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#### Their use of an ethical frame of “injustice” presumes a metaphysics of discrete individuals for injustice to be acted by and on – that’s both conceptually incorrect and leads us to egoistic violence

Carpenter 17 Carpenter, Amber, works in ancient Greek and classical Indian philosophy, with a topical focus on the metaphysics, epistemology and moral psychology underpinning Plato’s ethics and Indian Buddhist ethics, taught or held visiting research appointments at the University of York, St Andrews, Cornell, Oxford, the University of Melbourne and Yale University. BA (Yale), PhD (Kings College London). "Ethics without Justice." A Mirror Is for Reflection: Understanding Buddhist Ethics (2017).

This study in the Buddhist claim that we ought to eliminate anger, and the distinctively Buddhist mode of doing so, has shown that the link between injustice and anger presumes a metaphysics. The moral perspective that picks out injustice as a special and additional kind of harm requires a metaphysics of discrete individuals, doing and “being done to” in turn, with a clear distinction between the two. But such a metaphysics and its moral categories engender in turn certain typical modes of thought—in particular, obsessing about Who is to Blame. Particularly in our victim-status-claiming age, we should wonder whether this is especially fruitful—or apt.

The Buddhist cannot show that their view will confirm or conform to all our intuitions about injustice because their basic metaphysical presumptions do not support the centrality of autonomous agency as a distinctive sort of cause, nor the violation of that by such free agents as a distinctive sort of harm. This is not, however, just an oversight or a morally horrifying omission. The proposal of an alternative metaphysics is the proposal of an alternative way of conceiving the moral. For every exercise in appreciating what no-self means, and what its implications are, is simultaneously an exercise in detachment, in recognizing the impulse to blame and resent as harmful assertions of oneself over and against others. Removing the conceptual structures for righteous indignation strips our evaluations of situations and persons of its self-assertiveness. Rather than being enervating, or blinding us to what moral responsiveness demands, this outlook is resolutely practical. None of this denies the no-self anger-eliminativist the resources necessary for forensics: we can see that some sets of conditions have intentions among them, and we can recognize that under some circumstances, these are more effectively engaged with in modes that differ from how we would engage with a forest fire.30 To regard someone’s raging violence as a forest fire does not mean that we turn the fire hose on it; it means that we consider the enabling conditions and defeating conditions and seek to eliminate the one and enhance the other.31

At the same time, as no-self introduces fluidity into our practices of individuation, it presents us with the entangled mutual causation of all factors and the simultaneous suffering. To see no-self, Buddhist-wise, just is to see that everything is conditioned and conditioning. Released from the demands of indignation, we are left with the only attitude that is appropriate in the face of suffering—a practically oriented care to relieve that suffering. Karuṇā is not an additional feature of a Buddhist outlook or the next thing on the list of dogmata. Care just is the affective and practical recognition of no-self metaphysics. Without discrete individuals to appeal to in any situation—these the perpetrators, these the victims—we have only efficacy in removing suffering as the standard preventing us from nihilism. Where before there were culprits to blame, and myself to exonerate or assert in retaliation, there is now only suffering, for which care to alleviate it is simply what is left when I am no longer distracted by righteous indignation.

#### Delusional egoism collapses the biosphere and produces rampant nationalism – extinction

Loy 17 David R Loy, former Besl Professor of Ethics/Religion and Society at Xavier University, teacher in Sanbo Kyodan Buddhism. M.A. in Asian philosophy from the University of Hawaii in 1975, and Ph.D. in philosophy in 1984 from the National University of Singapore. “Are Humans Special?” Tikkun, Vol. 32, No. 1, Winter 2017, <http://www.davidloy.org/downloads/Loy%20Are%20Humans%20Special.pdf>.

One uniquely human characteristic, emphasized by Buddhism, is that we can develop the ability to “dis-identify” from anything and everything, letting go not only of the individual sense of separate self but also of collective selves: dissociating from dualisms such as patriarchy, nationalism, racism, even species-ism (“we’re human, not lower animals”). Meditation develops such nonattachment, yet the point of such letting-go is not to dissociate from everything but to realize our nonduality with everything.

That human beings are the only species (so far as we know) that can know it is a manifestation of the entire cosmos opens up a possibility that may need to be embraced if we are to survive the crises that now confront us. Instead of continuing to exploit the earth’s ecosystems for our own supposed benefit, we can choose to work for the well-being of the whole. That we are not separate from the rest of the biosphere makes the whole earth our body, in effect, which implies not only a sp cial understanding but also a special role in response to that realization. As the Metta Sutta declares: “Let one’s thoughts of boundless love pervade the whole world— above, below, and across — without any obstruction, without any hatred, without any enmity.”

To ask whether the universe itself is objectively meaningful or meaningless is to miss the point— as if the universe were outside us, or simply there without us. When we do not erase ourselves from the picture, we can see that we are meaning- makers, the beings by which the universe introduces a new scale of significance and value.

The Responsibility of Being Special

If we are special because of our potential, we must choose. We are free to derive the meaning of our lives from delusions about who we are—from dysfunctional stories about what the world is and how we fit into it—or we can derive that meaning from insight into our nonduality with the rest of the world. In either case, there are consequences.

The problem with basing one’s life on delusions is that the consequences are unlikely to be good. As well as producing poetry and cathedrals, our creativity has recently found expression in world wars, genocides, and weapons of mass destruction, to mention a few disagreeable examples. We are in the early stages of an ecological crisis that threatens the natural and cultural legacy of future generations, including a mass extinction event that may lead to the disappearance of half the earth’s plant and animal species within a century, according to E. O. Wilson—an extinction event that may include ourselves.

What needs to be done so that our extraordinary co-creative powers will promote collective well-being (collective in this case referring to all the ecosystems of the biosphere)? Must we evolve further—not biologically but culturally—in order to survive at all? From a Buddhist perspective our unethical tendencies ultimately derive from a misapprehension: the delusion of a self that is separate from others, a big mistake for a species whose well-being is not separate from the well-being of other species. Insofar as we are ignorant of our true nature, individual and collective self-preoccupation naturally motivates us to be selfish. Without the compassion that arises when we feel empathy—not only with other humans, but with the whole of the biosphere—it is likely that civilization as we know it will not survive many more generations.

In either case, we seem fated to be special. If we continue to devastate the rest of the biosphere, we are arguably the worst species on earth: a cancer of the biosphere. If, however, humanity can wake up to become its collective bodhisattva—undertaking the long-term task of repairing the rupture between us and Mother Earth—perhaps we as a species will fulfill the unique potential of precious human life.

#### Planetary interdependence uniquely extends into space – the alternative is a shift away from individuation towards a politics of care that recognizes our mutual interdependence

Gál 20 Réka Gál, PhD student at the Faculty of Information and a Fellow at the McLuhan Centre for Culture and Technology, work unites feminist media theory and postcolonial studies with the history of science and environmental studies and explores how technological tools and scientific methods are employed to purportedly solve socio-political problems. B.A American and Media Studies, Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, M.A Cultural Studies, Humboldt Universität zu Berlin. "Climate Change, COVID-19, and the Space Cabin: A Politics of Care in the Shadow of Space Colonization." mezosfera.org, Oct, 2020, mezosfera.org/climate-change-covid-19-and-the-space-cabin-a-politics-of-care-in-the-shadow-of-space-colonization.

As much as dominant cultural narratives encourage us to entertain the idea that humans stand separate from and above their environments, the planetary crises of climate change and COVID-19 are painful reminders of the ways in which human and nonhuman ecologies are perpetually entangled. It is well-known that industrialized human-nonhuman relations, based on the capitalist extraction of what are considered natural resources, stand at the root of numerous environmental problems that are contributing to climate change. Animal industries – specifically the livestock industry – are one of the largest contributors to deforestation, greenhouse gas emission, and species extinctions.17 COVID-19’s believed origins in the Huanan wild animal markets and its eventual spread to humans is further testament to the ways in which our ecologies are always inseparable, with their intertwined nature here manifesting violently towards humans. Moreover, the spread of the coronavirus lays bare how local exploitation of nature can have global repercussions: the wildlife industry in China exists to this day because wildlife is considered a natural resource owned by the state, and the breeding, domestication, and trading of wildlife is encouraged by law.18

What must be made clear to those who are entertaining the idea that space habitats could provide a solution to such crises is that leaving Earth does not render these entanglements null and void. As much as spacecraft have been positioned as examples of subordinating the rules of nature to human control, their material reality only further consolidates the reciprocity of human and nonhuman, including human-machine, relations. 19 Our dependence on our surroundings intensifies in outer space. The inhospitality of space makes even the most physically fit astronauts dependent on numerous life support systems: oxygen and food supplies, waste management, and humidity control are all technologically operated but require continuous maintenance by humans. As such, ensuring the normal operation of a spacecraft is a relevant analogy for how a relationship of care with the diverse life support systems on Earth could be established.20

However, governments and private companies have been selling people the dream of human spaceflight ever since the Cold War, and the origins of this project in a military enterprise have made a significant mark on its implications for care work. The world of the 1960-70s astronauts was extremely segregated: the popular narrative was that of the hypermasculine astronaut, able to cope with danger and pain without complaint, with a brave wife at home waiting for his return.21 This segregation has had a remarkable impact on the types of work which have been considered “worthy” of these hypermasculine astronauts. In fact, the first American to travel to space, Alan Shepard, explicitly objected to having to learn maintenance techniques. As historian David Mindell put it, “the hottest test pilots didn’t want to be repairmen in space.”22 Similarly, data collected from NASA’s Skylab and the International Space Station’s 4-8 expeditions reveal that the time needed to complete maintenance activities on the Environmental Control and Life Support Systems was vastly underestimated, and in some cases even completely left out of operations plans.23 Even as late as the 2000s, the gendered view of care activities aboard spacecraft persisted: regarding the first female commander of a Space Shuttle, Eileen Collins, NASA made sure that her public persona was level-headed but also “pleasing.” She was referred to as “nice.” She took care of her fellow astronauts on board, taking on emotional labor by “providing support in ways that ease[d] the long hours and tension of training.” Her Air Force nickname was Mom.24

When this article calls for a feminist critique of outer space colonization, the argument is not that banishing technology and returning to a “pristine” nature or some other type of utopian primitivism is going to solve our planetary crises. Nor is it the point that more women need to be hired. What is being critiqued here is what Debbie Chachra has pointed out as a masculinist-capitalist obsession with progress and technological innovation that casts all maintenance, repair, and care work as inferior to creation.25 Much as our current experience of physical isolation during COVID-19 has exhibited, only during breakdowns are such taken-for-granted services made visible anew.26 The privileging of production obscures the societal understanding of the very real relationality of living, and the ongoing care and maintenance work required to keep human life running smoothly both on Earth and in outer space.

Therefore, the problem with extraplanetary colonization is not solely that this escape reinforces an enduring gendered opposition between exit and care, privileging the former over the latter, but also that machines only give the illusion of providing humans with independence from care work. Orsolya Ferencz, the Hungarian Secretary of Space Affairs, claims that Hungarian machines in outer space do not break down27 but the truth is that machines, just like our “natural” environments, do repeatedly break down. They require maintenance. Humans whose lives are intimately intertwined with technology are all too aware of this. Social scientist Laura Forlano writes about her experience as a diabetic who uses various technologies to monitor and maintain her blood glucose levels: “With respect to my insulin pump and glucose monitor, often, I am not really sure whether I am taking care of them, or they are taking care of me.”28 This interdependence additionally applies to the care for “natural” environments which can be regularly observed, for example, in the relationship of Indigenous communities to the environment. In the Hā’ena community in Hawaii, for instance, not only do they always return some of the fish caught to the water as a way of thanking the ocean, but they also managed to impose a ten-year fishing moratorium around their island in 2019, which will both help the renewal of the ecosystem and the recovery of the immediate environment, allowing future generations to fish sustainably.29 With this moratorium, the Hā’ena are providing care-based, restorative justice: the ocean ecosystem has fallen victim to injustice (overfishing), and remedying this ought to help heal the party wounded by the injustice, which is in this case the ocean.30

The extractive industry practices deeply embedded within Western social systems clearly propel us toward unsustainable development. Escaping Earth will not solve these problems. Rather, the solution requires a fundamental onto-epistemological shift, one that will enable us to move away from the exploitative Western-colonialist worldview and towards one that prioritizes care and sustainability. The works of feminist and Indigenous thinkers can inspire us to imagine and understand such a worldview. Numerous pre-colonial Indigenous cultures were sustainability-centric: the acceptance of the reciprocity between humans and their environment and the enforcing of the ethics of care in all areas of life were essential parts of several nations’ worldviews. Indigenous epistemologies see humans and nature as members of an ecological family in which humans, the nonhuman beings around them (for example, badgers, antelopes) and materials (for example, water, clay) all form part of their kinship structures.31 In Indigenous cultures that have survived colonization, such teachings and ethical approaches are passed down to this day.32 Research by Potawatomi scholar Kyle P. Whyte and Chris Cuomo demonstrate that Indigenous conceptions of care emphasize the importance of recognizing that humans, nonhumans (animals) and collectives (e.g. forests) exist in networks of interdependence. Indigenous care ethics manifest also in the fact that mutual responsibility is seen as the moral basis of relationships.33 An important part of this mutual responsibility is that care-based justice is not punishment-centered but recovery-centered: as in the example of the fishing moratorium of the Hā’ena, it seeks to promote restorative justice for those wounded by injustice. This restoration is aimed not only at people and communities, but also at nature.34 Similarly, an ethics of care in feminist philosophy treats the state of interdependence of human and nonhuman beings as a moral foundation.35

Since all infrastructures break, they require continuous maintenance. Information scientist Steven Jackson therefore proposes that the starting point to our thinking on the human relationship to technology has to be a contemplation of “erosion, breakdown, and decay, rather than novelty, growth, and progress.”36 If we accept that our world is “always-almost-falling-apart,”37 then instead of simply focusing on technological innovation as the vessel of our salvation,38 we need to look at the ways in which the world is constantly fixed, cared for, and maintained. This, of course, does not only translate to humans’ relationship to machines, but also to our relationship to our environment –in fact, feminist scholars have already made this point about dealing with our environmental problems: historian of science Donna Haraway’s concept of “staying with the trouble”39 explicitly pleads for the foregrounding of the inherent interconnectedness and interdependence of living, and for working on restoring our broken systems. What we are looking at here is a promising paradigm shift in human-machine and human-nature relations that promotes the recognition that the processes of care and maintenance are foundational to the way humanity relates to our biotic and abiotic environments.40

Both life during the social isolation of COVID-19 and life in the space cabin highlight our perpetual interdependence with our environments. Our life support systems are in a state of continuous decay, but the solution to this is not building more and more invasive risk-mitigation machines based on individualization, isolation and an imperative of absolute, one-directional control. Instead, a better, safer, more sustainable future starts with acknowledging one’s place in a web of interdependent relationships.41 Among other steps, this means that instead of acting as though our biotic and abiotic infrastructures can endlessly care for us, we need to care for them in return. This entails not only planting new forests and cleaning up shorelines, but also policy decisions such as the fishing moratorium mentioned above. As anthropologist Gökçe Günel indicates, even the technologies used for the harvesting of renewable energies require maintenance: solar panels, for example, need to be wiped clean of dust and sand regularly.42 Thinking through the lens of maintenance and care also means providing infrastructures for effectively repairing machines as opposed to producing e-waste and continuously buying new ones which are thrown away once a smarter version is released. Additionally, it means respecting and paying theworkers who are cleaning our hospitals, nursing our sick and harvesting food – most of them immigrants, predominantly women43 – better, as they are the reason we have clean hospitals, transport, and food on our tables, even during a global pandemic.44
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#### Plan bans asteroid mining but the CP solves it

Sarah Scoles 15, “Dust from asteroid mining spells danger for satellites,” New Scientist, 5-27-2015, https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg22630235-100-dust-from-asteroid-mining-spells-danger-for-satellites/

NASA chose the second option for its Asteroid Redirect Mission, which aims to pluck a boulder from an asteroid’s surface and relocate it to a stable orbit around the moon. But an asteroid’s gravity is so weak that it’s not hard for surface particles to escape into space. Now a new model warns that debris shed by such transplanted rocks could intrude where many defence and communication satellites live – in geosynchronous orbit. According to Casey Handmer of the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena and Javier Roa of the Technical University of Madrid in Spain, 5 per cent of the escaped debris will end up in regions traversed by satellites. Over 10 years, it would cross geosynchronous orbit 63 times on average. A satellite in the wrong spot at the wrong time will suffer a damaging high-speed collision with that dust. The study also looks at the “catastrophic disruption” of an asteroid 5 metres across or bigger. Its total break-up into a pile of rubble would increase the risk to satellites by more than 30 per cent (arxiv.org/abs/1505.03800). That may not have immediate consequences. But as Earth orbits get more crowded with spent rocket stages and satellites, we will have to worry about cascades of collisions like the one depicted in the movie Gravity. Handmer and Roa want to point out the problem now so that we can find a solution before any satellites get dinged. “It is possible to quantify and manage the risk,” says Handmer. “A few basic precautions will prevent harm due to stray asteroid material.”

