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#### CP: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust with the exception of Starlink.

#### Satellites is key to rural broadband expansion

Weinschenk 2/25 [(Carl, IT and telecom journalist for Telecompetitor, Teleco Transformation, and IT Business Edge) “Report: Starlink Looks Very Promising for Rural Broadband,” Telecompetitor, 2/25/2021] JL

SpaceX’s Starlink satellite broadband service has the potential to be a game changer for rural broadband, according to an analysis by PCMag of Starlink speeds. The analysis is based on beta tester data exclusively provided to it by Ookla Speedtest.

The site looked at data from rural, suburban and urban areas. Among its more than 10,000 users in its semi-public beta were “a perplexing” number in urban and suburban areas where a variety of high-speed options already are available. The story cites Chicago, Seattle and Minneapolis as places where there were testers, despite readily available alternatives.

The site compared download speeds against other fixed service providers in 30 counties with at least 30 samples in any month from December 30 to February 24. The counties in which the fixed providers had the biggest speed advantage over Spacelink were urban or suburban: Los Angeles and Santa Clara counties, CA; Cook County, IL; King County, WA and Washington County, MN.

It is in rural areas that Starlink shines, according to the research. The five counties in which Starlink had the biggest download speed advantage over the fixed group were rural: Vilas County, WI; Ravali County, MT; Waldo County, ME; Okanogan County, WA and Lamoile County, VT.

The number of counties in which Starlink beat the fixed providers and those in which the fixed providers beat Starlink appeared to be about equal, as was the speed differential.

“Our own analysis shows that Starlink will make the biggest difference in rural, low-density, low-population counties with few options other than lower-quality satellite services,” wrote Sascha Segan, author of the PCMag article about Startlink rural speeds.

#### Broadband is key to precision agriculture transition

ABI 19 [(American Broadband Initiative, a leading force in driving changes across Federal Agencies to identify and remove barriers to broadband access and leverage public assets and resources to expand our Nation’s broadband infrastructure capacity.) “A Case for Rural Broadband,” The United States Department of Agriculture, 4/2019] BC

HOW E-CONNECTIVITY WILL TRANSFORM THE BUSINESS OF AGRICULTURE

Across the agricultural production cycle, farmers and ranchers can implement digital technologies as other modern businesses are doing, enhancing agriculture by driving decision-making based on integrated data, automating processes to increase operational efficiency, improving productivity with tasks driven by real-time insights, augmenting the role of management in the business of farming, and creating new markets with extended geographic reach.

These patterns of digital transformation create fundamental shifts in agricultural production, developing new ways of working that make the industry more productive, attractive, and financially sustainable for farmers and ranchers. Tech companies which stand to benefit from industry transformation continue to capitalize on these shifts by developing new technologies, which according to one recent study, may help position themselves to capture a portion of an estimated $254 billion to $340 billion in global addressable digital agriculture market.13

BUSINESS MANAGEMENT shifts decisionmaking from instinct to integrated data

Precision Agriculture is transforming the way producers collect, organize, and rely on information to make key decisions. Traditionally, producers’ long-term experiences have created a competitive advantage: years of experiments have produced insights and instincts about the land they have farmed and the animals they have raised. But the volume of data that is possible

to collect today can accelerate that learning curve, helping producers learn faster and more rapidly adapt to market shifts—particularly on new fields and with new animals—and creating more nuanced insights, enabling them to act on leading indicators. This creates a disparity between producers who can utilize high-speed Internet service and those who cannot. Examples include the ability to do the following:

create decision tools to help farmers and ranchers estimate the potential profit and economic risks associated with growing one particular crop over another • decide which fertilizer is best for current soil conditions • apply pesticides in targeted areas of the field, to control pests rather than applying pesticides over the entire field • use limited water resources more effectively • respond to findings of sensors that monitor animal health and nutrition

Better choices about what, where, and when to plant, fertilize, and harvest—or breed, feed, and slaughter—can drive above-average returns by removing unrecognized inefficiencies and scaling insights.

