, both for long-term humanitarian support and for immigration laws and enforcement. If these movements involve millions of desperate people, geographic and political boundaries will become increasingly problematic. Recommendations: National Security and Global Solidarity The incidence of military conflicts between states is at a historic low; even the number of conflicts within states has declined steeply since the twentieth century.51 However, both trends could be slowed or reversed by increased vulnerabilities to natural disasters and the limits of political and economic capacity to deal with them. How should the challenges ahead be framed in terms of U.S. national security and the larger “threats to the peace”?

Citizen Safety Most governments place their highest priority on national security, which begins with ensuring the physical safety of their citizens, or as John Jay famously put it in The Federalist: “Among the many objects to which a wise and free people find it necessary to direct their attention, that of providing for their safety seems to be the first.”52 While they are used to thinking of such safety in terms of protection from attacks by military or terrorist adversaries, Americans also regard their fundamental security as dependent on access to reliable supplies of air, water, food, medicine, and shelter.53 All would likely place these subsistence needs above any threat currently on the horizon, foreign or domestic. However, it is leaders—thought leaders as well as political leaders—who define the priorities for government policy and expenditures in dealing with what they perceive as the greatest threats to the country and its citizens. Such definitions of national security generally arise as narratives developed in the course or aftermath of major international attacks or threats of attack. Historical turning points in these narratives over the last hundred years include, for example, the German attacks on U.S. shipping that provoked the country into World War I; the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor that plunged the United States into World War II; the Berlin crisis, Korean War, and Soviet nuclear tests that intensified the Cold War; and the September 11, 2001, attacks that provoked the U.S. War on Terror. Whether or not all Americans agreed with the security rationales their leaders offered at those times, they provided bold assessments of the threats confronting the country, which gained wide acceptance. Each narrative was a necessary, and apparently sufficient, political basis to enlist political support for executive orders, policies, legislation, appropriations, treaties, and other international commitments that were consistent with the leaders’ justifications. At present there is no reasonable prospect that U.S. leaders would create a national security narrative focused on the cumulative threats from an overstressed planet.54 To mobilize popular support for the major initiatives necessary to reduce foreseeable risks, U.S. leaders would eventually have to shift their characterizations of such threats from environmental to existential and from futuristic (after 2050) to imminent (before 2020). That shift is unlikely until Americans experience a pattern of severe crises that would shift popular perceptions and political attitudes in decisively different directions. No one wants to contemplate the horrific disasters that might drive such a shift in attitudes, especially when the destruction from Katrina and Sandy seem not to have had such an effect on most political leaders. Political resistance to the recognition of these likely threats is reinforced by a suspicion that those who highlight them are also seeking to justify major government interventions and expenditures, involving severe changes in lifestyles. References to global warming, or even to obvious climate changes, sound to some audiences as code words to justify carbon caps and oil taxes. Therefore this report assumes that such mitigation programs are not foreseeable in time to avoid the climatic, economic, and demographic consequences of current trends. Indeed, it is because these trends will not be changed in time that steps must be taken to adapt to their likely effects. U.S. political and thought leaders need to fulfill their highest responsibility—for the safety of citizens—by beginning to consider a range of risk reduction policies, infrastructure investments, and preparedness strategies, including the necessary legislative and budgetary changes, that might constitute an approach to national security aimed at reducing the direct and secondary consequences of natural disasters. Whether or not the necessary stoic and heroic steps are all politically palatable, the larger arguments for them should at least be actively under current debate. As Stephen Flynn has emphasized, most of these steps would not only reduce U.S. vulnerability to extreme natural events but would also reduce the opportunities for terrorists to exploit the same vulnerabilities.55 How these competing political pressures will play out depends not only on the timing and locations of disasters but also on how soon the growing public perception of our vulnerabilities becomes a political reality. The combination in 2012 of major tornados, midwestern drought, Texas floods, Hurricane Isaac, western wildfires, Arctic ice depletion, and Tropical Storm Sandy could mark the beginning of a sea change in the electorate’s expectations of present and future exposure to natural disasters. In that event, the hardest challenge for U.S. leaders may well be to prevent the country from turning inward to focus on domestic priorities and resisting involvement in the crises of other countries or regions. Such isolationism could be expressed through intensified calls for energy independence, food selfsufficiency, foreign assistance cutoffs, and even military retrenchment. Reversing decades of generosity and pragmatism, donor fatigue and domestic needs could generate a new version of an “America First” constituency that opposes all such international engagement and punishes at the polls any politician who supports it. Collective Containment U.S. leaders also cannot ignore the national security implications of the most serious risks of disaster beyond our borders. The safety of U.S. citizens is inextricably bound through the global economy with the course of environmental events in other parts of the world. Disasters or extreme conditions that degrade major agricultural areas (Russian, Australian, or Argentinean wheat fields, Japanese, Burmese, Philippine rice), disrupt for prolonged periods key manufacturing, transportation, or communications infrastructure (greater Bangkok, Bosporus, European airspace), or create immense casualties among large stressed populations (pandemics in Pakistan, Brazil, Nigeria) could affect the stability of entire regions. The severe degradation of a megacity could snowball into wider instability and conflict if not managed collaboratively. The sooner and more deliberately U.S. leaders can articulate geographic, cultural, or economic justifications for targeting scarce assistance, the sooner they are to be persuasive to U.S. citizens. Political preparation is equally required of other governments and populations. If disasters multiply, U.S. influence with these countries will likely depend on the level of U.S. engagement, generosity, and leadership in promoting a sense of global solidarity through an agenda for collaboration on resilience, relief, and relocation options. For this purpose, the U.S. government will need to complement its domestic security rationale with a compelling diplomatic narrative that advocates the needs and priorities for dealing with events that might otherwise spark major confrontations. The alternative could well be aggressive measures by governments, desperate for necessities, to bypass market allocations or seize supplies by intercepting transports, deploying covert operations, or even initiating outright invasions. A series of functionally focused collaborations to identify and manage key risks could be indispensable to contain the political consequences of future extreme events. Whether the Security Council, the G-20, the World Health Organization, or some new or combined political coalition would be the locus for such negotiated understandings is unclear. But the likelihood is that all international institutions will have to elevate their focus and resources to address disaster scenarios and environmental vulnerabilities. The security agendas of politicians, policymakers, and intelligence personnel will likely be distracted, for the time being, by perceived dangers from rogue states armed with nuclear weapons, failed states and ungoverned areas as safe havens for terrorists, and economic criminals, such as cyberburglars, unfair traders, and intellectual property thieves. Meanwhile, the safety and prosperity of the United States, as well as peace throughout the world, increasingly will be endangered by unaddressed vulnerabilities to natural disasters and extreme environmental crises. Contention and conflict could also result from the sudden realization—or opportunistic exaggeration—among large groups of alarmed citizens that such vulnerabilities are both existential and irreversible. Given demographic and environmental trends, and the increasing vulnerabilities and probable shortages to be expected within this decade—and certainly before 2030—the threats to the peace from Mother Nature may soon come to dwarf any of the threats posed by mere mortals.