#### Asteroid mining is privatized and feasible – it solves resource conflict and environmental catastrophe

Kevin MacWhorter 16, J.D. Candidate, William & Mary Law School, "Sustainable Mining: Incentivizing Asteroid Mining in the Name of Environmentalism", William & Mary Environmental Law and Policy Review, Vol 40, Issue 2, Article 11, <https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1653&context=wmelpr>

A. Rare Element Mining on Earth In the next sixty years, scientists predict that certain elements crucial to modern industry such as platinum, zinc, copper, phosphorous, lead, gold, and indium could be exhausted on Earth. 12 Many of these have no synthetic alternative, unlike chemical elements such as oil or diamonds.13 Liquid-crystal display (LCD) televisions, cellphones, and laptops are among the various consumer technologies that use precious metals.14Further, green technologies including wind turbines, solar panels, and catalytic converters require these rare elements. 15 As demand rises for both types of technologies, and as reserves of rare metals fall, prices skyrocket.16 Demand for nonrenewable resources creates conflict, and consumerism in rich countries results in harsh labor treatment for poorer countries.17 In general, the mining industry is extremely destructive to Earth’s environment.18 In fact, depending on the method employed, mining can destroy entire ecosystems by polluting water sources and contributing to deforestation.19 It is by its nature an unsustainable practice, because it involves the extraction of a finite and non-renewable resource.20 Moreover, by extracting tiny amounts of metals from relatively large quantities of ore, the mining industry contributes the largest portion of solid wastes in the world.21 The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) describes the industry as the source of more toxic and hazardous waste than any other industrial sector [in the United States], costing billions of dollars to address the public health and environmental threats to communities. 22 Poor regulations and oxymoronic corporate definitions of sustainability, however, make it unclear as to just how much waste the industry actually produces.23 Platinum provides an excellent case study of the issue, because it is an extremely rare and expensive metal—an ore expected to exist in vast quantities in asteroids.24 Further, production of platinum has increased sharply in the past sixty years in order to keep up with growing demand for use in new technologies.25 In fact, despite their high costs, platinum group metals are so useful that [one] of [four] industrial goods on Earth require them in production. 26 Scholars do not expect demand to slow any time soon.27 Among other technologies, industries use platinum in products such as catalytic converters, jewelry production, various catalysts for chemical processing, and hydrogen fuel cells.28 While there is no consensus on how far the Earth’s reserves of platinum will take humanity, many scientists agree that platinum ore reserves will deplete in a relatively short amount of time.29 With the rate of mining at an all-time high,30 it is increasingly clear that historical patterns of mineral resources and development cannot simply be assumed to continue unaltered into the future. 31 The platinum mining industry, however, has a strong incentive to increase its rate of extraction as profits grow with the rate of demand. Without any alternative, this destructive practice will continue into the future.32 So-called platinum-group metal (PGM) ores are mined through underground or open cut techniques.33 Due to these practices, all but a very small fraction of the mined platinum ore is disposed of as solid waste.34 The environmental consequences of platinum production are thus quite significant, but like the mining industry in general, the amount of waste is typically under-reported.35 While this is due to high production levels at the moment, those levels will only increase given the estimated future demand of platinum.36 In spite of the negative consequences, mining continues unabated because it is economically important to many areas.37 The future environmental costs provide a major challenge in creating a sustainable system. Relegating at least some mining companies to near-Earth asteroids would reduce the negative effects of future mining levels on Earth. The economic benefits of mining need not be sacrificed for the sake of the environment.38 B. Privatization of the Space Industry For most of the Space Age, the role of private companies has been as that of government contractors.39 During the past fifteen years, however, space flight has become increasingly the realm of private industry.40 Space tourism is on the rise,41 and private companies have been launching their own satellites into orbit for decades.42 In May 2012, SpaceX docked with the International Space Station the first private company to do so. 43 While the National Aeronautics and Space Administrations (NASA) federal outlay has increased since 1958, NASAs budget as a percentage of US spending has decreased dramatically.44The private space industry has seen dramatic growth as a result.45 Since NASA retired its shuttle fleet in 2011, the agency has turned to private actors to design and build spacecraft.46 That year, NASA awarded four private space companies SpaceX, Blue Origin LLC, Boeing Co., and Sierra Nevada Corp. contracts worth a combined total of $269.3 million to transport cargo and crew to and from the International Space Station.47 More companies, such as Orbital Sciences, have followed suit.48 Space mining in particular has been a focus of private investment.49 The promise of abundant rare Earth resources creates the possibility of vast wealth for intrepid investors.50 For example, Google founders Larry Page and Eric Schmidt have invested heavily in private space flight.51 Google is offering the Lunar X Prize: $30 million in prizes to any team who is able to safely land a robot on the surface of the Moon, have that robot travel 500 meters [1,640 feet] over the lunar surface, and send video, images, and data back to the Earth before 2016. 52 The purpose behind the contest should be apparent: investors think private space flight and mining could be extremely lucrative.53 Rare metals, such as platinum, could become far more accessible.54 In 2012, Page, Schmidt, director James Cameron, and other distinguished entrepreneurs announced they were investing considerable financial resources in Planetary Resources, a company developing the technology to mine an asteroid.55The companys goalis to land a mining vessel on a near-Earth asteroid, mine its valuable minerals, and bring the natural resources of space within humanitys economic sphere. 56 To that end, many companies are focused on the idea of asteroid mining.57 Privatization, however, has brought many legal and economic considerations to the forefront. One of the most significant obstacles for the private space industry has been the price tag of traveling into space. Complicating matters, the current law governing claims of property in space is ambiguous.58 Companies therefore cannot be sure whether their property claims will be enforced after they extract minerals in space and bring them back to Earth.59 When investing large sums of money such a consideration is absolutely critical.60 Although there has been investment in the area, sending an actual mission to an asteroid will require less ambiguous property provisions in international space law. C. Asteroid Mining 101 As the Planetary Resources website exclaims, [T]he more we learn about asteroids, the more enticing they become! 61 Certain types of asteroids including X-type and S-type asteroids contain both precious and base metals in quantities sufficient to make any entrepreneur salivate.62 Metals on which many current technologies rely such as iron, gold, and platinum can be found in most asteroids. 63 Current estimates count around two million asteroids in the solar system that are a kilometer or more in diameter.64 Astrophysicists estimate that each could contain 30 million tons of nickel, 1.5 million tons of cobalt, and 7,500 tons of platinum, among other minerals.65 To put that in economic terms, the value of each asteroid could be somewhere in the trillions [of dollars] or higher. 66 Indeed, because of their zero gravity fields and availability of metals, asteroids have been considered as candidates for resource extraction since the beginning of the space age.67 The technology needed to extract resources from asteroids, however, is a very recent phenomenon.68 With the European Space Agency successfully landing the Philae Lander on Comet 67P, it is much more plausible to land a mining operation on an asteroid.69 Although companies likely are not able to send mining ventures to asteroids immediately, as the preceding section suggested, asteroid mining is a possibility in the near future.70 First of all, two companies are developing the technology needed to mine asteroids.71Planetary Resources is creating cheaper prospecting spacecraft small enough to hitch a ride into space with larger, primary payloads. 72 Another company, Deep Space Industries (DSI), is developing a four-stage system for mining in space: Prospecting, Processing, Harvesting, and Manufacturing.73 It has already invented one spacecraft to be used for the Prospecting stage: a tiny probe, called FireFly, designed to scout asteroids and study their size, shape, spin and composition . . . . 74 For the Processing phase, DSI is creating technology required to transform regolith to raw materials for manufacture.75 The company is currently developing another spacecraft, called a Harvestor, for the third stage to collect and transport resources.76Finally, the company is creating technology to manufacture finished products in space.77 The United States space policy is also embracing the idea of asteroid mining. In April 2010, President Obama promised to send astronauts to explore an asteroid by 2025.78 In 2014, NASA requested, much to the surprise of asteroid scientists, a budget that includes $105 million to begin work on a mission that would send a robotic spacecraft to capture an asteroid as early as 2019 and haul it back so that astronauts could rendezvous with it by 2022. 79 Further, NASA has awarded contracts to Planetary Resources and Deep Space Industries to prepare for and ultimately execute missions to land on and mine asteroids for valuable resources. 80 NASA is also designing a spacecraft, the primary goal of which is to land on an asteroid and take samples.81 It is scheduled for launch in September 2016.82 As all this recent development suggests, the technology to mine asteroids is not far off. In fact, the requisite technology exists it just needs to be adapted for use in an extraterrestrial environment.83 As Chris Lewicki, president of Planetary Resources, said: [T]he single biggest challenge that Planetary Resources will have to overcome is convincing people that asteroid mining will happen sooner than they think. 84 Asteroid mining will gain in popularity as resources deplete, forcing humans to dig deeper and deeper in the Earths crust for minerals. 85 A recent article summarized some of Lewickis reasoning succinctly: [T]he energy required to extract minerals from an asteroid is considerably less than to extract from the Earth, or even the moon . . . , because in space there is no atmosphere to oxidise or salt to corrode, no weather, no gravity or friction to oppose transportation, dissipate energy and waste heat and unlimited heat from the sun and coldness in space for refrigeration, creating the perfect vacuum . . . .86

#### Outweighs the aff.

Phil Torres 16. Affiliate scholar at the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies. “Biodiversity loss: An existential risk comparable to climate change.” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 4/11/2016. http://thebulletin.org/biodiversity-loss-existential-risk-comparable-climate-change9329

Such considerations warrant decoupling biodiversity loss from climate change, because the former has been consistently subsumed by the latter as a mere effect. Biodiversity loss is a distinct environmental crisis with its own unique syndrome of causes, consequences, and solutions—such as restoring habitats, creating protected areas (“biodiversity parks”), and practicing sustainable agriculture. The sixth extinction. The repercussions of biodiversity loss are potentially as severe as those anticipated from climate change, or even a nuclear conflict. For example, according to a 2015 study published in Science Advances, the best available evidence reveals “an exceptionally rapid loss of biodiversity over the last few centuries, indicating that a sixth mass extinction is already under way.” This conclusion holds, even on the most optimistic assumptions about the background rate of species losses and the current rate of vertebrate extinctions. The group classified as “vertebrates” includes mammals, birds, reptiles, fish, and all other creatures with a backbone. The article argues that, using its conservative figures, the average loss of vertebrate species was 100 times higher in the past century relative to the background rate of extinction. (Other scientists have suggested that the current extinction rate could be as much as 10,000 times higher than normal.) As the authors write, “The evidence is incontrovertible that recent extinction rates are unprecedented in human history and highly unusual in Earth’s history.” Perhaps the term “Big Six” should enter the popular lexicon—to add the current extinction to the previous “Big Five,” the last of which wiped out the dinosaurs 66 million years ago. But the concept of biodiversity encompasses more than just the total number of species on the planet. It also refers to the size of different populations of species. With respect to this phenomenon, multiple studies have confirmed that wild populations around the world are dwindling and disappearing at an alarming rate. For example, the 2010 Global Biodiversity Outlook report found that the population of wild vertebrates living in the tropics dropped by 59 percent between 1970 and 2006. The report also found that the population of farmland birds in Europe has dropped by 50 percent since 1980; bird populations in the grasslands of North America declined by almost 40 percent between 1968 and 2003; and the population of birds in North American arid lands has fallen by almost 30 percent since the 1960s. Similarly, 42 percent of all amphibian species (a type of vertebrate that is sometimes called an “ecological indicator”) are undergoing population declines, and 23 percent of all plant species “are estimated to be threatened with extinction.” Other studies have found that some 20 percent of all reptile species, 48 percent of the world’s primates, and 50 percent of freshwater turtles are threatened. Underwater, about 10 percent of all coral reefs are now dead, and another 60 percent are in danger of dying. Consistent with these data, the 2014 Living Planet Report shows that the global population of wild vertebrates dropped by 52 percent in only four decades—from 1970 to 2010. While biologists often avoid projecting historical trends into the future because of the complexity of ecological systems, it’s tempting to extrapolate this figure to, say, the year 2050, which is four decades from 2010. As it happens, a 2006 study published in Science does precisely this: It projects past trends of marine biodiversity loss into the 21st century, concluding that, unless significant changes are made to patterns of human activity, there will be virtually no more wild-caught seafood by 2048. Catastrophic consequences for civilization. The consequences of this rapid pruning of the evolutionary tree of life extend beyond the obvious. There could be surprising effects of biodiversity loss that scientists are unable to fully anticipate in advance. For example, prior research has shown that localized ecosystems can undergo abrupt and irreversible shifts when they reach a tipping point. According to a 2012 paper published in Nature, there are reasons for thinking that we may be approaching a tipping point of this sort in the global ecosystem, beyond which the consequences could be catastrophic for civilization. As the authors write, a planetary-scale transition could precipitate “substantial losses of ecosystem services required to sustain the human population.” An ecosystem service is any ecological process that benefits humanity, such as food production and crop pollination. If the global ecosystem were to cross a tipping point and substantial ecosystem services were lost, the results could be “widespread social unrest, economic instability, and loss of human life.” According to Missouri Botanical Garden ecologist Adam Smith, one of the paper’s co-authors, this could occur in a matter of decades—far more quickly than most of the expected consequences of climate change, yet equally destructive. Biodiversity loss is a “threat multiplier” that, by pushing societies to the brink of collapse, will exacerbate existing conflicts and introduce entirely new struggles between state and non-state actors. Indeed, it could even fuel the rise of terrorism. (After all, climate change has been linked to the emergence of ISIS in Syria, and multiple high-ranking US officials, such as former US Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel and CIA director John Brennan, have affirmed that climate change and terrorism are connected.) The reality is that we are entering the sixth mass extinction in the 3.8-billion-year history of life on Earth, and the impact of this event could be felt by civilization “in as little as three human lifetimes,” as the aforementioned 2012 Nature paper notes. Furthermore, the widespread decline of biological populations could plausibly initiate a dramatic transformation of the global ecosystem on an even faster timescale: perhaps a single human lifetime. The unavoidable conclusion is that biodiversity loss constitutes an existential threat in its own right. As such, it ought to be considered alongside climate change and nuclear weapons as one of the most significant contemporary risks to human prosperity and survival.

