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#### 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.\*
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#### Congress is inching towards a funding deal—but, it’s a deliberate dance to keep them focused on funding while avoiding political complications

Romm 2/2 [Tony Romm is the congressional economic policy reporter at The Washington Post, tracking infrastructure reform, government spending and the financial impacts of federal decision-making nationwide, "Democrats, GOP inch ahead toward potential deal to fund government, avert shutdown", 2/2/22, https://www.washingtonpost.com/us-policy/2022/02/02/democrats-republicans-spending-shutdown-covid/]

Top Democrats and Republicans inched forward Wednesday in pursuit of a deal that could fund the federal government for the remainder of the fiscal year, hoping to stave off a shutdown while potentially pumping new spending into health care, education, science and defense.

The continued negotiations marked the second consecutive day of developments on Capitol Hill, as lawmakers who oversee the federal purse increasingly have come to express a measure of confidence that they can act before an upcoming Feb. 18 deadline — and overcome months of prior political disputes and delays.

Since President Biden took office, the U.S. government has operated under short-term measures that sustain key federal agencies and programs largely at their existing spending levels. The stopgaps have kept the government running, but they have also delayed Democrats from delivering on some of the White House’s top priorities, from expanding affordable housing to confronting climate change.

Republicans appeared content to continue in that vein, essentially dealing a political blow to Biden’s agenda in the process. But the two sides have come to see mutual benefit in striking a longer-term resolution, putting aside their differences at a moment when the United States continues to confront the pandemic at home and faces new diplomatic challenges abroad. The omicron variant of the coronavirus has sparked fresh discussions about the need for another round of federal aid, while the intensifying standoff between Russia and Ukraine has emboldened a Republican-led push to spend more on defense.

Both spending priorities could be appended to any new government funding measure, provided the two sides can reach a deal in the first place. In a sign of progress, Republicans on Wednesday presented a counter-offer for federal spending over the rest of the 2022 fiscal year, which Democrats are reviewing. The GOP move had the effect of temporarily delaying a planned afternoon meeting of the House and Senate’s top appropriators, but it still reflected a new seriousness among negotiators who until now hadn’t traded such proposals.

Yet new political fault lines also emerged Wednesday. Taking to the chamber floor earlier in the day, Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) foreshadowed what could be staunch GOP opposition to another round of pandemic relief, as he cited roughly $6 trillion in spending that has been approved since the start of the public health emergency in 2020.

“Let’s start the discussion by talking about repurposing the hundreds of billions already sitting in the pipeline,” McConnell said.

Lawmakers begin discussing government spending deal as Democrats eye virus aid, paid leave

The promises and platitudes nonetheless amounted to noteworthy progress on Capitol Hill, a place where partisan disagreements these days have come to transform all but the most basic debates into intractable conflicts.

Twice in recent months, the appropriations process has nearly brought federal agencies to a screeching halt, threatening to shut down the government and hamstring the country’s response to the pandemic. Republicans at the end of last year even held up a swift resolution to the funding fight to launch an ill-fated political campaign against Biden’s vaccination and testing mandates targeting businesses. The Supreme Court later struck down some of the administration’s policies.

This year, lawmakers from both parties have pledged to steer clear of the same brinkmanship that characterized negotiations in fights past. Instead they have aimed for a deal that covers spending through the fiscal year, which concludes at the end of September. But they already face a race against the clock to act by Feb. 18, the date by which lawmakers must adopt another short-term measure or broker the sort of compromise that has so far eluded them during Biden’s presidency.

With the clock ticking, Democrats huddled Tuesday morning to discuss their political strategy. Emerging from the gathering, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) and Senate Majority Leader Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.) each offered their public, formal blessings for the nascent talks around a longer-term spending deal. Schumer added that the party’s negotiators are “on the same page,” though he and Pelosi noted they had not yet received an official counteroffer from their GOP counterparts.

The leaders of the House and Senate’s top panels overseeing appropriations then gathered on their own late Tuesday to try to put pen to paper. One of the participants in the bipartisan session, Sen. Richard C. Shelby (R-Ala.), later told reporters that lawmakers are still seeking an “agreement on our principles, then the [spending] top line will follow.”

Shelby acknowledged at the time that a slew of policy gaps still separate the parties, including the balance between “social spending versus national security.” But he joined his Democratic counterparts in maintaining that “we all want to try to get to yes,” adding: “We’re not there yet.”

