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### DA 1

#### CP: The appropriation of outer space by private entities for space colonization is unjust.

#### Commercial asteroid mining is coming now – lower costs and improving tech make it economically viable – and the legal basis is already in place in multiple countries– that helps acquire water for rocket fuel and rare earth metals

Gilbert, PhD student in space resources at the Colorado School of Mines, writes in 21 alex gilbert, is a complex systems researcher and a PhD student in space resources at the Colorado School of Mines. "Mining in Space Is Coming." Milken Institute Review, April 26, 2021, [www.milkenreview.org/articles/mining-in-space-is-coming](http://www.milkenreview.org/articles/mining-in-space-is-coming). [Quality Control]

Space exploration is back. after decades of disappointment, a combination of better technology, falling costs and a rush of competitive energy from the private sector has put space travel front and center. indeed, many analysts (even some with their feet on the ground) believe that commercial developments in the space industry may be on the cusp of starting the largest resource rush in history: mining on the Moon, Mars and asteroids.

While this may sound fantastical, some baby steps toward the goal have already been taken. Last year, NASA awarded contracts to four companies to extract small amounts of lunar regolith by 2024, effectively beginning the era of commercial space mining. Whether this proves to be the dawn of a gigantic adjunct to mining on earth — and more immediately, a key to unlocking cost-effective space travel — will turn on the answers to a host of questions ranging from what resources can be efficiently.

As every fan of science fiction knows, the resources of the solar system appear virtually unlimited compared to those on Earth. There are whole other planets, dozens of moons, thousands of massive asteroids and millions of small ones that doubtless contain humungous quantities of materials that are scarce and very valuable (back on Earth). Visionaries including Jeff Bezos imagine heavy industry moving to space and Earth becoming a residential area. However, as entrepreneurs look to harness the riches beyond the atmosphere, access to space resources remains tangled in the realities of economics and governance.

Start with the fact that space belongs to no country, complicating traditional methods of resource allocation, property rights and trade. With limited demand for materials in space itself and the need for huge amounts of energy to return materials to Earth, creating a viable industry will turn on major advances in technology, finance and business models.

That said, there’s no grass growing under potential pioneers’ feet. Potential economic, scientific and even security benefits underlie an emerging geopolitical competition to pursue space mining. The United States is rapidly emerging as a front-runner, in part due to its ambitious Artemis Program to lead a multinational consortium back to the Moon. But it is also a leader in creating a legal infrastructure for mineral exploitation. The United States has adopted the world’s first spaceresources law, recognizing the property rights of private companies and individuals to materials gathered in space.

However, the United States is hardly alone. Luxembourg and the United Arab Emirates (you read those right) are racing to codify space-resources laws of their own, hoping to attract investment to their entrepot nations with business-friendly legal frameworks. China reportedly views space-resource development as a national priority, part of a strategy to challenge U.S. economic and security primacy in space. Meanwhile, Russia, Japan, India and the European Space Agency all harbor space-mining ambitions of their own. Governing these emerging interests is an outdated treaty framework from the Cold War. Sooner rather than later, we’ll need new agreements to facilitate private investment and ensure international cooperation.

What’s Out There

Back up for a moment. For the record, space is already being heavily exploited, because space resources include non-material assets such as orbital locations and abundant sunlight that enable satellites to provide services to Earth. Indeed, satellite-based telecommunications and global positioning systems have become indispensable infrastructure underpinning the modern economy. Mining space for materials, of course, is another matter.

In the past several decades, planetary science has confirmed what has long been suspected: celestial bodies are potential sources for dozens of natural materials that, in the right time and place, are incredibly valuable. Of these, water may be the most attractive in the near-term, because — with assistance from solar energy or nuclear fission — H2O can be split into hydrogen and oxygen to make rocket propellant, facilitating in-space refueling. So-called “rare earth” metals are also potential targets of asteroid miners intending to service Earth markets. Consisting of 17 elements, including lanthanum, neodymium, and yttrium, these critical materials (most of which are today mined in China at great environmental cost) are required for electronics. And they loom as bottlenecks in making the transition from fossil fuels to renewables backed up by battery storage.

#### However, the legal framework that strikes the best balance of providing economic incentives for mining while preventing unbeneficial land claims requires a doctrine of appropriation – the plan prevents that

Meyers 15 Meyers, Ross. J.D. candidate at the University of Oregon Law School. "The doctrine of appropriation and asteroid mining: incentivizing the private exploration and development of outer space." Or. Rev. Int'l L. 17 (2015): 183. Italics in original. [Quality Control]

The doctrine of appropriation is a reasonable rule for adjudicating asteroid claims, and it could easily be modified to apply to asteroid mining. In the context of water rights, the doctrine of appropriation requires that the claimant be a landowner in order to claim the right to use a water source. It does not make sense, however, for the international community to grant complete ownership over asteroids toa single entity, so the landowner requirement of the rule should be removed. A similar modification would need to be made to the "beneficial use" language of the doctrine.