#### Resource wars go nuclear.

Klare 13 – Michael T., professor emeritus of peace and world-security studies at Hampshire College and senior visiting fellow at the Arms Control Association in Washington, DC, " How Resource Scarcity and Climate Change Could Produce a Global Explosion", *The Nation*, 4/22/2013, <https://www.thenation.com/article/how-resource-scarcity-and-climate-change-could-produce-global-explosion/> JHW

Resource Shortages and Resource Wars Start with one simple given: the prospect of future scarcities of vital natural resources, including energy, water, land, food and critical minerals. This in itself would guarantee social unrest, geopolitical friction and war. It is important to note that absolute scarcity doesn’t have to be on the horizon in any given resource category for this scenario to kick in. A lack of adequate supplies to meet the needs of a growing, ever more urbanized and industrialized global population is enough. Given the wave of extinctions that scientists are recording, some resources—particular species of fish, animals and trees, for example—will become less abundant in the decades to come, and may even disappear altogether. But key materials for modern civilization like oil, uranium and copper will simply prove harder and more costly to acquire, leading to supply bottlenecks and periodic shortages. Oil—the single most important commodity in the international economy—provides an apt example. Although global oil supplies may actually grow in the coming decades, many experts doubt that they can be expanded sufficiently to meet the needs of a rising global middle class that is, for instance, expected to buy millions of new cars in the near future. In its 2011 World Energy Outlook, the International Energy Agency claimed that an anticipated global oil demand of 104 million barrels per day in 2035 will be satisfied. This, the report suggested, would be thanks in large part to additional supplies of “unconventional oil” (Canadian tar sands, shale oil and so on), as well as 55 million barrels of new oil from fields “yet to be found” and “yet to be developed.” However, many analysts scoff at this optimistic assessment, arguing that rising production costs (for energy that will be ever more difficult and costly to extract), environmental opposition, warfare, corruption and other impediments will make it extremely difficult to achieve increases of this magnitude. In other words, even if production manages for a time to top the 2010 level of 87 million barrels per day, the goal of 104 million barrels will never be reached and the world’s major consumers will face virtual, if not absolute, scarcity. Water provides another potent example. On an annual basis, the supply of drinking water provided by natural precipitation remains more or less constant: about 40,000 cubic kilometers. But much of this precipitation lands on Greenland, Antarctica, Siberia and inner Amazonia where there are very few people, so the supply available to major concentrations of humanity is often surprisingly limited. In many regions with high population levels, water supplies are already relatively sparse. This is especially true of North Africa, Central Asia and the Middle East, where the demand for water continues to grow as a result of rising populations, urbanization and the emergence of new water-intensive industries. The result, even when the supply remains constant, is an environment of increasing scarcity. Wherever you look, the picture is roughly the same: supplies of critical resources may be rising or falling, but rarely do they appear to be outpacing demand, producing a sense of widespread and systemic scarcity. However generated, a perception of scarcity—or imminent scarcity—regularly leads to anxiety, resentment, hostility and contentiousness. This pattern is very well understood, and has been evident throughout human history. In his book Constant Battles, for example, Steven LeBlanc, director of collections for Harvard’s Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, notes that many ancient civilizations experienced higher levels of warfare when faced with resource shortages brought about by population growth, crop failures or persistent drought. Jared Diamond, author of the bestseller Collapse, has detected a similar pattern in Mayan civilization and the Anasazi culture of New Mexico’s Chaco Canyon. More recently, concern over adequate food for the home population was a significant factor in Japan’s invasion of Manchuria in 1931 and Germany’s invasions of Poland in 1939 and the Soviet Union in 1941, according to Lizzie Collingham, author of The Taste of War. Although the global supply of most basic commodities has grown enormously since the end of World War II, analysts see the persistence of resource-related conflict in areas where materials remain scarce or there is anxiety about the future reliability of supplies. Many experts believe, for example, that the fighting in Darfur and other war-ravaged areas of North Africa has been driven, at least in part, by competition among desert tribes for access to scarce water supplies, exacerbated in some cases by rising population levels. “In Darfur,” says a 2009 report from the UN Environment Programme on the role of natural resources in the conflict, “recurrent drought, increasing demographic pressures, and political marginalization are among the forces that have pushed the region into a spiral of lawlessness and violence that has led to 300,000 deaths and the displacement of more than two million people since 2003.” Anxiety over future supplies is often also a factor in conflicts that break out over access to oil or control of contested undersea reserves of oil and natural gas. In 1979, for instance, when the Islamic revolution in Iran overthrew the Shah and the Soviets invaded Afghanistan, Washington began to fear that someday it might be denied access to Persian Gulf oil. At that point, President Jimmy Carter promptly announced what came to be called the Carter Doctrine. In his 1980 State of the Union Address, Carter affirmed that any move to impede the flow of oil from the Gulf would be viewed as a threat to America’s “vital interests” and would be repelled by “any means necessary, including military force.” In 1990, this principle was invoked by President George H.W. Bush to justify intervention in the first Persian Gulf War, just as his son would use it, in part, to justify the 2003 invasion of Iraq. Today, it remains the basis for US plans to employ force to stop the Iranians from closing the Strait of Hormuz, the strategic waterway connecting the Persian Gulf to the Indian Ocean through which about 35 percent of the world’s seaborne oil commerce passes. Recently, a set of resource conflicts have been rising toward the boiling point between China and its neighbors in Southeast Asia when it comes to control of offshore oil and gas reserves in the South China Sea. Although the resulting naval clashes have yet to result in a loss of life, a strong possibility of military escalation exists. A similar situation has also arisen in the East China Sea, where China and Japan are jousting for control over similarly valuable undersea reserves. Meanwhile, in the South Atlantic Ocean, Argentina and Britain are once again squabbling over the Falkland Islands (called Las Malvinas by the Argentinians) because oil has been discovered in surrounding waters. By all accounts, resource-driven potential conflicts like these will only multiply in the years ahead as demand rises, supplies dwindle and more of what remains will be found in disputed areas. In a 2012 study titled Resources Futures, the respected British think-tank Chatham House expressed particular concern about possible resource wars over water, especially in areas like the Nile and Jordan River basins where several groups or countries must share the same river for the majority of their water supplies and few possess the wherewithal to develop alternatives. “Against this backdrop of tight supplies and competition, issues related to water rights, prices, and pollution are becoming contentious,” the report noted. “In areas with limited capacity to govern shared resources, balance competing demands, and mobilize new investments, tensions over water may erupt into more open confrontations.” Heading for a Resource-Shock World Tensions like these would be destined to grow by themselves because in so many areas supplies of key resources will not be able to keep up with demand. As it happens, though, they are not “by themselves.” On this planet, a second major force has entered the equation in a significant way. With the growing reality of climate change, everything becomes a lot more terrifying. Normally, when we consider the impact of climate change, we think primarily about the environment—the melting Arctic ice cap or Greenland ice shield, rising global sea levels, intensifying storms, expanding desert and endangered or disappearing species like the polar bear. But a growing number of experts are coming to realize that the most potent effects of climate change will be experienced by humans directly through the impairment or wholesale destruction of habitats upon which we rely for food production, industrial activities or simply to live. Essentially, climate change will wreak its havoc on us by constraining our access to the basics of life: vital resources that include food, water, land and energy. This will be devastating to human life, even as it significantly increases the danger of resource conflicts of all sorts erupting. We already know enough about the future effects of climate change to predict the following with reasonable confidence: \* Rising sea levels will in the next half-century erase many coastal areas, destroying large cities, critical infrastructure (including roads, railroads, ports, airports, pipelines, refineries and power plants) and prime agricultural land. \* Diminished rainfall and prolonged droughts will turn once-verdant croplands into dust bowls, reducing food output and turning millions into “climate refugees.” \* More severe storms and intense heat waves will kill crops, trigger forest fires, cause floods and destroy critical infrastructure. No one can predict how much food, land, water and energy will be lost as a result of this onslaught (and other climate-change effects that are harder to predict or even possibly imagine), but the cumulative effect will undoubtedly be staggering. In Resources Futures, Chatham House offers a particularly dire warning when it comes to the threat of diminished precipitation to rain-fed agriculture. “By 2020,” the report says, “yields from rain-fed agriculture could be reduced by up to 50%” in some areas. The highest rates of loss are expected to be in Africa, where reliance on rain-fed farming is greatest, but agriculture in China, India, Pakistan and Central Asia is also likely to be severely affected. Heat waves, droughts and other effects of climate change will also reduce the flow of many vital rivers, diminishing water supplies for irrigation, hydro-electricity power facilities and nuclear reactors (which need massive amounts of water for cooling purposes). The melting of glaciers, especially in the Andes in Latin America and the Himalayas in South Asia, will also rob communities and cities of crucial water supplies. An expected increase in the frequency of hurricanes and typhoons will pose a growing threat to offshore oil rigs, coastal refineries, transmission lines and other components of the global energy system. The melting of the Arctic ice cap will open that region to oil and gas exploration, but an increase in iceberg activity will make all efforts to exploit that region’s energy supplies perilous and exceedingly costly. Longer growing seasons in the north, especially Siberia and Canada’s northern provinces, might compensate to some degree for the desiccation of croplands in more southerly latitudes. However, moving the global agricultural system (and the world’s farmers) northward from abandoned farmlands in the United States, Mexico, Brazil, India, China, Argentina and Australia would be a daunting prospect. It is safe to assume that climate change, especially when combined with growing supply shortages, will result in a significant reduction in the planet’s vital resources, augmenting the kinds of pressures that have historically led to conflict, even under better circumstances. In this way, according to the Chatham House report, climate change is best understood as a “threat multiplier…a key factor exacerbating existing resource vulnerability” in states already prone to such disorders. Like other experts on the subject, Chatham House’s analysts claim, for example, that climate change will reduce crop output in many areas, sending global food prices soaring and triggering unrest among those already pushed to the limit under existing conditions. “Increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events, such as droughts, heat waves and floods, will also result in much larger and frequent local harvest shocks around the world….These shocks will affect global food prices whenever key centers of agricultural production area are hit—further amplifying global food price volatility.” This, in turn, will increase the likelihood of civil unrest. When, for instance, a brutal heat wave decimated Russia’s wheat crop during the summer of 2010, the global price of wheat (and so of that staple of life, bread) began an inexorable upward climb, reaching particularly high levels in North Africa and the Middle East. With local governments unwilling or unable to help desperate populations, anger over impossible-to-afford food merged with resentment toward autocratic regimes to trigger the massive popular outburst we know as the Arab Spring. Many such explosions are likely in the future, Chatham House suggests, if current trends continue as climate change and resource scarcity meld into a single reality in our world. A single provocative question from that group should haunt us all: “Are we on the cusp of a new world order dominated by struggles over access to affordable resources?” For the US intelligence community, which appears to have been influenced by the report, the response was blunt. In March, for the first time, Director of National Intelligence James R. Clapper listed “competition and scarcity involving natural resources” as a national security threat on a par with global terrorism, cyberwar and nuclear proliferation. “Many countries important to the United States are vulnerable to natural resource shocks that degrade economic development, frustrate attempts to democratize, raise the risk of regime-threatening instability, and aggravate regional tensions,” he wrote in his prepared statement for the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. “Extreme weather events (floods, droughts, heat waves) will increasingly disrupt food and energy markets, exacerbating state weakness, forcing human migrations, and triggering riots, civil disobedience, and vandalism.” There was a new phrase embedded in his comments: “resource shocks.” It catches something of the world we’re barreling toward, and the language is striking for an intelligence community that, like the government it serves, has largely played down or ignored the dangers of climate change. For the first time, senior government analysts may be coming to appreciate what energy experts, resource analysts and scientists have long been warning about: the unbridled consumption of the world’s natural resources, combined with the advent of extreme climate change, could produce a global explosion of human chaos and conflict. We are now heading directly into a resource-shock world.
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#### Text: The appropriation of outer space through the production of space debris by private entities is just.

#### States ought not infringe on private property rights but instead create an international governance institution to impose a system of tradable orbital permits as specified in Rao et al 20.

#### States ought to clarify and impose sanctions on violators of the UN COPUOS’s “Guidelines for Mitigation Actions against Space Debris Proliferation.”

#### States ought to require 90% PMD success rates of private entities that appropriate outer space through the production of space debris.

#### The ITU ought to recognize companies as actors that can appropriate frequency channels.

#### States ought to recognize that Earth’s orbit is a finite resource, the space and Earth environments are connected, and the actions of one actor can affect everyone.

* **States ought to participate in State Engagement Events and abide by the recommendations set forward by the Woomera Manual.**

#### Private property rights can be salvaged in space – but the debris incentive structure must be changed. Perm severs appropriate.

1AC Rao et al 20. Akhil, Matthew Burgess, and Daniel Kaffine \*Department of Economics, Middlebury College, Middlebury \*\*Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences, University of Colorado, Environmental Studies Program, and Department of Economics \*\*\*Department of Economics. 2020 [PNAS, “Orbital-use fees could more than quadruple the value of the space industry,” <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7293599/>] Justin

The space industry’s rapid recent growth represents the latest tragedy of the commons. Satellites launched into orbit contribute to—and risk damage from—a growing buildup of space debris and other satellites. Collision risk from this orbital congestion is costly to satellite operators. Technological and managerial solutions—such as active debris removal or end-of-life satellite deorbit guidelines—are currently being explored by regulatory authorities. However, none of these approaches address the underlying incentive problem: satellite operators do not account for costs they impose on each other via collision risk. Here, we show that an internationally harmonized orbital-use fee can correct these incentives and substantially increase the value of the space industry. We construct and analyze a coupled physical–economic model of commercial launches and debris accumulation in low-Earth orbit. Similar to carbon taxes, our model projects an optimal fee that rises at a rate of 14% per year, equal to roughly $235,000 per satellite-year in 2040. The long-run value of the satellite industry would more than quadruple by 2040—increasing from around $600 billion under business as usual to around $3 trillion. In contrast, we project that purely technological solutions are unlikely to fully address the problem of orbital congestion. Indeed, we find debris removal sometimes worsens economic damages from congestion by increasing launch incentives. In other sectors, addressing the tragedy of the commons has often been a game of catch-up with substantial social costs. The infant space industry can avert these costs before they escalate.

In 2017, 466 new satellites were launched—more than double the previous year’s launches and more than 20% of all active satellites in orbit in 2017 (1, 2). Rapid space industry growth is projected to continue, driven largely by commercial satellites (Fig. 1). This growth is driving buildup of debris in low-Earth orbit, currently including over 15,000 objects (3). Collision risk from debris is costly; collisions damage or destroy expensive capital assets that are difficult or impossible to repair. Debris buildup could eventually make some low-Earth orbits economically unviable and other orbits difficult or impossible to access (4). In the worst case—although uncertain and occurring over long time horizons—debris growth could become self-sustaining due to collisions between debris objects, a tipping point called Kessler Syndrome (4, 5).

Proposed solutions have so far largely been technological and managerial, aimed at mapping, avoiding, and removing debris (6, 7). These include end-of-life deorbit guidelines and “keep out” zones for active satellites and nets, harpoons, and lasers to deorbit debris (6). However, with open access to orbits, reducing debris and collision risk incentivizes additional satellite launches, which eventually restore the debris and risk. For instance, if firms were willing to tolerate a 0.1% annual risk of satellite loss before a technological improvement in debris removal, they will be willing to launch more satellites until the 0.1% annual risk of satellite loss was restored.

Thus, the core of the space debris problem is incentives, not technology. Since satellite operators are unable to secure exclusive property rights to their orbital paths or recover collision-related costs imposed by others, prospective operators face a choice between launching profitable satellites, thereby imposing current and future collision risk on others, or not launching and leaving those profits to competitors. This is a classic tragedy of the commons problem (1, 3, 8, 9). It can be economically efficiently addressed via incentive-based solutions, such as fees or tradable permits per year in orbit, analogous to carbon taxes or cap and trade (8, 10–12). Incentives should target objects in orbit—rather than launches—because orbiting objects are what directly imposes collision risk on other satellites (13). We quantify the economic benefits of implementing such incentives to correct the underlying open-access problem.

We use a coupled physical–economic model combining rich physical dynamics with satellite economics to quantify the benefits of an internationally harmonized “orbital-use fee” (OUF) relative to a business as usual (BAU) open-access scenario and relative to a scenario with active debris removal. An OUF is a type of Pigouvian tax—a well-known economic instrument for addressing externality problems (14). Our model accounts for the effects of each scenario on satellite launch decisions (Materials and Methods and SI Appendix). While we focus on an OUF for analytical convenience, it is conceptually equivalent to other mechanisms for pricing orbits, such as tradable permits.

