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### L- Generic- Space Management
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#### Private appropriation by US entities risks unraveling multilateral space governance.

Mike Wall 20, Senior Space Writer, “US policy could thwart sustainable space development, researchers say,” Space, 10-8-2020, https://www.space.com/us-space-policy-mining-artemis-accords

The United States' space policy threatens the safe and sustainable development of the final frontier, two researchers argue. The U.S. is pushing national rather than multilateral regulation of space mining, an approach that could have serious negative consequences, astronomer Aaron Boley and political scientist Michael Byers, both of the University of British Columbia in Vancouver, write in a "Policy Forum" piece that was published online today (Oct. 8) in the journal Science. Boley and Byers cite the 2015 passage of the Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act, which explicitly granted American companies and citizens the right to mine and sell space resources. That right was affirmed this past April in an executive order signed by President Donald Trump, they note. The researchers also point to NASA's announcement last month that it intends to buy moon dirt and soil collected by private companies, and its plan to sign bilateral agreements with international partners that want to participate in the agency's Artemis program of crewed lunar exploration. Artemis, one of NASA's highest-profile projects, aims to return astronauts to the moon in 2024 and establish a long-term, sustainable human presence on and around Earth's nearest neighbor by the end of the decade. Making all of this happen will require the extensive use of lunar resources, such as the water ice that lurks on the permanently shadowed floors of polar craters, NASA officials have said. Boley and Byers take special aim at the planned bilateral agreements, known as the Artemis Accords. In promoting them, the U.S. "is overlooking best practice with regard to the sustainable development of space," the researchers write. "Instead of pressing ahead unilaterally and bilaterally, the United States should support negotiations on space mining within the UN [United Nations] Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, the same multilateral body that drafted the five major space treaties of the 1960s and '70s," they write in the Science piece. (The most important of the five is the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, which forms the basis of international space law.) "Meanwhile, NASA’s actions must be seen for what they are — a concerted, strategic effort to redirect international space cooperation in favor of short-term U.S. commercial interests, with little regard for the risks involved," Boley and Byers add. The researchers worry that the U.S. is setting an unfortunate precedent for other countries to follow, and that space mining and other exploration activities may therefore proceed in a somewhat careless and chaotic fashion in the not-too-distant future. "That's kind of our worst-case scenario — that you have all of these different national regulations, and they can vary greatly, they allow for 'flag of convenience,' they cause disregard of the environment, large-scale pollution of orbital environments, of the surface of the moon in terms of waste materials and so forth," Boley told Space.com. "That's what we're worried about." He cited the growing space-junk problem as a cautionary tale. For decades, spacefaring nations have been licensing launches internally, without much international coordination, cooperation or long-term planning. In recent years, low-Earth orbit has become crowded enough with satellites and hunks of debris that collisions are a real concern. For example, the International Space Station has had to maneuver itself away from potential impacts three times so far in 2020 alone.

#### Space management cannot be understood outside of settler colonialism. The infrastructure, institutions, and Eurocentric values of space policy are considered the hallmarks of science and progress, which become weaponized against Indigenous resistance.

Matson and Nunn 17

(Zannah Mae Matson is a PhD student in Human Geography at the University of Toronto, Neil Nunn is a PhD candidate in the Department of Geography and Planning at the University of Toronto, 10-3-17, SPACE INFRASTRUCTURE, EMPIRE, AND THE FINAL FRONTIER: WHAT THE MAUNA KEA LAND DEFENDERS TEACH US ABOUT COLONIAL TOTALITY, Society and Space, <https://societyandspace.org/2017/10/03/space-infrastructure-empire-and-the-final-frontier-what-the-mauna-kea-land-defenders-teach-us-about-colonial-totality/>, JKS)