In the context of water rights, an appropriator obtains rights only to water that he or she can reasonably put to beneficial use. The metals contained in asteroids have a high level of marketability. For that reason, a mining entity could potentially put any amount of obtained metal to beneficial use, in the sense that the resources can be sold. This, however, would defeat the purpose of the rule, which is to limit such unreasonable claims. To ameliorate this problem, the doctrine of appropriation could be modified to define "beneficial use "constructively by providing that beneficial use is assumed for any resources that have been removed from the asteroid that the mining entity can reasonably hope to transport to market in a return journey. With the astronomical cost of undertaking a trip to such an asteroid, this modification would limit mining entities to only what they can carry back, thereby leaving the untapped resources available to other entities capable of making the same trip. Considering the size and profitability of metal deposits on asteroids, this modification to the doctrine of appropriation would not be overly burdensome to corporate interests. At the same time, it would satisfy the economic imperative of promoting the rapid development of asteroid resources.

By changing the landowner requirement, and qualifying the “beneficial use" language, the doctrine of appropriation would be essentially ready for application to asteroid mining claims. The only other changes necessary would be some additional requirements that are common to other space related provisions, like those found in the Outer Space Treaty of 1968. For example, a reporting requirement or clause guaranteeing asylum for other astronauts. A functional rule might read something like this:

*State parties or private entities may, upon actual possession, lay claim to natural resources found on or below the surface of asteroids. Rights to appropriate are given in order of seniority, starting with the first party to land on the surface of the asteroid and establish control over the resources, be it water, methane, metal, or any other beneficial substances. A party will be said to have established control over a resource once he has mined the substance and removed it from the asteroid. A senior appropriator may use as much of the asteroid's resources as he can take from the asteroid and put to beneficial use, and may continue to enlarge his share until another junior appropriator begins to appropriate resources from source for beneficial use. For the purposes of this Agreement, "beneficial use “refers to the amount of resources that an appropriator has removed from the asteroid that the actor may reasonably hope to bring home in a return voyage. Resources in excess of what an appropriator can reasonably hope to transport to market in a single voyage do not qualify as having a beneficial use, and are therefore not yet claimed. This means that the extraction of metal from an asteroid does not serve to provide ownership if the appropriator plans on letting the resources languish until another voyage is undertaken to secure the resources and bring them back to Earth. Junior appropriators receive rights in the source of resources (the asteroid) as they find it, and may prevent the senior appropriator from enlarging his share to the junior appropriator’s detriment under a no-injury rule. No state party will attempt to hinder other parties from landing on or using the asteroid, and parties will assist other entities on an asteroid, should they need emergency assistance. Mining claims on asteroids will be reported to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and state parties agree to release the location of the asteroid, and any scientific findings to the United Nations, the general public, and the scientific community. In the event that the asteroid is on a collision course with any other celestial body, all state parties agree to follow the course of action suggested by the United Nations. Should the United Nations decide the asteroid must be destroyed, no state party may claim liability for resources contained within the asteroid, but not yet captured. This provision applies only to asteroids as classified by the scientific community, and does not apply to planets, comets, meteorites, or any other celestial body not mentioned.*

There is no doubt that asteroids may be extremely beneficial to mankind, both as a source of resources and as a jumping-off point to far off locations in space. The human-race has progressed scientifically and technologically to the point that space travel is within commercial reach, and the need for new international laws governing the ownership of space has never been more apparent. The Outer Space Treaty of 1968made great strides in developing rational rules for space and many of its provisions should be maintained in their original form. However, by allowing ownership of asteroids under the doctrine of appropriation, the international community can incentivize the exploration and development of space in a way that reflects the needs of society in general, without vesting an absolute monopoly in a single entity. The doctrine of appropriation helped drive American westward expansion, and its application to space mining would help drive the human race in its expansion into the space, the final frontier.

#### Asteroid mining offsets terrestrial growth that ruins the environment and enables solar power satellites – both solve climate change

Taylor 19 Chris Taylor is a veteran journalist. Previously senior news writer for Time.com a year later. In 2000, he was named San Francisco bureau chief for Time magazine. He has served as senior editor for Business 2.0, West Coast editor for Fortune Small Business and West Coast web editor for Fast Company. Chris is a graduate of Merton College, Oxford and the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism. "How asteroid mining will save the Earth — and mint trillionaires." Mashable, 2019, mashable.com/feature/asteroid-mining-space-economy. [Quality Control]

The mission is essential, Joyce declares, to save Earth from its major problems. First of all, the fictional billionaire wheels in a fictional Nobel economist to demonstrate the actual truth that the entire global economy is sitting on a mountain of debt. It has to keep growing or it will implode, so we might as well take the majority of the industrial growth off-world where it can’t do any more harm to the biosphere.