Our physical model of satellite and debris evolution in orbit obeys relevant accounting identities and utilizes reduced form approximations of physical processes validated in other works (15, 16). We fit and calibrate the model using data on collision risk and orbital debris from the European Space Agency (ESA) (17) and data on active satellites from the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS) (2) (Materials and Methods and SI Appendix). The ESA dataset covers 1958 to 2017, and the UCS dataset covers 1957 to 2017. Our physical model assumes runaway debris growth (Kessler Syndrome) cannot occur, which likely leads our model to understate the benefits of OUFs (Materials and Methods). Our economic model assumes that satellites are launched and operated to maximize per satellite private profits, net of any fees, subject to collision risk. We calibrate the model by fitting the BAU scenario (no fees or debris removal) to historical industry data and launch trends (1, 2) (Materials and Methods and SI Appendix).

We project future launch rates to 2040 under the BAU scenario using our fitted model and published projections of future growth of the space economy (18). The projections in ref. 18 were developed by projecting how the industries constituting the space sector—telecommunications, imaging, etc.—would grow from 2017 to 2040 under different assumptions on their individual profitability over time, then aggregating up to obtain projections for the space sector. We then calculate launch rates that would maximize the long-run value of the industry, and we calculate the time series of OUFs that would incentivize these optimal launch rates. The industry value is measured as net present value (NPV)—the long-run value of the entire fleet of satellites in orbit, accounting for both the financial costs of replacing satellites due to natural retirement and collisions as well as the opportunity cost of investing funds in satellites rather than capital markets. For instance, an NPV of $1 trillion in 2020 means the sum total of the stream of net benefits, looking from 2020 into the future and accounting for the timing of the net benefits, is $1 trillion.

Although our models are deliberately simplified for tractability, they are based on previously validated approaches to orbital object modeling (15, 16), and our calibrations allow us to reproduce observed trends and magnitudes in the growth of orbital debris and satellite stocks as well as the calculated collision risk (Fig. 3). Nonetheless, our projections should be interpreted as order of magnitude approximations that can be refined as needed by more detailed models. In these respects, our approach mirrors integrated assessment modeling approaches that have been useful in developing solutions to other natural resource management problems (e.g., ref. 19).

RESULTS

We project that shifting from open access to the optimal series of OUFs in 2020 would increase the NPV of the satellite industry from around $600 billion under BAU to around $3 trillion—a more than 4-fold increase (4.18- to 6.49-fold increases in 95% of parameter sets randomly drawn from their calibrated distributions) (Fig. 2D). Assuming a 5% market rate of return, an increase of $2.5 trillion in NPV would be equivalent to annual benefits of approximately $120 billion in perpetuity. The large immediate increase in NPV that we project in each OUF scenario, relative to BAU (Fig. 2A), comes primarily from the immediate effect of reducing launch activity while the satellite and debris stocks are suboptimally high (SI Appendix).

Based on our calculations (Materials and Methods), the optimal OUF starts at roughly $14,900 per satellite-year in 2020 and escalates at roughly 14% per year (aside from some initial transition dynamics) to around $235,000 per satellite-year in 2040. Rising optimal price paths are common in environmental pricing such as carbon taxes (20), although declining optimal price paths are also possible (21). The rising price path in this case partly reflects the rising value of safer orbits (resulting in rising industry NPV) (Fig. 2A) from the OUF. For comparison, the average annual profits of operating a satellite in 2015 were roughly $2.1 million. The 2020 and 2040 OUF values we describe amount to roughly 0.7 and 11% of average annual profits generated by a satellite in 2015.

Forgone NPV from the satellite industry in 2040—which is the cost of inaction under BAU—escalates from around $300 billion if optimal management begins in 2025 to around $700 billion if optimal management begins in 2035. Without OUFs, losses remain substantial even when active debris removal (implemented in the model as removal of 50% of debris objects in orbit each year) is available. In a best-case analysis where we assume debris removal is costless (i.e., it requires no payments nor additional satellites to implement), debris removal can only recover up to 9.5% of the value lost under open access. (The satellite industry’s willingness to pay for debris removal is not easily calculable in our model [SI Appendix, section 1.9.2].) At worst, debris removal can exacerbate orbital congestion via a rebound-type effect, causing additional losses on the order of 3% of the value already lost from open access (Fig. 4 and SI Appendix). The inability of debris removal to induce efficient orbit use is driven by open-access launching behavior and underscores the importance of policies to correct economic incentives to launch satellites.

DISCUSSION

The costly buildup of debris and satellites in low-Earth orbit is fundamentally a problem of incentives—satellite operators currently lack the incentives to factor into their launch decisions the collision risks their satellites impose on other operators. Our analysis suggests that correcting these incentives, via an OUF, could have substantial economic benefits to the satellite industry, and failing to do so could have substantial and escalating economic costs.

Escalating costs of inaction are a common feature of the tragedy of the commons, evident in several other sectors in which it went unaddressed for lengthy periods (22). For example, tens of billions of dollars in net benefits are lost annually from open-access or poorly managed fisheries globally (23). Similarly, open access to oil fields in the United States at the turn of the century drove recovery rates down to 20 to 25% at competitively drilled sites, compared with 85 to 90% potential recovery under optimal management (24). Open access to roadways—somewhat analogous to orbits—is estimated to create traffic congestion costs in excess of $120 billion/y in the United States alone (25). In contrast, there is still time to get out ahead of the tragedy of the commons in the young space industry.

The international and geopolitically complex nature of the space sector poses challenges to implementing orbital-use pricing systems, but these challenges need not be insurmountable. Theory suggests countries could each collect and spend OUF revenues domestically, without losing economic efficiency, as long as the fee’s magnitude was internationally harmonized (20). Engaging in such negotiations would be in the economic interests of all parties involved (26). An example of such a system is the Vessel Day Scheme (VDS) used by the Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA) to manage tuna fisheries. Under the VDS, PNA countries each lease fishing rights within their waters, using a common price floor (27). The European Union’s Emissions Trading System provides an example of an internationally coordinated tradable permit system (28). Notably, each of these pricing programs is built on a preexisting international governance institution (the Nauru Agreement and the European Union).

An OUF could also be built within existing space governance institutions, such as the Outer Space Treaty (29). For example, Article VI states that countries supervise their space industries, which provides a framework for OUFs to be administered nationally. Article II prohibits national appropriation of outer space but does not prohibit private property rights, potentially allowing for tradable orbital permitting.

#### Appropriate = use, occupation, or any other means

Takaya et al 18 “The Principle of Non-Appropriation and the Exclusive Uses of LEO by Large Satellite Constellations” Yuri Takaya-Umehara [Visiting researcher at the University of Tokyo since April 2017. She was affiliated to the Kobe University to provide a course on space law to post-graduate students (2011-2017). She chairs a working group on the formulation of global norms in space law organized by the Keio University since 2018. She obtained her Ph.D. degree at the IDEST of Paris XI University in France, LL.M. at the Leiden University in the Netherlands.] Quentin Verspieren [Ph.D. in public policy @ The University of Tokyo, Assistant Professor of Space Policy @UTokyo, General Manager, Global Strategy @ArkEdge Space Inc., Associate Research Fellow @ESPI] Goutham Karthikeyan [The University of Tokyo & Institute of Space and Astronautical Science, Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency (ISAS-JAXA)] 2018 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328094878\_The\_Principle\_of\_Non-Appropriation\_and\_the\_Exclusive\_Use\_of\_LEO\_by\_Large\_Satellite\_Constellations SM

LSC raise concerns in the international community such as the IADC and the International Academy of Astronautics (IAA) whether or not it would result in the almost-exclusive use of selected orbits, the so-called “curtains of satellites”.22 The non-appropriation principle defined in Article II of the OST states that, Outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, “is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means”. The principle, that serves to regulate the exploration and use of outer space, is a fundamental rule and recognized as customary international law. The principle applies to LEO as the scope of its application and includes any orbits around the Earth and other celestial bodies, inter-planetary transfer orbits and Lagrangian point(s). In short, the use of LEO by LSC falls into the scope of the principle.

The principle prohibits any states from claiming sovereignty in outer space (including celestial bodies) which makes a difference between the legal status of air space and outer space. According to the Chicago Convention of 194423, every state has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the airspace above its territory, while the legal status of outer space is res communis omnium where it is free for exploration and use but “no portion of outer space may be appropriated to the sovereignty of individual states”24. By prohibiting states to claim any sovereignty in outer space, Article II transformed the legal status of outer space from res nullius to res communis omnium and the ultimate goal of the principle is to prohibit any taking of land by claims of sovereignty25 to prevent space colonization and an extension of the arms race in outer space. Thus, the principle is known for denying any claim of state sovereignty in outer space; however, an emphasis needs to be put on the provision that it also prohibits national appropriation, as well as private appropriation,26 by means of “use, or occupation, or by any other means”.

#### Plank 2 sanctions countries that don’t abide by international regulations which ensures follow-on large mitigation programs.

1AC BERNAT 20. Pawel @ Military University of Aviation. 11/4/20. [SAFETY ENGINEERING OF ANTHROPOGENIC OBJECTS, “ORBITAL SATELLITE CONSTELLATIONS AND THE GROWING THREAT OF KESSLER SYNDROME IN THE LOWER EARTH ORBIT,” Volume 4, PDF] Justin

4. The legal context and mitigation actions against space debris proliferation The UN Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space created a set of guidelines, which consist of the following postulates: (1) Limit debris released during normal operations; (2) Minimize the potential for break-ups during operational phases; (3) Limit the probability of accidental collision in orbit; (4) Avoid intentional destruction and other harmful activities; (5) Minimize potential for post-mission break-ups resulting from stored energy; (6) Limit the long-term presence of spacecraft and launch vehicle orbital stages in the lowEarth orbit (LEO) region after the end of their mission; (7) Limit the long-term interference of spacecraft and launch vehicle orbital stages with the geosynchronous Earth orbit (GEO) region after the end of their mission. (UN, 2010, pp. 2-4) It is worthwhile to notice that the above points are guidelines, not laws that would have to be complied with. The current situation is that space exploration and future exploitation is practically unlimited. It means that every state has total freedom to do what they want in terms of technology development, including space weapons and changing their national legal framework so they would allow, for example, future space mining. If there is one constraint still in force, it is a ban on placing nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction in orbit, which was established in the Article IV of the Outer Space Treaty from 1967 (UNOSA, 1967). There are many legal interpretations of what is prohibited by the Treaty, which is a consequence of the vague formulation of the Article, which reads the following: States Parties to the Treaty undertake not to place in orbit around the Earth any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction, install such weapons on celestial bodies, or station such weapons in outer space in any other manner. (…) The establishment of military bases, installations and fortifications, the testing of any weapons and the conduct of military maneuvers on celestial bodies shall be forbidden. (UNOSA, 1967) According to Boothby (2007), the Treaty unequivocally prohibits placing and keeping biological, bacteriological, chemical, and nuclear weapons in orbit. Bourbonniere and Lee (2008) argue that placing conventional weapons, even if they are equipped with nuclear drives, does not break the restriction imposed by the Treaty. They are also of the conviction that if the discussed weapons pass through the orbit on their ballistic trajectory, the law is not broken, although they add the statement that “while an activity that is prohibited by law should not occur, it is facile to argue that what is not prohibited by law should occur” (Bourbonniere & Lee, 2008, p. 901). In practice, such a wide window of interpretation translates into almost unlimited freedom on the part of countries that have sufficient technological capacity to do so. In summary, (1) the law is unclear – the Treaty, to give one example, uses the notion of weapons of mass destruction, on which there is no consensus and its UNRCPD definition (1977) is too vague in respect to the number of potential victims; the latter is crucial in categorizing potential orbital kinetic bombardment systems as weapons of mass destruction, or not; (2) the United Nations and its agencies have not enough power to impose sanctions on the Treaty’s violators. In the case of space debris regulation, there is no even a legal equivalent to the Treaty of Outer Space – it has become a problem relatively recently. There are guidelines, not laws. Any undertaken mitigation programs are carried out out of the good will of the parties involved. In consequence, the amount of space debris in orbit is rapidly growing (Fig. 1.), and the mitigation programs and technologies are developed too slowly and are too small in scale.

#### Plank 3 solves the “rigorous models”

1AC Virgili et al. 16. Bastida, J.C. Dolado, H.G. Lewis, J. Radtke, H. Krag, B. Revelin, C. Cazaux b , C. Colombo, R. Crowther, M. Metz. 4/26/16. [Act Astranautica “Risk to space sustainability from large constellations of satellites,” <https://sci-hub.se/10.1016/j.actaastro.2016.03.034>.] Justin

3. Conclusions The launch of large constellations to LEO to provide telecommunications services is anticipated to enable ubiquitous access to high-speed internet services. This represents an emerging opportunity to enable freedom of opinion and expression, and to promote the progress of society, on a global scale. However, the launch of such constellations will lead to an unprecedented, step increase in the number of satellites in LEO. As a consequence, those responsible for the constellations will need to understand the impact that such missions may have on the sustainability of wider space activities. Such awareness will be needed not only during the operational phase of their missions but also during the design and testing phases to achieve the highest reliability for the post-mission disposal operations and the lowest residual lifetime. While several large constellation projects have announced their willingness to target post-mission lifetimes far below those advocated within current guidelines (i.e. 25 years), we have shown that such efforts may still have an effect on the LEO object population, with consequences that are likely to be dominated by the success, or otherwise, of post-mission disposal activities within the constellations. For moderate PMD success rates (i.e. 50%), which are nevertheless higher than today's levels, the accumulation of failed constellation satellites may provide a catalyst for a detrimental population increase. For higher levels, in line with current ambitions (e.g. 90%), the population may still increase over the longterm (here, by at least one-quarter on average) but such levels may also be sufficient to prevent further growth. However, the results presented here are likely to be optimistic, especially if more than one large constellation is deployed into LEO as anticipated. The greatest challenge will be in delivering the reliability of disposal over the lifetimes of the satellites and the constellations envisaged. Nevertheless, the post-mission disposal guidelines appear to be applicable in a general sense to such constellations and represent a valid method for reducing their impact on the LEO population if implemented satisfactorily.

