### 1NC

#### Interpretation: The aff must defend a reduction in space appropriation by “private entities”

#### Space law proves they don’t mean “private entities”

Space Settlement Institute — (Extension The, [insert quals], “The Private Space Companies Act“,Available Online at http://www.space-settlement-institute.org/private-space-companies-act.html, accessed 3-26-2022, HKR-AR)

Private entity: A **private space company**, a **consortium of private space companies**, and/or one or more individuals that are not controlled by any sovereign state or government. Examples of state control of a space company include, but are not limited to, a government, government agency, or another government-controlled company owning or controlling an effective majority of the voting shares and/or having the ability to select the Board of Directors or executives. Merely being subject to normal government regulation, however, does not make a private space company government controlled in this sense.

#### Violation: Terrorists are not “private space companies”

#### Standards:

#### Limits: They explode the topic to any and all non-state actors, including terrorists, individual personhood affs, non-profit affs, etc – All of that breaks negative preparation. No generic applies to the China aff and the Bob Tom should stop appropriating outer space aff.

#### Reject the arg on 1AR Theory

#### 1. Proportionality- punishment is worse than the skew which is solved by investment in the original arg and defending theory.

#### 2. Creates perverse incentives to collapse to theory instead of returning to substance- turns deterrence since theory over-proliferates which crowds out substance.

### 1NC

#### Interpretation – affirmative teams must defend legal action by a government

John Bouvier 56 [The Free Dictionary, “Unjust”] [DS] [https://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/Unjust#:~:text=UNJUST.,test%20of%20right%20and%20wrong.]

Unjust Also found in: Dictionary, Thesaurus, Wikipedia. Related to Unjust: Unjust enrichment UNJUST. That which is done against the perfect rights of another; that which is against the established law; that which is opposed to a law which is the test of right and wrong.

#### This is clear

Black’s Law Dictionary ND [DS] [https://thelawdictionary.org/unjust/]

UNJUST Contrary to right and justice, or to the enjoyment of his rights by another, or to the standards of conduct furnished by the laws.

#### “Resolved” means enactment of a law.

Words and Phrases 64 Words and Phrases Permanent Edition (Multi-volume set of judicial definitions). “Resolved”. 1964.

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### Violation – the aff fiats private self-restriction, which is not a method of correcting injustice nor an enactment of a law.

#### Ground – generics on this topic must be tied to the actor, not the action, because each space appropriation is unique. A topic where the unifying thesis is countries legislating restrictions on space appropriation is much better than one about private actors self-restricting – their interp skirts multilat good/bad, K’s of IR and global governance, and CP’s to reform the OST – there are no unifying DA’s to different private companies around the world signing binding internal memos to restrict a type of space appropriation.

#### Fairness is a voting issue – you can’t deterine fairness is bad in an unfair debate and it’s a constituve rule

#### DTD on topicality – it kills our ability to engage starting from the 1AC and DTA is functionally DTD and means vote neg on presumption

#### No RVIs – they’re illogical, create a chilling effect on setting theory norms, and destroy substantive education.

### 1NC—T

#### Interpretation—the aff must directly regulate the appropriation by private entities of outer space. To clarify, they may not restrict an activity whose consequence is appropriation – they can’t be effects-T.

#### Violation – their offense is about terrorist attacks, the result of which is creating debris and nonfucntional objects, which is what their ev says is appropriation. Their 1ac Munoz-Patchen evidence concedes that the appropriation is a “result of terror attacks” – this is textbook effects-T.

#### FOR REFERENCE: their 1AC definition evidence:

#### Debris and nonfunctional objects constitute appropriation – both are results of terror attacks

Muñoz-Patchen 18 [(Chelsea, J.D. Candidate, 2019, The University of Chicago Law School.) “Regulating the Space Commons: Treating Space Debris as Abandoned Property in Violation of the Outer Space Treaty” Chicago Journal of International Law, 2018. https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1741&context=cjil] BC

Failing to Clean Up Space Debris Violates These Legal Principles

If one considers the orbital space taken up by debris and the collision threat posed by debris, it becomes hard to claim that states are not violating the basic norms of spacefaring. Debris and other nonfunctional objects serving no useful purpose take up orbital space, which could be used by other nations. If, or when, the Kessler Syndrome cascade is reached, the contributing nations will have made segments of Earth’s orbit unusable for any nation. Thus, according to some scholars, the very existence of space debris is illegal internationally according to the initial Outer Space Treaty of 1967.147 They suggest that this treaty, which “states that all activities must be carried on for the ‘benefit and interests of all countries,’ and that outer space shall never be subject to national appropriation” is now part of customary international space law.148 They argue that leaving space debris violates

Principle 21 of the 1972 Stockholm Declaration which allows states to exploit their resources pursuant to their own environmental policies, provided that their activities do not cause damage to areas beyond their national jurisdiction. Thus, a defunct satellite or space debris left behind in any orbit violates the Outer Space Treaty because: (a) it does not produce a benefit for mankind; (b) its use is not in the interest of all countries; and (c) it occupies a portion of space, causing national appropriation.149

Even short of a cascade removing or limiting the availability of space debris can, and indeed has, begun to affect the use of space. As described earlier, debris has caused the ISS and other space objects to use fuel to avoid collisions or risk the destruction of their craft and loss of life.150 There is already crowding in the geostationary orbit, used especially for communications satellites, causing fear of collisions and signal overlap.151 Initial access to space has been delayed because the launches of new spacecraft have had to be held back due to the risk of debris in their path.152 Other protective measures that spacefaring nations are contemplating include launching with more fuel to allow for avoidance maneuvers and protective shields—both of which cost money and add extra weight, requiring more fuel.153 These protective measures, which must be added due to the conduct of existing spacefaring nations, serve as an extra barrier to space access by increasing the cost of space operations.

Thus, states creating debris violate other nations’ right to use space as enshrined in the space treaty regime, and they violate their own obligations to not appropriate space.

#### Effects T is a voting issue for limits and ground – their interp unbounds the topic – infinite number of activities could result in appropriation, with long enough link chains. Even the most limited version of their interp still allows restricting any activity that could result in space debris – means hacking, ASAT attacks, missile launches, etc are all on the table. That outweighs – no unifying neg ground covers mining bad and ASAT attacks bad which destroys generics and clash – filters all of their offense about aff ground and education.

### 1NC

#### Counterplan: Violent non-state actors should not appropriate outer space except for terrestrially accessible blockchain verification computing centers and cryptocurrency mining centers. Violent non-state actors should significantly invest in the creation of terrestrially accessible blockchain verification computing centers and cryptocurrency mining centers on the Moon and Deep Space. Violent non-state actors should threaten, but never use, the Republic of Malta with bioweapons every day.