### 3

#### Mega-constellation investment is good for competition and business – contracts exist and they’re being manufactured now the aff crushes investor confidence

Cao 21 ­– [Sissi, “From Boeing to Astra, the Space Industry Is Vying to Challenge Starlink’s Dominance,” 11/5/2021, https://observer.com/2021/11/boeing-astra-space-startups-eye-satellite-constellation-compete-starlink/]

Low Earth orbit is about to get a lot more crowded in the next few years as a growing army of space companies look to deploy internet-beaming satellite constellations in that region of the sky to compete with SpaceX’s Starlink.

On Thursday alone, four companies filed applications with the Federal Communications Commission to deploy satellite constellations in the V-band frequency spectrum. The largest of the four proposals came from Astra Space (the company that made news headlines in August for its hilarious rocket launch incident, which plans to deploy a constellation of more than 13,600 satellites that would provide global broadband internet service. The proposed constellation will be about a quarter the size of SpaceX’ Starlink when completed.

Astra Space went public on NASDAQ in July. In its FCC application the company said “the financing secured through the recent public offering” made it “well-positioned to develop this project.” Like SpaceX, Astra plans to build satellites in-house and launch on the company’s own rockets, starting with at least two per payload. However, given that Astra’s rocket development is still at an early stage and that the size of payload is likely to increase more rapidly, the company is “willing and able to utilize third-party launch providers in part or in whole for constellation deployment,” says its FCC application.

Astra’s near-term goal is to reach orbit with its Rocket 3.3 vehicle. During the company’s last attempt, a test vehicle numbered LV0006 accidentally slid sideways seconds after liftoff due to an abnormal engine shutdown. The next launch opportunity will open on November 8 and run through November 14.

The other three companies that submitted similar FCC applications on Thursday were Hughes Network Systems, Inmarsat and Telesat. These proposals were all filed on the same day because Thursday was the FCC’s deadline for the latest processing round for V-band satellite systems.

On Wednesday, the FCC issued a license for Boeing to build its own satellite constellation, clearing the path for the aviation giant to compete with SpaceX in the megaconstellation frontier. Boeing’s initial plan is to place 147 satellites in low Earth orbit.

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

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

Innovation is generally hard to predict; some new technologies seem to come out of nowhere and others only take off when paired with a new application. It is difficult to predict the future, but it is reasonable to expect that a growing space economy would open opportunities for technological and organizational innovation. In terms of technology, the difficult environment of outer space helps incentivize progress along the margins. Because each object launched into orbit costs a significant amount of money—at the moment between $27,000 and $43,000 per pound, though that will likely drop in the future —each 19 reduction in payload size saves money or means more can be launched. At the same time, the ability to fit more capability into a smaller satellite opens outer space to actors that previously were priced out of the market. This is one of the reasons why small, affordable satellites are increasingly pursued by companies or organizations that cannot afford to launch larger traditional satellites. These small 20 satellites also provide non-traditional launchers, such as engineering students or prototypers, the opportunity to learn about satellite production and test new technologies before working on a full-sized satellite. That expansion of developers, experimenters, and testers cannot but help increase innovation opportunities. Technological developments from outer space have been applied to terrestrial life since the earliest days of space exploration. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) maintains a website that lists technologies that have spun off from such research projects. Lightweight 21 nanotubes, useful in protecting astronauts during space exploration, are now being tested for applications in emergency response gear and electrical insulation. The need for certainty about the resiliency of materials used in space led to the development of an analytics tool useful across a range of industries. Temper foam, the material used in memory-foam pillows, was developed for NASA for seat covers. As more companies pursue their own space goals, more innovations will likely come from the commercial sector. Outer space is not just a catalyst for technological development. Satellite constellations and their unique line-of-sight vantage point can provide new perspectives to old industries. Deploying satellites into low-Earth orbit, as Facebook wants to do, can connect large, previously-unreached swathes of 22 humanity to the Internet. Remote sensing technology could change how whole industries operate, such as crop monitoring, herd management, crisis response, and land evaluation, among others. 23 While satellites cannot provide all essential information for some of these industries, they can fill in some useful gaps and work as part of a wider system of tools. Space infrastructure, in helping to change how people connect and perceive Earth, could help spark innovations on the ground as well. These innovations, changes to global networks, and new opportunities could lead to wider economic growth.