Mauna Kea is a dormant volcano and the highest point on the archipelago of Hawai’i. When measured from its base at seafloor, it is the tallest mountain on earth. These towering heights, in a region of the world with minimal light pollution has also earned Mauna Kea recognition of being one of the best spots on the planet for examining the cosmos. Long before the development of modern space infrastructure, however, the peak of Mauna Kea was regarded by native Hawaiians as among the most sacred places on the archipelago of Hawai’i. The place where earth meets the heavens. These divergent perspectives are embedded within a larger relationship of imperial domination that has seeded a century of unrest. While the primary focus of the protest was to challenge a half-century disregard for this sacred site by numerous entities and interests, the Battle for Mauna Kea cannot be understood outside Hawaii’s 125 year-long history of colonial occupation. In 1893, the Hawaiian Kingdom and its Queen, Lydia Kamaka’eha Lili’uokalani, were overthrown by a US led military coup (Long, 2017). Speaking to a spirit of resistance that has existed on the islands since the coup, scholar-activist K. Kamakaoka’ilima Long (2017: 15) states: “four decades of land struggles and cultural historical recovery… have grown a Hawaiian sovereignty movement… playing out in both land defense and as a movement to re-realize Hawaiian political independence as a sovereign state.” This recent assertion of self-determination, now known as the battle for Mauna Kea, has grown to become a global movement with broad support from high-profile figures and the hashtags #Wearemaunakea, #ProtectMaunaKea, and #TMTshutdown trending widely on social media. More than just a source of inspiration for the groundswell anti-colonial movements around the world, this story provides a context to better understand ongoing colonial occupation that is reinforced through the constitutive power of space infrastructure. Working from decades of resistance that culminated in the “battle for Mauna Kea,” we engage the notion of colonial totality to conceptualize the resistance to space infrastructure and the ongoing US occupation of Hawaii, reflecting on what this movement provides for better understanding totality and the relationship between space infrastructure and the shifting nature of colonial occupation more broadly. The notion of totality describes the process by which occupied spaces are coded with Western values in the form of normalized cultures, epistemologies, and institutions that produces an “atomistic image of social existence” (Quijano, 2007: 174). The institutions, ideologies and systems that advocate for the construction of space infrastructure exemplify this process. Astronomers frame the building of the observatory infrastructure as an essential piece in advancing our knowledge of outer space and ultimately achieving ‘universal’ progress. The resistance to development of these infrastructural systems is an invitation to consider the relationship between space as a frontier of discovery and ongoing questions of settler colonialism; the blockade has made visible the inherent relationship between the infrastructure of scientific exploration and the logic of totalizing colonial rationality that enables the development of massive telescopes on occupied land. While these perspectives of colonial totality provide a useful understanding of power and institutions that shape this conflict, we suggest that the Hawaiian land defenders’ refusal of the normalizing force of space infrastructure demonstrates the complexities and conditions relating to the notion of totality and ultimately the inadequacies of the concept. During a public comment period at 2015 University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents meeting, Dr. Pualani Kanaka’ole Kanahele gestures to both the totalizing colonial discourse that suppresses her cultural beliefs and the importance of fighting back against these systems: … we believe in the word of our ancestors…they say we are the products of this land and that is our truth…and that is what we are fighting for. This is our way of life. This is not our job. We don’t earn money from doing this. But for generations after generations, we will continue to be doing what we are doing today. What Dr. Kanahele speaks of goes beyond the physical destruction of the sacred ancestral site, to describe a hegemonic normalization and occupation that actively effaces traditional Hawaiian ways of being in the world. The words and actions of the land defenders challenge totalizing structures that classify space according to a narrow set of beliefs about the world. Working from these acts of resistance, we want to suggest that the Hawaiian sovereignty movement illuminates how systems of scientific thought and the project of space exploration rely on Euro-western values being the standard by which all other values are measured. It is this wide acceptance of these structures and principles of reasoning that serve to justify the construction of infrastructure that at once reproduces and fortifies these myths. This self-reinforcing relationship between the production of space infrastructure and the logics that justify it speaks to a powerful aspects of colonial totality: the way it gains power by rendering illegible the very elements relied upon to actively produce the other. The generally unquestioned salience of space infrastructure is a powerful example of this. As Quijano (2007: 174) describes, the relationship between colonialism and scientific discourse is a mutually reinforcing and “part of, a power structure that involved the European colonial domination over the rest of the world.” In Hawai’i, we see the settler colonial process of cultural attrition operating through a totalizing force of colonial knowledge systems that extend beyond physical occupation of land to include an erasure of Indigenous Hawaiian ways of knowing. Although the spatialities and technologies associated with this form of stellar navigation are radically dissimilar, we suggest that on a basic level, this form of space exploration is continuous with a lineage of Euro-western projects of discovery. In short, space as the ‘final frontier’ is not simply a metaphor but speaks to the role of astronomy in upholding the ongoing projection of values onto new territories and extending power and acquisition of territory to those complicit in colonial processes. This extends both to the world’s highest peaks and into the heavens. Space infrastructure is central to this ongoing frontier process that seeks to code ‘new’ territories as knowable according to certain values and, as a result, casts inhabitants who fall outside this paradigm as irrational, less-than-human, and exploitable. However, as Lowe (2015: 2) warns, these abstract promises of human freedoms and rational progress are necessarily discordant with the “global conditions on which they depend.” Which is to say that these atomistic systems dispose of the very relationships and elements of life that make them possible. A belief in respecting the sacredness of the world is just one example of this. It is also essential to recognize the process of establishing colonial totality is one that imperial forces have worked tirelessly to instill. Recognizing this helps to disrupt an appearance of givenness that colonial occupation relies upon. The land defenders have been vocal about this, reminding of us of the fact that since the arrival of James Cook to the Hawaiian Islands in 1778, settler colonial campaigns have been advancing longstanding patterns of cultural removal, fueled by beliefs in colonial supremacy. Following the coup and overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy by US-led forces, a colonial oligarchy banned Hawaiian languages from schools and formalized English as the official language for business and government relations (Silva, 2004: 2-3). This legislation eroded language, culture, and sacred practice; and is an example of what Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o (cited in Silva, 2004: 3) describes as a “cultural bomb” of settler colonialism that serves to “annihilate a people’s belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves.” According to Chickasaw theorist Jodi Byrd, continually reflecting on the historical and ongoing work that maintains the conditions of settler colonialism is essential to resisting the tendency for colonial constraint to appear inevitable, unresolvable, and complete (Byrd, 2011; see also Simpson, 2014). There was nothing, easy, given, or natural about processes of colonial occupation. While we acknowledge the usefulness of totality for thinking about colonial supremacy, we have concerns about its tendency to inscribe an inaccurate depiction of Euro-western superpower with total ideological control over subjugated Indigenous population. Put differently, we are cautious of the work that the notion of totality does to reinforce a too widely accepted view of Indigenous populations as helplessly dominated, or even anachronistic. The Hawaiian sovereignty movement demonstrates that this is not the case. What the battle at Mauna Kea has shown—akin to other efforts of refusal, such as those at Standing Rock—is that the war against colonialism is ongoing. At present, it appears the land protectors have been successful in their goals of halting construction, as the development team behind the project has begun considering secondary sites for the telescope. The resistance at Mauna Kea, then, is a powerful symbol of the possibility of rupturing the normative totality of Modernist scientific rationality, but it also underscores the recalcitrance of the structures of control and the challenges of pushing back against colonial occupation. However, despite this rupturing of hegemonic ideas of science and progress through the resistance movement, the dominant response from the scientific community has been largely one of confusion and perplexity. This reaction to the uprising speaks to the power of the narratives that cement the Western framework as ‘truth,’ ‘natural,’ and ‘given.’ For these representatives of state and international institutions, violent control is re-framed as co-existence to achieve Modernist notions of progress, while the claims of Indigenous people are reduced to frivolous demands with primitive and irrational connections to the past. This, of course, exists with little consideration of the irony of how this frenzy to build infrastructure that works to “know” the cosmos may be read as equally irrational. This essay has sought to consider the relationship between infrastructure and colonialism, emphasizing that even the most futuristic space telescopes have embedded within them a lineage of Euro-western cultural supremacy. It is important to recognize the extant materiality of these infrastructures as a manifestation of hegemonic systems that perpetuate myths of rationality and Euro-western cultural supremacy. The battle for Mauna Kea movement highlights the importance of remembering the long historical processes and extensive exertion of colonial constraint and cultural removal that has been necessary to maintain control of the land. Despite the social processes that naturalize colonial infrastructure, there is nothing essential, necessary, or pre-ordained about enormous telescopes. The success of the land defenders at Mauna Kea, and the support the movement gained around the world, shows us that Euro-western forces and the infrastructure that is central to maintaining their normative influence, are replete with fissures and contradictions worth pushing against. In spite of the hegemonic forces of modernity and rationality behind the construction of the TMT and a continued attempt to assert colonial totality, the battle at Mauna Kea indicates these hegemonic forces have been far from totalizing. The colonial powers do not have the final word. The land defenders at Mauna Kea have demonstrated a powerful vision for disrupting normative ways of occupying land and knowing the cosmos inspiring us to think further on the complexities of mobilizing infrastructure to resist colonialism. It is within these ruptures that we see a potential for a continued learning from the stars and our social existence.

### L- International Law

#### International law’s origins are based on the racist refusal to acknowledge Native sovereignty. Treaty authority is predicated on the nonexistence of indigenous governance and seeks to reconcile Native indifference through genocidal means.