Secondly, there’s the climate change fix. Suarez sees asteroid mining as the only way we’re going to build solar power satellites. Which, as you probably know, is a form of uninterrupted solar power collection that is theoretically more effective, inch for inch, than any solar panels on Earth at high noon, but operating 24/7. (In space, basically, it’s always double high noon).

The power collected is beamed back to large receptors on Earth with large, low-power microwaves, which researchers think will be harmless enough to let humans and animals pass through the beam. A space solar power array like the one China is said to be working on could reliably supply 2,000 gigawatts — or over 1,000 times more power than the largest solar farm currently in existence.

“We're looking at a 20-year window to completely replace human civilization's power infrastructure,” Suarez told me, citing the report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change on the coming catastrophe. Solar satellite technology “has existed since the 1970s. What we were missing is millions of tons of construction materials in orbit. Asteroid mining can place it there.”

The Earth-centric early 21st century can’t really wrap its brain around this, but the idea is not to bring all that building material and precious metals down into our gravity well. Far better to create a whole new commodities exchange in space. You mine the useful stuff of asteroids both near to Earth and far, thousands of them taking less energy to reach than the moon. That’s something else we’re still grasping, how relatively easy it is to ship stuff in zero-G environments.

### DA 2

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

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

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

#### Short innovation cycles mean every contract counts

John J. Klein 19, Senior Fellow and Strategist at Falcon Research Inc. and adjunct professor at the George Washington University Space Policy Institute, 1-15-2019, "Rethinking Requirements and Risk in the New Space Age," Center for a New American Security, https://www.cnas.org/publications/reports/rethinking-requirements-and-risk-in-the-new-space-age

Unfortunately, these variances in models between the MDAP’s lengthy development cycle and the commercial space sector’s 18-month innovation cycle are a result of stark differences in thinking about requirements and risk. Requirements and risk for MDAPs commonly focus on ensuring critical mission capabilities at a given cost. In contrast, the commercial space sector tends to focus more on providing innovation quickly using economies of scale. The commercial sector understands that time dynamically shapes decisions related to requirements and risk because of the relatively short innovation cycle. In a highly competitive space sector with tight profit margins, those unable to innovate quickly will likely be out of business soon. Alternatively, space systems with mission assurance requirements – where failures are detrimental to national security and military operations – often drive DoD’s timelines. Program managers of critical national security space systems commonly require additional time to test and verify that satellites can perform missions with a very low probability of failure.

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

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

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

### DA 3

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Local Catastrophes and Global Repercussions

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

Political Catalysts

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

Defensive Measures and Strategic Adjustments

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

Stoic Resilience

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

Heroic Relief

Increased resilience must be matched with enhanced capabilities for effective relief. Improving the scale and effectiveness of assistance to the victims of disasters is an essential priority not only for limiting immediate effects but also for containing political fallout.

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

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

### Case

#### Alternative to cap causes backlash, fails to resolve environmental challenges, and causes chaos – growth solves.

Karlsson 21 – (Rasmus, "Learning in the Anthropocene" Soc. Sci. 10, no. 6: 233. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci10060233> 18 June 2021)// gcd