Democrats seek significant boosts in federal domestic spending, now that the country for the first time in a decade is not bound to strict budget caps. Writing to her caucus last month, Pelosi endorsed the need for a “strong omnibus” that would “address critical priorities for our country, including for our national security and for communities at home.”

Yet some of the Democrats’ proposed spending increases and policy tweaks have troubled Shelby and his fellow Republicans. Beginning last year, they pointed to a series of “poison pills” — from Democratic plans to enhance the IRS to the party’s effort to loosen a long-standing ban on federal funding for abortion services — that could sink any talks on a deal. GOP lawmakers also have called for parity in defense and nondefense spending, a move that historically has troubled some Democrats, who have sought greater cuts to the Pentagon than even Biden has proposed.

“We’re looking for parity. We live in a troubled world and a lot of us think national security is important for this country,” Shelby, who leads the GOP on the Senate’s appropriations panel, stressed on Tuesday.

Democrats and Republicans otherwise appeared to downplay any potential disagreements following their flurry of meetings. Sen. Patrick J. Leahy (D-Vt.), the chairman of the chamber’s appropriations panel, described himself as “always optimistic.” Rep. Rosa L. DeLauro (D-Conn.), his counterpart in the House, declined to specify any timelines or expectations for the follow-up session set for Wednesday afternoon.

“The goal is to get an agreement,” DeLauro said.

But such a deal, known in congressional parlance as an omnibus, is likely to carry additional significance this year. The compromise could pave the way for billions of dollars to flow toward projects that would improve the nation’s roads, bridges, pipes, ports and Internet connections. Lawmakers approved the money as part of a bipartisan infrastructure law finalized in 2021, but the package requires them to complete the act of writing the check, so to speak, before the real work can begin.

The must-pass spending measure also could serve as a legislative vehicle for lawmakers to advance a slew of other critical priorities. That includes new disaster aid in response to recent hurricanes and the tornadoes in and around Kentucky last year, for example, along with billions of dollars to augment the country’s efforts to combat the coronavirus.

With cases still rampant from the omicron variant, Democrats in recent weeks have renewed their calls for more federal spending to boost testing, therapeutics and vaccine access, especially abroad. Others have sought to provide additional benefits to workers, including the revival of a program that offers limited, pandemic-related paid family and medical leave. And still other Democrats have joined with a small but growing crop of Republicans who hope to give the green light to new assistance targeting restaurants, gyms, stages and other small businesses.

Lawmakers begin talks on another round of coronavirus relief for businesses

Publicly, the White House has maintained in recent months that significant money remains as part of the roughly $1.9 trillion American Rescue Plan that Biden signed into law last spring. White House officials, meanwhile, have quietly started preparing a supplemental request focused on outstanding public health needs.

But the Biden administration by Tuesday afternoon had not transmitted any official request to the Capitol, Democratic leaders said. “We’re waiting for the administration to send us something. They haven’t sent us anything yet,” Schumer told reporters.

Some party aides acknowledged it had become a deliberate, delicate dance, reflecting an attempt to keep Congress focused on solidifying government funding levels without adding any other political complications.

#### Space policy causes immense partisan backlash that wrecks the delicate balance

Dreier 16 [Casey Dreier, Chief Advocate & Senior Space Policy Adviser for The Planetary Society, April 13, 2016. “Does Presidential Intervention Undermine Consensus for NASA?” https://www.planetary.org/blogs/casey-dreier/2016/0413-does-a-strong-president-help-or-hurt-consensus-on-NASA.html]