Scott 18

(Xavier Scott, Department of Philosophy, York University, Repairing Broken Relations by Repairing Broken Treaties: Theorizing Post-Colonial States in Settler Colonies, Studies in Social Justice, Volume 12, Issue 2, 388-405, 2018, JKS)

The divisibility of sovereignty in the case of non-Europeans allowed colonial states to grant them partial recognition in the form of quasi-sovereignty, thereby enabling the local people to enter into treaties that they could be punished for violating (through just war doctrine) but which could be unilaterally broken by the colonial power once they were no longer politically expedient. Since all the nations of the world are part of a single international community, no country has the right to invade any other. Yet that community was not founded on universal principles, but was based on a European consensus. Since recognition was the basis for membership in the “international community” and the original members of the jus gentium were all European (in practice, if not in theory), the Westphalian system would seem to promote conquest and colonialism abroad, even as it promoted mutual recognition within Europe. The legacy of the Westphalian peace has been a system that simultaneously maintains the historical legality of colonialism, while rejecting it as a principle of justice. The origins of international law were inherently unjust and based on a racist refusal to acknowledge Indigenous sovereignty in its entirety. However, in recognizing the moral and legal chicanery that was required to deny Indigenous sovereignty, we can lay the groundwork for understanding the sovereign violence that European powers committed and how that was then tied to the numerous forms of injustice committed afterwards. Not only did Indigenous peoples have political societies, but European sovereigns and jurists regularly recognized their sovereignty by signing over 800 treaties with different Indigenous communities (Kickingbird, 1995). Siegfried Wiessner (1995) divides the treaty-making conventions between the United States and Indigenous communities into two time periods – prior to and following the end of the War of 1812. Prior to this date, treaties were concluded on a relatively equal basis. They fully recognized the Indigenous governance structures and were ratified by the U.S. Senate using the language of international law. Once the threat of other colonial powers was over, treaties became increasingly used “to regularize and channel the removal of Indians from their traditional vast hunting and fishing grounds to ever smaller, ever more barren areas of land” (Wiessner, 1995, p. 577). The War of 1812 marks a switch from the nation-to-nation relationships that characterized earlier agreements, to a new species of treaty which deprived Indigenous communities of nationhood. I call the means by which colonial states appropriated Indigenous sovereignty “theft,” since it deprived Indigenous peoples of their right to selfdetermination and full use of their traditional territories. Moreover, the quasisovereignty that was granted to Indigenous peoples made the destruction of their communities a requirement to establish the legitimacy of the colonial power’s occupation. Taiaiake Alfred and Jeff Corntassel argue that contemporary settlers are no longer trying to eradicate Indigenous peoples as bodies, but rather “as peoples through the erasure of the histories and geographies that provide the foundation for Indigenous cultural identities and sense of self” (2005, p. 598; emphasis in original). This is both a continuation of the desire to appropriate Indigenous land and an attempt to foreclose the possibility that land that has already been annexed by colonists be returned. Indigenous sovereignty in its current form in the British colonial states continues to act as a form of “quasi-sovereignty” the goal and legacy of which are the assimilation and destruction of Indigenous peoples. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2015) has outlined the crimes the Canadian government committed against Indigenous peoples. While the summary of their findings focuses on the cultural genocide the Canadian state engaged in through residential schools, it acknowledges the physical and biological genocides engaged in by the state as well. It states: Canada asserted control over Aboriginal land. In some locations, Canada negotiated Treaties with First Nations; in others, the land was simply occupied or seized. The negotiation of Treaties, while seemingly honourable and legal, was often marked by fraud and coercion, and Canada was, and remains, slow to implement their provisions and intent. (Truth & Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015, p. 1) Australian Prime Minister Kevin Rudd (2008) issued an apology for the “Stolen Generation,” which took Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children from their families. The U.S. issued its apology to Indigenous peoples, hidden in section 8113 of a 2010 Defense Appropriations Act. It acknowledges “that there have been years of official depredations, illconceived policies, and the breaking of covenants by the Federal Government regarding Indian tribes” and also “many instances of violence, maltreatment, and neglect inflicted on Native Peoples by citizens of the United States” (111th Congress, 2009, s.8113). All three of these apologies profess a desire to “remove a stain from its past” (Truth & Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015, p. 237), for “the nation to turn a new page” (Rudd, 2008), and look towards a future “where all the people of this land live reconciled as brothers and sisters” (111th Congress, 2009, s.8113). Yet the Australian apology made no reference to reparations, the American apology contains a disclaimer that nothing in it is meant to “serve as any settlement against the United States” (111th Congress, 2009, s.8113), and while Canada has attached its apology to court mandated reparations payments, it has failed to reform its relationship with Indigenous peoples by (for example) reforming the 1876 Indian Act. The existence of sovereignty in a colonial context is predicated on the nonsovereignty of Indigenous peoples. At best, they are granted a form of “quasisovereignty” that is not taken seriously by the international state system and is generally considered to be a temporary stage in the integration of Indigenous peoples into the colonial state.5 The quasi-status of their sovereignty is not a step on the path towards full sovereignty, but towards destruction and the seamless transfer of sovereignty from them to the colonial state. In their critique of the literature on post-colonial theory and antiracist work, Bonita Lawrence and Enakshi Dua ask, “what does it mean to look at Canada as colonized space?” (2005, p. 123). Because settler states are founded on policies that combine extermination and assimilation, the continued existence of Indigenous peoples as peoples depends on the full recognition of their inherent sovereignty. For this reason: To speak of Indigenous nationhood is to speak of land as Indigenous, in ways that are neither rhetorical nor metaphorical. Neither Canada, nor the United States – or the settler states of “Latin” America for that matter – which claim sovereignty over the territory they occupy, have a legitimate basis to anchor their absorption of huge portions of that territory. (Lawrence & Dua, 2005, p. 124) To claim respect for Indigenous sovereignty, therefore, is to deny the legal legitimacy of Settler colonies. This is because of the territoriality and legal supremacy claims of sovereign states. While the development of international law has served to strip Indigenous peoples of their traditional lands, it also contains a number of mechanisms that have been used in other contexts of occupation, violence, and genocide. First, the principle of pacta sunt servanda is the cornerstone of international law (Uribe, 2010; Wiessner 1995) – states are required to abide by their word. The fact that colonial powers broke their treaties with Indigenous governments ought not to mean that it is thereby nullified, but rather that “there may be legal consequences” (Kickingbird, 1995, p. 603). Furthermore, the principle of sovereignty contains a right to reassert authority when territory is unjustly annexed. When a state’s sovereignty is violated, international law calls for its restoration. Following Kirke Kickingbird, I believe that “treaties form the backdrop of the past, confirm rights in the present and provide the basic definition for the evolving future” (1995, p. 605). Only by respecting the traditional rights of Indigenous peoples – including rights to their territories – can colonial states repair the sovereign wrong done in the abrogation of their duty to stand by their treaties.

## \*\*Alternative\*\*

### 1NC- Indigenous Internationalism

#### This debate is not private space good/bad, but instead a question of Native sovereignty and the power to invoke the plan. The 1AC eclipses the authority of Native nations, so in response we affirm the long tradition of Indigenous internationalism across colonial borders.