Unpacking this argument, it is perhaps useful to first recognize that, stable as the Holocene may have seemed from a human perspective, life was always vulnerable to a number of cosmic risks, such as bolide collisions, risks that only advanced technologies can mitigate. Similarly, the Black Death of the 14th century should serve as a powerful reminder of the extreme vulnerability of pre-industrial societies at a microbiological level. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to think of the Holocene as providing a relatively stable baseline against which the ecological effects of technological interventions could hypothetically be evaluated. With most human activities being distinctively local, nature would for the most part “bounce back” (even if the deforestation of the Mediterranean basin during the Roman period is an example of that not always being the case) while larger geophysical processes, such as the carbon cycle, remained entirely beyond human intentional control. Even if there has been some debate about what influence human activities had on the preindustrial climate (Ruddiman 2007), anthropogenic forcing was in any case both marginal and gradual. All this changed with the onset of the Great Acceleration by which humans came to overwhelm the great forces of nature, causing untold damage to fragile ecosystems and habitats everywhere, forever altering the trajectory of life on the planet (Steffen et al. 2011b). In a grander perspective, humanity may one day become an interplanetary species and thus instrumental in safeguarding the long-term existence of biological life, but for the moment, its impact is ethically dubious at best as the glaciers melt, the oceans fill up with plastics, and vast number of species are driven to extinction. Faced with these grim realities, it is of course not surprising that the first impulse is to seek to restore some kind primordial harmony and restrain human activities. Yet, it is important to acknowledge that, even if their aggregate impact may have been within the pattern of Holocene variability, pre-modern Western agricultural societies were hardly “sustainable” in any meaningful sense. Experiencing permanent scarcity, violent conflict was endemic (Gat 2013), and as much as some contemporary academics like to attribute all evils to “capitalism” (Malm 2016), pre-capitalist societies exhibited no shortage of religious intolerance and other forms of social domination. It is thus not surprising that some have argued the need to reverse the civilizational arc further yet and return to a preliterate hunter-gather existence (Zerzan 2008) even if this, obviously, has very little to do with existing political realities and social formations. Under Holocene conditions, the short-term human tragedy may have been the same, but it did not undermine the long-term ability of the planet to support life. In a world of eight billion people, already accumulated emissions in the atmosphere have committed the planet to significant warming under the coming centuries, with an increasing probability that committed warming already exceeds the 1.5-degree target of the Paris Agreement even if all fossil-fuel emissions were to stop today (Mauritsen and Pincus 2017). This means that sustained negative emissions, presumably in combination with SRM, will most likely be needed just to stabilize global temperatures, not to mentioning countering the flow of future emissions. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), assuming that all the pledges submitted under the Paris Agreement are fulfilled, limiting warming to 1.5 degrees will still require negative emissions in the range of 100—1000 gigatons of CO2 (Hilaire et al. 2019, p. 190). The removal of carbon dioxide at gigaton scales from the atmosphere will presumably require the existence of an advanced industrial society since low-tech options, such as afforestation, will be of limited use (Gundersen et al. 2021; Seddon et al. 2020), especially in a future of competing land-uses. It is against this backdrop of worsening climate harms that the limits of “precaution”, at least as conventionally understood, become apparent. While degrowth advocates tend to insist that behavioral change, even explicitly betting on a “social miracle” (Kallis 2019, p. 195), is always preferable to any technological risk-taking (Heikkurinen 2018), that overlooks both the scope of the sustainability challenge and the lack of public consent to any sufficiently radical political project (Buch-Hansen 2018). While there may be growing willingness to pay for, say, an electric vehicle (Hulshof and Mulder 2020), giving up private automobile use altogether is obviously a different animal, to say nothing about a more fundamental rematerialization of the economy (Hausknost 2020). Again, the problem is one in which change either (a) remains marginal yet ecologically insufficient or (b) becomes sufficiently radical yet provokes a strong political counterreaction. A similar dynamic can be expected to play out at the international level where countries that remain committed to growth would quickly gain a military advantage. To make matters worse, there is also a temporal element to this dynamic since any regime of frugality and localism would have to be policed indefinitely in order to prevent new unsustainable patterns of development from re-emerging later on. All this begs the obvious question, if the political and economic enforcement of the planetary boundaries are fraught with such political and social difficulties, would it not be better to instead try to transcend them through technological innovation? Surprisingly, any high-energy future would most likely be subject to many of the same motivational and psychological constraints that hinder a low-energy future. While history shows that existing nuclear technologies could in theory displace all fossil fuels and meet the most stringent climate targets (Qvist and Brook 2015), it seems extremely unlikely, to put it mildly, that thousands of new reactors will be built over the course of the coming decades in response to climate change. Outside the world of abstract computer modelling, real world psychological and cultural inertia tends to ensure that political decision-making, at least for the most part, gravitates to what is considered “reasonable” and “common sense”—such as medium emissions electricity grids in which wind and solar are backed by biomass and gas—rather than what any utilitarian optimization scenario may suggest. Even if the global benefits of climate stabilization would be immense, the standards by which local nuclear risks are assessed, as clearly illustrated by the Fukushima accident which led to a worldwide retreat from nuclear energy despite only causing one confirmed death (which, though