To see how this happens, I recommend reading the book “[Beyond Ideology](http://smile.amazon.com/Beyond-Ideology-Politics-Principles-Partisanship/dp/0226470768/ref=smi_www_rco2_go_smi_g2243582042?_encoding=UTF8&*Version*=1&*entries*=0&ie=UTF8)” by Frances Lee. The author’s larger premise is that issues having no intrinsic relation to stated party ideology have become increasingly polarized in recent years. This is a function of the two party nature of our political system. If your party coalition wins, the other one loses. It’s [It is] zero-sum. Your party can win in one of two ways: you can make a better pitch to voters by demonstrating the superiority of your agenda; or you can undermine and stymie the agenda of the opposition party, making them unpopular with voters, and pick up the seats that they lose. Since you’re the only other political party, you gain in either scenario. I’m not sure if you’ve noticed, but the “undermine and stymie” approach has been popular for quite some time now in the U.S. Congress. Given this situation, the President and their policies naturally become the symbolic target of the opposition party. Anything promoted by the President effectively induces opposition by association. Lee demonstrates the magnitude of this induced polarization on various types of issues. For highly polarized issues like the role of government in the economy, or social issues, the impact is minimal—the opposition has already been clearly defined and generally falls into clearly defined ideologies of the Republican and Democratic parties. But for issues that do not fit readily into a predefined political ideology—like space—the induced polarization by the President can be significant. In fact, Lee showed that space, science, and technology issues incur the greatest increase in partisanship based on their inclusion in the Presidential agenda. One need only look to at the responses by political operatives of the opposing party to the strong human spaceflight proposals by [Barack Obama in 2010](http://www.shelby.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/mobile/newsreleases?ID=25F3AD2E-802A-23AD-4960-F512B9E205D2), [George W. Bush in 2004](http://www.nbcnews.com/id/3950099/ns/technology_and_science-space/t/bush-sets-new-course-moon-beyond/#.Vw3UMRMrKHo), and [George H.W. Bush in 1989](http://www.nytimes.com/1989/07/21/us/president-calls-for-mars-mission-and-a-moon-base.html) to see this reflected in recent history. This isn’t to say that Presidents can’t have a significant impact on the space program. Clearly they can. But the broad consensus needed for stability after their departure from office may be undermined by the very priority they gave it during their tenure. It what amounts to a mixed blessing for NASA, the U.S. space program does have an unusually strong bipartisan group of politicians who support the program due to NASA centers in a variety of states throughout the union. Berger notes this throughout his article, and it does, in a way, act as force that is resistant to change for good and bad. This mitigates somewhat the pure polarization seen on other science and technology issues. But for a Journey to Mars—a major effort that would, at best, require stability and significant funding over many Presidential administrations—that may not be enough. Perhaps the solution is for the next President to maintain a light touch on space. Maybe they should speak softly through the budget process, and avoid the Kennedyesque speeches and declarations to Congress that induce the types of partisanship we so dearly need to avoid.

#### Bipart’s key—otherwise, yearlong CR ruins defense industrial base and military modernization

Gould 1/22 [Joe Gould is senior Pentagon reporter for Defense News, “Defense industry frets as funding talks crawl”, 1/21/2022, https://www.defensenews.com/congress/budget/2022/01/21/defense-industry-frets-as-funding-talks-crawl/]

Despite repeated warnings from uniformed Pentagon leaders and lawmakers of both parties that a full-year continuing resolution will hurt national security, some defense industry advocates are still worried about an impasse.

On Thursday, both chambers of Congress left town on recess until the week of Jan. 31, after making scant progress on a deal for an omnibus federal spending package. Amid partisan divisions over funding levels and policy provisions, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, D-N.Y., warned that a full-year CR would create a national security crisis ― in an effort to pressure Republicans.

“It is a national security issue of the highest priority, with the threats that exist out there. To go to a continuing resolution instead of a decision-making omnibus bill is to weaken our security and our stability,” Pelosi told reporters Thursday. “The Republicans should know that, so we hope we will be able to bring that legislation to the floor before [the current CR] expires.”

With fiscal 2022 spending bills four months overdue, lawmakers and the Pentagon have warned against a yearlong CR that would freeze defense spending at the level of 2021 appropriations. CRs continue funding at the previous year’s level, preventing the Pentagon from starting new acquisition programs and ramping up production quantities.

And without a 2022 spending deal to set a new baseline, the president’s budget submission is in limbo and expected to come months late, which is sowing uncertainty for the military and its vendors.

President Joe Biden signed a defense policy bill that boosts his $753 billion national defense budget request for FY22 to $778 billion, a 3% increase. But Republicans have said they want more for defense, less than the 16% increase proposed by Democrats and an agreement on some politically charged policy riders.

By the reckoning of National Defense Industrial Association Chairman Arnold Punaro, lawmakers could meet somewhere in the middle with 8% increases for both defense and nondefense, but that’s far from a certainty. Democrats have raised fears some Republicans see budget gridlock as an advantage heading into midterm elections and don’t want a deal at all.

“We’re still in budget chaos,” Punaro told Defense News this week. “China’s on the march, Russia’s on the move and North Korea’s on the advance, and yet Congress is sitting on their duff, not passing a spending bill. It’s disgraceful.”