#### CP’s competitive

Wikipedia ND — ( “Violent non-state actor“, No Publication, xx-xx-xxxx, Available Online at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Violent\_non-state\_actor, accessed 3-26-2022, HKR-AR)

In international relations, violent non-state actors (VNSAs), also known as non-state armed actors or non-state armed groups (NSAGs), are individuals or groups that are wholly or partly independent of governments and which threaten or use violence to achieve their goals.[1][2]

#### Climate-motivated terrestrial mining regulations kill crypto now – those don’t get applied to space because of unique environments – that saves crypto with sufficient private investment

Greene 21 Greene, Tristan. Tristan covers human-centric artificial intelligence advances, quantum computing, STEM, Spiderman, physics, and space stuff. As far as I can tell his highest level of education was that he was in the Navy for a while. "What happens to Bitcoin when billionaires build cryptocurrency miners on the Moon?" TNW | Hardfork, 8 June 2021, thenextweb.com/news/bitcoin-billionaires-build-cryptocurrency-miners-on-moon-bitcoin.

Space exploration and exploitation have traditionally been nationalist endeavors. But the rise of the 12-digit billionaire has suddenly made outer space look like open territory. The players Jeff Bezos is stepping down from his position as the CEO of Amazon after 25 years ahead of his imminent launch into space aboard one of his own Blue Origin spaceships. This will be the future of fintech 6 trends that will dominate fintech in 2022 While it’s easy to imagine the long-time leader retiring to live out a childhood fantasy, there’s nothing in Bezos’ history as an incredibly ambitious person and businessman to indicate his he’ll just blast off into the sunset to live a life of quiet leisure. Simply put, Bezos’ interest in the space sector likely won’t end with offering consumer thrill rides. While it’s impossible to know where the soon-to-be-former CEO might take his ambition, it’s likely Amazon and/or Blue Origin is already looking for ways to exploit the space sector for profit. But, obviously, Bezos isn’t the only private citizen with a spaceship company. Elon Musk’s SpaceX has spent the last decade becoming the belle of NASA’s ball and he’s already all-in on the idea of sending humans to Mars. And we can’t forget Richard Branson. He may only be worth a paltry $5 billion (lol), but his Virgin Galactic company’s been banking on making some money in space tourism for a long time. Let’s also not forget that Virgin’s dabbled in everything from railroad technology to record labels. And the list goes on. Anyone with a few billion dollars has business options and opportunities that extend beyond our planet’s surface. Space for profit In the past, we’ve discussed the idea of mining space asteroids for profit. Some experts believe there are unimaginable fortunes floating around in space in the form of resource-rich asteroids. In fact, you can even get a degree in asteroid mining. And even Goldman Sachs has considered getting in on the action. But, at the end of the day, we still have to figure out where these resources are, build machines capable of extracting them, and get them safely to somewhere they can be useful. Right now, there’s not much value in investing in asteroid mining futures because the technology either doesn’t exist or isn’t ready yet. However, there’s more than one kind of mining you can do in space. Enter cryptocurrency and the future Elon Musk recently got involved in a friendly space race, but this time it has nothing to do with competition over rockets or government contracts. He’s racing against BitMEX, a cryptocurrency exchange and derivative platform, to see who can get a cryptocurrency on the Moon first. If you’re curious about how that works, here’s a snippet from BitMEX’s official announcement: BitMEX will mint a one-of-a-kind physical bitcoin, similar to the Casascius coins of 2013, which will be delivered to the Moon by Astrobotic. The coin will hold one bitcoin at an address to be publicly released, underneath a tamper-evident hologram covering. The coin will proudly display the BitMEX name, the mission name, the date it was minted and the bitcoin price at the time of minting. According to BitMEX, this isn’t just a ceremonial or token delivery. The coin itself is a hardware wallet containing an actual Bitcoin, so its value will change with the value of the BTC here on Earth. In other words, BitMEX is sending a literal treasure to the Moon for anyone brave (or rich) enough to retrieve it. Per the company’s blog post: A moon surface background with text superimposed, quote below Credit: BitMEX Come and Get It. When the physical coin lands, it will remain on the Moon until anyone deems it worthy of retrieval. Decades from now, what will it be worth? It’s a great question. Some experts have predicted a single bitcoin will one day be worth $100K, $1M, or even more. But an even better question is this: What’s the end game for cryptocurrency in space? Billionaires want to be trillionaires Back in 1999 Wired ran a feature about the imminent rise of the world’s first trillionaire. At the time, everyone assumed the richest man in the world, Microsoft CEO Bill Gates, would be the first trillionaire by a long shot. Here’s a quote from that article: The value of Bill’s Microsoft stake has grown from $233.9 million at the time of Microsoft’s 1986 IPO to $72.2 billion as of June 15, 1999 (disregarding stock sales). At this rate – 58.2 percent a year – he will become a trillionaire in March 2005, at age 49, and his Microsoft holdings will be valued at $1 quadrillion in March 2020, when he is 64. Of course, we still haven’t seen a trillionaire in modern history. As of the time of this writing, the richest person in the world is France’s Bernard Arnault, whose $193.6 billion empire edges out Jeff Bezos’ $189 billion. At some point, if Bezos wants to pull away with it or Elon Musk wants to close the widening gap between his $151.4 billion and a first place finish, the world’s richest people are going to have to do more than squeeze terrestrial markets for every last drop of profit. That’s why many experts view Elon Musk’s heavy involvement in cryptocurrency as the potential difference maker. On any given day the Tesla, SpaceX, and Neuralink founder’s total worth can skyrocket or plummet by tens of billions of dollars based on how his cryptocurrency holdings are performing. When you consider that market movements can be directly tied to Musk’s social media statements, the power proposition for billionaires holding cryptocurrency is unbridled. Simply put: Elon Musk has more control over the so-called “volatile” world of cryptocurrency than most. Putting a cryptocurrency in space, much like firing a Tesla off into the galaxy, is a PR move meant to generate interest in the burgeoning cryptomarket. But that’s not the only purpose they serve. These acts remind us that people like Musk and Bezos can do anything they want. If they want to put a coin on the Moon, they have the means to do it. And, for example, if Musk or Bezos suddenly wanted to solve the biggest problems with cryptocurrency mining – power consumption, carbon footprint, developing powerful-enough hardware – they’re in a unique position to do so. In space, no one can hear you mine Arguably, one of the biggest things stopping an apex whale like Elon Musk from spending a fair portion of his billions on cryptomining centers is the fact that such an operation would almost certainly draw universal condemnation for its potential effect on the global climate crisis. But the Moon’s atmosphere isn’t necessarily as fragile as the Earth’s. Hypothetically speaking, there’s nothing to stop a billionaire from building a facility on the Moon to mine cryptocurrency. They would, of course, need to be able to build their own batteries, have experience with artificial intelligence and supercomputers, and already have their own satellite network set up in space – all boxes Elon Musk can tick today. And, in the near-future, as we perfect deep space transmission technology, what’s to stop a billionaire from putting a supercomputer on a satellite and sending it somewhere in deep space to mine cryptocurrency 24/7 at near absolute-zero temperatures? All of this is conjecture, but the writing is on the wall. Cryptocurrency enthusiasts fear what the experts are consistently warning: regulation is coming. Eventually, it’s possible cryptocurrency mining could become regulated with harsh policies designed to keep mining operations from further damaging the environment. This could seriously hinder the market. If humanity walks away from terrestrial mining to save the planet, we’ll be leaving unfathomable amounts of money on table. Billionaires don’t become billionaires by doing that. The only logical path forward, barring some unknown new green mining technology, may be moving the cryptocurrency industry to space.