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

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

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

# On Case

### Starlink

#### Starlink is a service that’s contracted out to public entities so no private appropriation is involved

Bernat 19 “The Inevitability of Militarization of Outer Space” Paweł Bernat [Assistant Professor, Polish Air Force University] Safety & Defense 5(1) (2019) 49–54 <https://philarchive.org/archive/BERTIO-52> SM

Another example is the mentioned already Starlink system that will provide broadband internet for the Northern US and parts of Canada already in 2020, and the plan is to create the global system before 2027 (Mosher, 2019). Again, the system, although designed for civil purposes, will be used by the military – the US Air Force is testing SpaceX’s Starlink technology in military aircraft to deliver high bandwidth into the cockpit of Air Force planes under a program called Global Lightning (Malik, 2019). The facts are straightforward – there are more and more satellite systems that play an essential role in countries’ security and are part of critical infrastructure, so in order to secure their interests and protect that infrastructure, these national states keep developing both defensive and offensive means. The Worldwide Threat Assessment of the US Intelligence Community is very clear in its predictions in this regard:

#### Starlink ACA systems and de-orbiting solves any debris impact – Russian ASAT test proves and also non-uniques their impact

Kan 21 – [Michael, “Starlink Satellite Orbits Changed to Avoid Debris After Russia's Missile Test,” PC Mag, 12/1/2021, https://www.pcmag.com/news/starlink-satellite-orbits-changed-to-avoid-debris-after-russias-missile]

SpaceX has altered the orbits for its Starlink satellites, likely to prevent them from colliding with debris from Russia’s anti-satellite missile test.

On Tuesday, SpaceX CEO Elon Musk mentioned the issue after NASA abruptly delayed a spacewalk on the International Space Station due to the threat of space debris. In his tweet, Musk said: “We had to shift some Starlink satellite orbits to reduce probability of collision. Not great, but not terrible either.”

Musk didn’t explicitly blame the space debris on Russia’s anti-satellite missile test. Nevertheless, the “Not great, but not terrible” quote may be a subtle jab at the Russian government. The same line is used in the HBO series Chernobyl, which dramatizes the 1986 nuclear plant disaster in the Soviet Union. (In the show, a nuclear plant worker utters the line “Not great, but not terrible,” when in reality the conditions at the facility are catastrophic.)

Last month, the US was quick to condemn Russia’s anti-satellite missile test, which involved the Kremlin sending up a missile to destroy one of its own defunct satellites. The ensuing impact caused hundreds of thousands of pieces of debris to spill out into orbit, according to the US.

Because space debris can travel up to 17,500 miles per hour, even a small artifact can cause serious damage if strikes a spacecraft or an astronaut. "Russia's dangerous and irresponsible behavior jeopardizes the long-term sustainability of outer space,” the US State Department said at the time.

However, Russia claims the resulting debris poses no danger to any space activity. The Kremlin also points out other countries have embarked on their own anti-satellite missile tests too.

To avoid space debris, SpaceX has equipped each Starlink satellite with an “autonomous collision avoidance” system. The same satellites will eventually descend and burn up in Earth’s atmosphere within one to five years if the propulsion system on board ever fails.

In his tweet, Musk added that the International Space Station and SpaceX’s own Dragon craft possess “micrometeorite shields,” which can withstand high-velocity impacts. However, spacesuits lack such protection, hence the need for NASA to cancel the spacewalk.

#### Low altitude orbits zeroes risk of collision and doesn’t contribute to overall debris in dense areas – even if satellites fail no impact

Grush 18 – [Loren, “SpaceX wants to fly some internet satellites closer to Earth to cut down on space trash,” 10/9/2018, <https://www.theverge.com/2018/11/9/18016962/spacex-internet-satellites-space-debris-trash-orbit-closer-earth-distance-atmosphere>]

SpaceX is revising its satellite internet initiative, Starlink, and it now hopes to operate some of its spacecraft at a lower altitude than originally planned. In a new filing to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), SpaceX is asking the agency to modify its license so that more than 1,500 Starlink satellites can operate at an altitude 600 kilometers lower than the company originally requested.

SpaceX argues that this change will make the space environment safer, as it will be easier to get rid of these satellites at this new altitude when they run low on fuel or can no longer function properly in orbit. This update could also explain the unexpected behavior of two of SpaceX’s test satellites for Starlink, which have remained in lower orbits than expected.

Back in March, the FCC approved SpaceX’s license for the first phase of its ambitious Starlink initiative — the company’s long-term plan to launch nearly 12,000 satellites into orbit to beam internet coverage down to Earth. Initially, SpaceX asked the FCC for permission to launch 4,425 satellites into orbits ranging between 1,110 to 1,325 kilometers high. But with this new filing, SpaceX is requesting that 1,584 of those satellites, which were supposed to operate at 1,110 kilometers, be allowed to operate at 550 kilometers instead.