Estes 19

(Nick Estes is a citizen of the Lower Brule Sioux Tribe. He is an Assistant Professor in the American Studies Department at the University of New Mexico. In 2014, he co-founded The Red Nation, an Indigenous resistance organization. For 2017-2018, Estes was the American Democracy Fellow at the Charles Warren Center for Studies in American History at Harvard University. Chapter 6: Internationalism, Our History Is the Future: STANDING ROCK VERSUS THE DAKOTA ACCESS PIPELINE, AND THE LONG TRADITION OF INDIGENOUS RESISTANCE, 2019, hardback, JKS)

The Treaty Council, however, was not the first or only version of what historian Daniel Cobb calls a “global Indigenous identity.” Rather, it belonged to and drew from a long tradition of Indigenous internationalism.5 Prior to European contact, Indigenous nations had often entered into relations with each other for alliance, kinship, war, peace, or trade. As shown in previous chapters, agreements were made not solely between human nations, but also among nonhuman nations as well, such as the buffalo and the land. Such treaties were, and continue to be, the basis of diplomacy and the evidence of a prior and continuing status of Indigenous nationhood. Sovereign nations do not enter into international relations or treaties with domestic or “internal” populations. On the contrary, the very basis of sovereignty is the power to negotiate relationships between those who are seen as different— between other sovereigns and nations. But concepts of “sovereignty” and “nation” possess different meanings for Indigenous peoples than for their European-derived counterparts. And they are not entirely consistent, either, with the aspirations for a nation-state that came to define decolonization movements in the Third World. While doing important defensive work, on face value these Western and Third World concepts only partially reflect traditions of Indigenous resistance. Far beyond the project of seeking equality within the colonial state, the tradition of radical Indigenous internationalism imagined a world altogether free of colonial hierarchies of race, class, and nation. This vision allowed revolutionary Indigenous organizations such as the Treaty Council to make relatives, so to speak, with those they saw as different, imagining themselves as part of Third World struggles and ideologies, and entirely renouncing the imperialism and exceptionalism of the First World (while still living in it). They were in the First World but not of it—much like American Indians are in, but not entirely of, the United States. Indigenous peoples across North America and the world have fought, died, and struggled to reclaim, restore, and redefine these powerful ideas. Their goal has been to take their proper place in the family of nations. Radical Indigenous internationalism, however, predates AIM and the Treaty Council. Contemporary pan-Indigenous movements were a result of more than a decade of Red Power organizing that began in the early 1960s, nearly a decade before the creation of AIM. Earlier, in the 1950s, Flathead scholar and writer D’Arcy McNickle and the National Congress of American Indians had explored a similar intellectual and political terrain of internationalism. And before that, the Society of American Indians advocated for a seat at the table during the 1919 Paris peace talks and representation at the League of Nations. Each distinct instance posed a similar question: If Indigenous peoples are nations, why are they not afforded the right to self-determination? Two strands of thinking about self-determination for the colonial world prevailed following the First World War. In the first, US President Woodrow Wilson argued for self-determination with a limited set of rights that would not radically upset the colonial order. Such liberal internationalism, however, glaringly omitted Indigenous peoples, as they understood themselves as nations that existed prior to the formation of settler states. Rarely were Wilson’s principles applied to North America or the United States; nor were they ever intended to extend to Indigenous peoples. A second, more radical vision put forward by Communist revolutionary V. I. Lenin argued for the right of colonized nations to secede and declare independence from their colonial masters. This view was echoed by the Third World decolonization movement, as part of a global Socialist and Communist revolution, and it has frequently been applied in the Asian, African, and South American contexts. But this view remained almost entirely absent in North America, except among radical Indigenous, Black, Asian, Caribbean, and Chicanx national liberation movements. The Treaty Council advocated Indigenous nationhood as part of this global anti-colonial movement and in line with Third World liberation movements. After decades of experiencing land loss, enduring bare survival, attempting to work with federal programs, filing court cases, defeating termination legislation, and facing mass relocation, an assertion of Oceti Sakowin sovereignty went from ambition to prescription. Few avenues remained other than the pursuit of international treaty rights. Treaties made with the United States were proof of nationhood. But what legal institution would uphold this position if the United States refused to? If the goal was to reverse the unjust occupation of an entire continent, the advancement of Indigenous rights through the very legal and political systems that justified that occupation in the first place had proven limited in some instances, and hopeless in others. To survive, AIM and the Treaty Council therefore had to look elsewhere to make their case—beyond the confines of the most powerful political construct in world history, the nation-state. Prior to and during colonization, Indigenous nations had self-organized into deliberate confederacies, alliances, and governments. The Nation of the Seven Council Fires (the Oceti Sakowin), for instance, is a confederacy of seven different nations of Lakota-, Dakota-, and Nakota-speaking peoples in the Northern Plains and Western Great Lakes. They are hardly unique; in North America alone there are the Creek Confederacy in the Southeast, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy of Six Nations in the Northeast, the Council of Three Fires (made up of Ojibwes, Odawas, and Potawatomis) in the Great Lakes region, the United Indian Nations in the Ohio River valley (under the Shawnee leadership of Tecumseh), the All Indian Pueblo Council of the Southwest, and the Iron Confederacy of the Northern Plains. Many other political confederacies also flourished prior to, alongside, and in spite of settler states in North America. And their legacies are hardly relegated to the primordial past. Modern Oceti Sakowin internationalism, for instance, traces its origins to the early twentieth century, an era generally viewed as a low point for Indigenous activism and resistance. In North America alone, an estimated precolonial population of tens of millions of Indigenous peoples had been reduced to about 300,000, and for Flathead historian D’Arcy McNickle, writing in 1949, two processes contributed greatly to this decimation: the institution of private property and the destruction of Indigenous governance that once held land in common. Indigenous nations at the time also possessed little in the way of either collective property or political power, as Indigenous territory had been drastically diminished, and the reservation system had overthrown or almost entirely dissolved customary governments. If Indigenous peoples once constituted the tree of the Americas, whose roots deeply entwined in the land, the cultivation of “growth from the severed stump,” McNickle argued, was the pivotal challenge of the twentieth century.7 Physical extermination and the repression of Indigenous political power verified the United States’ genocidal intent, but these had not accomplished their purpose. And despite otherwise stating pluralistic claims to inclusion, McNickle concluded that the United States simply “can not tolerate a nation within a nation.” If Natives were to be assimilated, they would be assimilated as individuals and not as nations. In the popular imaginary, Natives disappeared into the wilderness of history, were never truly nations, and had been overpowered by a superior civilization. If they were nations, they were eclipsed and replaced by the real nation—the United States. Such erasure notwithstanding, vibrant Indigenous political traditions persisted. But to the untrained eye, nothing was awry. From the severed stump began to regrow the tree of life—the tree of resistance that would blossom into revolt decades later.

### 1NC- Alt Framing

#### The process and agents of political change matter. Indigenous internationalism must be asserted through Native sovereignty and organizing. The plan and the perm still collude with settlerism, which trades-off with meaningful resistance.

Simpson 16

(Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, renowned Michi Saagiig Nishnaabeg scholar. She holds a PhD from the University of Manitoba, and teaches at the Dechinta Centre for Research & Learning in Denendeh. An Interview with Eve Tuck (Unangax̂), Indigenous Resurgence and Co-resistance, Critical Ethnic Studies, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Fall 2016), pp. 19-34, JKS)

PLACE-BASED INTERNATIONALISM

Eve: One idea that Wayne and I floated in our call for papers is that how a person or community understands the roots or source of injustice will have implications for how they go about undoing that injustice. Does this make sense to you? Might it be too simplistic or problematic?