#### Bitcoin is private property in space – appropriation is key

Rule & LeClair 21 [Dylan LeClair And Sam Rule Bitcoin Magazine. "Bitcoin’s Private Property Rights." https://www.nasdaq.com/articles/bitcoins-private-property-rights-2021-09-28]

Bitcoin’s Superior Private Property Rights

For the first time in history, bitcoin offers us a property option that does not rely on a local authority or legal system to enforce or protect it. It’s protected by the natural incentives of those participating in the network.

“Satoshi Nakamoto has created a form of property that can exist without relying on the state, centralized authority, or traditional legal structures.” - Eric D. Chason,"How Bitcoin Functions As Property Law"

It provides us with a store of value and savings technology where no government, central institution or voting bloc can seize, freeze or access it through violence or force when properly secured. Anyone in the world with an internet connection can secure this property without permission, and no other person or institution may take it away or erode its value. Whether it’s real estate, cash, equities, bonds, or gold, no other asset on the market provides this level of assurance and security.

What we know of strong, well-defined property rights is that they are the basis of human cooperation and economic activity. When private property rights flourish, so do the people. When we look at the nations of the world with the lowest ranking of property rights, we also find some of the key regions where bitcoin is making its mark.

#### Cryptocurrency reaching a wide rollout builds resilience to survive inevitable existential filters.

Alex McShane 21, Writer and Head of Video for Bitcoin Magazine, BA from the University of Iowa, Degree from the University College Dublin, Degree from Kirkwood Community College, “Bitcoin and Existential Risk”, Bitcoin Magazine, 9/5/2021, https://bitcoinmagazine.com/culture/bitcoin-and-existential-risk-alex-mcshane

TL;DR - An existential risk is the possibility of an event or series of events that could drastically curtail humanity’s potential. A hypothetical global catastrophe could be anthropogenic or non-anthropogenic and internal or external in nature. The adoption of Bitcoin will better position us to address these risks as a society.

EXTERNAL NON-ANTHROPOGENIC

A catastrophic collision with an astronomical object, such as an asteroid impact would be an external non-anthropogenic risk. This has already occurred here several times. During the Permian Triassic period (ending 250 million years ago) an astronomical impact killed 90 percent of the species on Earth. It took tens of millions of years for life on Earth to repopulate and Earth’s intelligence potential to recover.

One interesting external non-anthropogenic risk is Earth’s reflected light, which could be measured by an external intelligence who then come to extinguish us. (The topic of our own signal bringing about this death by misadventure is discussed further below.)

What does this have to do with Bitcoin?

Generally, hard money facilitates greater innovation and technological process. At this point one might argue that if we do not migrate to some degree from Earth as a species, and are subsequently wiped out by an astronomical object impact or a super-volcanic event, the risk becomes anthropogenic in nature. We are a centralized species on a grand scale, and at this point one could say we have through consensus chosen to remain vulnerable to a single vector of attack by staying here.

Bitcoin is not only the hardest money known to man, it is the most responsible from this standpoint. Bitcoin as it currently operates is currency that can provide a monetary framework on which humans can achieve greater capital growth, collaboration, resource allocation, and therefore technological progress. Because the terminal supply of Bitcoin is capped, we can store value in it indefinitely as a society.

66 Million years ago the Cretaceous-Paleogene Extinction Event extinguished the life and intelligence potential of the non-avian dinosaurs. This series of events was external, and broadly non-anthropogenic in the sense that no form of life on Earth at the time contributed to its own demise, but more specifically, at the time of those astronomical impacts the first humans hadn’t split from chimpanzee lineages. This split is thought to have occurred between between 4 and 8 million years ago.

An important distinction between astronomical impacts or super-volcanic events of the past and such events if they were to happen today is that one could argue that our intelligence potential is now mature enough to tackle certain of the external existential risks. Today, the risk posed by an asteroid impact or something similar would still be external in its origin, but at what point does the burden of responsibility to migrate off of the planet fall upon our population? We can surely solve for some external existential risks, and in any case, no one is going to do it for us. You could say that failing to collectively pursue a solution when technically we could have would recategorize a civilization-extinguishing asteroid impact as an external but anthropogenic risk.

At what point do innovation dampening authoritarian states and their mandated broken money cause society to stall at a local optimum? Surely the government has already caused this. It’s only a matter of time before another object strikes the Earth with devastating consequence. I would argue it is irresponsible to continue life here with government money. Government money is an existential risk. Bitcoin is not only a solution, it is a societal responsibility.

INTERNAL ANTHROPOGENIC

Nuclear war is one example of an internal anthropogenic risk. That is, should nuclear war arise, it would be both self destructive, and relatively self contained on a cosmic scale. It follows that biological warfare is an internal anthropogenic risk, the reality of which we as a species can surely understand now. If I were to hazard a guess I would say virtual emergencies and cyber pandemics are next. These self constructed catastrophes are the government’s misguided attempts at proof of work. This is a topic for another time. Do not surrender your ability to think and speak freely.

The second law of thermodynamics can summed thus, processes that involve the transfer or conversion of heat energy are irreversible. The law indicates we have not observed a spontaneous transfer of energy from cold to hot. Another way to think of this is that there is no such thing as cold, only lesser degrees of hot. Nothing cannot transfer. So broadly, within a closed system, the second law of thermodynamics would indicate that all differences tend to level out.

So what has this got to do with Bitcoin?

Well firstly, all hardware is subject to entropy. The distributed nature of the blockchain increases the probability that it will survive centralized entropy. At Bitcoin’s inception, imagine a failure because Satoshi’s computer randomly crashed. Distributed networks are inherently hedged against this particular centralized form of existential risk.

The second law of thermodynamics also suggests that on a grander scale, relatively isolated (centralized) systems will degenerate more and more into disordered states. Proof of work, and network growth are two ways Bitcoin fights against falling into disrepair.

Bitcoin uses proof of work to stave off entropy. The system cannot stay dormant. It must continue to use proof of work to advance the state of the chain, and to fight entropy to secure the monetary value all of the users have stored in the network. The U.S. dollar, as many have pointed out, relies on proof of war, or distributed political energies to maintain dominance. Its methodology can be described as haphazard at best.

INTERNAL NON-ANTHROPOGENIC

One internal non-anthropogenic risk is that of a super-volcanic eruption, provided it wasn’t humans who brought about the eruption. Just like with external non-anthropogenic risks, Bitcoin alone cannot prevent them, but it can help humans prepare for them such that we may survive these relatively small intelligence filters the universe throws our way.