The lack of a 2022 deal as a baseline for defense amid escalating inflation presents a huge challenge for Pentagon planners crafting the FY23 budget request, Punaro said. He worried the administration could make a flat budget request, potentially costing the Pentagon billions of dollars in buying power.

Meanwhile, a full-year CR would yield $11 billion of lost growth, while 7% inflation would mean another $50 billion in lost buying power, according to defense consultant Jim McAleese, the founder of McAleese & Associates.

Though the current CR runs out on Feb. 18., recent negotiations in Congress have sparked some optimism.

Lead appropriators in the Senate met Jan. 13 with Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell to set the guidelines for negotiations. From there, lead House and Senate appropriators met to kick off talks, and Pelosi has said she’s been in discussions with House Appropriations Committee Chairwoman Rosa DeLauro, D-Conn.

Asked Thursday whether it’s realistic to get an agreement by Feb. 18, as Congress was about to leave town Senate Appropriations Committee Vice Chairman Richard Shelby, R-Ala., said: “That’s a good question. It’d be hard to get it by the 18th, but if we can make huge progress, we can probably get done soon.”

It’s unclear whether looming international crises with Russia and Ukraine, China and Taiwan, and North Korean missile tests would add pressure to pass defense spending. When asked about Pelosi’s comments, Shelby seemed to dig in.

“She’s right on that, but to underfund defense as some people would like to do, that would be a bigger challenge,” he said.

At a House Appropriations Committee hearing Jan. 12 about the effects of a potential full-year CR, the top officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps and Space Force warned such a move would sabotage the military’s efforts to compete with China by stalling new weapons like hypersonic missiles.

“CRs effectively prevent modernization at speed,” said Marine Corps Commandant Gen. David Berger. “We actually stand to be outpaced by China — not because of their speed but because of our failure to comply with our own budgetary processes.”

The president and CEO of the Aerospace Industries Association, Eric Fanning, has warned that budget unpredictability is inefficient for the defense industry, which has to idle while the Pentagon waits for its projects to be funded. Amid the Capitol Hill activity, Fanning said he is “hopeful that the momentum continues.”

“The hearing painted a concerning picture of additional and unnecessary costs, as well risks to capabilities and to the industrial base in the short and long-terms. There was bipartisan agreement on how devastating a year-long CR could be,” Fanning said in a statement Thursday. “Over the last few days, there are positive signs that the message is getting through and the top appropriators from both parties are coming to the table.”

Lead Pentagon officials have talked for years about the need to harness the innovation of small tech firms. But CRs stifle those efforts, an executive at one of those firms, Anduril Industries, wrote in an essay this week.

#### Impact’s cyber and deterrence crash

Manchester ’19, [Josh, Founder of Champion Hill and General Partner at Foundation Capital, Venture-backed Startups Will Build the Defense Technology the Free World Needs Right Now, https://medium.com/@joshmanchester/venture-backed-startups-will-build-the-defense-technology-the-free-world-needs-right-now-d2cefa2b2196]