#### Planks 4 and 5 creates lasting guidelines that fundamentally change actor behavior.

1AC Samson 22 – Victoria Samson is the Washington office director for the Secure World Foundation, an organization that focuses on space sustainability, and she has over 20 years of experience in military space and security issues. Previously, Ms. Samson was a senior analyst for the Center for Defense Information. She also was a senior policy associate at the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, a consortium of arms control groups. Earlier, she was a researcher at Riverside Research Institute, where she worked on war-gaming scenarios for the Missile Defense Agency. 1/17/22. [Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, “The complicating role of the private sector in space,” DOI: 10.1080/00963402.2021.2014229] Justin

Discussion National regulators such as the FCC are assigning orbital shells to mega-constellations on a frst come, frst served basis, without assessing the efects on other countries. Tese could include making any addition of further satellites to those shells too dangerous to contemplate. Tis de facto occupation of orbital shells likely violates Article I of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, which designates the exploration and use of space as “the province of all mankind” and open to all countries “without discrimination of any kind.” Tere is also Article II: “Outer space … is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means.” Although regulators are not claiming sovereignty over orbital shells, allowing national companies to saturate them with satellites could constitute appropriation by “other means.” Lastly, Article IX requires that space activities be conducted “with due regard to the corresponding interests of other States”. Mega-constellation operators and their regulators could respond that they are exercising the right to explore and use space without discrimination, the use of an orbital shell is time-limited as a result of the license, and the satellites will be actively de-orbited32. Tey could also reference that countries have been using slots in geostationary orbit for decades, resulting in the de facto exclusion of others from any given slot without this being considered appropriation. However, the use of slots in geostationary orbit is mediated by the International Telecommunications Union (ITU), which does not play the same role in LEO. Another ‘land rush’ is occurring over radio spectrum. Te ITU is involved in the allocation of frequencies to communications satellites. Under its binding instruments, countries must treat frequencies as limited resources to which others have equitable access, and therefore limit their own use. But companies are not party to those instruments and do not deal directly with the ITU. They apply for and obtain licenses from their national regulator, which early in the planning process fles a general description of the mega-constellation with the ITU, including the frequencies it will use33. A company is required to coordinate with any satellite system that might be afected by its planned mega-constellation, provided the other system was fled before its fling, but there is no requirement to coordinate with those whose flings are made afer its own. Te ITU recently adopted a tiered management approach, whereby listing a mega-constellation in its ‘Master Register’ depends on certain milestones being met. This deters companies from filing and effectively claiming orbital shells years before they are ready to launch, but thereby disadvantages smaller companies and exacerbates long-term equity concerns for those developing countries that are not yet active in space. No binding international rules exist on other aspects of mega-constellations. In 2007, the Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Committee (IADC), currently representing 13 space agencies, indicated that direct reentry at the end of a satellite’s operational life was preferred but nevertheless only recommended that deorbiting conclude within 25 years. Tis widely accepted guideline is poorly suited for mega-constellations made up of thousands of satellites with short operational lives. It also overlooks placement, with satellites at higher altitudes producing relatively high collision probabilities when de-orbiting timescales are long34. Te IADC also recommended collision avoidance and end-of-life deorbiting technologies. Tese add costs, and in 2017 the IADC reported that adherence to its guidelines was “insufficient and no apparent trend towards a better implementation is observed”35. More recent analyses indicate that compliance with the end-of-life guidelines is now improving by some metrics36. However, these improvements appear to be driven, at least in part, by SpaceX’s own practices, which may not be followed by other mega-constellation operators. Guidelines allow for ‘free riding’, whereby individual actors can save costs through non-compliance while beneftting from the compliance of others. In the context of any shared resource, free riding can lead to a ‘tragedy of the commons,’ which is exactly what needs to be avoided in LEO. Finally, we would be remiss not to mention the threats posed by mega-constellations to astronomy, although for a detailed discussion we refer to other recent work37–41. Briefy, astronomers pushed for reductions in the number and brightness of Starlink satellites afer an image from a telescope in Chile was ruined. SpaceX responded by adding visors to the satellites, which has reduced their naked-eye visibility while still leaving them bright to telescopes39. Next generation sky surveys and observations close to the horizon, especially near sunrise and sunset, are especially vulnerable—and critical for near-Earth object observations for planetary defence. Occultations are another issue: even a satellite that is unilluminated (i.e. passing through the shadow of the Earth) can interfere with rapid time domain astronomy when it passes in front of a star. Radio astronomy is also threatened39, since mega-constellations will require frequencies additional to those traditionally used by land stations. Tese could encroach on protected spectrum through out-of-band overtone emission. Te large number of fast-moving transmitting stations (i.e. satellites) will cause further interference. New analysis methods could mitigate some of these efects, but data loss is inevitable, increasing the time needed for each study and limiting the overall amount of science done. Tere are reasons for hope. SpaceX is showing some leadership with rapid end-of-life deorbiting, automatic collision avoidance, and visors to reduce light pollution, even if these are not yet sufcient. Spacefaring countries, moreover, recognize that debris threatens all satellites, including military satellites. Some are strengthening their national regulations, including by incorporating non-binding international guidelines into binding national laws. However, there is little recognition that Earth’s orbit is a fnite resource, the space and Earth environments are connected, and the actions of one actor can afect everyone. Until that changes, we risk multiple tragedies of the commons in space.

#### Plank 6’s assertion of international rules solves space escalation.

Adelaide University [DS] [https://law.adelaide.edu.au/woomera/system/files/docs/Woomera%20Manual.pdf]

AIM The Woomera Manual on the International Law of Military Space Operations aims to articulate and clarify extant law applicable to military activities associated with the space domain, especially that which is relevant in periods of tension (when States and non-State actors may consider using force) or outright hostilities. The Manual will examine the circumstances in which operations associated with space infrastructure would be considered unlawful as a violation of the law on the use of force. It will also consider the responses available to States in reacting to such operations. Further, the Manual will discuss how the law of armed conflict governs operations that are conducted from, to or through outer space, should armed conflict break out. Ultimately, the Manual is meant to support a stable, rules-based global order, even in periods of tension and armed conflict. SCOPE The Woomera Manual follows in the footsteps of, inter alia, the Oxford Manual, the San Remo Manual, the Harvard Manual and the Tallinn Manuals. Importantly, in the tradition of these manuals, it will maintain a strict focus on the law as it is (lex lata), not on the law as we might wish it to be (lex ferenda). The latter is more appropriate for official, intergovernmental efforts in drafting new international instruments. Yet, it is unlikely that the diverse interests of States in the current geopolitical environment will coalesce around any new international instruments on space security. For that reason, we consider a strict focus on lex lata to be essential. EXPERTS The Woomera Manual gathers together legal experts specialised in the fields of international space law, international law on the use of force and the law of armed conflict, together with technical experts. Experts contribute in a personal capacity on the basis of their own conclusions as to the state of the law, independent of the official position or preference of any State or organisation. Core Experts draft Rules and Commentary and attend each Workshop. The number attending each Workshop will vary, but there are expected to be approximately 20 such experts. There are also Associate Experts, who do not attend Workshops, but who contribute as reviewers of all draft Rules and Commentary and contribute in niche areas, including by providing examples of State practice and State assertions of a legal position. RULE-DRAFTING PROCESS The Rules set forth in The Woomera Manual are succinct statements of international law in a military space context. A Commentary accompanying each Rule expands on its interpretation, discusses difficult issues of application, and provides examples or scenarios as a means of clarification. Experts will come together in a series of workshops over the next several years to agree upon the Rules and Commentary on the basis of non-attribution and consensus (where possible). However, most of the work will take place between workshops, when the experts draft the proposed Rules and Commentary to be considered at the workshops. STATE ENGAGEMENT Once the Rules and Commentary are consolidated into a single text, the complete draft will be shared with officials from States that participate in State engagement events. The Board of Directors will also seek other opportunities for State engagement while the Rules and Commentary are being drafted. Other international law and space operations experts around the world will carefully scrutinise the draft text in a robust ‘peer review’ process. The Board welcomes proposals by States to host and contribute to State engagement events.

#### International governance solves escalation.

1AC Samson 22 – Victoria Samson is the Washington office director for the Secure World Foundation, an organization that focuses on space sustainability, and she has over 20 years of experience in military space and security issues. Previously, Ms. Samson was a senior analyst for the Center for Defense Information. She also was a senior policy associate at the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, a consortium of arms control groups. Earlier, she was a researcher at Riverside Research Institute, where she worked on war-gaming scenarios for the Missile Defense Agency. 1/17/22. [Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, “The complicating role of the private sector in space,” DOI: 10.1080/00963402.2021.2014229] Justin

The fundamental nature of space is changing to one of a domain that is dominated by commercial actors. This change will have consequences for international stability, both in terms of how it demonstrates that the old governance structure for space is being left behind as the domain evolves and how it highlights Russia’s declining rank in global space powers. It is important to work to develop new governance of space to meet the emerging needs of this ecosystem. Otherwise, we run the risk of inadvertent escalation and even conflict in space that can extend down to Earth.

## Plan

### NC – Top

#### No solvency – plan doesn’t define space debris.

#### \*\*Lack of enforcement is referring to government appropriation, and private appropriation solves debris.

1AC Shah 20. Sachin Shah is a write for Cornell Undergraduate Law and Society Review. 8/30/20 [CORNELL UNDERGRADUATE LAW & SOCIETY REVIEW “The International Legal Regulation of Space Debris,” <https://www.culsr.org/articles/the-international-legal-regulation-of-space-debris>] Justin

While many scholars agree that the Outer Space Treaty provides rudimentary regulation of the problem of space debris, therein lies the problem: it is only rudimentary. One of the most often cited problems with the Outer Space Treaty is that it was signed in 1967 (53 years ago) and that the technological climate of the space travel industry was not as advanced as it is today, reflected in a marked lack of specificity in the writing of these laws. [7] This lack of specificity highlights another issue: the imprecise language of the Treaty leaves unclear the definition of space debris, which leaves the regulation open to interpretation. Rather than agree with most scholars that space debris constitute “space objects,” scholar Chelsea Muñoz-Patchen uses the UN Space Debris Mitigation Guidelines’ definition of space debris along with the fact that space debris is non-functional and its ownership often untraceable in order to argue that space debris should be classified as “abandoned property” instead. [8] Furthermore, non-governmental private enterprises may be inclined to legally define space debris as something other than “space objects” in order to avoid the Outer Space Treaty’s aforementioned financial penalties, as will be explained below. The Outer Space Treaty also does not account for the fact that the space debris problem, especially as of late, has been becoming worse over time. As collisions between debris and satellites continue to occur, more debris is strewn across Earth’s orbit, endangering future spacecraft from safely orbiting Earth, supporting the theory of the Kessler Syndrome. [9] Thus, the Outer Space Treaty is not a very effective legal instrument with regards to mitigating the amount of space debris in orbit around Earth.

Due to the Treaty’s weakness, many of the aforementioned scholars support revising the Outer Space Treaty by clearly defining space debris, increasing its technology-specific language to combat space debris issues, and outlining specific punishments to negate the complete lack of enforcement built into the current Treaty. While nations do recognize the danger that space debris pose to orbital operations, stronger laws must be enacted in order to de-escalate an imminent arms race and incentivize them to mitigate their debris. [10] Believing that one convention or treaty would be insufficient, N. Jasentuliyana recommends the creation of a regulatory regime to solve the growing problem of space debris. Such a regime would “effectively deal with these technical problems and establish international legal rules, standards and procedures on a continuing basis.” [11] Thus, one potential solution to the legal lack of space debris mitigation is establishing a lawmaking agency which specifically focuses on the issue of space debris. In addition to the creation of a legal agency which could hold actors accountable for the amount of space debris produced, international laws guiding the actions of private companies’ activities may also provide an answer, as will be discussed in greater detail below.

Although there do exist international laws and regulations governing the use of space for states and governmental entities (albeit weak ones), the private enterprises sending objects into space are subject to even less stringent regulations than states are. SpaceX, for example, to authorize their sending of 42,000 Starlink satellites into orbit, only had to submit paperwork to the U.S. Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and the International Telecommunication Union (ITU). [12] Paul Larsen posits that, in the face of less stringent regulations, nongovernmental satellite companies send many satellites into orbit in order to maximize their profit, which is their primary objective. Unlike the vagueness and lack of enforcement that came with written law (which is apparent in the Outer Space Treaty), the unwritten market-oriented incentives for profit by large-scale satellite providers and operators provide a reason for actors to mitigate space debris in orbit around Earth. Larsen states that “They have huge sums of money invested in each satellite, perhaps as much as a half-billion dollars, when all costs are included. Loss of one satellite is a major event. They want their assets to be safe.” [13] Thus, these satellite companies have a major stake in space traffic management and their market incentives do a better job of mitigating space debris than the existing legal regulation does. The company SpaceX, as mentioned above, plans to send 42,000 satellites into space. While doing so would likely result in significant profits for the company, many believe this will diminish astronomical visibility as well as increase the chance of collisions with space debris. [14] Due to these effects, scientists and space law experts alike have called for a legal delay to the ITU’s decision on whether or not to accept SpaceX’s proposal to launch more satellites. If these parties are successful, a precedent-setting legal case regarding space debris mitigation and satellite use in space may well provide a solution to the outdated Outer Space Treaty of 1967.

## Underview

### NC – AT 1AR Theory [:10]

#### They get 1AR theory but it’s not DTD- incentivizes reading 10 friv shells since they can win on any of them- AND, 1AR time advantage on 1AR theory since they get 2 speeches and 7 min, abuse is self-imposed b/c they could always better develop the shell in the 1ar; proportional- reading theory cancels out the abuse; and no reason short speech means drop the debater- just get more efficient or don’t read theory.

## Advantage

### Turn – Sats Good

#### Satellite data ratchets up drug eradication efforts

Kieron Monks 14, Writer for CNN, The Guardian, and Prospect Magazine, BA from the University of Nottingham, “Spy Satellites Fighting Crime From Space”, CNN, 8/12/2014, https://www.cnn.com/2014/08/11/tech/innovation/spy-satellites-fighting-crime-from-space/index.html

The Alayed case is one of several pilot schemes the company is running with police forces and security agencies. A key focus is on organized crime, trafficking and smuggling. The satellites have been put to work on the illegal fishing industry, worth up to $23 billion a year, tracking ships to witness crimes in real time.

"We can identify a specific ship and monitor its behaviour from port to port. We can see if it meets another vessel in a strange way and offloads cargo, or fishes in water it's not allowed to," says Hilton.

In addition to improved resolution, SA Catapult is benefiting from a steady increase in the number of Earth observation satellites, with launches set to double over the next decade, making more data available as well as bringing down the cost. This progress is also enabling the growth of rivals such as U.S. firm Digital Globe, while the Asian market is also expanding.

Some experts believe space surveillance could become industry standard. "The technologies that Catapult is developing will have broad application not only for national and international police organizations but also for anyone working in international security," said Patricia Lewis, research director of International Security at think tank Chatham House. Drug trafficking and arms reduction treaties are among the priority applications, says Lewis.

Read this: Robot furniture builds itself

It will soon be cost effective for police forces to buy their own satellites, predicts Ray Purdy, expert on satellites and the law at University College London. Purdy has been able to monitor criminal activity -- such as large-scale illegal waste disposal -- through satellite surveillance, which would have allowed police to cheaply and easily strengthen existing cases.

"I've gone back and looked at crimes after a prosecution and in some cases you can see illegal activity a year before, which could have allowed a greater conviction," he said. "In other cases we found people resumed criminal activity immediately after they were prosecuted."

#### That backfires, destabilizing Latin America

Barney Lerten 19, Reporter for KTVZ News, “Computer Model: Big Cocaine Busts Backfire Big-Time”, KTVZ News 21, 4/3/2019, https://www.ktvz.com/news/osu-computer-model-big-cocaine-busts-backfire-big-time/1065357402

Efforts to curtail the flow of cocaine into the United States from South America have made drug trafficking operations more widespread and harder to eradicate, according to new research published this week in Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.

The National Science Foundation supported the study, which included an Oregon State University geographer and was led by Nicholas Magliocca from University of Alabama. The collaboration also included researchers from The Ohio State University, Northern Arizona University, Arizona State University, Texas State University-San Marcos, the University of Wyoming and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

“It really is surprising how the model matches our observations,” said David Wrathall of OSU’s College of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences. “Our team consists of researchers who worked in different parts of Central America during the 2000s and witnessed a massive surge of drugs into the region that coincided with a reinvigoration of the war on drugs. We asked ourselves: did drug interdiction push drug traffickers into these places?”

The findings are important because after five decades, the United States’ war on drugs has yet to prove itself effective or cost-efficient for dealing with cocaine trafficking, the researchers note. The study comes at a time of increased attention on Central American migrants fleeing drug-related violence in their home countries.

The scientists developed a computer model named NarcoLogic that shows how drug traffickers respond to interdiction strategies and tactics. It differs from previous approaches because it models local- and network-level trafficking dynamics at the same time.

Interdiction efforts are linked to the spread and fragmentation of trafficking routes – a phenomenon known as the “balloon and cockroach effect.” When interdiction efforts are focused in one location, drug traffickers simply relocate.

“Between 1996 and 2017, the Western Hemisphere transit zone grew from 2 million to 7 million square miles, making it more difficult and costly for law enforcement to track and disrupt trafficking networks,” Wrathall said. “But as trafficking spread, it triggered a host of smuggling-related collateral damages: violence, corruption, proliferation of weapons, and extensive and rapid environmental destruction, which has been the focus of my work.”