Bitcoin allows for fundamental capital accumulation and human innovation, and promotes collaboration to such a degree that we will find an increased collective problem solving power as humans the further Bitcoin adoption spreads. It is worth mentioning that Bitcoin also maintains and appreciates wealth to such a degree that often those of us to chose to live our lives on a Bitcoin standard will experience relatively greater freedoms, and vastly greater amounts of free time than our peers who chose to continue their lives on a fiat standard, and are perpetually working to outpace their chronic debt. Many Bitcoiners will likely forego that newfound free time to work and continue to provide value to others in whatever area interests them, because Bitcoin incentivizes the collaborative accumulation of capital but also the responsible reallocation of it.

EXTERNAL ANTHROPOGENIC

An external anthropogenic risk has the least probability of occurring. This is a problem of reach. Imagine human intelligence being sent into the cosmos and signaling or generally causing an external intelligence or astronomical object to come back to extinguish us. This is a most improbable extinction by misadventure.

The probability that we send messages of consequence into the cosmos that in turn cause some other far-flung intelligence, with knowledge enough to reach us, to come and bring about our own destruction is next to zero, but it isn’t zero.

I would posit that the probability increases every day that Bitcoin survives, with each person that chooses to hold Bitcoin over fiat, because on a fiat standard we are again, stuck at a local optimum at best, and each day the global monetary system devolves further into chaos. The fiat world may continue to be habitable chaos, but our technological progress and our greatest capacity for innovation cannot be achieved on a fiat standard.

A Bitcoin standard is not only our current best bet, it is the only monetary vehicle that will take us from here, or enable us to build technology that can effectively communicate with places in the universe where other intelligence has emerged. The other reason this fatal miscommunication is unlikely to occur is that once through a Bitcoin standard we have manage to build a society that can effectively reach and communicate at greater depths of the cosmos we will at that time have already become a multi-planetary, if not transitory, if not multi-solar system species. The topic of Bitcoin in space and planetary interoperability will be discussed in a later essay.

The most distant human made object from the earth is the Voyager 1, which is over 13 billion miles away. (For perspective, Apha Centuri, the nearest star system to Earth, is 25 trillion miles away.) Human radio signals have announced our presence and our intelligence to the cosmos since around 1900. The first human radio signals have all ready traveled 114 light years, that is 681,920,540,000,000 miles. Although the reach of our radio signals is very great, the probability of us being heard and subsequently extinguished is negligible. External anthropogenic risks are the least of our concerns at the moment.

As Bitcoin adoption grows, it serves to promote advances in artificial intelligence and nanotechnology. External anthropogenic risks will become more relevant to human intelligence at a much later time. External non-anthropogenic risks are similarly out of our hands for the time being. That is, at the moment there is nothing we can do to prevent the Sun from becoming a red giant star and subsuming the Earth.

But we do already have the monetary technology upon which to engineer solutions to some of these problems. We have the potential as humans to prevent internal global catastrophes, both those set on by us and not. Survival and longevity is arguably our greatest task as a species. Adopting Bitcoin, and protecting this network is proceeding with diligence and a long eye toward the future in all of our political and scientific affairs. The existential risks of living are great, though it is human nature for our ambitions to out pace our current abilities. The only evidence of life is change. To change is to exit fiat currency, it is to use Bitcoin instead.

### 1NC

#### Counterplan: Violent non state actors should not

#### Deploy or develop ASATS

#### Attack satellites with the intention of triggering satellite loss

#### Jam satellite communications

#### Hack nuclear storage facilities

#### Seek acquisition of nuclear material

#### Use nuclear weapons or dirty bombs

#### The counterplan PICs out of VNSA’s hacking space reconnaissance satellites to reveal military secrets – that’s good – it removes military information asymmetry which reduces incentives for war

Early and Gartzke 21 Early, Bryan R., and Erik Gartzke. Political Science, Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy, University at Albany CUNY. Political Science, University of California, San Diego"Spying from space: Reconnaissance satellites and interstate disputes." Journal of Conflict Resolution 65.9 (2021): 1551-1575.

This study has sought to explain how technological developments that affect the production and nature of strategic intelligence systematically affect the risk of military aggression. Drawing on bargaining and offense-defense theory, we devel- oped an argument that explains the role of technological change in altering key attributes of intelligence collection. Reconnaissance satellites provide a unique and durable source of defensive advantage, dramatically reducing the chances that states can leverage the element of surprise in major military actions against targets that possess them. They can also provide potential aggressors with credible, durable intelligence that they can exploit in compellent bargaining situations, allowing aggressors to achieve their objectives without having to engage in the use of force. When two states possess reconnaissance satellites, their deployment of military forces are highly transparent to one another—substantially diminishing potential the advantages/risks from surprise attacks and reducing private information about adversaries’ capabilities. We thus hypothesized that reconnaissance satellites will reduce the likelihood of substantial military conflicts when either or both states in a dyad possess them. We evaluated our argument by analyzing the effects that recon- naissance satellites have on salient military conflicts in the period of 1950 to 2010. The results reveal consistent support for our hypotheses. Our findings have substantive implications for international affairs. Reconnais- sance satellites enhance the role of intelligence in promoting peace. Spying from space makes a state’s informational advantages transparent to other nations, affect- ing not only potential outcomes of conflict, but also the bargaining that takes place before conflicts occur. By denying aggressors the ability to exploit surprise, satellites can reduce both the incentives to launch significant offensive actions and the ability to use threats of such attacks coercively. Greater transparency created when both states possess reconnaissance satellites allows leaders to bargain effectively and avoid the need to resort to war. Notably, we observed that serious MIDs between two reconnaissance satellite possessors almost never occurred during our sample period. As President Carter claimed, the proliferation of reconnaissance satellite technology appears to have a pacifying effect on the politics of nations. Our approach can be also interpreted as a useful way to revitalize offense-defense theory. By focusing on a capability that offers informational advantages rather than kinetic ones, we provide a perspective that is distinct from the classical tradition but consistent with current thinking about the causes of war. Our findings suggest that offense-defense theory contains useful insights about state behavior, though relevant mechanisms remain poorly conceptualized. Looking ahead, our findings suggest that scholars should examine what other technological capabilities can, or are likely to, operate in ways that complement or substitute for reconnaissance satellites. Our period of analysis tails off at roughly the time that high-resolution commercial satellite imagery has become widely available, a phenomenon with interesting implications for international affairs. On the one hand, it could be that many more states will behave as if they possess reconnaissance satellite capabilities, given wider access to intelligence through commercial satel- lites. Given our findings, this possibility implies an optimistic forecast. One the other hand, an abundance of reconnaissance makes it harder to demonstrate the impact of this capability in the future, as co-variance is required to demonstrate cause and effect. A final implication of our findings appears to us to be both problematic and likely. No one likes to be spied on, least of all sovereign powers. The advent of satellite surveillance and a widening awareness of their effects may drive states to seek new forms of secrecy and new forms of espionage, like cyber, that lack the transparency that characterizes satellite reconnaissance. This perspective paints a far less optimistic view of the future. In particular, eyes in the sky encourage actors to function in ways and in places where they are less likely to be seen, such as urban environments that increase the vulnerability and targeting of civilians by terrorists and others. Nothing is permanent; innovations that clarify lead to efforts to obscure in the cat-and-mouse game of international security. At the very least, our study suggests that the role of intelligence in explaining international conflict warrants increased analytical attention.