With U.S. defense spending exceeding $700 billion per year, how could the United States be on the brink of a national security emergency? Simply put, America’s national security competitors are outflanking an Industrial-Age U.S. military machine that, like a lumbering dinosaur, is not adapting fast enough to its changing environment. The Pentagon desperately needs rapid innovation. Yet the current defense industry structure is not compatible with U.S. venture capital and high-growth technology industries for several reasons: · The U.S. military’s industrial base is centered on a few huge oligopoly suppliers known within the Beltway as “the Primes” — Lockheed Martin, Boeing, Raytheon, General Dynamics, and Northrop Grumman. These companies, ancient by tech startup standards, have optimized themselves to sustain a 20th century Industrial Age World War II-style force structure which supports the political decision-makers across the country who appropriate the funding that industrial base receives. The Primes are great at building very large platforms that cost billions of dollars and take 15–30 years to field. The Primes are also historically heavy on hardware talent and much lighter on software talent. · The Primes receive the vast majority of defense spending. Defense budgets have historically not unlocked for startups. While a defense private equity industry exists to aggregate small companies and flip them downstream to the Primes, venture capital investors, who have a much higher return threshold, know that it’s hard to have venture outcomes (in other words, to make money) when a company can’t win large market share or survive as a stand-alone business. · Venture-backed tech industries have matured as an asset class in peacetime and most mainstream U.S. venture firms in existence today do not have institutional cultures or histories that include defense innovation, apart from cybersecurity. · Major tech companies, like the FAANGs (Facebook, Apple, Amazon, Netflix, Google and Microsoft too), are generally unwilling to work on defense related projects, and sometimes must deal with employee protests when they do. · Many observers perceive this as an indicator that software engineers generally don’t want to work on defense-related innovation. · Finally, in a bizarre set of twists, some of the organizations that comprise the Limited Partners of venture capital firms (the blue chip endowments and foundations of the U.S. Eastern establishment, often founded on the fortunes of great American industrialists from decades ago, along with public pension funds throughout the country) are [sometimes accidentally funding Chinese defense technology](https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/ryanmac/us-money-funding-facial-recognition-sensetime-megvii) while often restricting their U.S. venture managers from making defense investments. Foundations and endowments in particular often have negotiated Limited Partnership Agreements with the venture firms they finance precluding them from investing in anything that could have military usage. The irony is that these same tax-exempt pools of capital are frequently investors in Chinese venture funds which provide software to make smarter and more deadly Chinese weapons and to the advanced surveillance systems that have turned China’s Xinjiang province into a virtual Uighur prison camp and a human rights disaster. No single individual or entity has caused this state of events to transpire; it is simply the accumulation of various cultural aspects of the capital formation process of the venture industry and its portfolio companies. Fortunately, we believe that almost all these characteristics will rapidly change over the next few years. But first let’s discuss some additional background. Venture capital has come of age in a time of unprecedented peace The U.S. venture capital industry is about 100 years old. Bessemer Ventures was formed in 1911 and originally had just the family fortune of Henry Phipps Jr., a co-founder of Carnegie Steel, as its sole limited partner. Despite these deep roots, the U.S. venture industry has only institutionalized as an asset class since the mid-1990s. Until then it was extremely clubby and very small. Sequoia Capital, KPCB, Charles River Ventures, and NEA were all founded in the 1970s and Accel Partners in the 1980s. But it has really only been since the mid-1990s (Benchmark Capital was founded in 1995, as was my own former firm, Foundation Capital) that the industry has institutionalized and grown substantially, first in the desktop computing and internet boom, and second during the combination of platform shifts over the last ten years that have given us mobile computing, social media, e-commerce, cloud computing, software-as-a-service and all of their associated new business models. For a quarter of a century, the institutional, mainstream venture investing ecosystem, at the startup, venture firm and limited partner levels, developed business processes, mental models, networks, and expertise in certain technical areas and heuristics — in aggregate, an industry culture — that have created one of the most dynamic parts of the U.S. economy. The U.S. tech industry is also one of the most unique aspects of American life — and a powerful, difficult-to-replicate form of “soft power,” featuring an inclusivity for aspirational immigrant founders — a feature perhaps unequalled in human history. From a long-term U.S. historical viewpoint, it is striking that the venture industry’s maturation has occurred during a unique period in American history when the United States had no major great power competitor, either ideologically or technologically. The Cold War ended in 1991, the Soviet Union dissolved, and Russia was in disarray for the next 15 years. This period of peace was not without its own unique trials, but the security challenges associated with terrorism, counterinsurgency, and lower-intensity military activity have not required the sort of Herculean societal and political efforts that were drawn upon during the Cold War or World War II. We should all be grateful every day that this has been the reality of the last 25 years. A useful analogy might be made with gold. In 1933, President Roosevelt made it illegal for U.S. citizens to own gold. In 1934, Benjamin Graham published the first edition of Security Analysis. In January 1975 it became legal to own gold again. Graham died in 1976. It was therefore illegal to