## Theory

#### Their failure to specify an agent is a voting issue – makes mechanism counterplans and agent-based disads impossible – it’s a voter for fairness because the 1AR can spike out of DAs and CPs, which kills clash and nuance. Means stick them with governments implementing the plan – that’s normal means since it’s what the literature assumes and what most disad links are about

## China

#### Plan: The appropriation of space by private entities is unjust, except for companies incorporated in the People’s Republic of China.

#### Private Chinese space companies are set to outpace America in the squo.

Autry and Kwast 18

Greg Autry, professor of space leadership, policy, and business @ ASU, served on the 2016 NASA transition team Steve Kwast, Lieutenant General and commander for the Air Force, fellow in public policy @ Harvard, 12-8-2018, "America Is Losing the Second Space Race to China," Foreign Policy, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/08/22/america-is-losing-the-second-space-race-to-china/> //MLT

China’s aggressive investment in space solar power will allow it to provide cheap, clean power to the world, displacing U.S. energy firms while placing a second yoke around the developing world. Significantly, such orbital power stations have dual use potential and, if properly designed, could serve as powerful offensive weapons platforms. China’s first step in this process is to conquer the growing small space launch market. Beijing is providing nominally commercial firms with government-manufactured, mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles they can use to dump launch services on the market below cost. These start-ups are already undercutting U.S. pricing by 80 percent. Based on its previous success in using dumping to take out U.S. developed industries such as solar power modules and drones, China will quickly move upstream to attack the leading U.S. launch providers and secure a global commercial monopoly. Owning the launch market will give them an unsurmountable advantage against U.S. competitors in satellite internet, imaging, and power.

#### Chinese space dominance is k2 global hegemony.

Jaewoo 21

Jaewoo Choo, professor of international politics @ Kyung Hee U, director of China Research Center, 3-11-2021, "The United States and China: Competition for superiority in space to protect resources and weapon systems," OpenAsia | Thoughts and Ideas about Asia, <https://www.openasia.asia/the-united-states-and-china-competition-for-superiority-in-space-to-protect-resources-and-weapon-systems/> //MLT

Whoever rules space rules the future There is one reason why the two countries' space strategy competition will inevitably lead to a hegemony competition. This is because they try to conquer the space order. Conquering the space order is to define and establish the space order. Those who dominate space will dominate almost all sectors of the future world, including economy, technology, environment, cyberspace, transportation and energy. That's why the United States is considered as a hegemonic country on Earth today. The U.S. is recognized as a hegemonic country because it establishes and leads the economic, financial, trade, political, and diplomatic order. There are two areas in the world today where international order has not been established. One is virtual space, which is the cyber world. The other is the space. Since the international order of these two areas is closely correlated with each other, it is likely that the establishment of the order in these two areas will be pursued simultaneously. This means that cyber order cannot be discussed without discussing satellite issues. The Communist Party of China recognized this early on. At the 19th National Communist Party Congress in 2017, it expressed its justification for establishing space order. President Xi Jinping declared that China's diplomatic stage in the 21st century has expanded beyond the Earth into space and virtual space. It was the moment when China defined the concept of diplomatic space as the "universe" beyond the Earth. He then explained that the establishment of a system that can even manage the order of the universe and the virtual world eventually means the establishment of practical governance. Therefore, he justified that China's diplomatic horizon has no choice but to expand into space. Furthermore, he stressed that he is confident that the ideation of building such governance serves as the foundation for the community of common destiny for mankind which China pursues. In other words, he publicly urged China to have the capabilities and means to become a key country in building governance in these two areas.

**Chinese leadership solves extinction.**

Shen **Yamei 18**, Deputy Director and Associate Research Fellow of Department for American Studies, China Institute of International Studies, 1-9-2018, "Probing into the “Chinese Solution” for the Transformation of Global Governance," CAIFC, http://www.caifc.org.cn/en/content.aspx?id=4491

