## DA

## A. Link

#### [Zvobgo & Loken 1] The aff is rooted in INHERENTLY RACIST tenants of international law like global security – their race-neutral extinction scenarios are an “all lives matter” approach that ignores IR’s racism.

Zvobgo & Loken 1: Zvobgo, Kelebogile [Founder and Director, International Justice Lab at William & Mary] and Meredith Loken [Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Massachusetts, Amherst]. “Why Race Matters in International Relations.” *Foreign Policy*, June 19, 2020. CH

Race is not a perspective on international relations; it is a central organizing feature of world politics. Anti-Japanese racism guided and sustained U.S. engagement in World War II, and broader anti-Asian sentiment influenced the development and structure of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. During the Cold War, racism and anti-communism were inextricably linked in the containment strategy that defined Washington’s approach to Africa, Asia, Central America, the Caribbean, and South America. And today race shapes threat perception and responses to violent extremism, inside and outside the “war on terror.” Yet mainstream international relations (IR) scholarship denies race as essential to understanding the world, to the cost of the field’s integrity. Take the “big three” IR paradigms: realism, liberalism, and constructivism. These dominant frames for understanding global politics are built on raced and racist intellectual foundations that limit the field’s ability to answer important questions about international security and organization. Core concepts, like anarchy and hierarchy, are raced: They are rooted in discourses that center and favor Europe and the West. These concepts implicitly and explicitly pit “developed” against “undeveloped,” “modern” against “primitive,” “civilized” against “uncivilized.” And their use is racist: These invented binaries are used to explain subjugation and exploitation around the globe. While realism and liberalism were built on Eurocentrism and used to justify white imperialism, this fact is not widely acknowledged in the field. For instance, according to neorealists, there exists a “balance of power” between and among “great powers.” Most of these great powers are, not incidentally, white-majority states, and they sit atop the hierarchy, with small and notably less-white powers organized below them. In a similar vein, raced hierarchies and conceptions of control ground the concept of cooperation in neoliberal thought: Major powers own the proverbial table, set the chairs, and arrange the place settings.

## B. Impacts

#### [Zvobgo & Loken 2] MASKED IMPERIALISM: states use “security threats” to hide racist colonization.

Zvobgo & Loken 2: Zvobgo, Kelebogile [Founder and Director, International Justice Lab at William & Mary] and Meredith Loken [Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Massachusetts, Amherst]. “Why Race Matters in International Relations.” *Foreign Policy*, June 19, 2020. CH

Between 1945 and 1993, among the five major IR journals of the period—International Organization, International Studies Quarterly, Journal of Conflict Resolution, Review of International Studies, and World Politics—only one published an article with the word “race” in the title. Another four articles included “minorities” and 13 included “ethnicity.” Since then, mainstream IR has neglected race in theorizing, in historical explanation, and in prescription, and shuttled race (and gender) to the side as “other perspectives.” When IR scholars do engage with race, it is often in discussions of outwardly raced issues such as colonialism. Yet one cannot comprehend world politics while ignoring race and racism. Textbooks that neglect historical and modern slavery when explaining development and globalization obscure the realities of state-building and deny the harms committed in the process. Similarly, when scholarship fails to call attention to the role that race plays in Western nations’ use of international law as a pretext for military intervention, it provides cover for the modern-day equivalent of “civilizing missions.” Likewise, studies of trade and dispute settlement almost always overlook modern arbitration’s deep roots in the transatlantic slave trade. This history is often lost in analyses of wins and losses in negotiations. Race and the racism of historical statecraft are inextricable from the modern study and practice of international relations. They are also not artefacts: Race continues to shape international and domestic threat perceptions and consequent foreign policy; international responses to immigrants and refugees; and access to health and environmental stability. Because mainstream IR does not take race or racism seriously, it also does not take diversity and inclusion in the profession seriously. In the United States, which is the largest producer of IR scholarship, only 8 percent of scholars identify as black or Latino, compared to 12 percent of scholars in comparative politics and 14 percent in U.S. politics.

They add:

Constructivism, which rounds out the “big three” approaches, is perhaps best positioned to tackle race and racism. Constructivists reject the as-given condition of anarchy and maintain that anarchy, security, and other concerns are socially constructed based on shared ideas, histories, and experiences. Yet with few notable exceptions, constructivists rarely acknowledge how race shapes what is shared. Despite the dominance of the “big three” in the modern study of IR, many of the arguments they advance, such as the balance of power, are not actually supported by evidence outside of modern Europe. Consider the democratic peace theory. The theory makes two key propositions: that democracies are less likely to go to war than are nondemocracies, and that democracies are less likely to go to war with each other. The historical record shows that democracies have actually not been less likely to fight wars—if you include their colonial conquests. Meanwhile, in regions such as the Middle East and North Africa, democratizing states have experienced more internal conflicts than their less-democratic peers. Yet leaders in the West have invoked democratic peace theory to justify invading and occupying less-democratic, and notably less-white, countries. This is a key element of IR’s racial exclusion: The state system that IR seeks to explain arises from the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, which ended the Thirty Years’ War and established European principles of statehood and sovereignty. Far from 17th-century relics, these principles are enshrined in the United Nations Charter—the foundation for global governance since 1945. But non-European nations did not voluntarily adopt European understandings of statehood and sovereignty, as IR scholars often mythologize. Instead, Europe, justified by Westphalia, divided the world between the modern, “civilized” states and conquered those which they did not think belonged in the international system. IR scholar Sankaran Krishna has argued that, because IR privileges theorizing over historical description and analysis, the field enables this kind of whitewashing. Western concepts are prioritized at the expense of their applicability in the world. Krishna called this “a systematic politics of forgetting, a willful amnesia, on the question of race.” Importantly, IR has not always ignored race. In the late 1800s and early 1900s, foundational texts invoked race as the linchpin holding together colonial administration and war. Belief in white people’s biological and sociological supremacy offered a tidy dualism between the civilized and the savage that justified the former’s murderous exploitation of the latter. Paul Samuel Reinsch, a founder of modern IR and foreign policy, christened the 20th century as the “age of national imperialism.” He concluded that states “endeavor to increase [their] resources … through the absorption or exploitation of undeveloped regions and inferior races.” Yet, he assured readers that this was “not inconsistent with respect for … other nationalities” because states avoid exerting control over “highly civilized nations.”

**TURNS AND OUTWEIGHS THE AFF –** they *worsen* security threats to non-White states – all of 20th century history proves it.

# Cap-&-Trade CP

## A. Text

#### [Trapp 1] Instead of banning private space appropriation [OR: affirming], states should set up a cap-and-trade system. This entails:

**A] imposing a global limit on allowable space debris;**

**B] regularly recalculating that limit; and**

**C] creating a database to track all space objects.**

**Trapp 1:** Trapp, Timothy Justin. [J.D., University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign School of Law; tax associate] “Taking Up Space By Any Other Means: Coming to Terms with the Nonappropriation Article of the Outer Space Treaty.” *University of Illinois Law Review*, Vol. 2013, No. 4, August 2013. https://www.illinoislawreview.org/wp-content/ilr-content/articles/2013/4/Trapp.pdf JP/CH

**To effectively combat** the **space debris** problem**, a cap-and-trade system should be set up** that will both be effective and withstand scrutiny under the nonappropriation article of the Outer Space Treaty**. As such, an international regulatory agency should be created to serve two functions: first,** the agency should **impose an international limit to** the addition of **debris and** should then **apportion** these **allowances to nations based on their current use of space. The total allowable debris addition should be recalculated yearly based on the state of the space environment**, and individual allowances should also be recalculated annually to account for changes in the abilities and needs of different nations**.** Second, the agency should allot specific LEO area orbital trajectories, such as the ITU allots GEO orbital slots.294 Though this will be more difficult than allocating GEO slots, since those slots appear stationary while LEO orbital paths are constantly in motion, it can be done. **First, an international electronic database should be produced which tracks** the current location of **all space objects registered in the Space Object Registry, which should include all spacecraft** launched into space. It should also record, to the greatest extent possible, the location and trajectory of any debris. **This database should be updated daily** to represent the most accurate portrayal of the location and trajectory of space objects by the nations responsible for those space objects. Second, this database should be used to calculate predictions of where spacecraft will be in the future, and LEO orbital slots should be defined both in time and space, as opposed to being defined purely by location. This may seem difficult, but it is actually made quite simple by the use of computers. Though these calculations will become less accurate over longer periods of time, the constant updating of the database will allow these predictions to be constantly updated as well, so that they will be accurate for at least the immediate future. When a nation applies for a trajectory slot, the agency should only allocate that slot if it can be entered into and sustained for a certain amount of time without requiring a trajectory modification of any other spacecraft. **With a workable allocation system in place, the agency should be in conformity with the nonappropriation article of the Outer Space Treaty.** To ensure this, it is important that, in allocating slots, both the interests of current space-faring nations, as well as those without the capability to get into space, are provided for. To do so, the agency should only allow actual physical entry into trajectory slots to those who comport with the cap-and-trade regime, while allowing claims to such slots to all nations, on bases similar to those of the ITU.299 This will ensure that this agency will not run into some of the problems that the ITU did when it began.300 In doing this, the agency will be comporting to the ideal that space be preserved for all mankind. **Furthermore, since the purpose of the agency would be to mitigate the debris problem, its purpose would be ensuring future access to space**. This, in connection to the fact that this is an international agency responding proportionately to an international problem,301 will allow the agency to withstand scrutiny under the nonappropriation article of the Outer Space Treaty.302

## B. Competition

#### [Competition] It’s mutually exclusive – private entities can still appropriate outer space under the CP, but can’t under the aff – makes perms impossible.