own gold during key years of the development of modern security analysis. From this gap came gold bugs — the weirdos who seemed to always talk about nothing else, and didn’t get invited to key social events. No analogies are perfect but this captures some of the similarities between venture and defense today. Cybersecurity investors understand the cybersecurity parts of U.S. defense. But most mainstream Silicon Valley venture firms do not spend time on other parts of defense due to the industry’s institutionalization during this recent period of relative peace and American dominance — which has also been a time when the lion’s share of defense spending has gone to the Primes, as discussed. Sadly, peace is ahistorical. Great power competitions are a feature of humanity, not a bug. Periods of time when a major power, or superpower, are not challenged in some profound fashion by one or more other powers, regardless of whether they are driven by fear, prestige, economic interest, or ideology — are, in short, rare when looking back on the sojourn of homo sapiens on planet earth. The period when the free world had a monopoly on power has now ended. The tech-defense status quo is inverting The only previously delineated area where we don’t expect much change is from the FAANGs. These massive companies are best viewed as small nation-states themselves with global stakeholders. For example, many of their employees are not U.S. citizens and may not want their employers engaged in U.S. defense work. We think everything else will invert. · We believe defense budgets will begin unlocking for young startups. Many key national security decision-makers in Washington are now seeking better, faster alternatives to the byzantine Pentagon acquisitions process. Thought leaders like Will Roper, in charge of the U.S. Air Force’s $40 billion annual research and acquisition budget, are [eagerly welcoming the contributions that smaller, nimble venture-capital funded entrepreneurs can make](https://federalnewsnetwork.com/dod-reporters-notebook-jared-serbu/2019/03/air-force-looks-to-build-big-idea-pipeline-to-expand-its-industrial-base/). Roper, and others in the Pentagon, are reforming their practices to make it easier for genuine innovators to compete against the legacy defense oligopoly. When recently asked at a conference what problem keeps him up at night, Roper replied, “The industrial base.” · Given the hardware roots of the Primes, they are ill-suited to provide solutions to many of the most pressing problems today. The Defense Department will increasingly allocate resources to startups solving software problems for which the Primes have no existing stock of machine learning engineers. · As this happens some venture firms will experience cultural shifts toward more defense investing. As venture capitalists see that startups are receiving large purchase orders from various Defense Department units, they will develop strategies to deploy capital toward defense innovation. A good example is [last week’s award by the Air Force of $121 million to Pivotal Software in San Francisco](https://dod.defense.gov/News/Contracts/Contract-View/Article/1861753/source/GovDelivery/). · Institutional limited partners as a group will likely slowly allocate away from any China-based manager who could be investing in Chinese military technologies. Some LPs with the freedom to do so may remove restrictions on defense investing from limited partnership agreements. · We believe it is a myth that software engineers do not want to work on defense. This is a classic case of preference falsification, the social phenomenon in which people do not speak their true minds about a given topic, though their actions often indicate otherwise. We believe that talented engineers are often very attracted to defense-related work because it often offers the hardest problems to solve. An enormous opportunity therefore exists for startups: to hire the engineers who don’t want to work for ancient and outdated Primes, and who aren’t very welcome at the FAANGS, but who wish to create the technologies that an increasingly eager democratic government needs to defend itself and its allies. Companies in our own portfolio, like [SpaceX](https://www.spacex.com/), [Rigetti Computing](https://www.rigetti.com/), [Anduril Industries](https://www.anduril.com/), and [Umbra Lab](https://umbralab.com/) are executing this strategy. The hardest technical problems today are defense-related How can data from satellites, drones, land-based radar, ships, and other sources be stitched together, in real time, to find long-range missiles on mobile transporters, hiding among the background in cities, forests, and mountains? How can friendly troops, who have separated into very small units in order to hide and survive, be connected to each other electronically, and be resupplied from historically long ranges? How and to what degree and in what conditions should an adversary’s sensor networks be spoofed? What type of false electronic picture can be painted? The aggregation of targeting data for an air wing takes 72 hours today and has a heavy human component. Can this complex optimization problem be solved autonomously, such that the targeting list for pilots is developed in 15 minutes? How does a deployed force of perhaps 50,000 personnel, with planes, ships, and land forces, continue to fight when satellite links have been knocked out, and “reachback” to the U.S., for data processing, is no longer possible? Can deep learning be used for crisis diplomacy? Put another way, since DeepMind’s AlphaZero can teach itself to move pieces forward on a board to win a game, can it learn to move them backwards, to de-escalate a crisis? These problems, and many others, are asking to be solved by entrepreneurs. Phase change There is a looming breakdown in deterrence. If the U.S. defense establishment is unable to adapt to the new great power competitive environment, then adversaries will be tempted to grab for a fait accompli, with war the result. This has been the pattern since Homer wrote The Iliad; there is no evidence to conclude human behavior is different in the 21st Century. We believe the prevention of this scenario involves rapid technical innovation. The defense environment is more favorable now for upstart firms than anytime in the past several decades. If you are a founder building technology to ensure the survival of government by consent, our firm would like to talk to you.