obviously regrettable, has to be put in relation to the hundred and thousands of people dying every year from the use of fossil fuels), underscores the uneven distribution of perceived local risks versus global benefits and the associated problem of socio-political learning across spatial scales. Almost two decades ago, Ingolfur Blühdorn identified “simulative eco-politics” as a key strategy by which liberal democracies reconcile an ever-heightened rhetoric of environmental crisis with their simultaneous defense of the core principles of consumer capitalism (Blühdorn 2007). Since then, declarations that we only have “ten years to save the planet” have proliferated, and so have seemingly bold investments in renewable energy, most recently in the form of US President Joseph Biden’s USD 2.25 trillion climate and infrastructure plan. Still, without a meaningful commitment to either radical innovation or effective degrowth, it is difficult to see how the deployment of yet more wind turbines or the building of new highways will in any way be qualitatively different from what Blühdorn pertinently described as sustaining “what is known to be unsustainable” (Blühdorn 2007, p. 253). However, all is not lost in lieu of more authentic forms of eco-politics. Independent of political interventions, accelerating technological change, in particular with regard to computing and intelligent machine labor, may one day make large-scale precision manipulation of the physical world possible in ways that may solve many problems that today seem intractable (Dorr 2016). Similarly, breakthroughs in synthetic biology may hold the key to environmentally benign biofuels and carbon utilization technologies. Yet, all such progress remains hypothetical and uncertain for now. Given what is at stake, there is an obvious danger in submitting to naïve technological optimism. What is less commonly recognized is that naïve optimism with regard to the prospects of behavioral change may be equally dangerous. While late-capitalist affluence has enabled many postmaterial identities and behaviors, such as bicycling, hobby farming, and other forms of emancipatory self-expression, a collapsing economy could quickly lead to a reversal back to survivalist values, traditional hierarchical forms of domination, and violence (Quilley 2011, p. 77). As such, it is far from obvious what actions would actually take the world as a whole closer to long-term sustainability. If sustainability could be achieved by a relatively modest reduction in consumption rates or behavioral changes, such as a ban on all leisure flights, then there would be a strong moral case for embracing degrowth. Yet, recognizing how farreaching measures in terms of population control and consumption restrictions that would be needed, the case quickly becomes more ambiguous. While traditional environmentalism may suggest that retreating from the global economy and adopting a low-tech lifestyle would increase resilience (Alexander and Yacoumis 2018), it may do very much the opposite by further fragmenting global efforts and slowing the pace of technological innovation. Without an orderly and functioning world trade system, local resources scarcities would be exacerbated, as seen most recently with the different disruptions to vaccine supply chains. In essence, given the lack of a stable Holocene baseline to revert to, it becomes more difficult to distinguish proactionary “risk-taking” from “precaution”, especially as many ecosystems have already been damaged beyond natural recovery. In this context, it is noteworthy that many of the technologies that can be expected to be most crucial for managing a period of prolonged overshoot (such as next-generation nuclear, engineering biology, large-scale carbon capture and SRM) are also ones that traditional environmentalism is most strongly opposed to. 3. Finding Indicators From the vantage point of the far-future, at least the kind depicted in the fictional universe of Star Trek, human evolution is a fairly straightforward affair along an Enlightenment trajectory by which ever greater instrumental capacity is matched by similar leaps in psychological maturity and expanding circles of moral concern. With the risk of sounding Panglossian, one may argue that the waning of interstate war in general and the fact that there has not been any major nuclear exchange in particular, does vindicate such an optimistic reading of history. While there will always be ups and downs, as long as the most disastrous outcomes are avoided, there will still be room for learning and gradual political accommodation. Taking such a longer view, it would nevertheless be strange if development was simply linear, that former oppressors would just accept moral responsibility or that calls for gender or racial justice would not lead to self-reinforcing cycles of conservative backlash and increasingly polarizing claims. Still, over the last couple of centuries, there is little doubt that human civilization has advanced significantly, both technologically and ethically (Pinker 2011), at least from a liberal and secular perspective. However, unless one subscribes to teleology, there is nothing inexorable with this development and, it may be that the ecological, social, and political obstacles are simply too great to ever allow for the creation of a Wellsian borderless world (Pedersen 2015) that would allow everyone to live a life free from material want and political domination. On the other hand, much environmental discourse tends to rush ahead in the opposite direction and treat the c limate crisis as ultimate evidence of humanity’s fallen nature when the counter-factual case, that it would be possible for a technological civilization to emerge without at some point endangering its biophysical foundations, would presumably be much less plausible. From an astrobiological perspective, it is easy to imagine how the atmospheric chemistry of a different planet would be more volatile and thus more vulnerable to the effects of industrial processes (Haqq-Misra and Baum 2009), leaving a shorter time window for mitigation. Nick Bostrom has explored this possibility of greater climate sensitivity further in his “vulnerable world hypothesis” (Bostrom 2019) and it begs to reason that mitigation efforts would be more focused in such a world. However, since climate response times are longer and sensitivity less pronounced, climate mitigation policies have become mired in culture and media politics (Newman et al. 2018) but also a statist logic (Karlsson 2018) by which it has become more important for states to focus on their own marginal emission reductions in the present rather than asking what technologies would be needed to stabilize the climate in a future where all people can live a modern life.