#### 1AC Kwok says the only impact to this is “revealing military secrets” – they have no argument for why that would cause escalation, why that would cause countries around the globe to use that military information to hit assets – the 1AR is too late to read a new terminal, our decision to read this PIC was entirely based on this aff being trash

### 1NC

#### Reject their Memhood and Ahmed cards – they’re literally written by undergraduates at a Pakistani war college – that’s not qualified and obviously incentives to inflate risks

Mehmood and Ahmed 21 [(Ashna Mehmood is a student of International Relations at National Defence University, Islamabad) (Shiza Ahmed is a student of International Relations at National Defence University, Islamabad.) “Terrorism in Space: A Possibility” A Journal of Strategic Studies, Summer 2021. http://journal.ciss.org.pk/index.php/ciss-insight/article/view/204] BC

#### Their author admits Space terror includes purely terrestrial actions – means they don’t solve because the majority of their Aff is about terrestrial actions which “private space appropriation” can’t solve

Mehmood and Ahmed 21 [(Ashna Mehmood is a student of International Relations at National Defence University, Islamabad) (Shiza Ahmed is a student of International Relations at National Defence University, Islamabad.) “Terrorism in Space: A Possibility” A Journal of Strategic Studies, Summer 2021. http://journal.ciss.org.pk/index.php/ciss-insight/article/view/204] BC

The possibility of terrorism in space is an emerging concept, yet it has attracted attention of s ome experts and scholars like J.R Cain who described space terrorism as: - “An act of violence by one or more individuals or groups to prevent the development of a space settlement(s) and/or their aims including those of a spaceship or space station during Man‘s exploration of space”. 3 Howeve r, this definition is extremely vague and does not include the destruction that can occur on Earth and may have nothing to do with the settlement but still be related to the space sector, such as ground space stations, r ocket launch sites, and cyber - attacks on space system on ground etc. Also, this definition can be misleading as it regards all acts of violence or terror as terrorism regardless of the motivation. By following that analogy, every attack against the develop ment of space settlement, such as theft, can be considered as terrorism. Another definition of Space terrorism is proposed by Paweł Bernat and Elżbieta Posłuszna, “A purposeful and well - thought - out act of destruction against human and/or material resources of space industry undertaken by individuals or groups out of ideological motivation, where space industry is understood as an economic sector dedicated to producing components that go into Earth's orbit or beyond, delivering them to those regions, and rel ated services”. 4 This definition too is narrow as it states the space industry only in the economic domain whereas space is beyond that. It encompasses cultural, social, national security and cyber aspects as well. To narrow it to economically motivated terrorism excludes terrorist activities targeting other domain s . Hence, we have proposed the definition of Space terrorism that covers all aspects. “Space terrorism is an act of violence or terror that targets space industry whether in space (such as spa ce station, satellites, etc.) Or on Earth (ground stations, rocket launcher sites, etc.) and particular individuals (astronauts) that will endanger human and material resources in space and Earth alike. These acts can be motivated by ideological factors th at aim to target countries, and region as a whole since the world is increasingly becoming dependent on space technology”.

#### No way the Aff solves – terrorist groups could still make ASATS even if they don’t deploy them and no evidence that using them is “appropriation” because the weapon would only use space until it hit the payload

#### No miscal - Lack attribution means they have no one to retaliate against

Schwarzer et al ’19 [Daniela, Eva-Marie McCormack, and Torben Schutz; Director, Editor, and Associate Fellow in the Security, Defense, and Armaments Program at the German Council of Foreign Relations; Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Auswartige Politik, “Technology and Strategy: The Changing Security Environment in Space Demands New Diplomatic and Military Answers,” [https://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/bitstream/handle/document/63288/ssoar-2019-schutz-Technology\_and\_Strategy\_the\_Changing.pdf](https://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/bitstream/handle/document/63288/ssoar-2019-schutz-Technology_and_Strategy_the_Changing.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y&lnkname=ssoar-2019-schutz-Technology_and_Strategy_the_Changing.pdf);]

However, even a (misinterpreted) threat to space assets could start a chain reaction and quickly escalate an incident in space to a wider war. Successful deterrence, therefore, requires situational awareness, attribution capabilities and resilient assets. Especially the latter two are notoriously difficult to achieve in space. While it might be easy to attribute a kinetic attack executed with a missile, the same is not true for ASAT attacks by other satellites, and, especially, not for cyberattacks and electronic warfare measures. Without clear attribution, however, it is difficult to deter any adversary, since he could speculate that an attack cannot be traced back to him – making deterrence and retaliation more difficult. Although cross-domain deterrence, i.e. threatening an actor through potential retaliation attacks on or by other-than-space assets, is always possible, it also amplifies the problems involved in traditional deterrence: A response has to be timely and proportionate, and it should not further expand of the conflict.

#### Even if there is miscal, no one would escalate – official statements prove

Colby 16 (Elbridge, Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security, “From Sanctuary to Battlefield: A Framework for a U.S. Defense and Deterrence Strategy for Space”)SLAIR

But such a threat is of substantially decreasing credibility. In today’s much different context, no one really believes that a limited space attack would necessarily or even plausibly be a prelude to total nuclear war. Would the United States respond with a major strategic strike if China or Russia, in the context of a regional conflict with the United States, struck discriminately at implicated U.S. space assets in the attempt to defang U.S. power projection, all while leaving the broader U.S. space architecture alone? Not only does such a massive response seem unlikely – it would be positively foolish and irresponsible. Furthermore, would other nations regard attacks on assets the United States was actively employing for a local war as off limits to attack? Indeed, any reasonable observer would have to judge that such discriminate attacks on U.S. space assets would not necessarily be illegitimate, as, by the United States’ own admission, it relies greatly on its space architecture for conventional power projection. Moreover, official U.S. statements on how the United States would respond to attacks on its space assets – to the limited extent such statements exist and the degree to which those given are clear – offer no indication it would respond massively to such strikes.53 Perhaps more to the point, senior responsible U.S. officials have telegraphed that the United States would indeed not necessarily respond massively to attacks against its space assets.54 In light of these factors, any U.S. space deterrence strategy that is predicated on an all-or-nothing retaliation to space attacks will become increasingly incredible and thus decreasingly effective – and indeed might even invite an adversary’s challenge in order to puncture or degrade U.S. credibility. In other words, since space assets can increasingly be attacked segmentally and discriminately rather than totally, this means that credibly and effectively deterring such attacks requires a less than total response. Since the threat is more like a rapier than a broadsword, the United States needs rapier-like ripostes of its own. Accordingly, the United States Any U.S. space deterrence strategy that is predicated on an all-or-nothing retaliation to space attacks will become increasingly incredible and thus decreasingly effective. needs a more discriminate deterrent for space. In particular, it needs a flexible deterrent capable of meeting the intensifying challenge of deterring an adversary – and particularly a highly capable potential opponent like China or Russia – from attacking (or attacking to a sufficient degree) those U.S. space assets needed for the United States to effectively and decisively project power and ultimately prevail in a conflict in a distant theater. At the same time, this flexible deterrent must contribute to dissuading such an enemy from striking at the nation’s broader military and civilian space architecture, and in particular those core strategic space assets needed for central deterrence.