#### Nuclear war

Dr. Andrew F. Krepinevich 14, Jr., President of the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, M.P.A. and Ph.D. from Harvard University, and Eric Lindsey, Analyst at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, M.A. in Strategic Studies and International Economics from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), “Hemispheric Defense in the 21st Century”, 1/9/2014, https://csbaonline.org/research/publications/hemispheric-defense-in-the-21st-century

As the previous chapter demonstrates, for the past two hundred years the principal cause of concern for U.S. defense policymakers and planners thinking about Latin America has been the prospect that great powers outside the Western Hemisphere could exploit the military weakness and internal security challenges of the states within it to threaten U.S. security. While there is reason for optimism about the future of Latin America,58 there is also cause for concern. The region faces enduring obstacles to economic59 and political development60 as well as signi􀂿cant internal security challenges. As General John Kelly, the commander of U.S. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM)61 noted in his March 2013 posture statement before Congress, Latin America: 􀀾I􀁀s a region of enormous promise and exciting opportunities, but it is also one of persistent challenges and complex threats. It is a region of relative peace, low likelihood of interstate con􀃀icts, and overall economic growth, yet is also home to corrosive criminal violence, permissive environments for illicit activities, and episodic political and social protests.62 The instability and non-traditional security challenges that General Kelly cites provide potential opportunities for the United States’ major rivals to (borrowing a term from Monroe’s declaration) “interpose” themselves into the region and, by so doing, threaten regional stability and U.S. security. Two discernible trends suggest that current and prospective Eurasian rivals could seek to exploit regional conditions and dynamics in ways that could impose immense costs on the United States and divert its attention from more distant theaters overseas. The first trend is a return to a heightened level of competition among the “great powers” following two decades of U.S. dominance. The second trend concerns the growing cost of projecting power by traditional military means due to the proliferation of “anti-access/area-denial” (A2/AD) capabilities in general, and precision-guided munitions (PGMs) in particular. These trends suggest that, despite a possible decline in relative U.S. power, external forces will continue to 􀂿nd it beyond their means to threaten the hemisphere through traditional forms of power projection. Far more likely is a return of a competition similar to that which the United States engaged in with the Soviet Union during the Cold War. During that period both powers sought to avoid direct con􀃀ict with the other, given the risks of escalation to nuclear con􀃀ict. Instead each focused primarily on gaining an advantage over the other through the employment of client states and non-state groups as proxies. Proxies were employed for reasons other than avoiding a direct clash, such as gaining positional advantage (e.g., enabling the sponsor to establish bases in its country, as the Soviets did in Cuba). Proxies were also employed as a means of diverting a rival’s attention from what was considered the key region of the competition and to impose disproportionate costs on a rival (e.g., Moscow’s support of 􀀱orth Vietnam as a means of drawing o􀌆 U.S. resources from Europe). This chapter outlines trends in the Western Hemisphere security environment that outside powers may seek to exploit to advance their objectives in ways that threaten regional stability and U.S. security. This is followed by a discussion of how these external powers might proceed to do so. Seeds of Instability Crime, Illicit Networks, and Under-Governed Areas Latin America has a long history of banditry, smuggling, and organized crime. As in the case of Pancho Villa and the 1916-1917 Punitive Expedition, these activities have occasionally risen to a level at which they in􀃀uence U.S. national security calculations. Rarely, however, have these activities been as pervasive and destabilizing as they are today. Although a wide variety of illicit activity occurs in Latin America, criminal organizations conducting drug tra􀌇cking are the dominant forces in the Latin American underworld today, accounting for roughly 􀀇􀀗0 billion per year63 of an estimated 􀀇100 billion in annual illicit trade.6􀀗 Since the Colombian cartels were dismantled in the 1990s, this lucrative trade has been dominated by powerful Mexican cartels whose operations extend across the length and breadth of Mexico, as well as up the supply chain into the cocaine-producing regions of the Andean Ridge and through their wholesale and retail drug distribution networks across the United States.65 The cartels, along with countless smaller criminal organizations, comprise what the head of SOUTHCOM has described as, 􀀾a􀁀n interconnected system of arteries that traverse the entire Western Hemisphere, stretching across the Atlantic and Paci􀂿c, through the Caribbean, and up and down 􀀱orth, South, and Central America . . . 􀀾a􀁀 vast system of illicit pathways 􀀾that is used􀁀 to move tons of drugs, thousands of people, and countless weapons into and out of the United States, Europe, and Africa with an e􀌇ciency, payload, and gross pro􀂿t any global transportation company would envy.66 That being said, the drug tra􀌇cking underworld is by no means a monolithic entity or cooperative alliance. Rather, it is a fractious and brutally competitive business in which rival entities are constantly and literally 􀂿ghting to maximize their share of the drug trade and for control of the critical transshipment points, or plazas, through which it 􀃀ows. To attack their competitor’s operations and protect their own operations from rivals and the Mexican government’s crackdown that began in 2006, the cartels have built up larger, better armed, and more ruthless forces of hired gunmen known as sicarios. Using the billions of dollars generated by their illicit activities, they have acquired weapons and equipment formerly reserved for state armies or state-sponsored insurgent groups, including body armor, assault ri􀃀es, machine guns, grenades, landmines, anti-tank rockets, mortars, car bombs, armored vehicles, helicopters, transport planes, and—perhaps most remarkably—long-range submersibles.67 The cartels’ pro􀂿ts have also enabled them to hire former police and military personnel, including members of several countries’ elite special operations units68 and, in several cases, active and former members of the U.S. military.69 These personnel bring with them—and can provide to the cartels—a level of training and tactical pro􀂿ciency that can be equal or superior to those of the government forces they face. As a result of this pro􀂿ciency and the military-grade weapons possessed by the cartels, more than 2,500 Mexican police o􀌇cers and 200 military personnel were killed in confrontations with organized crime forces between 2008 and 2012 along with tens of thousands of civilians.70 In the poorer states of Central America, state security forces operate at an even greater disadvantage.71 While their paramilitary forces enable the cartels to dominate entire cities and large remote areas through force and intimidation, they are not the only tool available. The cartels also leverage their immense wealth to buy the silence or support of police and government o􀌇cials who are often presented with a choice between plata o plomo—“silver or lead.” According to the head of the Mexican Federal Police, around 2010 the cartels were spending an estimated 􀀇100 million each month on bribes to police.72 By buying o􀌆 o􀌇cials—and torturing or killing those who cannot be corrupted—the cartels have greatly undermined the e􀌆ectiveness of national government forces in general and local police in particular. This, in turn, has undermined the con􀂿dence of the population in their government’s willingness and ability to protect them. Through these means and methods the cartels have gained a substantial degree of de facto control over many urban and rural areas across Mexico, including major cities and large swathes of territory along the U.S.-Mexico border. In many of these crime-ridden areas the loss of con􀂿dence in the government and police has prompted the formation of vigilante militias, presenting an additional challenge to government control.73 Meanwhile, in the “northern triangle” of Central America (the area comprising Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador through which the cartels transship almost all cocaine bound for Mexico and the United States) the situation is even more dire. Approximately 90 percent of crimes in this area go unpunished, while in Guatemala roughly half the country’s territory is e􀌆ectively under drug tra􀌇ckers’ control.7􀀗 Further south, similar pockets of lawlessness exist in coca-growing areas in Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia. In Colombia and along its borders with Venezuela, Ecuador, and Peru, much of the coca-growing territory remains under the control of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, or FARC. A guerrilla organization founded in the 1960s as a Marxist-Leninist revolutionary movement dedicated to the overthrow of the Colombian government, the FARC embraced coca growing in the 1990s as a means of funding its operations and has subsequently evolved into a hybrid mix of left-wing insurgent group and pro􀂿t-driven cartel.76 This hybrid nature has facilitated cooperation between the FARC and ideological sympathizers like the Bolivarian Alliance, Hezbollah, Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb, and other extremist groups77 as well as with purely criminal organizations like the Mexican cartels. Although the FARC has been greatly weakened over the past decade and no longer poses the existential threat to the Colombian government that it once did, it remains 􀂿rmly in control of large tracts of coca-producing jungle, mostly straddling the borders between Colombia and FARC supporters Venezuela and Ecuador. In summary, organized crime elements have exploited under-governed areas to establish zones under their de facto control. In so doing they pose a signi􀂿cant and growing threat to regional security in general and U.S. interests in particular. As SOUTHCOM commander General Kelly recently observed: 􀀾T􀁀he proximity of the U.S. homeland to criminally governed spaces is a vulnerability with direct implications for U.S. national security. I am also troubled by the signi􀂿cant criminal capabilities that are available 􀀾within them􀁀 to anyone—for a price. Transnational criminal organizations have access to key facilitators who specialize in document forgery, trade-based money laundering, weapons procurement, and human smuggling, including the smuggling of special interest aliens. This criminal expertise and the ability to move people, products, and funds are skills that can be exploited by a variety of malign actors, including terrorists.78 Hezbollah and the Bolivarian Alliance Hezbollah in Latin America 􀀱on-state entities recognized by the U.S. as terrorist organizations also operate in the region, most notably Lebanon-based Hezbollah, an Iranian client group. Hezbollah maintains an active presence in the tri-border area (TBA) of South America— the nexus of Argentina, Brazil, and Paraguay—stretching back to the 1980s. The TBA has traditionally been under-governed and is known by some as “the United 􀀱ations of crime.”79 Eight syndicate groups facilitate this activity in South America’s so-called “Southern Cone,” overseeing legitimate businesses along with a wide range of illegal activities to include money laundering, drug and arms traf- 􀂿cking, identity theft and false identi􀂿cation documents, counterfeiting currency and intellectual property, and smuggling. 􀀱ot surprisingly they are linked to organized crime and to non-state insurgent and terrorist groups, such as the FARC.80 Estimates are that over 􀀇12 billion in illicit transactions are conducted per year, a sum exceeding Paraguay’s entire GDP by a substantial amount.81 Hezbollah achieved notoriety in the region in 1992 when it bombed the Israeli embassy in Argentina. This was followed with the bombing of the AMIA Jewish community center in Buenos Aires two years later. Like many other terrorist organizations, as Hezbollah expanded it established relationships with drug cartels82 that it supports in a variety of ways. For example, the cartels have enlisted Hezbollah, known for its tunnel construction along the Israeli border, for help in improving their tunnels along the U.S.-Mexican border. In 2008, Hezbollah helped broker a deal in which one of Mexico’s major drug cartels, Sinaloa, sent members to Iran for weapons and explosives training via Venezuela using Venezuelan travel documents. 83 As the locus of the drug trade and other illegal cartel activities moved north into Central America and Mexico, Hezbollah has sought to move with it with mixed success. In October 2011, Hezbollah was linked to the e􀌆orts of an Iranian-American to conspire with Iranian agents to assassinate the Saudi ambassador to the United States. The plot involved members of the Los Zetas Mexican drug cartel.8􀀗 The would-be assassin, Mansour Arbabsiar, had established contact with his cousin, a Quds Force85 handler, Gen. Gholam Shakuri. The plot is believed by some to be part of a wider campaign by the Quds Force and Hezbollah to embark on a campaign of violence extending beyond the Middle East to other Western targets, including those in the United States.86 In early September 2012, Mexican authorities arrested three men suspected of operating a Hezbollah cell in the Yucatan area and Central America, including a dual U.S.-Lebanese citizen linked to a U.S.-based Hezbollah money laundering operation. 87A few months later, in December 2012, Wassim el Abd Fadel, a suspected Hezbollah member with Paraguayan citizenship, was arrested in Paraguay. Fadel was charged with human and drug tra􀌇cking and money laundering. Fadel reportedly deposited the proceeds of his criminal activities—ranging from 􀀇50-200,000 per transaction—into Turkish and Syrian bank accounts linked to Hezbollah. In summary, Hezbollah has become a 􀂿xture in Central and Latin America, expanding both its activities and in􀃀uence over time. It has developed links with the increasingly powerful organized crime groups in the region, particularly the narco cartels, along with radical insurgent groups such as the FARC and states like Venezuela who are hostile to the United States and its regional partners. Hezbollah’s principal objectives appear to be undermining U.S. in􀃀uence in the region, imposing costs on the United States, and generating revenue to sustain its operations in Latin America and elsewhere in the world. These objectives are shared by Iran, Hezbollah’s main state sponsor. The Bolivarian Alliance As noted above, geographic, economic, and cultural factors have traditionally helped to prevent the emergence in Latin America of any real military rival to the United States. Although there are no traditional military threats in the region, there are indigenous states whose actions, policies, and rhetoric challenge regional stability and U.S. security. Over the past decade, several states have come together to form the Bolivarian Alliance of the Americas (ALBA), an organization of left-leaning Latin American regimes whose overarching purpose is to promote radical populism and socialism, foster regional integration, and reduce what they perceive as Washington’s “imperialist” influence in the region.89 Since its founding by Hugo Chavez of Venezuela and Fidel Castro of Cuba in December 200􀀗, the Bolivarian Alliance has expanded to include Antigua and Barbuda, Bolivia, Dominica, Ecuador, 􀀱icaragua, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. Although the members of the Bolivarian Alliance are militarily weak and pose almost no traditional military threat to the United States or its allies in the region,90 they challenge American interests in the region in other ways. First, they espouse an anti-American narrative that finds substantial support in the region and consistently oppose U.S. efforts to foster cooperation and regional economic integration.91 Second, in their efforts to undermine the government of Colombia, which they consider to be a U.S. puppet, ALBA states provide support and sanctuaries within their borders to coca growers, drug traffickers, other criminal organizations, and the FARC.92 Links to Hezbollah have also been detected.93 Perhaps of greatest concern, they have aligned themselves closely with Iran, inviting it and Syria to participate as “observer states” in the alliance. Other worrisome ALBA activities involve lifting visa requirements for Iranian citizens and hosting large numbers of Iranian diplomats and commercial exchange members that some observers believe to be Iranian intelligence and paramilitary Quds Force operatives.9􀀗 By hosting and cooperating with both foreign agents and violent non-state actors, the ALBA states have come to function as critical nodes in a network of groups hostile to the United States. A Coming Era of Proxy Wars in the Western Hemisphere? History shows that Washington has often emphasized an indirect approach to meeting challenges to its security in Latin America. Yet the United States has not shied away from more direct, traditional uses of force when interests and circumstances dictated, as demonstrated over the past half century by U.S. invasions of the Dominican Republic (1965), Grenada (1983), and Panama (1989) and the occupation of Haiti (199􀀗).Yet several trends seem likely to raise the cost of such operations, perhaps to prohibitive levels. Foremost among these trends is the diffusion of precision-guided weaponry to state and non-state entities. 92 The Second Lebanon War as “Precursor” War A precursor of this trend can be seen in the Second Lebanon War between Israel and Hezbollah.95 During the con􀃀ict, which lasted less than 􀂿ve weeks, irregular Hezbollah forces held their own against the highly regarded Israeli Defense Force (IDF), demonstrating what is now possible for non-state entities to accomplish given the proliferation of militarily-relevant advanced technologies. Hezbollah’s militia engaged IDF armor columns with salvos of advanced, man-portable, antitank guided missiles and other e􀌆ective anti-armor weapons (e.g. rocket-propelled grenades (RPGs) with anti-armor warheads) in great numbers. When the IDF employed its ground forces in southern Lebanon, its armored forces su􀌆ered severe losses; out of the four hundred tanks involved in the 􀂿ghting in southern Lebanon, forty-eight were hit and forty damaged.96 Hezbollah’s defensive line was also well equipped with latest-generation thermal and low-/ no-light enhanced illumination imaging systems, while frontline units were connected to each other and higher command elements via a proprietary, 􀂿ber-optic based communications network, making collection of communications tra􀌇c by Israeli intelligence extremely di􀌇cult. Perhaps most important, Hezbollah possessed thousands of short- and medium- range rockets, often skillfully hidden below ground or in bunkers that made detection from overhead surveillance platforms nearly impossible. During the brief con􀃀ict Hezbollah’s forces 􀂿red some four thousand unguided rockets of various types that hit Israel. Hezbollah’s rocket inventory enabled its forces to attack targets throughout the northern half of Israel. Over nine hundred rockets hit near or on buildings, civilian infrastructure, and industrial plants. Some two thousand homes were destroyed, and over 􀂿fty Israelis died with several thousand more injured. The casualties would undoubtedly been greater if between 100,000 and 250,000 Israeli civilians had not 􀃀ed their homes. Haifa, Israel’s major seaport had to be shut down, as did its oil re􀂿nery.97 Hezbollah also employed several unmanned aerial vehicles for surveillance of Israel, as well as C-802 anti-ship cruise missiles used to attack and damage an Israeli corvette. 98 The G-RAMM Battlefield The brief war between Israel and Hezbollah suggests that future irregular forces may be well-equipped with enhanced communications, extended-range surveillance capabilities, and precision-guided rockets, artillery, mortars and missiles (G-RAMM) 99 able to hit targets with high accuracy at ranges measured from the tens of kilometers perhaps up to a hundred kilometers or more. In projecting power against enemies equipped in this manner and employing these kinds of tactics U.S. forces—as well as other conventional forces— will find themselves operating in a far more lethal battlefield than those in either of the Gulf wars or in stability operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. Moreover, currently constituted conventional forces typically depend on large fixed infrastructure (e.g., military bases, logistics depots, ports, airfields, railheads, bridges) to deploy themselves and sustain combat operations. These transportation and support hubs also serve as the nodes through which internal commerce and foreign trade moves within a country. This key, fixed infrastructure will almost certainly prove far more difficult to defend against irregular forces armed with G-RAMM weaponry. Indeed, had Hezbollah’s “RAMM” inventory had only a small fraction of G-RAMM munitions, say 10-20 percent, it would have been able to in􀃀ict far greater damage than it did historically to Israeli population centers, key government facilities, military installations, and essential commercial assets such as ports, air􀂿elds, and industrial complexes. An irregular enemy force armed with G-RAMM capabilities in substantial numbers could seriously threaten Latin American governments as well as any U.S. (or external great power) forces and support elements attempting a traditional intervention operation. Implications for the U.S. and Other Major Powers The preceding narrative suggests that the combat potential of irregular forces is likely to increase dramatically in the coming years. As this occurs, the cost of operating conventional forces—especially ground forces—and defending key military support infrastructure is likely to rise substantially. Given these considerations the United States and other major powers external to the Western Hemisphere will have strong incentives to avoid the use of conventional forms of military power, particularly large ground forces, in favor of employing irregular proxy forces to advance their interests. Moreover, the high cost and questionable bene􀂿t of the campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq are likely to create strong domestic opposition in the United States to such operations for some time to come. This must be added to the United States’ greatly diminished 􀂿scal standing that has led to large cuts in planned investments in defense. These factors suggest that Washington will be much less likely to engage in direct military action in Latin America in the coming years than historically has been the case. At the same time, rivals of the United States like China and Russia may be incentivized by these trends, as well as the United States’ overwhelming military dominance in the Western Hemisphere, to avoid the direct use of force to expand their in􀃀uence in Latin America. Instead, like some of the Bolivarian Alliance members, they appear likely to follow the path taken by the Soviet Union during the Cold War and Iran today: supporting non-state proxies to impose disproportionate costs on the United States and to distract Washington’s resources and attention from other parts of the world. This is not to say that Beijing, Moscow, and Tehran would eschew future opportunities to establish bases in Latin America. As in the past, such bases can support efforts to accomplish several important objectives. They can, for example, further insulate a Latin American regime from the threat of direct U.S. military intervention, since Washington would have to account for the possibility that the conflict would lead to a direct confrontation with a more capable and potentially nuclear-armed power.100 Bases in the hemisphere can also enable external powers to conduct military assistance activities, such as training, more easily. Electronic surveillance of the United States and Latin American states could be accomplished more cheaply and e􀌆ectively from forward positions. Finally, certain kinds of military capabilities, such as long-range ballistic missiles and attack submarines, could be pro􀂿tably stationed in Latin America by powers external to that region, particularly if they intended to create the option of initiating con􀃀ict at some future date. These reasons, among others, have made preventing an extra-hemispheric power from establishing bases in Latin America an enduring U.S. priority. Players in a Latin American Great Game Given current trends, several powers external to the region may, either now or over the coming decade, have both the motive and the means to employ both state and non-state proxies in Latin American to achieve their interests. Principal among them is Iran, which is already engaged in supporting proxies against the United States and its partners in the Middle East and has long been developing proxies in Latin America. Additionally, there are reasons to think that China and Russia may be interested in cultivating and supporting Latin American proxies as well.