As the world is in a period of great development, transformation and adjustment, the international power comparison is undergoing profound changes, global governance is reshuffling and traditional governance concepts and models are confronted with challenges. The international community is expecting China to play a bigger role in global governance, which has given birth to the Chinese solution. A. To Lead the Transformation of the Global Governance System. **The “shortcomings” of the existing global governance system are prominent, which can hardly ensure global development. First, the traditional dominant forces are seriously imbalanced**. The US and Europe that used to dominate the global governance system have been beset with structural problems, with their economic development stalling, social contradictions intensifying, populism and secessionism rising, and states trapped in internal strife and differentiation. These countries have not fully reformed and adjusted themselves well, but rather pointed their fingers at globalization and resorted to retreat for self-insurance or were busy with their own affairs without any wish or ability to participate in global governance, which has encouraged the growth of “anti-globalization” trend into an interference factor to global governance. Second, the global governance mechanism is relatively lagging behind. Over the years of development, the strength of emerging economies has increased dramatically, which has substantially upset the international power structure, as the developing countries as a whole have made 80 percent of the contributions to global economic growth. These countries have expressed their appeal for new governance and begun policy coordination among themselves, which has initiated the transition of global governance form “Western governance” to “East-West joint governance”, but **the traditional governance mechanisms such as the World Bank, IMF and G7 failed to reflect the demand of the new pattern, in addition to their lack of representation and inclusiveness.** Third, the global governance rules are developing in a fragmented way, with governance deficits existing in some key areas. With the diversification and in-depth integration of international interests, the domain of global governance has continued to expand, with actors multiplying by folds and action intentions becoming complicated. As relevant efforts are usually temporary and limited to specific partners or issues, global governance driven by requests of “diversified governance” lacks systematic and comprehensive solutions. Since the beginning of this year, there have been risks of running into an acephalous state **in such key areas as global economic governance and climate change**. **Such emerging issues as nuclear security and international terrorism have suffered injustice because of power politics**. **The governance areas in deficit, such as cyber security, polar region and oceans, have “reversely forced” certain countries and organizations to respond hastily**. All of these have made the global governance system trapped in a dilemma and call urgently for a clear direction of advancement. B. To Innovate and Perfect the International Order. Currently, whether the developing countries or the Western countries of Europe and the US are greatly discontent with the existing international order as well as their appeals and motivation for changing the order are unprecedentedly strong. The US is the major creator and beneficiary of the existing hegemonic order, but it is now doubtful that it has gained much less than lost from the existing order, faced with the difficulties of global economic transformation and obsessed with economic despair and political dejection. Although the developing countries as represented by China acknowledge the positive role played by the post-war international order in safeguarding peace, boosting prosperity and promoting globalization, they criticize the existing order for lack of inclusiveness in politics and equality in economy, as well as double standard in security, believing it has failed to reflect the multi-polarization trend of the world and is an exclusive “circle club”. Therefore, there is much room for improvement. For China, to lead the transformation of the global governance system and international order not only supports the efforts of the developing countries to uphold multilateralism rather than unilateralism, advocate the rule of law rather than the law of the jungle and practice democracy rather than power politics in international relations, but also is an important subject concerning whether China could gain the discourse power and development space corresponding to its own strength and interests in the process of innovating and perfecting the framework of international order. C. To Promote Integration of the Eastern and Western Civilizations. Dialog among civilizations, which is the popular foundation for any country’s diplomatic proposals, runs like a trickle moistening things silently. Nevertheless, in the existing international system guided by the “Western-Centrism”, the Western civilization has always had the self-righteous superiority, conflicting with the interests and mentality of other countries and having failed to find the path to co-existing peacefully and harmoniously with other civilizations. **So to speak, many problems of today, including the growing gap in economic development between the developed and developing countries against the background of globalization, the Middle East trapped in chaos and disorder, the failure of Russia and Turkey to “integrate into the West”, etc., can be directly attributed to lack of exchanges, communication and integration among civilizations.** Since the 18th National Congress of CPC, Xi Jinping has raised the concept of “Chinese Dream” that reflects both Chinese values and China’s pursuit, re-introducing to the world the idea of “all living creatures grow together without harming one another and ways run parallel without interfering with one another”, which is the highest ideal in Chinese traditional culture, and striving to shape China into a force that counter-balance the Western civilization. He has also made solemn commitment that “we respect the diversity of civilizations …… cannot be puffed up with pride and depreciate other civilizations and nations”; “facing the people deeply trapped in misery and wars, we should have not only compassion and sympathy, but also responsibility and action …… do whatever we can to extend assistance to those people caught in predicament”, etc. China will rebalance the international pattern from a more inclusive civilization perspective and with more far-sighted strategic mindset, or at least correct the bisected or predominated world order so as to promote the parallel development of the Eastern and Western civilizations through mutual learning, integration and encouragement. D. To Pass on China’s Confidence. Only a short while ago, some Western countries had called for “China’s responsibility” and made it an inhibition to “regulate” China’s development orientation. Today, China has become a source of stability in an international situation full of uncertainties. Over the past 5 years, China has made outstanding contributions to the recovery of world economy under relatively great pressure of its own economic downturn. Encouraged by the “four confidences”, the whole of the Chinese society has burst out innovation vitality and produced innovation achievements, making people have more sense of gain and more optimistic about the national development prospect. It is the heroism of the ordinary Chinese to overcome difficulties and realize the ideal destiny that best explains China’s confidence. When this confidence is passed on in the field of diplomacy, it is expressed as: first, China’s posture is seen as more forging ahead and courageous to undertake responsibilities ---- proactively shaping the international agendas rather than passively accepting them; having clear-cut attitudes on international disputes rather than being equivocal; and extending international cooperation to comprehensive and dimensional development rather than based on the theory of “economy only”. In sum, China will actively seek understanding and support from other countries rather than imposing its will on others with clear-cut Chinese characteristics, Chinese style and Chinese manner. Second, China’s discourse is featured as a combination of inflexibility and yielding as well as magnanimous ---- combining the internationally recognized diplomatic principles with the excellent Chinese cultural traditions through digesting the Chinese and foreign humanistic classics assisted with philosophical speculations to make “China Brand, Chinese Voice and China’s Image get more and more recognized”. Third, the Chinese solution is more practical and intimate to people as well as emphasizes inclusive cooperation, as China is full of confidence to break the monopoly of the Western model on global development, “offering mankind a Chinese solution to explore a better social system”, and “providing a brand new option for the nations and peoples who are hoping both to speed up development and maintain independence”. II.Path Searching of the “Chinese Solution” for Global Governance Over the past years’ efforts, China has the ability to transform itself from “grasping the opportunity” for development to “creating opportunity” and “sharing opportunity” for common development, hoping to pass on the longing of the Chinese people for a better life to the people of other countries and promoting the development of the global governance system toward a more just and rational end. It has become the major power’s conscious commitment of China to lead the transformation of the global governance system in a profound way. A. To Construct the Theoretical System for Global Governance. The theoretical system of global governance has been the focus of the party central committee’s diplomatic theory innovation since the 18th National Congress of CPC as well