#### Kwok – also an undergraduate, good grief Immaculate Heart – reject it because he’s unqualified to talk about the Aff

Kwok 9/9 [(Andre, an Asian studies and law student at The Australian National University.) “The growing threat of cybercrime in the space domain” East Asia Forum, 9/9/2021. https://www.eastasiaforum.org/2021/09/09/the-growing-threat-of-cybercrime-in-the-space-domain/] BC

#### But, this isn’t space appropriation – it’s about hacking satallites which is just terrestrial cyberattacks on existing space infrastructure – zero evidence that that’s appropriation

#### No nuke terror – NTI is about non state actos hacking TERRESTRIAL NUCLEAR SITES and stealing nuclear material from that – literally nothing to do about space and these capabilities all exist now. We’ll insert lines:

#### 1AC NTI:

What if a hacker shut down the security system at a highly sensitive nuclear materials storage facility, giving access to terrorists seeking highly enriched uranium to make a bomb? What if cyber-terrorists seized control of operations at a nuclear power plant–enabling a Fukushima-scale meltdown? Or, worse, what if hackers spoofed a nuclear missile attack, forcing a miscalculated retaliatory strike that could kill millions?

#### 1AC NTI:

The threat extends to the command, control, and communications (NC3) for nuclear weapons. Even in the United States, officials have stated that it cannot be fully confident that these systems will operate as planned if attacked by a sophisticated cyber opponent.

#### No nuke terror – people like Allison are hacks

* Two decades of threats haven’t panned out
* Too many things can go wrong:

Getting trusted collaborators

Stealing and transporting guarded material

Getting the top technicians in the world

No ability to test

Skilled detonation crew

All that while attracting zero attention

* Weapons have safety devices, are stored in pieces in different places
* Terrorists are like Bond villains that scheme instead of accomplishing anything
* Most attacks are bombs which don’t even work

Mueller and Stewart 10/29/18 [John Mueller is Woody Hayes Senior Research Scientist, Mershon Center for International Security Studies, and adjunct professor of Political Science, at Ohio State University. He is also a Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute in Washington. Mark G. Stewart is Professor of Civil Engineering and Director of the Centre for Infrastructure Performance and Reliability at The University of Newcastle in Australia. Terrorism and Bathtubs: Comparing and Assessing the Risks. October 29, 2018. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09546553.2018.1530662?journalCode=ftpv20]

However, there is of course no guarantee that things will remain that way, and the 9/11 attacks inspired the remarkable extrapolation that, because the terrorists were successful with box cutters, they might soon be able to turn out weapons of mass destruction— particularly nuclear ones—and then detonate them in an American city. For example, in his influential 2004 book, Nuclear Terrorism, Harvard’s Graham Allison relayed his “considered judgment” that “on the current path, a nuclear terrorist attack on America in the decade ahead is more likely than not.”11 Allison has had a great deal of company in his alarming pronouncements. In 2007, the distinguished physicist Richard Garwin put the likelihood of a nuclear explosion on an American or European city by terrorist or other means at 20 percent per year, which would work out to 91 percent over the eleven-year period to 2018.12

Allison’s time is up, and so is Garwin’s. These off-repeated warnings have proven to be empty. And it is important to point out that not only have terrorists failed to go nuclear, but as William Langewiesche, who has assessed the process in detail, put it in 2007, “The best information is that no one has gotten anywhere near this. I mean, if you look carefully and practically at this process, you see that it is an enormous undertaking full of risks for the would-be terrorists.”13 That process requires trusting corrupted foreign collaborators and other criminals, obtaining and transporting highly guarded material, setting up a machine shop staffed with top scientists and technicians, and rolling the heavy, cumbersome, and untested finished product into position to be detonated by a skilled crew, all the while attracting no attention from outsiders.

Nor have terrorist groups been able to steal existing nuclear weapons—characteristically burdened with multiple safety devices and often stored in pieces at separate secure locales—from existing arsenals as was once much feared. And they certainly have not been able to cajole leaders in nuclear states to palm one off to them—though a war inflicting more death than Hiroshima and Nagasaki combined was launched against Iraq in 2003 in major part under the spell of fantasies about such a handover.14

More generally, the actual terrorist “adversaries” in the West scarcely deserve accolades for either dedication or prowess. It is true, of course, that sometimes even incompetents can get lucky, but such instances, however tragic, are rare. For the most part, terrorists in the United States are a confused, inadequate, incompetent, blundering, and gullible bunch, only occasionally able to get their act together. Most seem to be far better at frenetic and often self-deluded scheming than at actual execution. A summary assessment by RAND’s Brian Jenkins is apt: “their numbers remain small, their determination limp, and their competence poor.”15 And much the same holds for Europe and the rest of the developed world.16 Also working against terrorist success in the West is the fact that almost all are amateurs: they have never before tried to do something like this. Unlike criminals they have not been able to develop street smarts.

Except perhaps for the use of vehicles to deliver mayhem (though this idea is by no means new in the history of terrorism), there has been remarkably little innovation in terrorist weaponry or methodology since 9/11.17 Like their predecessors, they have continued to rely on bombs (many of which fail to detonate or do much damage) and bullets.18

#### Motive is false

McIntosh, PhD, and Storey, PhD, 18 – Christopher McIntosh [PhD Political Science from University of Chicago (Go Maroons!), Assistant Professor of Political Studies @ Bard] and Ian Storey [PhD Political Science from University of Chicago (Go Maroons!), Associate Fellow @ the Hannah Arendt Center for Politics and Humanities, Bard College], “Between Acquisition and Use: Assessing the Likelihood of Nuclear Terrorism,” International Studies Quarterly, Vol 62, 2018, <https://academic.oup.com/isq/article-abstract/62/2/289/4976557> C.VC

Our approach offers a point of departure for strategically assessing the options, likely responses, and potential outcomes that could arise from the different paths available to a nuclear-armed non-state group. Too often analysts treat the decision by such groups to use nuclear weapons as if it occurs in a vacuum. In practice, terrorist groups face many short-term and long-term considerations. They are influenced by factors both external and internal to their organization. These include the potential for backlash among supporters, internal factionalization over nuclear strategy and doctrine, and an overwhelming response by the target state and the international community.

Moreover, we suggest a way to bring the recursivity of strategic choice into the account of terrorist organizational decision-making. These organizations must consider the long-term effects of a nuclear attack. An attack occurs in the context of an ongoing campaign by a well-established organization. Opportunity costs exist because escalating to nuclear attack forecloses future options. As well, conducting an attack may not only preclude other strategies, but the continued existence of the group itself. This changes the game significantly. In most cases, a nuclear attack must present not just an effective option for the moment, but the only strategic option worth pursuing going forward.

Once we take these considerations into account, the detonation of a nuclear weapon generally appears the least strategically advantageous option for non-state groups. Indeed, the factors presented here are analytically independent, adaptable, and scalable to particular threat contexts. We can therefore use our framework to study the opportunities and constraints faced by specific future groups. It should therefore assist in the process of planning responses to potential nuclear acquisition by terrorist groups.