#### Capitalism causes dematerialization which solves sustainability questions

Zitelmann 21 – studied history and political sciences, graduating with a doctorate “summa cum laude” in 1986. His dissertation was published in both German and English: Hitler. The Policies of Seduction. Rainer Zitelmann began his career lecturing history at the Freie Universität Berlin from 1987 to 1992. He then became chief editor at one of the leading and most prestigious publishing houses in Germany, Ullstein-Propyläen. He followed this with the role of section editor at the major German daily newspaper “Die Welt”, which he held until 2000. (Rainer, "Consumption Presumption: Are Human Beings Destroying the World?," National Interest, 2-12-2021, https://nationalinterest.org/feature/consumption-presumption-are-human-beings-destroying-world-178114, Accessed 3-8-2021, )

Some people claim that we need to cut our consumption or there will be no hope for the planet. Such claims are based on the thesis that continued growth increases the rate at which the earth’s finite resources are consumed and, moreover, leads to irreversible climate change. And such warnings are by no means new. In 1970, for instance, the Club of Rome attracted a great deal of attention with the publication of The Limits to Growth. A Report for the Club of Rome’s Project on the Predicament of Mankind, which has to date sold more than thirty million copies in thirty languages. The book warned people to change their ways and had a clear message: the world’s raw materials, and in particular, oil would soon be used up. In twenty years, the scientists predicted, we would have used the very last drop of oil. Of course, the Club of Rome’s models for the depletion of oil—and almost all other major raw materials—were wrong. According to the scenarios presented in The Limits to Growth, we should now be living on a planet that has been devoid of natural gas, copper, lead, aluminum and tungsten for decades. And we were supposed to have run out of silver in 1985. Despite the bleak forecasts, as of January 2020, the United States Geological Survey estimated silver reserves worldwide at 560,000 tons. Employing an extensive array of data, the American scientist Andrew McAfee proves in his book More from Less that economic growth is no longer coupled to the consumption of raw materials. Data for the United States, for example, show that of seventy-two resources, from aluminum to zinc, only six are not yet post-peak. Nevertheless, despite the fact that the U.S. economy has grown strongly in recent years, consumption of many commodities is actually decreasing. Back in 2015, the American environmental scientist Jesse Ausubel wrote an essay, “The Return of Nature: How Technology Liberates the Environment,” showing that Americans are consuming fewer and fewer raw materials per capita. Total consumption of steel, copper, fertilizer, wood and paper, which had previously always risen in line with economic growth, had plateaued and was now in constant decline. Such across-the-board reductions in natural resource consumption are only possible because of much-maligned capitalism: companies are constantly developing more efficient production methods and reducing the amount of raw materials they consume. Of course, they are not doing this primarily to protect the environment but to cut costs. What's more, a constant stream of innovations has promoted the trend of miniaturization or dematerialization. Just think of your smartphone. How many devices has your smartphone replaced and how many raw materials did they use to consume? Nowadays, many people no longer have a fax machine or street atlas because they have everything they need on their smartphone. Some even use their phones instead of a wristwatch. You used to need four separate microphones in your telephone, cassette recorder, Dictaphone and video camera, today you just need one—in your smartphone. The finite nature of the world’s natural resources is one argument against growth, climate change is another. Let’s take China as an example: China currently emits more CO2 than any other country in the world and is building a number of new nuclear power plants in order to achieve carbon neutrality by 2060. With the new build program well underway, China’s first new-generation nuclear power plant recently went into operation. In the very near future, China intends to start exporting power plants. The latest generation of nuclear power plants is much safer than earlier models—and can play a pivotal role in the fight against climate change. In the United States, Joe Biden is already evaluating the advantages of small modular reactor (SMR) nuclear power plants. As the name suggests, SMRs are smaller than traditional nuclear fission reactors and offer a maximum capacity of three hundred megawatts. In the United Kingdom, for example, a consortium led by Rolls-Royce has announced plans to build up to sixteen SMR power plants. So far, two reactors of this type are in operation, both onboard the floating nuclear power plant “Akademik Lomonosov, which supplies heat and electricity to the Siberian city of Pevec and its one hundred thousand inhabitants. Anticapitalists blame capitalism for resource consumption and climate change. But political decisions—such as Germany’s decision to phase out nuclear energy—frequently have a negative impact on climate change. Telling people to cut their consumption must seem like pure mockery to the hundreds of millions of people around the world who are still living in extreme poverty. What they need is more capitalism and economic growth. Just like in China, where the number of people living in extreme poverty has fallen from 88 percent in 1981 to less than 1 percent today. Andrew McAfee’s book has an optimistic message about how we don't have to turn back the clocks and cut our consumption: capitalism and technological progress are allowing us to steward the world’s resources, rather than stripping them bare.