as an important component of the theory of socialism with Chinese characteristics for a new era, which is not only the sublimation of China’s interaction with the world from “absorbing and learning” to “cooperation and mutual learning”, but also the cause why so many developing countries have turned from “learning from the West” to “exploring for treasures in the East”. In the past 5 years, the party central committee, based on precise interpretation of the world pattern today and serious reflection on the future development of mankind, has made a sincere call to the world for promoting the development of global governance system toward a more just and rational end, and proposed a series of new concepts and new strategies including engaging in major power diplomacy with Chinese characteristics, creating the human community with common destiny, promoting the construction of new international relationship rooted in the principle of cooperation and win-win, enriching the strategic thinking of peaceful development, sticking to the correct benefit view, formulating the partnership network the world over, advancing the global economic governance in a way of mutual consultation, joint construction and co-sharing, advocating the joint, comprehensive, cooperative and sustainable security concept, and launching the grand “Belt and Road” initiative. The Chinese solution composed of these contents, not only fundamentally different from the old roads of industrial revolution and colonial expansion in history, but also different from the market-driven neo-liberalism model currently advocated by Western countries and international organizations, stands at the height of the world and even mankind, seeking for global common development and having widened the road for the developing countries to modernization, which is widely welcomed by the international community. B. To Supplement and Perfect the Global Governance System. Currently, the international political practice in global governance is mostly problem-driven without creating a set of relatively independent, centralized and integral power structures, resulting in the existing global governance systemcharacterized as both extensive and unbalanced. China has been engaged in reform and innovation, while maintaining and constructing the existing systems, producing some thinking and method with Chinese characteristics. First, China sees the UN as a mirror that reflects the status quo of global governance, which should act as the leader of global governance, and actively safeguards the global governance system with the UN at the core. Second, China is actively promoting the transforming process of such recently emerged international mechanisms as G20, BRICS and SCO, perfecting them through practice, and boosting Asia-Pacific regional cooperation and the development of economic globalization. China is also promoting the construction of regional security mechanism through the Six-Party Talks on Korean Peninsula nuclear issue, Boao Forum for Asia, CICA and multilateral security dialog mechanisms led by ASEAN so as to lay the foundation for the future regional security framework. Third, China has initiated the establishment of AIIB and the New Development Bank of BRICS, creating a precedent for developing countries to set up multilateral financial institutions. The core of the new relationship between China and them lies in “boosting rather than controlling” and “public rather than private”, which is much different from the management and operation model of the World Bank, manifesting the increasing global governance ability of China and the developing countries as well as exerting pressure on the international economic and financial institution to speed up reforms. **Thus, in leading the transformation of the global governance system, China has not overthrown the existing systems and started all over again, but been engaged in innovating and perfecting; China has proactively undertaken international responsibilities, but has to do everything in its power and act according to its ability.** C. To Reform the Global Governance Rules. Many of the problems facing global governance today are deeply rooted in such a cause that the dominant power of the existing governance system has taken it as the tool to realize its own national interests first and a platform to pursue its political goals. Since the beginning of this year, the US has for several times requested the World Bank, IMF and G20 to make efforts to mitigate the so-called global imbalance, abandoned its commitment to support trade openness, cut down investment projects to the middle-income countries, and deleted commitment to support the efforts to deal with climate change financially, which has made the international systems accessories of the US domestic economic agendas, dealing a heavy blow to the global governance system. On the contrary, the interests and agendas of China, as a major power of the world, are open to the whole world, and China in the future “will provide the world with broader market, more sufficient capital, more abundant goods and more precious opportunities for cooperation”, while having the ability to make the world listen to its voice more attentively. With regard to the subject of global governance, China has advocated that what global governance system is better cannot be decided upon by any single country, as the destiny of the world should be in the hands of the people of all countries. In principle, all the parties should stick to the principle of mutual consultation, joint construction and co-sharing, resolve disputes through dialog and differences through consultation. Regarding the critical areas, opening to the outer world does not mean building one’s own backyard, but building the spring garden for co-sharing; the “Belt and Road” initiative is not China’s solo, but a chorus participated in by all countries concerned. **China has also proposed international public security views on nuclear security, maritime cooperation and cyber space order, calling for efforts to make the global village into a “grand stage for seeking common development” rather than a “wrestling arena”; we cannot “set up a stage here, while pulling away a prop there”, but “complement each other to put on a grand show”**. From the orientation of reforms, efforts should be made to better safeguard and expand the legitimate interests of the developing countries and increase the influence of the emerging economies on global governance. Over the past 5 years, China has attached importance to full court diplomacy, gradually coming to the center stage of international politics and proactively establishing principles for global governance. By hosting such important events as IAELM, CICA Summit, G20 Summit, the Belt and Road International Cooperation Forum and BRICS Summit, China has used theseplatforms to elaborate the Asia-Pacific Dream for the first time to the world, expressing China’s views on Asian security and global economic governance, discussing with the countries concerned with the Belt and Road about the synergy of their future development strategies and setting off the “BRICS plus” capacity expansion mechanism, in which China not only contributes its solution and shows its style, but also participates in the shaping of international principles through practice. On promoting the resolution of hot international issues, China abides by the norms governing international relations based on the purposes and principles of the UN Charter, and insists on justice, playing a constructive role as a responsible major power in actively promoting the political accommodation in Afghanistan, mediating the Djibouti-Eritrea dispute, promoting peace talks in the Middle East, devoting itself to the peaceful resolution of the South China Sea dispute through negotiations. In addition, China’s responsibility and quick response to international crises have gained widespread praises, as seen in such cases as assisting Africa in its fight against the Ebola epidemic, sending emergency fresh water to the capital of Maldives and buying rice from Cambodia to help relieve its financial squeeze, which has shown the simple feelings of the Chinese people to share the same breath and fate with the people of other countries. D. To Support the Increase of the Developing Countries’ Voice. The developing countries, especially the emerging powers, are not only the important participants of the globalization process, but also the important direction to which the international power system is transferring. With the accelerating shift of global economic center to emerging markets and developing economies, the will and ability of the developing countries to participate in global governance have been correspondingly strengthened. As the biggest developing country and fast growing major power, China has the same appeal and proposal for governance as other developing countries and already began policy coordination with them, as China should comply with historical tide and continue to support the increase of the developing countries’ voice in the global governance system. To this end, China has pursued the policy of “dialog but not confrontation, partnership but not alliance”, attaching importance to the construction of new type of major power relationship and global partnership network, while making a series proposals in the practice of global governance that could represent the legitimate interests of the developing countries and be conducive to safeguarding global justice, including supporting an open, inclusive, universal, balanced and win-win economic globalization; promoting the reforms on share and voting mechanism of IMF to increase the voting rights and representation of the emerging market economies; financing the infrastructure construction and industrial upgrading of other developing countries through various bilateral or regional funds; and helping other developing countries to respond to such challenges as famine, refugees, climate change and public hygiene by debt forgiveness and assistance.