Successive governments have now identified nuclear terrorism as a critical concern in the formulation of security policy. This line of thinking systematically underspecifies, or simply misunderstands, key considerations that terrorist organizations take into account. These include the group’s organizational survival, opportunity costs, and the conflation of victory with the end of hostilities. Each factor presents strong disincentives to immediate nuclear attack. A nuclear-armed terrorist group is exceedingly dangerous, but for different reasons than normally assumed. The options available to the group that fall short of detonation or attack remain considerable, albeit less spectacular and immediate.

Just as scholars like Bunn et al. (2015) are careful to do, political actors and analysts should resist uncritically deploying the term “nuclear terrorism” in an umbrella fashion. This point goes beyond even the attempts at disaggregating “use” presented here. The threat of an attack involving an improvised nuclear device is vastly different than that of a “dirty bomb,” and both have little in common with the threat posed by an attack on a nuclear facility. Each deserves separate consideration when formulating policy, even if measures taken to address these concerns, such as controlling nuclear leakage, ultimately overlap. If any of the acquisition or threat scenarios we explore come to fruition, then potential target states will need strategies that potentially employ positive, as well as negative, incentives to lessen the attractiveness of nuclear attack. As we argue, a crisis involving a nuclear-armed terrorist group will be a negotiation— regardless of what the target state chooses to label it. Far from demonstrating weakness, employing threats while dangling the possibility of political concessions can widen internal divisions, heightening the overall organizational costs of escalating violence (Toros 2008; Cronin 2009).

Finally, efforts designed to improve intelligence capabilities both prior to and post-attack remain vital. Signature analysis as a forensic measure has shown promise as a way of identifying the origin of nuclear material—in some cases it can identify whether or not it was provided by a state (Kristo and Tumey 2013). These efforts would be improved with a more widespread international commitment via the IAEA to placing signature markers in weapons and weaponizable material (Korbatov et al. 2015, 70; Findlay 2014, 6).

Ultimately, when it comes to the threat of a nuclear attack by a terrorist, presumption should lie squarely on the side of skepticism rather than inevitability. While some terrorist organizations have some incentives for nuclear acquisition, paradoxically and thankfully, the most strategic uses of a nuclear weapon fall well short of actual nuclear attack. From a scholarly perspective, as well as a political one, we need to start to think through how states would act in a world with nuclear-armed non-state actors. In doing so, we should avoid assumptions that fit neither with known nuclear strategy nor the empirical behavior of non-state organizations. Like most clichés, the post–Cold War trope that the threat of attack is higher now than it was during the US-USSR arms race (Litwak 2016) obscures much more than it reveals.

**Growth makes war inevitable**

Manuchehr **Irandoust 17**, Department of Economics and Finance, School of Business Studies, Kristianstad University, “Militarism and globalization: Is there an empirical link?” *Quality and quantity*, June 16, 2017, Springer Open Access

[GLOB = globalization index, MIS = militarized spending]

The results of the bootstrap panel Granger causality test are shown in Table 2. The findings show that **GLOB and MIS are causally related** in most of the countries under review. There is a bi-directional causality in UK, US, Saudi Arabia, and Russia. The causality is unidirectional running from GLOB to MIS in Australia, Brazil, India, and China, and running from MIS to GLOB in Turkey. The degree of significance level varies from country to country. There is no any causal relationship between military spending and globalization in France, Italy, South Korea, Germany, and Japan. Overall, this evidence shows a **relatively robust association** between changes in globalization and changes in military expenditure. In other words, countries experiencing greater globalization have relatively **large increases in militarization** over the past 20 years.

However, it has been shown that globalization may not lead to more peaceful relations or demilitarization. As we discussed in Sect. 2, bilateral trade increases the opportunity cost of bilateral war and may hinder bilateral war. Globalization (equivalent to multilateral economic openness) **reduces this opportunity cost with any given country** and devitalize the incentive to make concessions during negotiations, and, therefore, **increases the probability of war** between any given pair of country. Thus, an increase in trade or openness between two countries may restore peace between those but may increase the probability of conflict with third countries.

6 Conclusion

While previous studies mostly focused on the causal nexus between military expenditure and economic growth, those studies have not considered the role of globalization. This study uses data from the top 15 military expenditure spenders over the period 1990–2012 to examine the relationship between militarism and globalization. The bootstrap panel Granger causality that accounts for both cross-sectional dependence and heterogeneity across countries is utilized to detect the direction of causality. The results show that military expenditures and globalization are causally related in most of the countries under review. Despite the increasing role of globalization, the results show that **military expenditures are growing** and pointing to a strengthening in nationalist sentiments and militarism. This paper suggests that changes in domestic political and economic conditions might hinder the process of globalization. The results are consistent with those of Acemoglu and Yared (2010) who conclude that high military spending endangers globalization. This study also supports the results of Martin et al. (2008) who find that an increase in multilateral trade raises the chance of conflict between states. The policy implication of the findings is that greater military spending by a country increases the likelihood of military conflict in the future, the anticipation of which discourages globalization.

**Growth ensures extinction:**

**A). Insect loss**

Robert **Hunziker 18**, MA in Economic History from DePaul University, environmental journalist for over fifty publications, 3/27/18, “Insect Decimation Upstages Global Warming,” https://www.transcend.org/tms/2018/04/insect-decimation-upstages-global-warming/

Everybody’s heard about global warming. It is one of the most advertised **existential** events of all time. Who isn’t aware? However, there’s a new kid on the block. An alarming **loss of insects** will likely **take down humanity** before global warming hits maximum velocity.

For the immediate future, the Paris Accord is riding the wrong horse, as global warming is a long-term project compared to the insect catastrophe happening right now! Where else is found 40% to 90% species devastation?

The worldwide loss of insects is simply staggering with some reports of 75% up to 90%, happening much faster than the paleoclimate record rate of the past five major extinction events. It is possible that some insect species may **already be close to total extinction!**

It’s established that species evolve and then go extinct over thousands and millions of years as part of nature’s course, but the current rate of devastation is simply “off the charts, and downright scary.”

Without any doubt, it is difficult to imagine how humanity survives without insects, which are dropping dead in bunches right before our eyes. For proof, how many insect splats do people clean off windshields nowadays? Not many…. How many fireflies do children chase at night? Not many….

Several naturalists and environmental writers believe the massive loss of insects has everything to do with three generations of **industrialized farming** and the vast tide of **poisons** pouring over the landscape year-after-year, especially since the end of WWII. Ours is the first-ever pesticide-based agricultural society. Dreadfully, it’s an experiment that is going dead wrong… all of a sudden!

Insects are basic to thousands of food chains; for example, the disappearance of Britain’s farmland birds by over 50% in 40 years. Additionally, North America and Europe species of birds like larks, swallows, and swifts that feast on flying insects have plummeted.

But, these are only a few of many, many recorded examples of massive numbers of wildlife dropping dead right before our eyes.