## C. Solvency

#### [Trapp 2] WE SOLVE 100% OF THE AFF – the CP follows the Outer Space Treaty’s ban on state appropriation, but doesn’t let private entities pollute.

**Trapp 2:** Trapp, Timothy Justin. [J.D., University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign School of Law; tax associate] “Taking Up Space By Any Other Means: Coming to Terms with the Nonappropriation Article of the Outer Space Treaty.” *University of Illinois Law Review*, Vol. 2013, No. 4, August 2013. https://www.illinoislawreview.org/wp-content/ilr-content/articles/2013/4/Trapp.pdf JP/CH

Space debris poses a threat to future open access to the space environment. Without some sort of action, the problem will continue to escalate, putting at risk the sustainability of the space around our planet. **An international regulatory authority that operated under the U.N. to institute a cap-and-trade regulation system and to allocate LEO orbital trajectories is the best way to curb** the **space debris** problem **while staying within the** mandate of the **nonappropriation article of the O**uter **S**pace **T**reaty**. The allotment of trajectories would ensure that everyone has fair access to the resource, as well as facilitate the reduction of** space **debris caused by** collision.3 A cap-and-trade system would make sure that the proliferation of further debris is curbed, as well as incentivize actors to contribute to cleaning up the space resource. Since **such an agency would operate under** the authority of **the U.N.,** it would be of an international character, similar to the ITU. Moreover, since the purpose of the regulation would be to curb the space debris problem, it would fall directly in line with the principle of ensuring continued access to the space resource for all mankind.308 Final**ly, since the regulation would benefit** those **nations currently acting in space as well as those who will explore space in the future, without unduly favoring one or the other as some have claimed the ITU allocation procedures have done, it** i**s a proportional response to an international** concern. Thus, the suggested system represents the best way to handle the debris problem without effecting a prohibited appropriation of space.

# **Case**

#### [Duren] PRIVATE ENTITIES HELP THE ENVIRONMENT – Carbon Mapper’s nonprofit program will map out emissions to help fight climate change.

**Duren:** Duren, Riley. [Research Scientist at the University of Arizona and an Engineering Fellow at NASA’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory.] "In Partnership with UArizona, New Nonprofit to Launch Satellite Program to Track Greenhouse Gas Emissions" *UArizona.* April 15, 2021. TB

**In a first-of-its-kind coalition to accelerate climate change action**, and with help from UArizona researchers, **a** new **nonprofit organization called Carbon Mapper is launching a program to improve scientific understanding of global methane and carbon dioxide emissions**. Carbon Mapper, a new nonprofit organization partnering with the University of Arizona, today announced a groundbreaking program **to help improve understanding of and accelerate reductions in global methane and carbon dioxide emissions.** The **Carbon Mapper** consortium also **announced plans to deploy a satellite constellation to pinpoint, quantify and track methane and carbon dioxide emissions.** "This decade represents an all-hands-on-deck moment for humanity **to make critical progress in addressing climate change**," said Riley Duren, research scientist in the UArizona Office of Research, Innovation and Impact and CEO of Carbon Mapper. "**Our mission is to** help **fill gaps in the emerging global ecosystem of methane and CO2 monitoring systems by delivering data that's timely, actionable and accessible for science-based decision making**." **Current approaches to measuring** methane and carbon dioxide **emissions** at the scale of individual facilities – particularly intermittent activity – **present challenges, especially in terms of transparency, accuracy, scalability and cost.** **Carbon Mapper** – which also is **partnering with** the state of California, **NASA**'s Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Planet, Arizona State University, High Tide Foundation and RMI – **will help overcome these technological barriers and enable accelerated action by making publicly available high emitting methane and carbon dioxide sources quickly and persistently visible** at the facility level. The data collected by the Carbon Mapper constellation of satellites will provide more complete, precise and timely measurement of methane and carbon dioxide source level emissions as well as more than 25 other environmental indicators. **Through the** Carbon Mapper-**UArizona partnership**, Duren and other UArizona **researchers offer scientific leadership** of the methane and carbon dioxide emissions data delivery **including developing new algorithms** and analytic frameworks **for testing** them with an ongoing research program. "Time is of the essence when it comes to understanding and mitigating methane and CO2 emissions," said Senior Vice President for Research and Innovation Elizabeth "Betsy" Cantwell. "Partnering with **Carbon Mapper will give** University of Arizona **researchers the tools needed to** not only see emissions hot spots, but to **understand their causes and develop actionable plans** for reducing or eliminating these sources." **Carbon Mapper, in collaboration with its public and private partners, is developing the satellite constellation** in three phases. The initial study phase, now complete, included two years of preliminary engineering development and manufacturing. **The first phase is underway and includes development of the first two satellites** by Planet and JPL, **scheduled for launch in 2023**, accompanying data processing platforms, and ongoing cooperative methane mitigation pilot projects using aircraft in California and other U.S. states. P;’