## Innovation

#### Space innovation is high and on the rise- **but innovation could tank in the absence of private companies**

Peterson 21 Bob Peterson is based out of Colorado Springs, Colorado, United States and works at Lockheed Martin as VP Space Systems. Peterson, Bob. “Commercializing the Race to Space - Insigniam.” Insigniam, August 9, 2021. https://insigniam.com/private-space-exploration-innovating-future-space/.//WL

After publicly stalling out due to cost concerns circa 2011, America’s space race is quickly heating up again. Only instead of NASA, this time it’s being spearheaded through private space exploration by three billionaire investors and the companies that mirror these entrepreneurs’ out-of-this-world ambitions: Richard Branson (Virgin Galactic), Elon Musk (SpaceX) and Jeff Bezos (Blue Origin). Expected to be a $1.4 trillion market by 2030, according to analysts at Bank of America, private space exploration and tourism are already ushering in a host of new innovations outside of traditional aerospace and defense realms. For example: Morgan Stanley suggests that the business world’s growing rush to reach orbit may also help sate the world’s ever-growing appetite for high-speed satellite broadband technology and data, kick-start rocket-fueled delivery services and even enable asteroid mining in years to come. Here, we take a closer look at the field’s three front-runners, how each is pioneering new scientific advancements, and various trickle-down innovations that private space exploration may soon bring back to dozens of industries on planet Earth. Virgin Galactic On July 11—just 17 years after announcing the company—Virgin Group founder Richard Branson took his inaugural trip 53 miles above the Earth’s surface in Virgin Galactic’s suborbital, rocket-powered space plane VSS Unity. Capable of holding six passengers and two pilots, the craft isn’t likely to be earthbound for very long; the company has already sold around 600 tickets for flights at the princely sum of $200,000 to $250,000 apiece. As of early August, more tickets were available starting at $450,000 each. The increasing desire for private space exploration points to companies’ growing desire to more cost-efficiently use resources, leverage emerging or preexisting technology in new ways, optimize processes and workflows, and pioneer new markets by democratizing access to resources and equipment. The first of the billionaire space company founders to reach the edge of space (depending on the definition), Branson did so thanks to myriad scientific and business innovations made by his firm. Advancements not only include a new high-speed aircraft design that leverages modular technology to improve flight rate and maintenance access. They also incorporate a livery design built from a mirrorlike material that provides heightened thermal protection and color-changing potential, a spectacular display of the plane’s advanced capabilities in keeping with Branson’s notoriously flashy brand of showmanship. These upgrades have helped power Virgin Galactic’s ongoing push to capture public and media attention, enticing armchair astronauts to fulfill childhood dreams and fueling a booming business in space tourism. Moreover, unlike traditional crewed rockets, which launch from ground-based locales, Virgin’s ships lift off from bigger planes that drop them off in midair. It’s a highly efficient technique that consumes less fuel and reduces the need for custom launch pad infrastructure. Passengers, who can enjoy three to five minutes of weightlessness, will soon include scientists who can run experiments midflight, as opposed to primarily using traditional suborbital space testing methods—i.e., spacecraft without a crew. SpaceX Tesla founder Elon Musk’s SpaceX is an all-purpose space technology firm that designs and manufactures myriad cutting-edge rockets and spacecraft. Case in point: Its Dragon capsule has already proved it can cost-efficiently carry crew and cargo to the International Space Station. The company’s Starship large-scale rocket and spacecraft system is also designed to carry massive payloads into orbit—and, thanks to NASA’s support, is expected soon to land the first astronauts on the moon since the Apollo program. Not yet 20 years old, SpaceX is additionally focused on introducing more dependable equipment at a fraction of standard production and operating costs. Other innovations include the Falcon 9, a reusable two-stage rocket for repeatedly transporting people and equipment into space, and Falcon Heavy, the world’s most powerful rocket today, which can carry twice as much weight as its closest competitor. SpaceX’s ambitions even extend to commercial space flight and ride-sharing if you or your company’s inventory need to catch a quick lift into the atmosphere. Almost as curious as the company’s public-facing creations are those powering its operations behind the scenes, including a fleet of autonomous drone ships that catch rockets as they hurtle back to earth, landing in the ocean. SpaceX is also heavily investing in building out Starlink, a broadband internet service powered by thousands of satellites that has the potential to bring high-speed connectivity to remote and rural areas around the globe. In short, by leveraging a host of leading-edge technical advancements to power practical innovations in communications, transport and aerospace operations, SpaceX aims to privatize the field of space flight as a whole. No wonder NASA ranks among the company’s biggest customers. Blue Origin The brainchild of Amazon founder Jeff Bezos, Blue Origin was founded in 2000 with the mission of expanding humanity’s reach into space, fueling interstellar exploration, and powering the search for new material and energy resources. It hopes to do so by delivering low-cost, fully or partly reusable orbital launch vehicles that can serve the needs of businesses and individuals alike. One person recently paid an astounding $28 million for a ticket. Unlike Virgin Galactic, Blue Origin makes spacecraft that are able to cross the Kármán line—the 62-mile-high measurement that most countries consider to be the boundary of outer space. (The U.S. uses 50 miles as a benchmark instead.) The company’s mantra is “Launch, Land, Repeat,” a testimonial to its commitment to drastically lower expenses associated with space travel, and to the built-in vertical takeoff and landing technology that allows used vehicles to be quickly refurbished and once again take flight. Note that Blue Origin is also experimenting with oversized lunar landers designed to ferry astronauts and equipment affordably to and from the moon. Investment Opportunities and New Innovations The increasing desire for private space exploration points to companies’ growing desire to more cost-efficiently use resources, leverage emerging or preexisting technology in new ways, optimize processes and workflows, and pioneer new markets by democratizing access to resources and equipment. Each of the big three players has sought to tap into a mix of proprietary and community knowledge bases, leverage new high-tech and engineering advancements to lower overhead and operating costs, and boost the accessibility of space travel. Likewise, all have looked to raise public awareness, amortize their investments in new innovations and extend potential revenue streams by finding new business applications for their proprietary solutions at every turn. To read more about the commercialization of space, read “Commercial Space Is Becoming Big Business.” Virgin Galactic is publicly traded, Blue Origin and SpaceX are not. However, more than 10,000 companies (42% of which are American), worth upward of $4 trillion in total, are now pioneering space-based business solutions. In addition, many of these firms—which are looking to make plays in many fields, like telecom, tourism, artificial intelligence and robotics—are investor-friendly startups helping to further capitalize or expand upon the innovations that the big three players are ushering in. Key areas of growth going forward for space-based business are expected to include navigation and mapping, satellite communications, cloud-based applications, manufacturing, and health care/medicine. And that’s before you factor in potential research and scientific applications. Example: the University of Florida researching plants’ changing gene activity in weightless environments via experiments conducted in partnership with Virgin Galactic. It’s yet to be determined whether billionaire-funded private space exploration spaceflight firms will successfully deliver on their aim to democratize space travel, or such trips will remain a prohibitively pricey luxury for most aspiring voyagers. Regardless of whether casual flights into space and stargazing business or research contracts become more commonplace, it’s clear that this nascent field has a promising future. While a Jetsons-style culture of weekend jaunts into orbit is still the stuff of science fiction for now, don’t forget: Succeed or fail, to their credit, all of these firms are helping expand businesses’ ambitions to the stars and beyond and helping illustrate a multitude of potential new uses for aerospace solutions.

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

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

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

#### impacts:

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

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

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

#### **Space innovation is key to colonizing outer space- scientific discovery promotes breakthroughs that benefit society**

Raghavan 21 Seetha Raghavan is a professor in UCF’s Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering. “The Impact of Innovation in the New Era of Space Exploration | University of Central Florida News.” 2021. University of Central Florida News | UCF Today. August 5, 2021. https://www.ucf.edu/news/the-impact-of-innovation-in-the-new-era-of-space-exploration/.//WL

Every once in a while, a confluence of discoveries, events and initiatives results in a breakthrough so significant that it propels the entire world to a higher level, redefining what is possible in so many different fields. This breakthrough is taking centerstage now, as the new era of space exploration — catalyzed by increasing launch access — dawns upon us. The surge of innovation that comes with this will create new opportunities and inspire the next generation of doers. When this happens, boundaries between scientific and social impact are blurred. Innovation leading to scientific discovery can benefit society in the same way that social innovation can diversify and support scientific innovators, who can contribute to global progress. To ride this wave of progress, we must all participate and innovate in the new era of space exploration. The intersection of space exploration, innovation and impact isn’t a new phenomenon. In the past, technology developments and spin-offs from space research have consistently found their way into communities worldwide sometimes with lifesaving benefits. The International Space Station supports experiments that have led to discoveries and inventions in communication, water purification, and remote guidance for health procedures and robotic surgeries. Satellite-enabled Earth observation capabilities that monitor natural disasters, climate and crops often support early warnings for threats and mitigation strategies. Space exploration has always been relevant to everyone no matter the discipline or interest. Commercialization of space has been key in many ways to the current boost in “firsts” over the last few years. It has spurred innovation in launch vehicles and related technologies that led to firsts in vertical-takeoff-vertical landing rocket technology, reusability of rocket boosters and privately developed crewed missions to orbit. Concurrently, NASA has continued to captivate our imagination with the first flight of a helicopter in another world, a mission to return an asteroid sample to Earth and sending a probe to make the closest ever approach to the sun. While we celebrate the scientific progress, there is a vastly important question that we all need to focus on: How can we drive the surge in innovation offered by increased access to space, to benefit humankind? Access to low-Earth orbit, and eventually human exploration of space, is a portal to achieve many impactful outcomes. The numbers and completion rate of microgravity experiments conducted by scientists will be greatly increased as a range of offerings in suborbital flights provide more opportunities to advance critical research in health, agriculture, energy, and more. Lunar, planetary, and even asteroid exploration may lead to discoveries of new materials — busting the limitations now imposed on capabilities for energy, transportation, and infrastructure or creating new sensors and devices that enhance safety on Earth. Space tourism —one can hope — has the power to potentially create an awareness of our oneness that may lead to social change. But much like all scientific endeavors, we cannot ignore the importance of pre-emptively identifying and mitigating negative impacts of new ventures some of which may have already taken shape. We need to consider space debris that threatens the very access that facilitates it, safety and rescue readiness to support increased crewed missions and space tourism, national security, and effects of light pollution on astronomy. Much of these can be approached and mitigated with new concepts and ideas that have already been set in motion. One thing is for certain, space has always been the inspiration for the next generation of innovators and creative thinkers. Architects of new ideas in this era will inspire many more. Ingenuity must also come from academic and research institutions building a new space-ready generation through innovative curriculum, scholarships, and research opportunities for key fields at all levels. Most of all, engaging participation is a responsibility anyone can take by steering the conversation and gathering ideas on how we can make this era one of positive benefit for all, while making opportunities inclusive to all.