SpaceX says moving the satellites to a lower altitude means it can do more with less. Originally, the company said it needed 1,600 satellites to operate at the 1,110-kilometer altitude, but moving them lower means the company can get the same results with 16 fewer spacecraft. And the lower altitude makes it easy to dispose of these satellites once they’re done in space. At this height, particles from Earth’s atmosphere bombard the spacecraft more rapidly, pushing them out of orbit and dragging them down to the planet. And on the way down, they burn up in the atmosphere.

Making sure these spacecraft come out of orbit in a timely manner is crucial because of the vast number of vehicles that SpaceX wants to put into orbit. A constellation the size of Starlink could dramatically increase the number of operational satellites in space, raising the risk of in-space collisions. A recent NASA study argued that 99 percent of these satellites will need to be taken out of orbit, reliably, within five years of launch, or the risk of satellite collisions goes up quite a bit.

De-orbiting a satellite typically entails bringing the vehicle to a low enough altitude with thrusters where Earth’s air particles and gravity drag the probe down so that it burns up. Now, with this new filing, SpaceX won’t have to significantly move 1,584 of its satellites to get rid of them. The atmosphere at 550 kilometers should do the job within a few years. That’s also helpful in case the spacecraft fails in orbit. Satellites that fail in higher altitudes could turn into unoperational space debris that stay in orbit for long periods of time. At lower altitudes, they can still fail, and the atmosphere will still swallow them up in a timely manner.

### Ozone Adv

#### No Ozone Impact - The ozone layer doesn’t matter – empirical ozone holes solve

**Ridley 14** [Matt, DPhil from Oxford, Fellow of the Academy of Medical Sciences, The Times, September 15, 2014, “The ozone hole isn’t fixed. But that’s no worry,” http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/opinion/columnists/article4206440.ece]

How much damage did the ozone hole ever threaten to do anyway? It is fascinating to go back and read what the usual hyperventilating eco-exaggerators said about ozone thinning in the 1980s. As a result of the extra ultraviolet light coming through the Antarctic ozone hole, southernmost parts of Patagonia and New Zealand see about 12 per cent more UV light than expected. This means that the weak September sunshine, **though it feels much the same**, has the power to cause sunburn more like that of latitudes a few hundred miles north. **Hardly Armageddon**. The New York Times reported “an increase in Twilight Zone-type reports of sheep and rabbits with cataracts” in southern Chile. Not to be outdone, Al Gore wrote that “hunters now report finding blind rabbits; fisherman catch blind salmon”. Zoologists briefly blamed the near extinction of many amphibian species on thin ozone. Melanoma in people was also said to be on the rise as a result. **This was nonsense**. Frogs were dying out because of a fungal disease spread from Africa — nothing to do with ozone. Rabbits and fish blinded by a little extra sunlight proved to be as mythical as unicorns. An eye disease in Chilean sheep was happening outside the ozone-depleted zone and was caused by an infection called pinkeye — nothing to do with UV light. And melanoma incidence in people actually levelled out during the period when the ozone got thinner. Then remember that the ozone hole appears when the sky is dark all day, and over an uninhabited continent. **Even if it persists into the Antarctic spring and spills north briefly, the hole allows 50 times less ultraviolet light through than would hit your skin at the equator at sea level** (let alone at a high altitude) in the tropics. So it would be bonkers to worry about UV as you sailed round Cape Horn in spring, say, but not when you stopped at the Galapagos: the skin cancer risk is 50 times higher in the latter place.

#### Nonunique – other space activities like space tourism produce black carbon buildups, soot, and particle emissions that destroys ozone

### Debris Adv

#### Space miscalc unlikely --- hotlines and info sharing agreements avoids accidents

Chen Lan 16, an independent analyst and founder of the 'Go Taikonauts!', “Chinese Space Quarterly Report”, January 2016, http://www.go-taikonauts.com/images/newsletters\_PDF/GoTaikonauts18.pdf