#### Alt cannot solve warming.

Book 21 – writer, researcher and editor on all things money, finance and financial history. He holds a masters degree from the University of Oxford and has been a visiting scholar at the American Institute for Economic Research in 2018 and 2019. His works can be found at joakimbook.com and on the blog Life of an Econ Student. (Joakim, ""Sustainability" Misses the Point by Joakim Book," Capitalism Magazine, 2-10-2021, https://www.capitalismmagazine.com/2021/02/sustainability-misses-the-point/, Accessed 3-5-2021, )

The thing is, climate gases (primarily CO2) linger in the atmosphere for a very long time: the vast majority of these gases were emitted by people who are already dead and couldn’t have known the impact of their actions. Even if by waving a wand we could cease CO2 emissions tomorrow, grand changes to a number of climate indicators (sea level, glacier melts, temperature rise) are already baked into the system. Unless we figure out a cost-effective way to remove CO2 from the atmosphere (which we are and should be doing), the only way to prevent harm to other humans is to ensure that they have the same revolutionary access to protective measures that I have in mid-winter. How is it that I have those? Growth, trade, economic well-being and yes, fossil fuels are the best protection we have from a nature that isn’t nice – so in the name of sustainability, let’s have more of those things.

#### Private companies turns debris

Erwin 22 - <https://spacenews.com/space-debris-expert-warns-u-s-woefully-behind-in-efforts-to-clean-up-junk-in-orbit/>

WASHINGTON — The United States is a space superpower but is not doing as much as other nations to solve the problem of [orbital debris](https://spacenews.com/op-ed-damage-to-canadarm2-on-iss-once-again-highlights-space-debris-problem/), an industry expert said Jan. 6.

Darren McKnight, senior technical fellow at LeoLabs and member of the International Academy of Astronautics’ Space Debris Committee, said [initiatives by the U.S. Space Force](https://spacenews.com/space-force-wants-to-help-fund-technologies-to-recycle-reuse-or-remove-space-debris/) to fund debris cleanup technologies are laudable but not nearly enough to address what is becoming a serious threat to the space business.

[LeoLabs](https://spacenews.com/leolabs-on-asat-debris/) is a private company based in California that uses ground-based radars to monitor low Earth orbit.

“I love the fact that that Space Force said ‘yes, we’re concerned about picking up debris.’ But I will tell you the U.S. is woefully behind the rest of the world in this area,” McKnight said on a webcast hosted by the University of Washington Space Policy and Research Center.

Unlike other countries, the United States is tackling the debris issue as a long-term problem that is decades away, he said. In reality, the risk of satellites colliding with debris objects — and debris-on-debris collisions that create even more space junk — is increasing rapidly and could soon begin to impact the industry’s ability to operate satellites reliably.

“It’s embarrassing to me hearing people talk about the need for active debris removal and the need for debris mediation as if it’s something that’s going to be decades out,” said McKnight. “The European Space Agency and Japan’s space agency are way ahead on those sorts of things.”

The European Space Agency awarded [ClearSpace](https://www.space.com/esa-startup-clearspace-debris-removal-2025) a $104 million contract to launch a mission to remove a debris object from orbit in 2025. The Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency (JAXA) selected Astroscale to send a spacecraft into orbit in 2023 to inspect a discarded rocket upper stage, a step that would pave the way for a debris-removal mission.  Astroscale also signed an [agreement with New Zealand](https://spacenews.com/astroscale-and-new-zealand-to-partner-on-space-sustainability-projects/) to study advanced concepts for orbital debris removal. And it won a contract from the [U.K. Space Agency](https://spacenews.com/uk-funds-studies-to-remove-two-spacecraft-from-leo/) to study the removal of two defunct satellites from low Earth orbit by 2025.

“You don’t have any of these companies in the U.S. doing things right now because it’s sort of seen as something we can worry about decades later. We need to worry about it now,” said McKnight.

Active satellites not the main concern

In the United States, the focus of space traffic management are operational satellites and making sure they don’t collide with each other or get hit by debris, said McKnight. But not enough attention is paid to debris management, he added.

Dead payloads, abandoned rocket bodies or pieces of fragmentation debris are flying out of control and likely to collide, McKnight said. “Two-thirds of the debris generating potential in low Earth orbit does not come from space traffic management. It comes from space debris management, it comes from preventing big, dead things from hitting other big dead things.”