#### Colonizing space solves extinction

Munevar, PhD, 19 [Gonzalo Munevar, Professor Emeritus at Lawrence Technological University, PhD Philosophy @ UC Berkeley. "An obligation to colonize outer space", Futures, Vol. 110, Pg. 38-40, published June 2019, accessed 11-1-2021, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0016328718302660#!] HWIC

We have an obligation to colonize outer space. This colonization may include establishing bases on the Moon, Mars, and other bodies in the solar system, perhaps leading to terraforming some of them, as well as building the sorts of space colonies championed by Gerard O’Neill.1 By doing so we may save humanity from collisions with asteroids and other cosmic catastrophes, while also bringing clean energy to Earth and giving us access to the resources of the solar system. Carrying out such tasks will, moreover, increase our scientific knowledge of heaven and Earth. A collision with a large asteroid may bring human life on Earth to an end. Space colonization would allow human life to continue. Smaller, and far more likely, collisions will cause great destruction and kill millions of people. Furthermore, a heavy human presence throughout the solar system would make it possible, even highly probable, that many such collisions may be prevented, thus saving billions of humans, and many other living beings, from a horrible death. And whether we are able to avert such a catastrophes, the sun will become a red giant in four or five billion years; but even long before then, it will make the Earth an unbearable planet. In the long run, thus, space colonization will give terrestrial life another chance. Space colonization will give us many opportunities to improve the Earth itself, for example by moving polluting industries into space, providing clean solar power from space at reasonable prices, and making available to our home planet many of the resources of the asteroids and other bodies in the solar system. Doing so will enable us to increase our knowledge of the universe, and particularly of planetary science, which would then permit a wiser approach to our own planet. The word limit narrows my scope, and thus I will concentrate on the likelihood of collisions with comets and asteroids. Gravitational disturbances of the asteroid belt, the Kuiper Belt (a little beyond Pluto) or of the Oort cloud, in the outskirts of the solar system, send many large bodies towards the sun.2 Some of them collide with the planets and moons of the solar system. Consider that there are trillions of objects larger than 1 km and billions larger than 20 km in the Oort cloud alone. Given its position, and its gravitation, the Earth becomes a target for collisions. Even in recent geologic times (within the last 100 million years) large meteors indeed have collided with the Earth, altered the weather catastrophically and brought extinction to the majority of species then living. One asteroid about 10 km in diameter, now called the Alvarez asteroid, is held responsible for the disappearance of the dinosaurs about 65 million years ago,3 although some think a comet may have been the culprit.4 And in 1994, large fragments of Comet Shoemaker-Levy 9 hit the atmosphere of Jupiter at velocities over 200,000 km per hour, exploding with a brightness as much as fifty times that of the entire planet, and ejecting searing materials thousands of kilometers above the clouds. Had Shoemaker-Levy 9 hit the Earth instead, we would have gone the way of the dinosaurs.5 Apart from the realization that our natural history has to make conceptual room for such catastrophes,6 there is a most obvious practical issue of survival involved. With a reliable tracking system in place, space technology might allow us to change the orbits of those comets or asteroids most in danger of colliding with the Earth. But how worried should we be? According to present models, meteors large enough to create Meteor Crater in Arizona would hit an urban area every 100,000 years on average. That meteor was presumably 60 m across; the crater is 1.2 km across. A body with a diameter of 250 m would cause a crater 5 km across and destroy some 10,000 square Kilometers (about the area of greater Los Angeles). And global catastrophes would take place every 300,000 years. These would be caused by meteors with a diameter of approximately 1.7 km.7 What is the evidence for these calculations? Soon after impact on Earth, craters are attacked by wind, water, life, lava and a myriad of tectonic motions. In the blink of an eye, geologically speaking, all obvious traces of them disappear from the surface of our active planet. But we find a good record on the Moon. And in Venus, where most of the surface is 600 million years old, the spacecraft Magellan counted nearly one thousand impact craters at least twice the diameter of Meteor Crater. Venus is almost the same size as Earth, and in the Earth’s vicinity, and since the impacts are geologically recent, the Venusian impact record makes it reasonable to fear catastrophic impact on Earth every half a million years or so.8 Still greater collisions, with bodies of 5 km across, would happen, on the average every 20 million years.9 Apart from the asteroid that led to the extinction of the dinosaurs and the majority of species on Earth 65 million years ago, there have been at least two more impacts by asteroids 10 km or larger in the last 300 million years.10 New worries have been caused by the discovery of “rogue planets,” i.e. planets that were expelled from their solar systems and boulder their way through interstellar space. Some will be rocky like the Earth and some will resemble Jupiter, even much larger, carrying their large moons with them. Were one of them to come into our solar system, it would disrupt the orbits of our planets, perhaps sending the Earth itself into interstellar space. A collision would pulverize both bodies. Some scientists think that there are far more rogue planets than stars in the Milky Way, whereas the lowest estimate of Jupiter-size rogue planets is that of one per every four stars.11 Whether those of us living today will experience such catastrophes, eventually our descendants will be thankful to us for creating a warning system and the technology to prevent disaster.12 There can hardly be a better reason than the preservation of life, and perhaps the survival of the species, to establish the importance of colonizing space. An expansion of human colonies throughout the solar system would make it far easier to reach, say, an asteroid in a collision path with the Earth, when it is still very far away, and thus when the angle is small and the necessary alteration of its path will be relatively minor. Such deflection can be accomplished by several means: astronauts could make a smaller asteroid collide with the larger one, or use one of the mass drivers designed by O’Neill. Nuclear explosions might work also. If we are established in outer space. To do a proper mission starting from Earth may take many years, thus making it far less likely to succeed. Robotic deep-space missile platforms, which can never achieve human flexibility, let alone human ingenuity, are unlikely solutions, as can be gathered from previous discussion on robotic missions.13

## Util

#### The standard is maximizing expected well-being. Prefer –

#### Only pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable – all other frameworks collapse.

Moen 16 [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281]

Let us start by observing, empirically, that a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues. This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. “Pleasure” and “pain” are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative.2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values. If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, I might ask: “What for?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable. You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good.3 As Aristotle observes: “We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value

#### Epistemic modesty breaks any tie and answers all AC pre-empts.

#### Bostrom 12 (Nick Bostrom, Existential Risk Prevention as a Global Priority, 2012. NS)

These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk. Let me elaborate. Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know—at least not in concrete detail—what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving—and ideally improving—our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value.