During the IAC 2015, China re-iterated the wish for international participation and cooperation in its space station project including extending the station by modules provided by international partners. Twitter messages posted by a European journalist from the Congress, that is still to be confirmed, however, showed a different view from ESA. ESA’s new Director General JohannDietrich Wörner said he had told China that the world does not need two space stations and will likely persuade China to drop its space station in favour of joining the ISS. On the other side, during the traditional “Heads of Space Agencies Panel” in IAC 2015, NASA Administrator Charles Bolden expressed his belief that the current exclusion of China from the ISS will not last forever. Though Sino-U.S. cooperation on human spaceflight is still uncertain, a positive move between the two countries has been made, that is the establishment of a space hotline. Western media reported in November that the hotline has been setup between Washington and Beijing to allow easy sharing of technical information about their space operations, hopefully avoiding any misunderstandings or accidents. Russia’s space agency Roscosmos on 17 December signed a cooperation agreement with the China National Space Administration (CNSA). The document was signed at the 20th regular meeting of Russian and Chinese Heads of Government, during Russian Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev’s three-day visit to Beijing. The two sides agreed to promote the use of “GLONASS” and “Beidou” and their augmentations in their own countries and around the world, expanding the market of navigation services provided by these systems. The two space agencies signed another agreement on the same day on cooperation in the field of space electronics. It was reported earlier that the two countries were discussing a barter deal that Russia will import Chinese space electronic components and will export rocket engines, presumably the RD-180, to China. However, an official statement about the agreement did not mention the engine. Also on the same day, Russian state-owned nanotechnology company RUSNANO and the China Aerospace Science and Industry Corporation (CASIC) signed a strategic partnership agreement. CNSA also signed an agreement with the Netherlands on 26 October, and a memorandum of understanding with the UAE (United Arab Emirates) on 15 December, on exploration and peaceful use of outer space. A year after India signed its first space cooperation agreement with China, scientists from ISRO and the Chinese space agency have decided on six major areas of interest, including the hosting of payloads on each other’s satellites and inter-planetary missions. The other areas of interest are Earth observation, disaster management, space science and navigation, as the Times of India reported on 5 October. The Brazilian Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation announced on 30 December that the sixth CBERS (China-Brazil Earth Resources Satellite) satellite, CBERS-4A, is scheduled to be launched into space in December 2018. The Planetary Science Institute signed a cooperation agreement with the Qian Xuesen Laboratory of Space Technology (Qian Xuesen Lab), CAST, on 15 December to advance their mutual interests in facilitating the open-ended expansion of the exploration of the solar system and to use the knowledge thus gained in supporting the expansion of human activity beyond the Earth. Both institutions also wish to advance their common interest in communicating to the public the knowledge and benefits gained through robotic and human exploration of the solar system

#### No correlation between resources and war

Atkins, 16—PhD Candidate in Energy, Environment & Resilience at the University of Bristol (Ed, “Environmental Conflict: A Misnomer?,” <http://www.e-ir.info/2016/05/12/environmental-conflict-a-misnomer/>, dml)

The economic and strategic importance of oil and other non-renewable resource is indisputable. Yet the globalised character of international commerce has resulted in many nations ceasing to perceive resource dependency as a threat to autonomy or survival (Deudney, 1990). This interdependence has resulted in the decreased likelihood of inter-state conflict over control of resources, due to the price shocks these actions could propel across the system and the increasingly technological developments (Lipschutz and Holdren, 1990). Such dynamics are well illustrated by the 1973 oil crisis (Dabelko and Dabelko, 1993). Although the move by the Organisation of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries (OAPEC) to restrict exports resulted in record price rises and the transformation of the international sphere, thus illustrating the economic relevance of resources, it did not result in international violent conflict. Furthermore, Le Billon (2001) has stated that the spectre of resource scarcity has resulted in the escalation of socioeconomic innovation and economic diversification – with the market mechanisms of contemporary capitalism creating an important impediment to conflict. In Botswana and Norway, minerals and oil, respectively, have been mobilised to ensure peaceful development rather than violent confrontation (Le Billon, 2001). Furthermore, in many cases potential scarcity has resulted in increased inter-state cooperation due to the shared interest in continued supply. The continued sanctity of the 1960 Indus Waters Treaty, between Pakistan and India, is an important example, with the spirit of cooperation over water resources enduring despite increased political tensions between the two nations (Wolf, 1998).

#### **Alt cause – ASATs**

Sariak 17 [George Sariak Swansea University, Swansea, UK. "Between a Rocket and a Hard Place: Military Space Technology and Stability in International Relations." Astropolitics. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14777622.2017.1288509]

Unlike nuclear weapons, proffered by deterrence theory academics to have a stabilizing effect on international relations due to a doctrine of mutual assured destruction, space weapons are destabilizing. It is an important factor that “first-strike deterrence does not exist for space weapons.” 83 Military space technology may grant an early warning for a nuclear strike, but an “early warning does not exist for space-based weapons.” 84 This means that a state equipped with space weapons can “successfully execute a first strike and destroy numerous key targets before their opponent is aware an attack has occurred” or are “able to execute a counter attack.” 85 It is largely agreed that “the Chinese ASAT test [of 2007] has been a shock to the international system, releasing 35,000 pieces of debris, putting hundreds of spacecraft at risk of damage or destruction.” 86 Further, any use of these weapons would “disintegrate target satellites into thousands of pieces, resulting in a burdensome debris field that could, depending on the orbit, remain for thousands of years.” 87

However, without law to regulate active military space technology, namely ASAT weapons, Russia, the United States, and China share the threats collectively. A state that possesses an “ASAT, or other debris-causing space weapon capability that does not possess a vested interest in space,” or at least is “not overly reliant on the capabilities provided by space assets” will have “less to lose than someone who relies heavily on space assets.” 88 This is an “asymmetric proliferation of space power,” since de facto equal access to space is based on a technological and economic capacity; rather than attempting to benefit from the uses of outer space, “weaker nations consider defending themselves by developing anti-satellite systems.” 89 This a classic tragedy of the commons, as space debris stands to “threaten space assets of all spacefaring countries, not just intended target countries.” This means that “any attack by one country against another using space weapons will result in many losers,” a zero-sum outcome.90