Sometimes remediation doesn’t mean removing, but just making sure it doesn’t collide, he said. Some rocket bodies orbiting the Earth are huge, weighing about 9,000 kilograms. “They’re big yellow school buses without brakes and without a driver,” said McKnight. “There isn’t a single company right now that is planning to bring down a 9,000-kilogram object.” An option in this case would be to “nudge it out of the way.”

Some of the scariest altitudes in low Earth orbit are from 750 to 850 kilometers where there are numerous Russian, Chinese and U.S. dead satellites that have been abandoned over several decades. “This is a uniquely ironic, collaborative effort by the three major spacefaring countries to muck up this altitude significantly,” said McKnight. All three nations “had done a great job of cooperating on messing up a very important part of low Earth orbit.”

Another problematic altitude is between 1,400 to 1,500 kilometers where there is not enough atmospheric drag to help bring down debris. At 500 to 600 kilometers, atmosphere drag will wash out debris even if it takes 10 to 20 years.  “At 1,400 kilometers, it’s there for centuries.”

When people talk about the potentially catastrophic effects of debris they think of the Kessler syndrome, or a cascade of collisions in LEO caused by the density of debris. That may be way into the future, said McKnight. “When I think of catastrophic is when it starts to affect the industry’s bottom line and people have to change where they put satellites. And we’re not far from that.”

McKnight said commercial mega-constellations like SpaceX’s Starlink or OneWeb are criticized for compounding the congestion in LEO but these companies should be seen as victims that are increasingly at risk. “Old abandoned massive objects pose greater risk than smaller, more agile constellations,” he added. “Many of these satellite operators are working with mitigation guidelines and operational procedures that are much more stringent than any government guidelines. They’re being safer than what the government’s asking them to do. But they are going to likely have some difficult times in the near future because of debris objects.”

U.S. Space Command currently tracks about 35,000 debris objects, 70% of which are in low Earth orbit. LeoLabs tracks softball-size and larger objects. McKnight said there are anywhere from 500,000 to 900,000 smaller items that currently are not tracked and “we just cross our fingers and hope we will not be hit by.”

#### 5. 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](http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/opinion/columnists/article4206440.ece) 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](http://bigstory.ap.org/article/scientists-say-ozone-layer-recovering) 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. In the 1970s the Sahara desert was said be advancing a mile a year; it was not true — the region south of the Sahara has grown markedly greener and more thickly vegetated in recent decades. In the 1980s acid rain was said to be devastating European forests; not true — any local declines in woodland were caused by pests or local pollution, not by the sulphates and nitrates in rain, which may have contributed to an actual increase in the overall growth rate of European forests during the decade. In the 1990s sperm counts were said to be plummeting thanks to pollution with man-made “endocrine disruptor” chemicals; not true — there was no fall in sperm counts. In the 2000s the Gulf Stream was said to be failing and hurricanes were said to be getting more numerous and worse, thanks to global warming; neither was true, except in a Hollywood studio. The motive for last week’s announcement was to nudge world leaders towards a treaty on climate change by reminding them of how well the ozone treaty worked. But getting the world to agree to cease production of one rare class of chemical, for which substitutes existed, and which only a few companies mainly in rich countries manufactured, was a very different proposition from setting out to decarbonise the whole economy, when each of us depends on burning carbon (and hydrogen) for almost every product, service, meal, comfort and journey in our lives. The true lesson of the ozone story is that taking precautionary action on the basis of dubious evidence and exaggerated claims might be all right if the action does relatively little economic harm. However, loading the entire world economy with costly energy, and new environmental risks based on exaggerated claims about what might in future happen to the climate makes less sense.

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

#### //No debris impact – China and Russia ASAT tests outweigh the link, debris cleanup happening now solves any risk

#### 6. Moral obligation to preserve humanity from future catastrophe through space colonization

Munevar 19 [Gonzalo, PhD in philosophy, author, “An obligation to colonize outer space”, submitted June 2019, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016328718302660]

We have an obligation to colonize outer space. This colonization may include establishing bases on the Moon, Mars, and other bodies in the solar system, perhaps leading to terraforming some of them, as well as building the sorts of space colonies championed by Gerard O’Neill.1 By doing so we may save humanity from collisions with asteroids and other cosmic catastrophes, while also bringing clean energy to Earth and giving us access to the resources of the solar system. Carrying out such tasks will, moreover, increase our scientiﬁc knowledge of heaven and Earth.

A collision with a large asteroid may bring human life on Earth to an end. Space colonization would allow human life to continue. Smaller, and far more likely, collisions will cause great destruction and kill millions of people. Furthermore, a heavy human presence throughout the solar system would make it possible, even highly probable, that many such collisions may be prevented