#### Extinction justifies moral loopholes

Bok, 1988 (Sissela Bok, Professor of Philosophy, Brandeis, Applied Ethics and Ethical Theory, Ed. David Rosenthal and Fudlou Shehadi, 1988)

The same argument can be made for Kant’s other formulations of the Categorical Imperative: “So act as to use humanity, both in your own person and in the person of every other, always at the same time as an end, never simply as a means”; and “So act as if you were always through actions a law-making member in a universal Kingdom of Ends.” No one with a concern for humanity could consistently will to risk eliminating humanity in the person of himself and every other or to risk the death of all members in a universal Kingdom of Ends for the sake of justice. To risk their collective death for the sake of following one’s conscience would be, as Rawls said, “irrational, crazy.” And to say that one did not intend such a catastrophe, but that one merely failed to stop other persons from bringing it about would be beside the point when the end of the world was at stake.For although it is true that we cannot be held responsible for most of the wrongs that others commit, the Latin maxim presents a case where we would have to take such a responsibility seriously—perhaps to the point of deceiving, bribing, even killing an innocent person, in order that the world not perish.

#### That means their FW collapses to util; only util can explain why things like gov. legitimacy and democracy are good since the lack of them causes pain.

## Their FW

#### Democracy will catastrophically delay action on climate change---authoritarianism is necessary to ensure rapid state-led transformation

Mann & Wainwright ’18 (Geoff, teaches political economy and economic geography at Simon Fraser University, where he directs the Centre for Global Political Economy, Joel *Climate Leviathan: A Political Theory of Our Planetary Future*, pp. 38-40, ME)

Relative to the institutional means currently available to capitalist liberal democracy and its sorry attempts at “consensus,” this trajectory has some distinct advantages with respect to atmospheric carbon concentration, notably in terms of the capacity to coordinate massive political-economic reconfiguration quickly and comprehensively. In light of our earlier question—how can we possibly realize the necessary emissions reductions?—it is this feature of Climate Mao that most recommends it. As the climate justice movement struggles to be heard, most campaigns in the global North are premised on an unspoken faith in a lop-sided, elite-biased, liberal proceduralism doomed to failure given the scale and scope of the changes required. If climate science is even half-right in its forecasts, the liberal model of democracy is at best too slow, at worst a devastating distraction. Climate Mao reflects the demand for rapid, revolutionary, state-led transformation today. Indeed, calls for variations on just such a regime abound on the Left. Mike Davis and Giovanni Arrighi have more or less sided with Climate Mao, sketching it as an alternative to capitalist Climate Leviathan.35 We might even interpret the renewal of enthusiasm for Maoist theory (including Alain Badiou’s version) as part of the prevailing crisis of ecological-political imagination.36 Minqi Li’s is arguably the best developed of this line of thought, and like Arrighi he locates the fulcrum of global climate history in China, arguing that Climate Mao offers the only way forward: [U]nless China takes serious and meaningful actions to fulfill its obligation of emissions reduction, there is little hope that global climate stabilization can be achieved. However, it is very unlikely that the [present] Chinese government will voluntarily take the necessary actions to reduce emissions. The sharp fall of economic growth that would be required is something that the Chinese government will not accept and cannot afford politically. Does this mean that humanity is doomed? That depends on the political struggle within China and in the world as a whole.37 Taking inspiration from Mao, Li says a new revolution in the Chinese revolution—a re-energization of the Maoist political tradition—could transform China and save humanity from doom. He does not claim this is likely; one need only consider China’s massive highway expansions, accelerated automobile consumption, and subsidized urban sprawl.38 But he is right that if an anticapitalist, planetary sovereign is to emerge that could change the world’s climate trajectory, it is most likely to emerge in China.

#### Climate change causes extinction --- latest studies.

Sprat and Dunlop 19 (David Spratt and Ian Dunlop, \*Research Director for Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration and co-author of *Climate Code Red: The case for emergency action*; \*\*member of the Club of Rome AND formerly an international oil, gas and coal industry executive, chairman of the Australian Coal Association, chief executive of the Australian Institute of Company Directors, and chair of the Australian Greenhouse Office Experts Group on Emissions Trading, "Existential climate-related security risk: A scenario approach," Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration, 5-30-2019, https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/148cb0\_90dc2a2637f348edae45943a88da04d4.pdf, Date Accessed: 7-5-2019, SB)

2050: By 2050, there is broad scientific acceptance that system tipping-points for the West Antarctic Ice Sheet and a sea-ice-free Arctic summer were passed well before 1.5°C of warming, for the Greenland Ice Sheet well before 2°C, and for widespread permafrost loss and large-scale Amazon drought and dieback by 2.5°C. The “hothouse Earth” scenario has been realised, and Earth is headed for another degree or more of warming, especially since human greenhouse emissions are still significant. While sea levels have risen 0.5 metres by 2050, the increase may be 2–3 metres by 2100, and it is understood from historical analogues that seas may eventually rise by more than 25 metres. Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and 55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of lethal heat conditions, beyond the threshold of human survivability. The destabilisation of the Jet Stream has very significantly affected the intensity and geographical distribution of the Asian and West African monsoons and, together with the further slowing of the Gulf Stream, is impinging on life support systems in Europe. North America suffers from devastating weather extremes including wildfires, heatwaves, drought and inundation. The summer monsoons in China have failed, and water flows into the great rivers of Asia are severely reduced by the loss of more than one-third of the Himalayan ice sheet. Glacial loss reaches 70 percent in the Andes, and rainfall in Mexico and central America falls by half. Semi-permanent El Nino conditions prevail. Aridification emerges over more than 30 percent of the world’s land surface. Desertification is severe in southern Africa, the southern Mediterranean, west Asia, the Middle East, inland Australia and across the south-western United States. Impacts: A number of ecosystems collapse, including coral reef systems, the Amazon rainforest and in the Arctic. Some poorer nations and regions, which lack capacity to provide artificially-cooled environments for their populations, become unviable. Deadly heat conditions persist for more than 100 days per year in West Africa, tropical South America, the Middle East and South-East Asia, which together with land degradation and rising sea levels contributes to 21 perhaps a billion people being displaced. Water availability decreases sharply in the most affected regions at lower latitudes (dry tropics and subtropics), affecting about two billion people worldwide. Agriculture becomes nonviable in the dry subtropics. Most regions in the world see a significant drop in food production and increasing numbers of extreme weather events, including heat waves, floods and storms. Food production is inadequate to feed the global population and food prices skyrocket, as a consequence of a one-fifth decline in crop yields, a decline in the nutrition content of food crops, a catastrophic decline in insect populations, desertification, monsoon failure and chronic water shortages, and conditions too hot for human habitation in significant food-growing regions. The lower reaches of the agriculturally-important river deltas such as the Mekong, Ganges and Nile are inundated, and significant sectors of some of the world’s most populous cities — including Chennai, Mumbai, Jakarta, Guangzhou, Tianjin, Hong Kong, Ho Chi Minh City, Shanghai, Lagos, Bangkok and Manila — are abandoned. Some small islands become uninhabitable. Ten percent of Bangladesh is inundated, displacing 15 million people. According to the Global Challenges Foundation’s Global Catastrophic Risks 2018 report, even for 2°C of warming, more than a billion people may need to be relocated due to sea-level rise, and In high-end scenarios “the scale of destruction is beyond our capacity to model, with a high likelihood of human civilisation coming to an end.