Leanne: I think we need to be a bit careful here, particularly in the academy. I think Indigenous peoples understand pretty well injustice in their own lives whether or not they can articulate it using the language of colonialism or decolonization. I think movements that link social realities with political systems and focus on creating real-world-on-the-ground alternatives are powerful. I worry that too much of our energy goes into trying to influence the system rather than creating the alternatives. It matters to me how change is achieved. Change achieved through struggle, organizing, and creating the alternatives produces profoundly different outcomes than change achieved through recognition-focused protest, and pressuring the state to make the changes for us. That is a recipe for co-option. I think it is important to understand root causes of injustice, but it is also important to understand think strategically and intelligently about approaches to undoing that injustice. I think that diagnosis and strategic action must be done within grounded normativity. Indigenous thought has a tradition of place-based internationalism that I think is this beautifully fertile spot because it links place-based thinking and struggle with the same decolonial pockets of thinking throughout the world. Nishnaa- beg have been linking ourselves to the rest of the world since the beginning of time, and throughout our resistance to colonialism we have our people traveling throughout the world to link with other communities of resistors. Grassy Narrows First Nation comes to mind in their nearly four- decade fight against mercury poisoning in their river system and the relationship they have made with the Japanese community in Mnimata.6 We need to use our experiences in the past to think critically about how we respond to injustice today. Right now, Indigenous peoples in Canada need to be thinking critically about the implications of seeking recogni- tion within the colonial state because we have a government that is very good at neoliberalism and seducing our hope for their purposes. Again, Glen Sean Coulthard, in Red Skin, White Masks, using the Dene nation’s experience in the 1970s, provides a blistering critique of the pitfalls of seeking political recognition within state structures. He makes the point that continually seeking recognition with the settler-colonial state is a process of co-option and neutralization, and is a way of bringing Indigenous peoples into the systems that guts our resistance movements, for instance, and we get very little in return.7 In fact, in terms of dispossession—that is, the removal, murdering, displacement, and destruction of the relation- ship between Indigenous bodies and Indigenous land—this serves only to facilitate land loss, not improve things. Engagement with the system changes Indigenous peoples more than it changes the system. This can be destructive in terms of resurgence because resurgent movements are trying to do the opposite—we are trying to center Indigenous practices and thoughts in our lives as everyday acts of resistance, and grow those actions and processes into a mass mobilization. I think it is useful to apply this same critique of recognition to orga- nizing and mobilizing with the purpose of making a switch from mobi- lizing around victim-based narratives—that is, publically demonstrating the pain of loss as a mechanism to appeal to the moral and ethical fabric of Canadian society (which has over and over again proven to be morally bankrupt when it comes to Indigenous peoples)—to using that same pain and anger to fuel resurgent actions. This organizing from within grounded normativity has always fueled Indigenous resistance and continues to happen all the time in Indigenous communities—it is just often misread by others. The community of Hollow Water First Nation created the Community Holistic Circle of Healing as a Nishnaabeg restoration of relationships, or a restorative justice model to address sexual violence in their community.8 Christi Belcourt’s Walking with Our Sisters exhibit has created a traveling display of 1,800 moccasin vamps as a way of honoring and commemorating missing and murdered Indigenous women and children in Canada and the United States. The exhibit does not rely on state funding.9 Thousands of volunteers made the vamps. The exhibit works with local communities and their cultural and spiritual practices to install the exhibit and do the necessary ceremony and community processes. Walking with Our Sisters works with local organizers a year in advance of installation, using Indigenous processes to embed the art in community on the terms of the local community. There is also the work of countless urban Indigenous organizations supporting the families of MMIWG2S people. The Native Youth Sexual Health Network provides on-the-ground, community-embedded, peer-to-peer support around sex- ual health and addiction for youth.10 The Akwesasne Freedom School provides Mohawk education for Mohawk children.11 The Iroquois national and Haudenosaunee women’s lacrosse teams travel using Haudenosau- nee passports instead of American or Canadian ones.12 The Unist’ot’en Camp pursues land protection resurgent action and the reclamation of the original name of Mount Douglas, PKOLS, in the city of Victoria, British Columbia.13

#### ROB-> vote for the team that best represents indigenous scholarship since in round impacts o/w
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#### The US government is perfectly positioned to focus on space governance and let private entities develop tech – this avoids bilateral or unilateral missions that increase the chance for conflict and space weaponization while creating effective multilateral agreements that spill over

Rosenberg and Marber 21 (Mark Y. - CEO of Geoquant and an adjunct professor at Columbia University’s School of International and Public Affairs, Peter - teaches at Harvard University and is a senior portfolio manager at Aperture Investors, 2/22, “America Needs a Supercharged Space Program,” [accessed 9/25/21], <https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/02/22/biden-space-force-race-policy-rockets-china/>)

In 2015, the U.S. government granted U.S. citizens the right to own any materials they extract in space, blowing open the door for civilian space business. In 2018, China launched a reconnaissance rover on the moon’s far side that’s been gathering data for more than 18 months now. In late 2019, then-President Donald Trump launched the formation of the U.S. Space Force as part of the military, while early 2020 saw the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) sign a contract with Axiom Space to build the first commercial space station. And in October 2020, the United States led the signing of the Artemis Accords, a set of bilateral agreements on space with Australia, Canada, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Italy, the United Kingdom, and the United Arab Emirates, which deliberately skirted the United Nations and did not include space rivals such as China and Russia. (Ukraine and Brazil were later added to the accords.) Although this pact claims to affirm the Outer Space Treaty, it actually increases the potential for conflict by expanding the interpretation of commercial space law while drawing hard geopolitical borders. Without Russia and especially China on board, much of the world will see the Artemis Accords as the informal rulebook of a cliquish club rather than a true multilateral agreement. Meanwhile, a new space race is gathering stream: In addition to this year’s unmanned missions to Mars, both the United States and China are planning moon landings later this decade. The Biden administration must prioritize a more multilateral approach to space governance than what was taken under Trump. Just like on Earth, a lack of international standards in space will likely lead to chaotic, wasteful competition. A 2011 U.S. law blocking NASA from cooperating with Chinese agencies has already shut China out of the U.S.-Russian International Space Station, prompting the Chinese to start building their own while partnering with Russia on a lunar research station. Revising this law would be a good place for the Biden administration to start. Cooperating with China in space might be a sensible hedge against growing conflict on Earth. Unregulated space activity could create a myriad of problems from accidentally or intentionally blocked data transmission to orbital pollution from too many space objects. Indeed, U.S. companies are currently the worst offenders, highlighting the need for more targeted regulation. Just a few uncontrolled collisions could generate enough debris to render near-Earth space unusable. And of course, no one wants to see space weaponized with extremely expensive, escalating arms races. Given private U.S. companies’ increasingly aggressive push to expand space exploration, the U.S. government is in a position to structure a more effective extraterrestrial regulatory regime. Renewed U.S. leadership founded on rebuilt space capabilities will be key to any hope for multilateral space cooperation. A more dedicated focus on space governance and a more aggressive approach to exploration can be the underpinnings of a future “New Space Deal.” A supercharged space program can help build entire new industries, create new jobs, green the economy, turbocharge next-generation communications, and expand the frontiers of science and technology. By uniting Americans behind a common purpose, it could even help mend the country’s frayed democracy. It would also reestablish Washington’s leadership in the fight against climate change and for a stronger multilateral system. Who else but the United States could even contemplate such a bold plan?