# Case

### PGS

**No nuke terror impact – no country will give them a bomb and carrying out an attack would be too complex.**

John **Mueller, PhD, 18** [PhD Political Science, Political Science @ THE Ohio State University, Woody Hayes Senior Research Scientist @ Mershon Center for International, Security Studies @ OSU], "Nuclear Weapons Don’t Matter," Foreign Affairs, 10-15-2018, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2018-10-15/nuclear-weapons-dont-matter> C.VC

As for nuclear terrorism, ever since al Qaeda operatives used box cutters so effectively to hijack commercial airplanes, **alarmists have warned that radical Islamist terrorists would soon apply equal talents in science and engineering to make and deliver nuclear weapons so as to destroy various so-called infidels**. In practice, however, **terrorist groups have exhibited only a limited desire to go nuclear and even less progress in doing so**. Why? Probably because **developing one’s own bomb from scratch requires a series of risky actions, all of which have to go right for the scheme to work. This includes trusting foreign collaborators and other criminals; acquiring and transporting highly guarded fissile material; establishing a sophisticated, professional machine shop; and moving a cumbersome, untested weapon into position for detonation. And all of this has to be done while hiding from a vast global surveillance net** looking for and trying to disrupt such activities.

**Terrorists are unlikely to get a bomb from a generous, like-minded nuclear patron, because no country wants to run the risk of being blamed** (and punished) **for a terrorist’s nuclear crimes. Nor are they likely to be able to steal one**. Notes Stephen Younger, the former head of nuclear weapons research and development at Los Alamos National Laboratory: “**All nuclear nations take the security of their weapons very seriously**.”

#### If the constellations are sent into space by the USFG or any govt actor then the aff is powerless to stop them – they are not private actors

### Asteroids

#### No extinction and current tech solves

Coates 2009 – former adjunct professor at George Washington University, President of the Kanawha Institute for the Study of the Future and was President of the International Association for Impact Assessment and was President of the Association for Science, Technology and Innovation, M.S., Hon D., FWAAS, FAAAS, (Joseph F., Futures 41, 694-705, "Risks and threats to civilization, humankind, and the earth”, ScienceDirect, WEA)

The most likely **hit** from a modest sized asteroid **does not leave us without recourse. There is active research** now on how to influence and what to do when we are faced with an impending asteroid hit. Keep in mind that **because of the astronomical distances, paths can be** extremely **closely calculated** while the asteroid is still far away in time and space. **We could send up spacecraft to intersect and act** on the threatening asteroid. One concept being developed is **the** **gravity tractor**, a large machine that **would not land on the asteroid, but would create a gravity situation in which the asteroid would slowly move** to a slightly different track, enough of a move **to** take a path **avoid**ing the **earth**.

#### No risk of an extinction level asteroid

Schweickart & Graham 8 (Thomas, Council of American Ambarssadors, and Russell L., Chairman of the B612 Foundation. “NASA's Flimsy Argument for Nuclear Weapons” Scientific American Magazine, <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=nasas-flimsy-argument-for-nuclear-weapons> February 08, 2007)

Nuclear explosives would be needed only for deflecting the **largest NEOs**, which **are the least common and most easily detectable objects. Scientists are not concerned about a collision with an extremely large NEO**—say, 10 kilometers in diameter—**because all these objects have been discovered and none currently threatens Earth. Big things are easy for astronomers to find**; the smaller objects are what we have to worry about./Of the estimated 4,000 NEOs with diameters of 400 meters or more—which includes all objects that might conceivably require nuclear explosives to divert them—researchers have so far identified about 1,500. And if NASA meets the search goals mandated by Congress, it will locate 98 percent of these objects and calculate 100-year projections of their orbits by 2020**. As NASA continues to find big NEOs, the calculations of risk change accordingly**. A decade ago, before astronomers began to systematically locate NEOs larger than 400 meters in diameter, they estimated that we faced a statistical risk of being struck by such an object once every 100,000 years. But now that researchers have identified and are tracking about 37 percent of these NEOs, the frequency of being hit by one of the remaining large objects has dropped to once in 160,000 years. Unless NASA finds a large NEO on an immediate collision course by 2020 (a very unlikely event), the **frequency of a collision** with one of the 80 still undiscovered objects (2 percent of 4,000) will drop to **once every five million years.**