## Case:

### collision

#### All their ev are just one off accidents that aren’t a pattern, their incidents are years apart from each other which proves that this isn’t intentional

#### The only reason why spaceX didn’t move out of the way which they warrant is missing a email and there’s tons of alt causes to them not moving; not seeing the email, viewing it too late

#### Private companies have incentive to move their satellites out of the way

#### Every satellite is an investment of their own money that they don’t want to waste

#### Crashing their satellites looks really bad for the company

### Debris

#### Probability – 0.1% chance of a collision.

Salter 16

Alexander William Salter, Economics Professor at Texas Tech, ’16, “SPACE DEBRIS: A LAW AND ECONOMICS ANALYSIS OF THE ORBITAL COMMONS” 19 STAN. TECH. L. REV. 221 \*numbers replaced with English words

The probability of a collision is currently low. Bradley and Wein estimate that the maximum probability in LEO of a collision over the lifetime of a spacecraft remains below one in one thousand, conditional on continued compliance with NASA’s deorbiting guidelines.3 However, the possibility of a future “snowballing” effect, whereby debris collides with other objects, further congesting orbit space, remains a significant concern.4 Levin and Carroll estimate the average immediate destruction of wealth created by a collision to be approximately $30 million, with an additional $200 million in damages to all currently existing space assets from the debris created by the initial collision.5 The expected value of destroyed wealth because of collisions, currently small because of the low probability of a collision, can quickly become significant if future collisions result in runaway debris growth.

#### Time frame – Kessler effect 200 years away.

Stubbe 17

Peter Stubbe, PhD in law @ Johann Wolfgang Goethe University Frankfurt, ’17, State Accountability for Space Debris: A Legal Study of Responsibility for Polluting the Space Environment and Liability for Damage Caused by Space Debris, Koninklijke Brill Publishing, ISBN 978-90-04-31407-8, p. 27-31

The prediction of possible scenarios of the future evolution of the debris p o p ulation involves many uncertainties. Long-term forecasting means the prediction of the evolution of the future debris environment in time periods of decades or even centuries. Predictions are based on models84 that work with certain assumptions, and altering these parameters significantly influences the outcomes of the predictions. Assumptions on the future space traffic and on the initial object environment are particularly critical to the results of modeling efforts.85 A well-known pattern for the evolution of the debris population is the so-called Kessler effect’, which assumes that there is a certain collision probability among space objects because many satellites operate in similar orbital regions. These collisions create fragments, and thus additional objects in the respective orbits, which in turn enhances the risk of further collisions. Consequently, the num ber of objects and collisions increases exponentially and eventually results in the formation of a self-sustaining debris belt aroundthe Earth. While it has long been assumed that such a process of collisional cascading is likely to occur only in a very long-term perspective (meaning a time 1 n of several hundred years),87 a consensus has evolved in recent years that an uncontrolled growth of the debris population in certain altitudes could become reality much sooner.88 In fact, a recent cooperative study undertaken by various space agencies in the scope of i a d c shows that the current l e o debris population is unstable, even if current mitigation measures are applied. The study concludes: Even with a 90% implementation of the commonly-adopted mitigation measures [...] the l e o debris population is expected to increase by an average of 30% in the next 200 years. The population growth is primarily driven by catastrophic collisions between 700 and 1000 km altitudes and such collisions are likely to occur every 5 to 9 years.89

#### Kessler syndrome is media hype – no risk

Von Fange 17

Daniel von Fange (systems engineer. Fond of charts), 5-21-2017, "Kessler Syndrome is Over Hyped," braino, http://braino.org/essays/kessler\_syndrome\_is\_over\_hyped/, // HW AW