#### Non-state actors in space are conflict dampeners – they avoid geopolitical tension and have financial incentives to keep conflict low

Frankowski 17 (Pawel, Assistant Professor at the Faculty of National Security. His current research interests include space policy, labour standards in free trade agreements, and theories of international relations, Jagiellonian University in Kakow, “OUTER SPACE AND PRIVATE COMPANIES CONSEQUENCES FOR GLOBAL SECURITY”, <https://doi.org/10.12797/Politeja.14.2017.50.06>)

In the terms of privatization and space security, space remains relatively untapped, but commercial and military benefits from space exploration/exploitation could even lead to ‘privatization of space’. Such privatization will result from growing pressure on spacefaring countries to defect from cooperation, since is less viable with good number of multiple actors who entered the space.36 However, space policy and space research are characterized by very high costs, which are rather impossible to bear by private companies, limited by economic calculation. As pointed out earlier, under-investment in technological development by private companies it is related to the fact that these actors are not focused on profits of a social nature, such as improving the quality of life of the recipient of the product.37 This makes some technology, potentially beneficial to society, not developed or introduced into use, because the profit margin is too small to make this viable for commercial players. To conclude, privatization of space security can develop in unexpected ways, but in today’s space environment private actors would rather play the role of security regulators than security providers. When investment in space technologies is less profitable than other areas of economy, private actors would focus on soft law and conflict prevention in space, and new private initiatives will appear. For example, apart from important space companies, as SpaceX or Blue Origin active in outer space, other private actors as Secure World Foundation (SWF), who focus on space sustainability, will play more important role in crafting international guidelines for space activities.38 This path the way for future solutions and projects, as cleaning the space debris, extracting resources from asteroids and planetoids, refuelling satellites, providing payload capabilities for governmental entities on market-based logic, will be based on activity non-state actors, providing soft law and regulatory solutions, where space faring states are unable to find any compromise. Therefore private companies will be in fact global (or space) regulators, as part of UNCOPUS, being involved in space activities.39 The last argument for private involvement in space security comes from an approach based on common good and resilience of space assets, emphasized by the Project Ploughshares, as an important part of space security. As of 2017 there are more than 700,000 man-made objects on the Earth’s orbit bigger than 1 cm, while 17,000 of them are bigger than 10 cm.40 Some of them are traced by SSA systems, both American and European, but these systems are public-military owned, and private operators are not granted any access to this data. Any collision of space object with space debris, even with small particles, might result in a chain reaction, called Kessler’s syndrome, and not only private but public, and military assets will be destroyed or impaired. In such conditions, a reluctant cooperation between the public and private sector, and unwillingness to share vulnerable data by public actors seem to confirm that private space activity is more than necessary. This is an apparent case when logic of mistrust between state powers must be overcome by private actors, perhaps by suggesting common preferences for debris mitigation, and space situational awareness. In the case of space debris, Space Data Association, an initiative supported by private sector, with its main aim to enhance data sharing between commercial satellite operators, could be an example of nascent public good provided by private actors for the sake of global security.

#### Space weaponization and arms racing ensure space war goes nuclear – only strong private competition can check conflict

Hitchens ’17 (Theresa Hitchens, Theresa Hitchens is Senior Research Scholar at the Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland, Prior to joining CISSM, Hitchens was the director of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) in Geneva from 2009 through 2014. Among her activities and accomplishments at UNIDIR, Hitchens served as a consultant to the U.N. Group of Governmental Experts on Transparency and Confidence Building Measures in Outer Space Activities, provided expert advice to the Conference on Disarmament regarding the prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS), and launched UNIDIR's annual conference on cyber security, From 2001 to 2008, Hitchens worked at the Center for Defense Information, where she served as Director, and headed the center’s Space Security Project, setting the strategic direction of the center and conducting research on space policy and other international security issues, “Space weapon technology and policy”, School of Public Policy University of Maryland, <https://aip.scitation.org/doi/pdf/10.1063/1.5009221?class=pdf>, November 2017)