### Top – AT: Debris

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

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

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

What is Kessler Syndrome?

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

It is a dark picture.

Is Kessler Syndrome likely to happen?

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

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

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

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

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

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

How bad could Kessler Syndrome in High LEO be?

Let’s imagine a worst case scenario.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### \*\*It takes centuries and adaptation solves

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Top – AT: Space War

#### This is silly – CP solves it, orbital carrying capacity disproves debris internals, using a broader range of frequencies solves, and Perez is about the broader militarization of space which is a total alt cause.

#### No space war – it’s hype and systems are redundant

Johnson-Freese and Hitchens 16 [Dr. Joan Johnson-Freese is a member of the Breaking Defense Board of Contributors, a Professor of National Security Affairs at the Naval War College and author of Space Warfare in the 21st Century: Arming the Heavens. Views expressed are those of the author alone. Theresa Hitchens is a Senior Research Scholar at the Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland (CISSM), and the former Director of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) in Geneva, Switzerland. Stop The Fearmongering Over War In Space: The Sky’s Not Falling, Part 1. December 27, 2016. https://breakingdefense.com/2016/12/stop-the-fearmongering-over-war-in-space-the-skys-not-falling-part-1/]

In the last two years, we’ve seen rising hysteria over a future war in space. Fanning the flames are not only dire assessments from the US military, but also breathless coverage from a cooperative and credulous press. This reporting doesn’t only muddy public debate over whether we really need expensive systems. It could also become a self-fulfilling prophecy. The irony is that nothing makes the currently slim possibility of war in space more likely than fearmongering over the threat of war in space.

Two television programs in the past two years show how egregious this fearmongering can get. In April 2015, the CBS show 60 Minutes ran a segment called “The Battle Above.” In an interview with General John Hyten, the then-chief of U.S. Air Force Space Command, it came across loud and clear that the United States was being forced to prepare for a battle in space — specifically against China — that it really didn’t want.

It was explained by Hyten and other guests that China is building a considerable amount of hardware and accumulating significant know-how regarding space, all threatening to space assets Americans depend on every day. If viewers weren’t frightened after watching the segment, it wasn’t for lack of trying on the part of CBS.

Using terms like “offensive counterspace” as a 1984 NewSpeak euphemism for “weapons,” it was made clear that the United States had no choice but to spend billions of dollars on offensive counterspace technology to not just thwart the Chinese threat, but control and dominate space. While it didn’t actually distort facts — just omit facts about current U.S. space capabilities — the segment was basically a cost-free commercial for the military-industrial complex.

In retrospect though, “The Battle Above” was pretty good compared to CNN’s recent special, War in Space: The Next Battlefield. The latter might as well have been called Sharknado in Space – because the only far-out weapons technology our potential adversaries don’t have, according to the broadcast, seems to be “sharks with frickin’ laser beams attached to their heads!”

First, CNN needs to hire some fact checkers. Saying “unlike its adversaries, the U.S. has not yet weaponized space” is deeply misleading, like saying “unlike his political opponents, President-Elect Donald Trump has not sprouted wings and flown away”: A few (admittedly alarming) weapons tests aside, no country in the world has yet weaponized space. Contrary to CNN, stock market transactions are not timed nor synchronized through GPS, but a closed system. Cruise missiles can find their targets even without GPS, because they have both GPS and precision inertial measurement units onboard, and IMUs don’t rely on satellite data. Oh, and the British rock group Pink Floyd holds the only claim to the Dark Side of the Moon: There is a “far side” of the Moon — the side always turned away from the Earth — but not a “dark side” — which would be a side always turned away from the Sun.

More nefariously, the segment sensationalized nuggets of truth within a barrage of half-truths, backed by a heavy bass, dramatic soundtrack (and gravelly-voiced reporter Jim Sciutto) and accompanied by sexy and scary visuals.

Make no mistake there are dangers in space, and the United States has the most to lose if space assets are lost. The question is how best to protect them. Here are a few facts CNN omitted.

The Reality

The U.S. has all of the technologies described on the CNN segment and deemed potentially offensive: maneuverable satellites, nano-satellites, lasers, jamming capabilities, robotic arms, ballistic missiles that can be used as anti-satellite weapons, etc. In fact, the United States is more technologically advanced than other countries in both military and commercial space.

That technological superiority scares other countries; just as the U.S. military space community is scared of other countries obtaining those technologies in the future. The U.S. military space budget is more than 10 times greater than that of all the countries in the world combined. That also causes other countries concern.

More unsettling still, the United States has long been leery of treaty-based efforts to constrain a potential arms race in outer space, as supported by nearly every other country in the world for decades. Indeed, under the administration of George W. Bush, the U.S. talking points centered on the mantra “there is no arms race in outer space,” so there is no need for diplomat instruments to constrain one. Now, a decade later, the U.S. military – backed by the Intelligence Community which operates the nation’s spy satellites – seems to be shouting to the rooftops that the United States is in danger of losing the space arms race already begun by its potential adversaries. The underlying assumption — a convenient one for advocates of more military spending — is that now there is nothing that diplomacy can do.

However, it must be remembered that most space-related technologies – with the exception of ballistic missiles and dedicated jammers – have both military and civil/commercial uses; both benign — indeed, helpful — and nefarious uses. For example, giving satellites the ability to maneuver on orbit can allow useful inspections of ailing satellites and possibly even repairs.

Further, the United States is not unable to protect its satellites, as repeated during the CNN broadcast by various interviewees and the host. Many U.S. government-owned satellites, including precious spy satellites, have capabilities to maneuver. Many are hardened against electro-magnetic pulse, sport “shutters” to protect optical “eyes” from solar flares and lasers, and use radio frequency hopping to resist jamming.

Offensive weapons, deployed on the ground to attack satellites, or in space, are not a silver bullet. To the contrary, U.S. deployment of such weapons may actually be detrimental to U.S. and international security in space (as we argued in a recent Atlantic Council publication, Towards a New National Security Space Strategy). Further, there are benefits to efforts started by the Obama Administration to find diplomatic tools to restrain and constrain dangerous military activities in space.

These diplomatic efforts, however, would be undercut by a full-out U.S. pursuit of “space dominance.” This includes dialogue with China, the lack of which Gen. William Shelton, retired commander of Air Force Space Command, lamented in the CNN report.

Given CNN’s “cast,” the spin was not surprising. Starting with Ghost Fleet author Peter Singer set the sensationalist tone, which never altered. The apocalyptic opening, inspired by Ghost Fleet, posited a scenario where all U.S. satellites are taken off-line in nearly one fell swoop. Unless we are talking about an alien invasion, that scenario is nigh on impossible. No potential adversary has such capabilities, nor will they ever likely do so. There is just too much redundancy in the system.

### Top – AT: Agriculture

#### GPS is already up there so plan doesn’t ban it, card says imaging software could help food, one billion alt causes to food mentioned in aff ev.

#### \*\*Satellite sensing fails and alternatives fill-in

Joseph Byrum 17, Senior R&D and Strategic Marketing Executive in Life Sciences – Global Product Development, Innovation, and Delivery at Syngenta, “How Remote Sensing Powers Precision Agriculture”, Ag Funder News, 3/14/2017, https://agfundernews.com/remote-sensing-powers-precision-agriculture.html

Remote sensing devices take measurements throughout a field over time so that the grower can analyze conditions based on the data and take action that will have a positive influence on the harvest outcome. For instance, sensors can serve as an early warning system allowing a grower to intervene, early on, to counter disease before it has had a chance to spread widely. They can also perform a simple plant count, evaluate plant health, estimate yield, assess crop loss, manage irrigation, detect weeds, identify crop stress and map a field.

A variety of sensors is available to perform one or more of these tasks. Which one will a grower need? It all depends. A small-scale vegetable farmer will have different needs than a commercial grain farmer managing multiple fields.

Sensor Platforms

Sensors can be grouped according to their enabling technology — ground sensors, aerial sensors and satellite sensors. Ground sensors are handheld, mounted on tractors and combines, or free-standing in a field. Common uses for these include evaluating nutrient levels for more specific chemical and nutrient application, measuring weather, or the moisture content of the soil.

Aerial sensors have become far more affordable with the advent of drone technology that places the bird’s-eye view of a field within reach of most farmers. They are also attached to airplanes, another relatively cheap option. The systems are capable of capturing high-resolution images and data slowly enough, at low altitude, to enable thorough analysis. Typical uses include plant population count, weed detection, yield estimates, measuring chlorophyll content and evaluating soil salinity. The downside of aerial platforms is that wind and cloud cover can limit their use.

Satellite sensors provide coverage of vast land areas and are especially useful for monitoring crops status, calculating losses from severe weather events and conducting yield assessments. Initially, such systems were tailored to the needs of the military and government, not agriculture. So the main downside, aside from cost, was that these systems were tasked in advance — usually months — to look at a specific area at a certain time. Worst of all, cloud cover could ruin that expensive purchase. Now many governments have opened up satellite imaging databases to the public, providing an important and accessible resource for understanding crop conditions.

#### No food wars – the countries that matter their impact are resilient and institutional responses prevent escalation

Cliffe 16 [Sarah Cliffe, Director of the Center on International Cooperation at New York University, 3/29/16, “Food Security, Nutrition, and Peace,” http://cic.nyu.edu/news\_commentary/food-security-nutrition-and-peace

However, current research does not yet indicate a clear link between climate change, food insecurity and conflict, except perhaps where rapidly deteriorating water availability cuts across existing tensions and weak institutions. But a series of interlinked problems – changing global patterns of consumption of energy and scarce resources, increasing demands for food imports (which draw on land, water, and energy inputs) can create pressure on fragile situations. Food security – and food prices – are a highly political issue, being a very immediate and visible source of popular welfare or popular uncertainty. But their link to conflict (and the wider links between climate change and conflict) is indirect rather than direct. What makes some countries more resilient than others? Many countries face food price or natural resource shocks without falling into conflict. Essentially, the two important factors in determining their resilience are: First, whether food insecurity is combined with other stresses – issues such as unemployment, but most fundamentally issues such as political exclusion or human rights abuses. We sometimes read nowadays that the 2006-2009 drought was a factor in the Syrian conflict, by driving rural-urban migration that caused societal stresses. It may of course have been one factor amongst many but it would be too simplistic to suggest that it was the primary driver

of the Syrian conflict. Second, whether countries have strong enough institutions to fulfill a social compact with their citizens, providing help quickly to citizens affected by food insecurity, with or without international assistance. During the 2007-2008 food crisis, developing countries with low institutional strength experienced more food price protests than those with higher institutional strengths, and more than half these protests turned violent. This for example, is the difference in the events in Haiti versus those in Mexico or the Philippines where far greater institutional strength existed to deal with the food price shocks and protests did not spur deteriorating national security or widespread violence.

### Top – AT: Grid

#### Alternatives solve---it’d just make life slightly harder

Bob Hannent 17, BSc (Hons) Media Technology, Southampton Solent University, Technologist and Video Architect, “Can We Make It Without Satellites?”, Quora, 6/29/2017, https://www.quora.com/Can-we-make-it-without-satellites

Can we make it without satellites?

Yes, although it would make life slightly harder.

Weather forecasting relies on satellites these days.

Remote high speed communications from

Ships at sea often use satellites for weather reports, communications and entertainment

Remote oil rigs or processing stations in remote areas use them for communication and entertainment

Islands without fiber optic links such as many Pacific islands

Navigation of ships and aircraft using GPS/GNSS

All pilots and ships are supposed to be able to navigate without GPS

Without satellite communications many communities and groups would be isolated. They would probably be dependent on very slow HF communications or relatively slow and expensive VHF relays.

Navigation on land can be done with ground station beacon navigation perhaps using cell towers and TV/radio transmitters. Navigation at sea near to shore can use the same beacons and longer range ones can give more coverage. Deep sea? You could use some kind of long range positioning or even astronavigation with some compute power and clear skies.