“Given the vital and growing role that space plays in modern life, the world has an overriding interest in maintaining the safety, survival, and function of space assets so that the profound civilian, commercial, and military benefits they enable can continue to be available.” 91 The escalating space debris crisis stands to “increase the risk of satellite collisions and force satellite operators into making frequent, costly, and satellite-lifetime shortening manoeuvres.” 92 Even without the devastating impacts of active military space technology “space debris is growing by about 10 percent per year, even without space conflict.” 93 This is due to “cascading effects, where debris collides with other debris in space to create still more, known as the Kessler Syndrome.” 94 This issue will be intensified by the weaponization of outer space as “even a modest space war, involving the destruction of 30 satellites, could increase the level of space debris by almost a factor of four,” based on the measurements of debris produced by the Chinese ASAT test of 2007.95 Using this estimation of orbital debris again, “a larger conflict, involving the destruction of 100 satellites, would quickly increase space debris by over 1250 percent, and that does not include Kessler Syndrome effects, which would increase the debris level still further.” 96 The great irony of this situation is that the hostile implications of active military space technology stand to undermine the peaceful uses of passive military space technology. MacDonald highlights, “the inability to use space-based assets could threaten international security in other ways, as states would be unable to use their satellites to verify arms control agreements.”

#### No debris cascades, but even a worst case is confined to low LEO with no impact

Daniel Von Fange 17, Web Application Engineer, Founder and Owner of LeanCoder, Full Stack, Polyglot Web Developer, “Kessler Syndrome is Over Hyped”, 5/21/2017, http://braino.org/essays/kessler\_syndrome\_is\_over\_hyped/

Kessler Syndrome is overhyped. A chorus of online commenters great any news of upcoming low earth orbit satellites with worry that humanity will to lose access to space. I now think they are wrong.

What is Kessler Syndrome?

Here’s the popular view on Kessler Syndrome. Every once in a while, a piece of junk in space hits a satellite. This single impact destroys the satellite, and breaks off several thousand additional pieces. These new pieces now fly around space looking for other satellites to hit, and so exponentially multiply themselves over time, like a nuclear reaction, until a sphere of man-made debris surrounds the earth, and humanity no longer has access to space nor the benefits of satellites.

It is a dark picture.

Is Kessler Syndrome likely to happen?

I had to stop everything and spend an afternoon doing back-of-the-napkin math to know how big the threat is. To estimate, we need to know where the stuff in space is, how much mass is there, and how long it would take to deorbit.

The orbital area around earth can be broken down into four regions.

Low LEO - Up to about 400km. Things that orbit here burn up in the earth’s atmosphere quickly - between a few months to two years. The space station operates at the high end of this range. It loses about a kilometer of altitude a month and if not pushed higher every few months, would soon burn up. For all practical purposes, Low LEO doesn’t matter for Kessler Syndrome. If Low LEO was ever full of space junk, we’d just wait a year and a half, and the problem would be over.

High LEO - 400km to 2000km. This where most heavy satellites and most space junk orbits. The air is thin enough here that satellites only go down slowly, and they have a much farther distance to fall. It can take 50 years for stuff here to get down. This is where Kessler Syndrome could be an issue.

Mid Orbit - GPS satellites and other navigation satellites travel here in lonely, long lives. The volume of space is so huge, and the number of satellites so few, that we don’t need to worry about Kessler here.

GEO - If you put a satellite far enough out from earth, the speed that the satellite travels around the earth will match the speed of the surface of the earth rotating under it. From the ground, the satellite will appear to hang motionless. Usually the geostationary orbit is used by big weather satellites and big TV broadcasting satellites. (This apparent motionlessness is why satellite TV dishes can be mounted pointing in a fixed direction. You can find approximate south just by looking around at the dishes in your northern hemisphere neighborhood.) For Kessler purposes, GEO orbit is roughly a ring 384,400 km around. However, all the satellites here are moving the same direction at the same speed - debris doesn’t get free velocity from the speed of the satellites. Also, it’s quite expensive to get a satellite here, and so there aren’t many, only about one satellite per 1000km of the ring. Kessler is not a problem here.

How bad could Kessler Syndrome in High LEO be?

Let’s imagine a worst case scenario.

An evil alien intelligence chops up everything in High LEO, turning it into 1cm cubes of death orbiting at 1000km, spread as evenly across the surface of this sphere as orbital mechanics would allow. Is humanity cut off from space?

I’m guessing the world has launched about 10,000 tons of satellites total. For guessing purposes, I’ll assume 2,500 tons of satellites and junk currently in High LEO. If satellites are made of aluminum, with a density of 2.70 g/cm3, then that’s 839,985,870 1cm cubes. A sphere for an orbit of 1,000km has a surface area of 682,752,000 square KM. So there would be one cube of junk per .81 square KM. If a rocket traveled through that, its odds of hitting that cube are tiny - less than 1 in 10,000.

So even in the worst case, we don’t lose access to space.

Now though you can travel through the debris, you couldn’t keep a satellite alive for long in this orbit of death. Kessler Syndrome at its worst just prevents us from putting satellites in certain orbits.

In real life, there’s a lot of factors that make Kessler syndrome even less of a problem than our worst case though experiment.

* Debris would be spread over a volume of space, not a single orbital surface, making collisions orders of magnitudes less likely.
* Most impact debris will have a slower orbital velocity than either of its original pieces - this makes it deorbit much sooner.
* Any collision will create large and small objects. Small objects are much more affected by atmospheric drag and deorbit faster, even in a few months from high LEO. Larger objects can be tracked by earth based radar and avoided.
* The planned big new constellations are not in High LEO, but in Low LEO for faster communications with the earth. They aren’t an issue for Kessler.
* Most importantly, all new satellite launches since the 1990’s are required to include a plan to get rid of the satellite at the end of its useful life (usually by deorbiting)

So the realistic worst case is that insurance premiums on satellites go up a bit. Given the current trend toward much smaller, cheaper micro satellites, this wouldn’t even have a huge effect.