Abstract. The military use of space, including in support of nuclear weapons infrastructure, has greatly increased over the past 30 years. In the current era, **rising geopolitical tensions between** the United States and Russia and China **have led to assumptions** in all three major space powers **that warfighting in space now is inevitable, and possible because of rapid technological advancements**. New capabilities for disrupting and destroying satellites include radio-frequency jamming, the use of lasers, maneuverable space objects and more capable direct-ascent anti-satellite weapons. **This situation, however, threatens international security and stability among nuclear powers. There is a continuing and necessary role for diplomacy, especially the establishment of normative rules of behavior, to reduce risks of misperceptions and crisis escalation, including** up to the **use of nuclear weapons**. U**.S. policy and strategy should seek a balance between traditional military approaches to protecting its space assets and diplomatic tools to create a more secure space environment.** I. INTRODUCTION Outer space is recognized by all nations as “the province of mankind” not subject to national boundaries or appropriation via both treaty – especially the 1967 Outer Space Treaty1 – and by the practice of nation states. Since the dawn of the space age, the use of satellites has become integral to the global economy, including providing communications, weather services, mapping, precision timing and navigation services for shipping, secure crossborder banking, and Internet connectivity. Every state has both an interest in making use of space, and reason to deal with its use by other states, because **the activities in space by one actor have the potential to impact all others**, for good or for bad. In addressing international and national security, and nuclear security in particular, the space environment has played a role of great importance from almost the beginning of the nuclear age. The first satellites launched by the Soviet Union and the United States were oriented toward seeking information on what was transpiring in areas controlled by the other, and to verify bilateral arms control agreements. While in short order space systems also were integrated to the offensive uses of long-range delivery systems by providing photographic information about potential targets, strategic space systems were during the Cold War widely viewed as stabilizing the Superpower nuclear competition. The use of space for military purposes has continued into the present era, with increasing capabilities to take advantage of large segments of the electromagnetic spectrum for acquiring intelligence, communicating globally, and generally supporting ways of using nuclear weapons both for deterrence, and, should deterrence fail, use of those weapons against an adversary. Most of the nuclear weapon possessing states operate satellites for these purposes. Perhaps as importantly, space systems over the last two decades have become integral to the tactical warfighting ability of many modern states – a situation that has complicated the status of space systems as strategically stabilizing. Indeed, the growing use of space by many countries to achieve victory on the battlefield has increased both the vulnerability of militaries to attacks on their space systems and has, at the same time, increased their value as potential targets in a war. Over the past 50 years, the Soviet Union, the United States, and China have carried out experiments in or aimed at the outer space environment – mostly the area close to the atmosphere in Low Earth Orbit (LEO) – that show the capability to destroy a satellite, or to disrupt its functions. The specter of space warfare for many years has, among other negative consequences, raised concerns that a state’s nuclear retaliatory capability could be compromised. This concern also applies more generally, of course, to an ability to disrupt communications functions for other military, or civilian, purposes. In the 1980s, there was a period when the United States, and perhaps others, explored whether systems based in space could be used to destroy an adversary’s intercontinental ballistic missiles, or their payloads. The so-called Star Wars program under the Reagan Administration envisioned the deployment of a system of satellites that would seek to destroy the missiles/warheads launched at the United States. One technology explored envisioned detonating a nuclear explosive to generate a beam of x-rays that would put out of commission the adversary’s warhead. Thus far, such technologies have not succeeded in playing a role in the nuclear-weapon situation globally. However, the U.S. descendant of the Star Wars program – currently limited to conventionally equipped, ground- and sea-based missile defense interceptors with limited capability against a full-blown nuclear attack – continues to stress nuclear deterrence and stability between the United States and Russia, as well as China, which maintains a much smaller nuclear arsenal than the Cold War adversaries. However, recent missile experiments by China have demonstrated the vulnerability of the geosynchronous equatorial orbit (GEO), where many hundreds of satellites are “parked” carrying out communications and other functions, including nuclear weapons support systems and spy satellites. II. INCREASED THREATS INVOLVING OUTER SPACE Since the first satellites were launched in the 1950s by the Soviet Union and then the United States, the Russian Federation, the United States, China, India, Japan, and other states have, without much coordination, launched so many satellites into space into various orbits and at various altitudes that there is currently a strong risk of both congestion and competition. There is no global regime for regulating outer space activities. The Outer Space Treaty of 1967, to which all the launching states, and most others, are party2 mandates that outer space be used solely for peaceful purposes, and prohibits the stationing of nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction in that environment. (The Treaty does not prohibit the transit of nuclear weapons, e.g. as a payload on a submarine-launched ballistic missile, through outer space; furthermore under common law practice, defensive military activities are tolerated as compliant with “peaceful purposes.”) The Outer Space Treaty, however, makes it clear that states are responsible for their own space activities, and compliance with international law. And while there are a number of other spacerelated treaties, UN principles and voluntary agreements managed by various UN and multilateral bodies, a nation’s activities in space are largely regulated by that nation alone. There is no international legal requirement for any one state to coordinate its satellite launches or maneuvers with others. Environmental Threats: Crowding and Debris Some 1,500 operational satellites are now in orbit, owned by more than 80 states or other entities. These states and entities have varying levels both of proficiency and of knowledge of the established laws and rules affecting space. In the radio frequency band of the electromagnetic spectrum, interference is rising, especially in the GEO regime. Some of this interference is deliberate, undertaken for political purposes, despite the fact that deliberate interference is one of the few legally binding restraints in the international space arena3 . The evolution in satellite technology has led to the wider use of smaller satellites, including so-called “Cubesats,” that can be deployed in constellations, especially in LEO. The number of operational satellites is expected to rise to many thousands within the decade. LEO, in particular, is becoming incredibly crowded with satellites, making tracking of on-orbit objects extremely difficult. Furthermore, many small satellites have no ability to maneuver to avoid collisions with other satellites and space debris. The half-century of using space has resulted, from the breakup of satellites and other activities, in a considerable amount of on-orbit debris – including satellites no longer in use, parts of satellites that have broken up, launcher stages, nuts and bolts, and debris from the deliberate destruction of satellites. The United States and others track some 23,000 orbiting pieces with a diameter of greater than 10 cm. This debris is especially dangerous if a satellite or transiting vehicle collides with a piece, since the closing velocity of such a collision on-orbit is very high – some 7.5 kilometers per second (faster than a bullet) in LEO. Worse yet, even very small debris, most of which cannot be detected much less tracked, can destroy an operational satellite; it is estimated that some 500,000 to one million pieces of debris smaller than 10 centimeters exist on orbit. **It is widely agreed that new international measures to better coordinate space activities are required to ensure that the space environment is sustained**. In 2007, the United Nations Committee for the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS) in Vienna, Austria, agreed on a set of guidelines for the mitigation of space debris, which are slowly being implemented by many space-faring states. It may be that such measures will eventually require removal of debris from orbit, as the decay of debris from space into the atmosphere where it burns up (or falls on Earth) is a very long-term prospect, taking as much as 25 years in LEO. Sadly, the lifetime of debris in GEO, like diamonds, is practically forever. COPUOS currently is working on a set of recommended best practices to ensure the “long-term sustainability of space.” COPUOS has a 2018 deadline to finish this work; however, there is already discussion of follow-on effort that may include international guidelines for debris removal. Increasing Military Tensions in Space In the geopolitical sphere, compared with the period following the breakup of the Soviet Union, the current decade is witnessing increased tensions between the United States and Russia, and between the United States and China. The geopolitical situation in space has been further eroded by the proliferation of experimentation with and/or deployment of dual-use technologies with “counterspace,” i.e. satellite attack, capabilities. As noted above, China, Russia and the United States all have tested (or in some cases deployed) such technologies in both LEO and GEO. The United States continues to have an advantage in military space capabilities, but its edge is eroding as China and Russia dedicate more resources. Most technologies involved in sustaining systems in orbit are dual-use, but certain specific activities are raising suspicions about potential intended weapons use. The capability to maneuver satellites is particularly relevant. Russia placed a satellite called Luch/Olymp in GEO that maneuvered or drifted over a considerable range, and at several points in 2015 came extremely close to commercial satellites owned by Intelsat.4 Intelsat called the move “irresponsible,” but their request for information from Russia went unanswered. The maneuvers further prompted concern at the U.S. Defense Department about the satellite’s mission, which has not been revealed by Moscow. The United States also has carried out programs in GEO that could