Significantly, insects are the **primary source for ecosystem creation and support**. The world literally crumbles apart without mischievous burrowing, forming new soil, aerating soil, pollinating food crops, etc. **Nutrition for humans happens because insects pollinate**.

**B). Deforestation**

Dominik **Goldstein 16**, “Eliminating deforestation and forest degradation in order to prevent species from extinction, especially with regard to areas in Asia, Africa and South America,” <http://www.balmun.de/fileadmin/2016/Research_Reports/RR_EC_I_Deforestation.pdf>

Deforestation and forest degradation are undoubtedly part of the **largest environmental problems** our world is facing today. Of the 16 million square kilometers of forest that once covered the earth’s surface, only 6.2 million remain up to date. 2.3 million have been destroyed between 2000 and 2012 alone. Not only does this threaten the balance of local important environmental factors such as **water cycles** and **g**reen**h**ouse **g**as decomposition and harm the economy and society of affected areas, but it also **endangers many different species**, as **80% of all biodiversity** is found in forests. **The entire planet and its population** rely on the fate of forests, it is vital that the issues of deforestation and forest degradation are tackled thoroughly, however, it can only be achieved through close cooperation amongst all UN member nations.

#### No econ impact

Walt 20 — (Stephen M. Walt, Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international relations at Harvard University., “Will a Global Depression Trigger Another World War?“, Foreign Policy, 5-13-20, Available Online at https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/05/13/coronavirus-pandemic-depression-economy-world-war/, accessed 11-5-2020, HKR-AR)

One familiar argument is the so-called diversionary (or “scapegoat”) theory of war. It suggests that leaders who are worried about their popularity at home will try to divert attention from their failures by provoking a crisis with a foreign power and maybe even using force against it. Drawing on this logic, some Americans now worry that President Donald Trump will decide to attack a country like Iran or Venezuela in the run-up to the presidential election and especially if he thinks he’s likely to lose.

This outcome strikes me as unlikely, even if one ignores the logical and empirical flaws in the theory itself. War is always a gamble, and should things go badly—even a little bit—it would hammer the last nail in the coffin of Trump’s declining fortunes. Moreover, none of the countries Trump might consider going after pose an imminent threat to U.S. security, and even his staunchest supporters may wonder why he is wasting time and money going after Iran or Venezuela at a moment when thousands of Americans are dying preventable deaths at home. Even a successful military action won’t put Americans back to work, create the sort of testing-and-tracing regime that competent governments around the world have been able to implement already, or hasten the development of a vaccine. The same logic is likely to guide the decisions of other world leaders too.

Another familiar folk theory is “military Keynesianism.” War generates a lot of economic demand, and it can sometimes lift depressed economies out of the doldrums and back toward prosperity and full employment. The obvious case in point here is World War II, which did help the U.S economy finally escape the quicksand of the Great Depression. Those who are convinced that great powers go to war primarily to keep Big Business (or the arms industry) happy are naturally drawn to this sort of argument, and they might worry that governments looking at bleak economic forecasts will try to restart their economies through some sort of military adventure.

I doubt it. It takes a really big war to generate a significant stimulus, and it is hard to imagine any country launching a large-scale war—with all its attendant risks—at a moment when debt levels are already soaring. More importantly, there are lots of easier and more direct ways to stimulate the economy—infrastructure spending, unemployment insurance, even “helicopter payments”—and launching a war has to be one of the least efficient methods available. The threat of war usually spooks investors too, which any politician with their eye on the stock market would be loath to do.

Economic downturns can encourage war in some special circumstances, especially when a war would enable a country facing severe hardships to capture something of immediate and significant value. Saddam Hussein’s decision to seize Kuwait in 1990 fits this model perfectly: The Iraqi economy was in terrible shape after its long war with Iran; unemployment was threatening Saddam’s domestic position; Kuwait’s vast oil riches were a considerable prize; and seizing the lightly armed emirate was exceedingly easy to do. Iraq also owed Kuwait a lot of money, and a hostile takeover by Baghdad would wipe those debts off the books overnight. In this case, Iraq’s parlous economic condition clearly made war more likely.

Yet I cannot think of any country in similar circumstances today. Now is hardly the time for Russia to try to grab more of Ukraine—if it even wanted to—or for China to make a play for Taiwan, because the costs of doing so would clearly outweigh the economic benefits. Even conquering an oil-rich country—the sort of greedy acquisitiveness that Trump occasionally hints at—doesn’t look attractive when there’s a vast glut on the market. I might be worried if some weak and defenseless country somehow came to possess the entire global stock of a successful coronavirus vaccine, but that scenario is not even remotely possible.

If one takes a longer-term perspective, however, a sustained economic depression could make war more likely by strengthening fascist or xenophobic political movements, fueling protectionism and hypernationalism, and making it more difficult for countries to reach mutually acceptable bargains with each other. The history of the 1930s shows where such trends can lead, although the economic effects of the Depression are hardly the only reason world politics took such a deadly turn in the 1930s. Nationalism, xenophobia, and authoritarian rule were making a comeback well before COVID-19 struck, but the economic misery now occurring in every corner of the world could intensify these trends and leave us in a more war-prone condition when fear of the virus has diminished.

On balance, however, I do not think that even the extraordinary economic conditions we are witnessing today are going to have much impact on the likelihood of war. Why? First of all, if depressions were a powerful cause of war, there would be a lot more of the latter. To take one example, the United States has suffered 40 or more recessions since the country was founded, yet it has fought perhaps 20 interstate wars, most of them unrelated to the state of the economy. To paraphrase the economist Paul Samuelson’s famous quip about the stock market, if recessions were a powerful cause of war, they would have predicted “nine out of the last five (or fewer).”

Second, states do not start wars unless they believe they will win a quick and relatively cheap victory. As John Mearsheimer showed in his classic book Conventional Deterrence, national leaders avoid war when they are convinced it will be long, bloody, costly, and uncertain. To choose war, political leaders have to convince themselves they can either win a quick, cheap, and decisive victory or achieve some limited objective at low cost. Europe went to war in 1914 with each side believing it would win a rapid and easy victory, and Nazi Germany developed the strategy of blitzkrieg in order to subdue its foes as quickly and cheaply as possible. Iraq attacked Iran in 1980 because Saddam believed the Islamic Republic was in disarray and would be easy to defeat, and George W. Bush invaded Iraq in 2003 convinced the war would be short, successful, and pay for itself.

The fact that each of these leaders miscalculated badly does not alter the main point: No matter what a country’s economic condition might be, its leaders will not go to war unless they think they can do so quickly, cheaply, and with a reasonable probability of success.

Third, and most important, the primary motivation for most wars is the desire for security

, not economic gain. For this reason, the odds of war increase when states believe the long-term balance of power may be shifting against them, when they are convinced that adversaries are unalterably hostile and cannot be accommodated, and when they are confident they can reverse the unfavorable trends and establish a secure position if they act now. The historian A.J.P. Taylor once observed that “every war between Great Powers [between 1848 and 1918] … started as a preventive war, not as a war of conquest,” and that remains true of most wars fought since then.