I’m removing Kessler Syndrome from my list of things to worry about.

#### It takes centuries and adaptation solves

Ted Muelhaupt 19, Associate Principal Director of the Systems Analysis and Simulation Subdivision (SASS) and Manager of the Center for Orbital and Reentry Debris Studies at The Aerospace Corporation, M.S., B.S. Aerospace and Aeronautical Engineering & Mechanics, University of Minnesota - Twin Cities, Senior Member of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, “How Quickly Would It Take For the Kessler Syndrome To Destroy All The Satellites In LEO? And Could You See This Happening From Earth?”, Quora, 2/28/2019, https://www.quora.com/How-quickly-would-it-take-for-the-Kessler-Syndrome-to-destroy-all-the-satellites-in-LEO-And-could-you-see-this-happening-from-Earth

The dynamics of the Kessler Syndrome are real, and most people studying it agree on the concept: if there is sufficient density of objects and mass, a chain reaction of debris breaking up objects and creating more debris can occur. But the timescale of this process takes decades and centuries. There are many assumptions that go into these models. Though there is still argument about this, many people in the field think that the process is already underway in low earth orbit. But others, including myself, think we can stop it if we take action. This is a slow motion disaster that we can prevent.

But in spite of hype to the contrary, we will never “lose access to space”. Certain missions may become impractical or too expensive, and we may decide that some orbits are too risky for humans. Even that depends on the tolerance for the risk. But robots don’t have mothers, and if we feel it is worthwhile we will take the risk and fly the satellites where we need to.

To the specifics of the question, it will take many decades. It will not destroy all satellites in LEO. You won’t be able to see it from the ground unless you were extraordinarily lucky, and you happened to see a flash from a collision in the instant you were looking, with just the right lighting.

#### Squo tracking, shielding, and removal plans solve

Dr. Brian Koberlein 16, Professor of Physics at the Rochester Institute of Technology and PhD in Astrophysics from the University of Connecticut, “Cascade Effect”, 5-4, https://archive.briankoberlein.com/2016/05/04/cascade-effect/index.html

In the movie Gravity the driving force of the plot is a catastrophic cascade of space debris. An exploding satellite sends high speed debris into the path of other satellites, and the resulting collisions create more space debris until everything from a space shuttle to the International Space Station faces an eminent threat of destruction. Not unexpectedly, the movie portrayal of such a situation is not particularly accurate, but the risk of a debris cascade is very real.

It’s known as the Kessler syndrome, after Donald Kessler, who first imagined the scenario in the 1970s. The problem comes down to the fact that small objects in Earth orbit can stay in orbit for a very long time. If an astronaut drops a bolt, it can stay in orbit for decades or centuries. Because the relative speed of two objects in orbit can be quite large, it doesn’t take a big object to pose a real threat to your spacecraft. On the highway a small pebble can chip your car windshield. In space it can be done by a chip of paint traveling at thousands of kilometers per hour. In the history of the space shuttle missions, there were more than 1,600 debris strikes. Because of such strikes, more than 90 space shuttle windows had to be replaced over the lifetime of shuttle missions.

While that might sound alarming, it’s actually quite manageable. Upgrades and maintenance were quite common on the shuttle missions, and we tend to err on the side of caution when it comes to replacing parts. Modern spacecraft also have ways to mitigate the risk of small impacts, such as Whipple shields made of thin layers of material spaced apart so that objects disintegrate when hitting the shield rather than the spacecraft itself. We also have a tracking system that currently tracks more than 300,000 objects bigger than 1 cm, so we can make sure that most spacecraft avoid these objects.

But the risk of big collisions isn’t negligible. In 2009 the Iridium 33 and Kosmos-2251 satellites collided at high speed, destroying both spacecraft and creating more dangerous debris. It wouldn’t take many collisions like this for the debris numbers to rise dramatically, and more debris means a greater risk of collisions. In Gravity the cascade happens very quickly, triggered by a single event. The reality is not quite so grave. Instead of happening overnight, Kessler syndrome would occur gradually, raising collision risks to the point where certain orbits become logistically impractical. It could occur so gradually that we might not notice it early on, and there are some that argue it’s already underway.

The good news is that we’re aware of the threat. And, as the old saying goes, knowing is half the battle. Already we take steps to limit the amount of debris created. New spacecraft include end of life plans to remove them from orbit, either by sending them into Earths atmosphere to burn up, or sending them to a “graveyard orbit” that poses little risk to other spacecraft. There are also plans on the drawing board to clear orbits of debris, particularly in low-Earth orbit where the risk is greatest. The cascade effect is a real risk, but it’s also one we can likely manage with a bit of ingenuity.