Kessler Syndrome is overhyped. A chorus of online commenters greet any news of upcoming low earth orbit satellites with worry that humanity will to lose access to space. I now think they are wrong. What is Kessler Syndrome? Here’s the popular view on Kessler Syndrome. Every once in a while, a piece of junk in space hits a satellite. This single impact destroys the satellite, and breaks off several thousand additional pieces. These new pieces now fly around space looking for other satellites to hit, and so exponentially multiply themselves over time, like a nuclear reaction, until a sphere of man-made debris surrounds the earth, and humanity no longer has access to space nor the benefits of satellites. It is a dark picture. Is Kessler Syndrome likely to happen? I had to stop everything and spend an afternoon doing back-of-the-napkin math to know how big the threat is. To estimate, we need to know where the stuff in space is, how much mass is there, and how long it would take to deorbit. The orbital area around earth can be broken down into four regions. Low LEO - Up to about 400km. Things that orbit here burn up in the earth’s atmosphere quickly - between a few months to two years. The space station operates at the high end of this range. It loses about a kilometer of altitude a month and if not pushed higher every few months, would soon burn up. For all practical purposes, Low LEO doesn’t matter for Kessler Syndrome. If Low LEO was ever full of space junk, we’d just wait a year and a half, and the problem would be over. High LEO - 400km to 2000km. This where most heavy satellites and most space junk orbits. The air is thin enough here that satellites only go down slowly, and they have a much farther distance to fall. It can take 50 years for stuff here to get down. This is where Kessler Syndrome could be an issue. Mid Orbit - GPS satellites and other navigation satellites travel here in lonely, long lives. The volume of space is so huge, and the number of satellites so few, that we don’t need to worry about Kessler here. GEO - If you put a satellite far enough out from earth, the speed that the satellite travels around the earth will match the speed of the surface of the earth rotating under it. From the ground, the satellite will appear to hang motionless. Usually the geostationary orbit is used by big weather satellites and big TV broadcasting satellites. (This apparent motionlessness is why satellite TV dishes can be mounted pointing in a fixed direction. You can find approximate south just by looking around at the dishes in your northern hemisphere neighborhood.) For Kessler purposes, GEO orbit is roughly a ring 384,400 km around. However, all the satellites here are moving the same direction at the same speed - debris doesn’t get free velocity from the speed of the satellites. Also, it’s quite expensive to get a satellite here, and so there aren’t many, only about one satellite per 1000km of the ring. Kessler is not a problem here. How bad could Kessler Syndrome in High LEO be? Let’s imagine a worst case scenario. **An evil alien intelligence chops up everything in High LEO, turning it into 1cm cubes of death orbiting at 1000km, spread as evenly across the surface of this sphere as orbital mechanics would allow. Is humanity cut off from space? I’m guessing the world has launched about 10,000 tons of satellites total.** For guessing purposes, I’ll assume 2,500 tons of satellites and junk currently in High LEO. If satellites are made of aluminum, with a density of 2.70 g/cm3, then that’s 839,985,870 1cm cubes. A sphere for an orbit of 1,000km has a surface area of 682,752,000 square KM. So there would be one cube of junk per .81 square KM. If a rocket traveled through that, **its odds of hitting that cube are tiny - less than 1 in 10,000**. **So even in the worst case, we don’t lose access to space.** Now though you can travel through the debris, you couldn’t keep a satellite alive for long in this orbit of death. Kessler Syndrome at its worst just prevents us from putting satellites in certain orbits. In real life, there’s a lot of factors that make Kessler syndrome even less of a problem than our worst case though experiment. Debris would be spread over a volume of space, not a single orbital surface, making collisions orders of magnitudes less likely. Most impact debris will have a slower orbital velocity than either of its original pieces - this makes it deorbit much sooner. Any collision will create large and small objects. **Small objects are much more affected by atmospheric drag and deorbit faster**, even in a few months from high LEO. Larger objects can be tracked by earth based radar and avoided. The planned big new constellations are not in High LEO, but in Low LEO for faster communications with the earth. They aren’t an issue for Kessler. Most importantly, all new satellite launches since the 1990’s are required to include a plan to get rid of the satellite at the end of its useful life (usually by deorbiting) So the realistic worst case is that insurance premiums on satellites go up a bit. Given the current trend toward much smaller, cheaper micro satellites, this wouldn’t even have a huge effect. **I’m removing Kessler Syndrome from my list of things to worry about.**

### Astronomy

#### No reason why astronomy is the key cause to public determination; governments barely listen to citizens right now

#### 0 impact to starlink in astronomy and

#### SpaceX satellites are key to solving poverty

James Pethokoukis 11/30 [James Pethokoukis, a columnist and an economic policy analyst, is the Dewitt Wallace Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, where he writes and edits the AEIdeas blog and hosts a weekly podcast, “Political Economy with James Pethokoukis.” He is also a columnist for The Week and an official contributor to CNBC. “Why a SpaceX bankruptcy would hurt the global poor” Faster, Please! November 30, 2021 <https://fasterplease.substack.com/p/-why-a-spacex-bankruptcy-would-hurt>

I don’t have enough deep knowledge about SpaceX’s business or financials to reliably gauge the actual bankruptcy risk here, and the piece’s reporter is skeptical. I will note, however, that although the company is currently valued at around $100 billion, the bank Morgan Stanley assigns it a valuation “of somewhere between $5bn and $200bn, with uncertainty about its success accounting for the wide range,” according to The Economist. Starship and Starlink are key to that upper bound. (Also: A Morgan Stanley survey of “institutional investors and industry experts” expect SpaceX to become more valuable than Tesla, currently a trillion-dollar company. We’ll see.) So it’s not surprising that Musk emphasizes the importance of the Starlink internet satellite venture here, especially its next incarnation. Now go and Twitter search on the terms “Musk,” “ruining,” and “sky,” and you’ll find plenty of complaints about the Starlink constellation — with currently more than 1,700 satellites in low-Earth orbit. For many of these keyboard critics, Starlink is nothing more than an uberbillionaire's reckless effort to become an even wealthier uberbillionaire. Or maybe it’s just another Muskian vanity project, like building rockets to Mars. Either way, these diehard anti-Muskers see a cluttered sky for visual astronomers, both amateur and professional, as a horrific tradeoff just so the entrepreneur can sell global internet access. Now, the extreme version of this critique is unserious, little more than anti-billionaire emoting. The profit potential of Starlink is unclear, though it seems to be Musk’s goal that the telecom business will one day help fund his Mars ambitions. But the venture isn’t there yet. Last summer, Musk estimated that Starlink would likely need between $20 billion and $30 billion in investment. "If we succeed in not going bankrupt, then that'll be great, and we can move on from there," Musk said. For now, Starlink aims to add another 1,000 satellites a year, even more when Starship is operational. That is, assuming Starship become operational. But the astronomy issue is a real one, as SpaceX has acknowledged. And after astronomer complaints about the brightness of the first group of 60 satellites launched in 2019, SpaceX developed a work-around to minimize the glare from solar reflection on subsequent launches. Of course, some scientists don’t want to rely on the goodwill of SpaceX and other satellite companies. They see an international regulatory agreement, perhaps a new protocol under the Outer Space Treaty, as a necessity. But as such an add-on is unlikely to happen anytime soon, notes The Economist, “not least because other issues raised by the mega constellations, such as risks from debris, will doubtless seem more pressing.” Here’s one of the many pictures floating around the Internet showing the impact of Starlink satellites — “the 333-second exposure shows at least 19 satellites passing overhead” — on astronomical observations, via the IFLScience website: Of course, framing the trade-off as the above picture vs. “better global internet” doesn’t quite capture the benefits of the latter. And they are considerable. There remains a stark digital divide in global internet access. As the World Economic Forum notes: “Globally, only just over half of households (55 percent) have an internet connection, according to UNESCO. In the developed world, 87 percent are connected compared with 47 percent in developing nations, and just 19 percent in the least developed countries.” It seems pretty clear that broadband internet access brings considerable economic gains, particularly to poorer countries. (Musk has specifically said this is a goal of Starlink.) Here are a few examples from the August 2021 analysis “The Economic Impact of Internet Connectivity in Developing Countries” by Jonas Hjort (Columbia University) and Lin Tian (INSEAD): Quite a few studies convincingly estimate the effect on consumption of specific internet-enabled technologies (rather than internet connectivity itself) through model-based approaches, and a few do so more directly. Jack & Suri (2014) show that access to mobile money decreased consumption poverty

### Control

#### Govs don’t listen to the public, they listen to lobbyists/elites

#### Private space investments benefit the public, stuff like starlink and asteroid mining prove that private space companies can benefit people on earth

#### Musk and Bezos aren’t out in space to be evil, they’re out there to provide services and products to people on earth which benefit humanity

#### Private space k2 exploring space, stuff like james webb prove that the gov is completely incompetent + slow at realizing the benefits of space