#### Their IL card is one line and gives alt causes, doesn’t establish sufficiency/necessity, etc.

#### Grid collapse won’t happen and no widespread blackouts

Uchill 18 [Joe Uchill, Reporter @ The Hill and writes at Axios, Cyber Expert, “Why "crashing the grid" doesn't keep cyber experts awake at night”, 8/23/18, https://www.axios.com/why-crashing-the-grid-doesnt-keep-cyber-experts-awake-at-night-a40563a5-f266-493d-856a-5c9a5c1383dd.html]

In news stories, TV shows and at least one bestselling non-fiction book, you'll see warnings that hackers are coming to take out the U.S. electric grid, plunging the nation into democracy-ending darkness. An attack on that scale was even raised by leading intelligence officials in an Axios deep dive on global security threats.

Reality check: The people tasked with protecting U.S. electrical infrastructure say the scenario where hackers take down the entire grid — the one that's also the plot of the "Die Hard" movie where Bruce Willis blows up a helicopter by launching a car at it — is not a realistic threat. And focusing on the wrong problem means we’re not focusing on the right ones.

Show less

So, why can't you hack the grid? Here's one big reason: "The thing called the grid does not exist," said a Department of Homeland Security official involved in securing the U.S. power structure.

Think of the grid like the internet. We refer to the collective mess of servers, software, users and equipment that routes internet traffic as "the internet." The internet is a singular noun, but it’s not a singular thing.

You can’t hack the entire internet. There’s so much stuff running independently that all you can hack is individual pieces of the internet.

Similarly, the North American electric grid is actually five interconnected grids that can borrow electricity from each other. And the mini-grids aren't singular things either. Taking down "the grid" would be more like collapsing the thousands of companies that provide and distribute power accross the country.

"When someone talks about 'the grid,' it's usually a red flag they aren't going to know what they are talking about," says Sergio Caltagirone, director of threat intelligence at Dragos, a firm that specializes in industrial cybersecurity including the energy sector.

Redundancy and resilience: Every aspect of the electric system, from the machines in power plants to the grid as a whole, is designed with redundancy in mind. You can’t just break a thing or 10 and expect a prolonged blackout.

On some level, most people already know this. Everyone has lived through blackouts, but no one has lived through a blackout so big it caused the Purge.

'The power system is the most complex machine ever made by humans," said Chris Sistrunk, principle consultant at FireEye in energy cybersecurity. "Setting it up, or hacking it, is more complicated than putting a man on the moon."

An attack that took out power to New York using cyber means would require a nearly prohibitive amount of effort to coordinate, said Lesley Carhart of Dragos. Such a failure would also tip off other regions that there was an attack afoot. Causing a power outage in New York would likely prevent a power outage in Chicago.

There are two real problems with getting this issue wrong:

Unnecessarily scaring people about the threat of terrorism is harmful in itself.

Setting the expectations too high for what an attack looks like can divert attention from more realistic and still pretty devastating attacks on the electric system and blunt the need to prepare for smaller attacks. "You run the risk of desensitizing people of the issue," said Mark Orlando, CTO of Raytheon's cybersecurity practice.

The real threat:

National attacks are unlikely. Small attacks matter more than you'd think.

"People can relate to their freezer stopping working. It's tough to relate to what would happen if oil refineries stopped working," said Mike Spear, global operations director for industrial cyber security at Honeywell.

An industrial plant that lost power by hacking nearby plants and onsight generators, for example, could lose as much as $50,000 a minute. Spears' oil refinery example would not only lose more money, but also impact anyone who drove a car.

Harming Cleveland's economy is less exciting than a nationwide blackout, but it still matters.

What about Russia? Periodically, news stories will cover the Russian malware implanted in industrial networks. One story cautioned that Russia had its "fingers on the switch."

It's no small task to get into industrial networks — most attacks at plants are limited to business networks.

But Russia's aim in hacking electric networks does not appear to be an imminent attack. Rather, experts agree, it's likely a reconnaissance mission for potential future actions.

While the threat here is real, an actual attack is more speculative than is sometimes portrayed.

Russia is the likely culprit behind the only two cyber-related blackouts in history, both launched against the Ukraine. But cybersecurity experts see no evidence that Russia is capable of more than localized attacks.

### Top – AT: Ocean Acidification

#### Imaging doesn’t work unless climate action is taken, and this impact is garbage and nonlinear.

#### \*\*Satellites fail and alternatives fill-in

Dr. Balázs M. Fekete 15, Professor in the Graduate School of Engineering at the City College of New York, PhD from the University of New Hampshire, MSc from the Budapest University of Technology and Economics, et al., “Time For In Situ Renaissance”, Science, August 2015, p. 686

FIDELITY, RESOLUTION, CONSISTENCY. Only in situ sensors, typically in close contact with the monitored medium, can measure a host of water-related quantity and quality parameters and processes ( 6) with reliable accuracy and sufficient frequency. Remote sensing provides indirect measurements normally limited to the near surface of the monitored object and affected by the media between the sensors and the monitored object. Remote-sensing observations are often the result of complex retrieval algorithms. In extreme cases, like satellite-derived evapotranspiration ( 7– 9), the algorithm is almost indistinguishable from land surface hydrology models, such that it is questionable that this qualifies as “observation.”

In situ observations are better suited for gradually changing observational targets, when strategically placed point measurement sensors are representative for larger areas. River discharge in particular is an ideal target for point monitoring because discharge only changes gradually along a river channel (except for confluences) and represents an integrated signal of the hydrological processes from a larger area upstream (1). Unless measurement requires laboratory processing of samples, in situ monitoring can provide observations at high temporal frequency. Many in situ observational records cover multiple decades of continuous data at high temporal resolution. Observation consistency depends on continuous instrument maintenance and recalibration that is often the most expensive part of the monitoring program. Remote sensing that only replaces relatively inexpensive measurements without comparably rigorous calibration will compromise monitoring ( 5).

Satellites are placed either in geostationary orbit, where they can provide continuous observations at low spatial resolution, or in low Earth orbits, which results in low repeat frequencies flying over the same area unless a constellation of satellites is deployed at added expense. It can be difficult to derive continuous (multidecadal) time series from satellite records, because technology changes and space agencies do not pay adequate attention to the homogeneity of observational records. Many satellite platforms (with the exception of meteorological satellites in geostationary orbits) are still in an “experimental” phase without long-term commitment for continued operations. Satellite sensors without adequate backup present a single point of failure leading to abrupt termination of observations.

COST, INNOVATION, ACCESS. Cost comparison of satellite remote sensing versus in situ monitoring is difficult because the final products are rarely comparable. Satellite remote sensing only competes in large-scale or global applications, because it cannot replace in situ monitoring in most cases. Cost comparison should be posed as the additional expense of extending existing in situ monitoring, including incentives for data sharing and aggregating observations, versus operating an independent satellite monitoring infrastructure. A recent World Bank report ( 10) estimated that $1.5 to $2 billion would be necessary to modernize developing countries’ hydrometeorological monitoring infrastructure and an additional $0.4 to $0.5 billion annually for maintenance. These are comparable to the typical $0.3 to $0.6 billion price tag of medium-sized satellite missions.

Telecommunication breakthroughs and their widespread use lower barriers to data transmission. New sensor and deployment technologies are improving performance and cost. Autonomous drone vehicles (aircraft, boats, or submarines) could operate as monitoring platforms, which would blur the distinction between remote sensing and in situ observations. Solar unmanned aerial vehicles may offer cost-effective alternatives to satellites.

#### Marine ecosystems are resilient to everything

Nield 17 [David Nield, freelance journalist who has been writing about technology, science, apps, gadgets and the web since 2002. Extensively citing "Impact of the Late Triassic mass extinction on functional diversity and composition of marine ecosystems," written by Alexander M. Dunhill, William J. Foster, James Sciberras, and Richard J. Twitchett. Marine Ecosystems Can Survive The Worst Mass Extinction Events, Study Shows. October 23, 2017. <https://www.sciencealert.com/marine-ecosystems-cling-on-to-life-through-some-of-the-worst-mass-extinction-events>]

Researchers have studied fossil records from the Late Triassic mass extinction, which happened around 201.3 million years ago, and found that marine life did not fundamentally change, even though the vast proportion of species were killed off.

The international team of researchers says that while marine species were still badly affected by the event, enough life survived underwater to keep the ecosystems functioning. The findings could help us understand more about how the changing climate of today could affect the planet.

"While the Late Triassic mass extinction had a big impact on the overall number of marine species, there was still enough diversity among the remaining species that the marine ecosystem was able to function in the same way it had before," says lead researcher Alex Dunhill from the University of Leeds in the UK.

It's thought that huge volcanic eruptions, and the subsequent warming of the planet caused by the greenhouse gases produced, was behind the Late Triassic extinction event.

At least half the species on Earth at that time were wiped out by the rise in temperatures, and in the event's aftermath, dinosaurs came to dominate life on our planet.

The researchers analysed fossils dated between the Middle Triassic to the Middle Jurassic periods, a time span of around 70 million years, covering life before and after the mass extinction event.

Ocean-dwelling animals were classified by how they moved, where they lived, and how they fed, and the study showed that none of these categories of life completely disappeared after the extinction event.

That said, there were major impacts on different regions and the environment as a whole, and some specific marine ecosystems were badly damaged.

"We're not saying nothing happened," says one of the researchers, palaeontologist William Foster from the University of Texas at Austin. "Rather, global oceans in the extinction's aftermath were a bit like a ship manned by a skeleton crew – all stations were operational, but manned by relatively few species."

The idea of a skeleton crew of lifeforms keeping the lights on in an ecosystem was first raised by Foster and his colleague Richard J. Twitchett in 2014, after another study focussed on the Late Permian mass extinction event about 252 million years ago.

The current study found one of the hardest-hit underwater organisms were corals, and the fossil record shows it took some 20 million years before tropical reef ecosystems recovered from the Late Triassic extinction, even though the ecosystem as a whole carried on functioning.

With corals again under threat from rising temperatures in the modern day, the new research could provide a blueprint for the potential damage we're going to see – and perhaps give us some clues for how to prevent it.

On a more positive note, it shows life underwater is incredibly resilient, and capable of surviving through even the worst times of environmental upheaval on our planet.

### Top – AT: Miscalc

#### Space war answered above. Farley is about purposeful attacks, not debris.

#### No miscalc

Zarybnisky 18 [Eric J. Zarybnisky, MA in National Security Studies from the Naval War College, PhD in Operations Research from the MIT Sloan School of Management, Lt Col, USAF. Celestial Deterrence: Deterring Aggression in the Global Commons of Space. March 28, 2018. <https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1062004.pdf>]

PREVENTING AGGRESSION IN SPACE

While deterrence and the Cold War are strongly linked in the public’s mind through the nuclear standoff between the United States and the Soviet Union, the fundamentals of deterrence date back millennia and deterrence remains relevant. Thucydides alludes to the concept of deterrence in his telling of the Peloponnesian War when he describes rivals seeking advantages, such as recruiting allies, to dissuade an adversary from starting or expanding a conflict.6F 6 Aggression in space was successfully avoided during the Cold War because both sides viewed an attack on military satellites as highly escalatory, and such an action would likely result in general nuclear war.7F 7 In today’s more nuanced world, attacking satellites, including military satellites, does not necessarily result in nuclear war. For instance, foreign countries have used highpowered lasers against American intelligence-gathering satellites8F 8 and the United States has been reluctant to respond, let alone retaliate with nuclear weapons. This shift in policy is a result of the broader use of gray zone operations, to which countries struggle to respond while limiting escalation. Beginning with the fundamentals of deterrence illuminates how it applies to prevention of aggression in space.

### \*\*Top – AT: Ozone

#### Ozone depletion is super slow and incoherent there’s no brink argument or falsifiable data that explains the brink, 50 years of debris proves resilience

#### No ozone impact

**Ridley 14** -- Matthew White Ridley, 5th Viscount Ridley DL FRSL FMedSci, known commonly as Matt Ridley, is a British journalist, businessman and author of popular science books. Since 2013 Ridley has been a Conservative hereditary peer in the House of Lords. “THE OZONE HOLE WAS EXAGGERATED AS A PROBLEM” http://www.rationaloptimist.com/blog/the-ozone-hole-was-exaggerated-as-a-problem.aspx

Serial hyperbole does the environmental movement no favours My recent Times column argued that the alleged healing of the ozone layer is exaggerated, but so was the impact of the ozone hole over Antarctica: The ozone layer is healing. Or so said the news last week. Thanks to a treaty signed in Montreal in 1989 to get rid of refrigerant chemicals called chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), the planet’s stratospheric sunscreen has at last begun thickening again. Planetary disaster has been averted by politics. For reasons I will explain, this news deserves to be taken with a large pinch of salt. You do not have to dig far to find evidence that the ozone hole was never nearly as dangerous as some people said, that it is not necessarily healing yet and that it might not have been caused mainly by CFCs anyway. The timing of the announcement was plainly political: it came on the 25th anniversary of the treaty, and just before a big United Nations climate conference in New York, the aim of which is to push for a climate treaty modelled on the ozone one. Here’s what was actually announced last week, in the words of a Nasa scientist, Paul Newman: “From 2000 to 2013, ozone levels climbed 4 per cent in the key mid-northern latitudes.” That’s a pretty small change and it is in the wrong place. The ozone thinning that worried everybody in the 1980s was over Antarctica. Over northern latitudes, ozone concentration has been falling by about 4 per cent each March before recovering. Over Antarctica, since 1980, the ozone concentration has fallen by 40 or 50 per cent each September before the sun rebuilds it. So what’s happening to the Antarctic ozone hole? Thanks to a diligent blogger named Anthony Watts, I came across a press release also from Nasa about nine months ago, which said: “ Two new studies show that signs of recovery are not yet present, and that temperature and winds are still driving any annual changes in ozone hole size.” As recently as 2006, Nasa announced, quoting Paul Newman again, that the Antarctic ozone hole that year was “the largest ever recorded”. The following year a paper in Nature magazine from Markus Rex, a German scientist, presented new evidence that suggested CFCs may be responsible for less than 40 per cent of ozone destruction anyway. Besides, nobody knows for sure how big the ozone hole was each spring before CFCs were invented. All we know is that it varies from year to year. How much damage did the ozone hole ever threaten to do anyway? It is fascinating to go back and read what the usual hyperventilating eco-exaggerators said about ozone thinning in the 1980s. As a result of the extra ultraviolet light coming through the Antarctic ozone hole, southernmost parts of Patagonia and New Zealand see about 12 per cent more UV light than expected. This means that the weak September sunshine, though it feels much the same, has the power to cause sunburn more like that of latitudes a few hundred miles north. Hardly Armageddon. The New York Times reported “an increase in Twilight Zone-type reports of sheep and rabbits with cataracts” in southern Chile. Not to be outdone, Al Gore wrote that “hunters now report finding blind rabbits; fisherman catch blind salmon”. Zoologists briefly blamed the near extinction of many amphibian species on thin ozone. Melanoma in people was also said to be on the rise as a result. This was nonsense. Frogs were dying out because of a fungal disease spread from Africa — nothing to do with ozone. Rabbits and fish blinded by a little extra sunlight proved to be as mythical as unicorns. An eye disease in Chilean sheep was happening outside the ozone-depleted zone and was caused by an infection called pinkeye — nothing to do with UV light. And melanoma incidence in people actually levelled out during the period when the ozone got thinner. Then remember that the ozone hole appears when the sky is dark all day, and over an uninhabited continent. Even if it persists into the Antarctic spring and spills north briefly, the hole allows 50 times less ultraviolet light through than would hit your skin at the equator at sea level (let alone at a high altitude) in the tropics. So it would be bonkers to worry about UV as you sailed round Cape Horn in spring, say, but not when you stopped at the Galapagos: the skin cancer risk is 50 times higher in the latter place. This kind of eco-exaggeration has been going on for 50 years. In the 1960s Rachel Carson said there was an epidemic of childhood cancer caused by DDT; it was not true — DDT had environmental effects but did not cause human cancers.