have potential weapons capabilities. For example, the PAN, an acronym for Palladium at Night, is a classified program apparently dealing with communications platforms, and perhaps providing other capabilities.5 The Geosynchronous Space Situational Awareness Program (GSSAP) is a U.S. military satellite constellation that also maneuvers in orbit, designed, according to the Pentagon, with the objective of inspecting other satellites orbiting in GEO. Such activities are known as Rendezvous and Proximity Operations (RPO), and have a number of benign applications such as satellite refueling, inspection and repair. Russia is carrying out other such experiments in LEO, as are China, the United States, Japan and Sweden. The commercial applications of maneuvering satellites are also increasing. Among the number of more directly identifiable counterspace technologies now available, the most widespread are ground-based radio-frequency jammers, which can be used to disrupt satellite communications and operations. In addition, there are efforts to develop lasers for disrupting or degrading systems based in space. Russia, China and the United States have also carried out projects involving terrestrially based missiles carrying anti-satellite payloads. The United States as early as the 1980s launched missiles from an F-15 fighter jet with this objective. A 2007 Chinese test, involving the destruction of a non-functional Chinese weather satellite in LEO, released a considerable quantity of debris. The United States subsequently launched a missile from an Aegis cruiser that was advertised to have the objective of destroying a satellite in a decaying orbit, but this did not prevent speculation that the mission also had the objective of demonstrating a similar capability to that of China. Over decades, the U.S. missile defense program has also heavily relied on the space environment, for early warning, for communications, and as a place for engaging and destroying hostile systems. Noted above is the Reagan Administration’s “Star Wars” program, pursued with the idea of creating a “shield” against intercontinental ballistic missiles. **The harder-line rhetoric that has been employed in recent years also has had an inevitable impact of raising tensions**. The United States has pivoted from an approach of “strategic restraint” to one emphasizing “warfighting.”6 In particular, the budgets for providing resiliency in space systems and counterspace capabilities have been increasing. At the same time, Russian accusations that U.S. activities have a hostile objective, and its responses to U.S. representations, have become shriller. Russia has called the anti-ballistic missile system SM-3 2A an anti-satellite weapon, while touting its own objectives for acquiring anti-satellite capabilities. In 2013, China tested a missile, the Dong Ning-2, which appears capable of reaching satellites in GEO. Chinese military space activities lack transparency, but it seems clear that such activities include the objective of being able to exercise counterspace actions. Most troubling, there has been a lack of serious dialogue among these Big Three states. Multilateral Efforts to Reduce Risks For many years, a direct approach to concerns about the potential for weaponizing space (space has been militarized since the dawn of the space age, but so far cannot be said to have been weaponized) has been debated within the United Nations, as well as at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. The Russian-Chinese cosponsored initiative, on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space, has been on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament since 1985, and under that agenda item Moscow and Beijing have proposed a treaty to ban weapons in space.7 However, the Conference has been all but immobilized by wider disagreements since that time; and the United States remains firmly opposed to the proposed treaty. There have been a number of efforts to set norms of behavior in space in order to guard against misunderstanding and conflict in space. Most recently, the 2013 UN Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Transparency and Confidence-Building Measures in Outer Space Activities released a set of recommended initiatives for states to implement, including improved communications about objects in orbit.8 Unfortunately, little work has been done since to implement the recommendations, either at the multilateral level or by individual states. However, the United States, Russia and China have recommended that the UN Disarmament Commission, based in New York, and the deliberative body on arms control issues, take up the question of implementation of the GGE recommendations. While the initial proposal has been received favorably, a decision regarding whether to put the issue on the Commission’s formal agenda will not be made until Fall. III. POLICY QUESTIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES In view of the increased uncertainties affecting the use of outer space, particularly in the area of international security, the United States needs to address several issues with some urgency. First, what is the appropriate mix of resiliency measures to apply in the coming years? A subsidiary question in this regard is what is an appropriate role for commercial providers? And should the U.S. military switch to constellations of small satellites for some national security missions? The budgetary implications of achieving objectives, and establishing appropriate requirements, are important components of pursuing this mix. And there is the inevitable bureaucratic overlap between the Department of Defense and the Intelligence Community. Such “turf” issues require constant attention lest they adversely impact on the fulfillment of national, vice institutional, objectives. Lengthy acquisition programs put systems at risk of becoming obsolescent earlier than they would otherwise become outdated. As part of this latter issue, the United States will need to consider what reforms are needed in the acquisition process, and related organizational arrangements. The integration of Department of Defense and Intelligence Community programs and activities is inevitably a delicate matter; it will require especial focus from the White House, in particular as resiliency is now being embedded into the requirements for acquisition of new systems. A more far reaching issue is how best to strike a balance between the defensive aspects of counterspace and the offensive aspects. And integral to addressing this balance is the impact of U.S. options to respond to hostile space activities on the stability of the strategic/nuclear relationships: U.S.-Russia, U.S.-China, and a large number of other such relationships involving the nuclear-weapon-possessing states. If “arms racing” resumes, or, in the case of India and Pakistan, continues, how will the use of space, specifically for counterspace activities, impact on these races, and vice-versa? Will there be a deterioration in nuclear deterrence? Will an offensive strategy involving the targeting of an adversary’s nuclear-related satellites emerge? These are questions that beg answers in the near-term, as budgetary and policy decisions are being made. **It is also important to consider the role of diplomacy in dealing with international security for outer space.** Diplomacy, in the form of both self-restraint and in reassurance of potential adversaries regarding intentions, has been a part of the tool kit for managing competition in space from the beginning of the space age. Can effective “rules of the road” be further developed? The limited success, but slow pace, of multilateral efforts should not be seen as failure, however. Diplomacy is a difficult business, often characterized by a “one step forward, one step back” dynamic. There is some optimism to be found in the ongoing COPUOS effort, which while a slightly sideways approach, will have positive impacts on international security if successful. While the Disarmament Commission has little power, the advent of discussions there would provide a much needed multilateral forum for addressing the security issues for space given the decades-long impasse at the Conference on Disarmament. Finally, **one should not overlook the value of bilateral diplomacy, particularly among the Big Three space powers. Further work will also be needed to regulate the proliferation of technologies in the commercial sector**. This will likely involve export control, and measures for the management of “traffic” in space (STM). However, care must be given to weigh national security concerns against the needs of commercial industry to thrive in the international marketplace. There is a tendency in the national security community to try to “close the barn door after the horses have escaped” that must not be indulged in the space domain, given the reliance of the national security sector on commercial capabilities and technological innovation. IV. THE NEED FOR A “TIME OUT” To date, no state is deploying dedicated anti-satellite weapons. Testing of capabilities does not a program make. That said, the trend lines are currently negative and require both time and analysis to mitigate. It would be irresponsible for the United States, or any other country, to leap to conclusions about the “inevitability” of all-out war in space. A balanced strategy, which combines resiliency, deterrence, and diplomacy **will be required to** protect national security and **ensure international security**. While development of some anti-satellite capabilities for potential future use may be wise, a run-away space arms race is not desirable for any party. It may be that a viable modus vivendi could be a situation of “implied deterrence:” i.e., the development of dual-use technologies with inherent weapons capabilities in a transparent manner so as to provide the knowledge to others that, if pushed, antisatellite weapons could be deployed. And despite the difficulties to date, **the prospect of the multilateral establishment of norms shows some possibility of promise.** This involves the implementation of recommendations by the Group of Governmental Experts discussed above; of the COPUOS LTS (long-term sustainability) best practices work making progress by 2018; the successful efforts to codify the legal regime that are underway (e.g., those at McGill University in Montreal), and perhaps the UN Disarmament Commission addressing TCBMs in 2018. These efforts must be given a chance to ripen, however much frustration is involved in the processes. It can perhaps be helpful to think of the world as being surrounded on all sides by a large fishbowl, of indefinite dimensions in the outward direction, with the atmosphere at the intersection between “outer” space and the land and waters below. Looked at in this way, human activities in outer space have little room to be confined to a single state: the world as a whole is impacted by those activities. Accordingly, when dealing with outer space, traditional concepts of absolute roles for state sovereignty must inevitably be modified to serve the objectives of global peace, security and stability. Whether this reality will at some point lead to an appreciation that reliance on force, nuclear weapons in particular, cannot play the role in space that it does on the Earth, remains to be seen.