#### Collisions are unlikely because all debris is moving in the same direction, at the same speed

Michael McClennen 18, Research Informaticist in the Department of Geoscience at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, “With So Many Satellites and Space Junk Floating Around the Earth, How Is It That There Are Not Very Many of Them Colliding With One Another or Crashing Into The Space Station or Even New Ships Sent Into Space?”, Quora, 10/10/2018, https://www.quora.com/With-so-many-satellites-and-space-junk-floating-around-the-earth-how-is-it-that-there-are-not-very-many-of-them-colliding-with-one-another-or-crashing-into-the-space-station-or-even-new-ships-sent-into-space

In addition to the other answers, there is another very important factor. A large majority of the orbiting objects (both satellites and debris) are all going in roughly the same direction around Earth, in the same direction as Earth’s rotation with an orbital inclination of between 0º and 22º with respect to the equator. This is due primarily to the fact that launching due East is more efficient than launching in any other direction, and allows you to use the least amount of fuel in getting your payload to orbit. In addition, the laws of physics mandate that all of the objects at a given orbital altitude are moving at roughly the same speed. These basic facts substantially lower the chances of collision. As these objects all move around the globe, they are roughly keeping station with respect to most of the other objects at the same altitude.

There is, of course, another group of satellites and debris that are moving in polar orbits, which are roughly perpendicular to the the mostly-equatorial orbits I discussed in the previous paragraph. These satellites and most of their associated debris were deliberately placed into orbit at a different range of altitudes from the equatorially-orbiting satellites, specifically so that the two populations of objects would not crash into each other.

So it is not the case that the tracks of orbiting objects randomly cross in all directions. Rather the ones at any given altitude are (mostly) moving in the same direction and at roughly the same speed. This has helped quite a bit to keep the orbital-debris situation tolerable so far.

#### Kessler recanted

Dr. Alice Gorman 14, Professor of Archeology at Flinders University and Adjunct Fellow at the Research School of Astronomy and Astrophysics at the Australian National University, “Robot Avatars: The Material Culture of Human Activity in Earth Orbit” in Archaeology and Heritage of the Human Movement into Space, Ed. O’Leary and Capelotti, p. 42

At the same time as this proposed evolution of orbital objects, entropy may be on the verge of taking over the system. The so-called Kessler Syndrome is an emergence that could occur in the near future. In popular (and occasionally scien- tific) contexts, the Kessler Syndrome is the worst case scenario for space junk: a cascade of random collisions that create so much debris the Earth is enveloped and cut off from space. When Fengyun 1C was destroyed, many feared it would be the ‘tipping point’ into the cascade. However, this conception is not strictly accurate.

The Kessler Syndrome derives from an early paper by Kessler and Cour-Palais (1978), in which they argued that a situation could arise in which “the debris flux will increase exponentially with lime, even though a zero net input may be main- tained” (Kessler et al. 2010: 47). The idea of such a cascade derives from planetary formation, where collisions cause the lowering of inclination and the eventual formation of a ring or belt around a celestial body. However, LEO debris collisions are highly unlikely to behave like other planetary rings, as the smaller particles will be removed by atmospheric drag before that point. While Kessler et al. (2010) argue that the orbital debris situation is indeed critical, they stop short of endorsing the irreversible negative feedback version of the Syndrome.

#### It’ll take decades

Donald J. Kessler 10, Retired Senior Scientist for Orbital Debris Research at NASA/JSC, Nicholas L. Johnson, Chief Scientist for Orbital Debris Research, Orbital Debris Program Office, NASA Johnson Space Center, and J.-C. Liou, Lead Scientist for In-Situ Measurements, Orbital Debris Program Office, and Mark Matney, Lead Scientist for Modeling, Orbital Debris Program Office, NASA Johnson Space Center, “The Kessler Syndrome: Implications to Future Space Operations”, 33rd Annual AAS Guidance and Control Conference, http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.394.6767&rep=rep1&type=pdf2/10/2010,

INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning of the space program through the 1970’s, it was generally believed that NORAD was tracking all man-made objects in Earth orbit and that the catalogued objects represented the major collision threat to other operational spacecraft. In 1978, Kessler and Cour-Palais published the paper Collision Frequency of Artificial Satellites: The Creation of a Debris Belt.1 The paper concluded that if the past growth rate in the catalogued population continued, around the year 2000 a more hazardous population of small debris would be generated as a result of fragments from random collisions between cataloged objects. This new source of debris would quickly produce a hazard that exceeds the hazard from natural meteoroids, and over a longer period of time the growth in small debris would become exponential, even if a zero net input rate in the catalogue is maintained. Shortly after the publication, John Gabbard from NORAD (known for his “Gabbard Plot”), introduced the term “Kessler Syndrome” to describe the future collisional cascading described in the paper. Over the years, the term has developed definitions from the press that are not necessarily consistent with the paper or Mr. Gabbard’s intent.

A segment of the Japanese animated TV series Planetes,2 set in the year 2075, is an example of a popular definition of the Kessler Syndrome that includes both factual and exaggerated components. While an episode appropriately defines the Kessler Syndrome as the cascading of fragments from collisions breaking up other intact objects at an increasing rate, it goes on to say that, once initiated, “…. billions of other pieces [would be generated] in a very short time [and] the Earth would be surrounded by debris …. completely cut off from space.” In general, collisional cascading is a slow process, but very much depends on the population density and size of the objects in orbit. Current population densities would require decades to produce a significant change in the small debris environment, and much longer to approach a condition where the Earth might be “completely cut off from space”. However, it is conceivable that some ill-planned rapid expansion in the use of low Earth orbit could produce a much more rapid increase in small debris as a result of collisional cascading.