DIGITIZATION shifts supply chain management and resource allocation from generic to precise

Precision Agriculture helps make the business of farming more efficient by minimizing inputs— such as raw materials and labor—and maximizing outputs.

For example, previous research has found that 40 percent of fields are over-fertilized, which not only inflates the cost of inputs but also results in 15 percent–20 percent yield loss suffered from improper fertilizer application.14 Precise application of inputs, such as fertilizer, herbicides, and pesticides, allows farmers to adjust inputs to location-based characteristics and use exact amounts needed, which saves money and increases sustainability due to more efficient resource stewardship. Improved fertilizer, soil, and water use can significantly improve water quality with less runoff and reduce climate gas emissions, which is important since agriculture accounts for 10-15 percent of worldwide emissions.15 Despite reductions in necessary inputs, Next Generation Precision Agriculture helps maintain or increase yields, leading to significant gains in efficiency14.

Real-time insights also improve logistics. When growing melons, for instance, real-time data can help farmers overcome challenges in storing and shipping their products. Melons should be stored in an optimal refrigeration environment to minimize spoilage, and real-time precision sensors can reduce spoilage by alerting staff to suboptimal variations in temperature and humidity, allowing the execution of remedies before major losses occur. When refrigerated storage is full or the market price is at a peak, the “Internet of Things” can provide real-time information about where trucks are located and locating customers to market products to help make the sale.

LABOR EFFICIENCY boosts productivity by automating routine processes and enabling real-time response

Connected devices equip farmers with a clear picture of their operations at any moment, making it possible to prioritize tasks more effectively and triage the most pressing issues. While routine inspection and scouting has typically been a regular part of farm management and has increased farm profitability14, connected technologies can track, sense, and flag where a producer should focus their time and attention that day. Similarly, e-connectivity has allowed rural farms to access new training resources and high-skilled labor that has not been previously available.

#### Food insecurity causes state collapse, nuclear war, and terror – extinction

DeFeo 17 [(Michael, Regional Organizing Director at Arizona Democratic Party who graduated in 2019 with a bachelor’s degree in political science from Gettysburg College) “Food Insecurity and the Threat to Global Stability and Security in the 21st Century” Inquires Journal, 2017] BC

Poor Institutional Capacity

Although the developed world experiences food insecurity, it is the lack of infrastructure and government institutions in developing countries that contribute to civil wars and state fragility. Foreign exchange shortages can provoke food and fuel scarcities that force governments to spend less on essential services and public goods. Accordingly, citizens see their medical and educational entitlements melt away. Such circumstances create breeding grounds for internal conflict.

All violent conflicts destroy land, water, and social resources for food production. Developing countries do not have massive industrial machines that can remedy such losses, therefore, the population will suffer. Food insecurity is a recruitment tool for violent extremist groups. Promising food and water to a starving population, especially in urban areas, makes recruiting young and disgruntled youth easier (Messer & Cohen, 2015). Syria had limited institutional capacity to deal with the mass displacement, and that lead to a civilian revolt and recruitment into the Islamic State.

Countries that fail to provide their people with basic services often experience gross economic inequality, and even human-rights violations, as was the case in both Syria and Sudan. Both countries are classified as Least Developed Countries (LDCs). LDCs are distinguished not just by their widespread poverty, but also by their structural weaknesses in economic, institutional, and human resources that make them unable to maintain stability during a drought. The combination of drought and political instability or violence led to famine in Somalia (another LDC) in 2011. Even with urgent humanitarian action, the country still plunged into chaos and violence (Messer & Cohen, 2015). Severe drought, like Somalia's, may result in crop failure in major food producing areas, which in turn is a significant threat to social stability and peace (Wischnath, 2014).

Sometimes droughts of exceptional severity (and the civil unrest that follows) are attributed to climate change, especially in particularly arid regions. Scholars are divided on whether climate change actually impacts civil conflict. That is why African countries like Somalia and Sudan are prime case studies. Africa has the lowest percentage of irrigated land in the world. Agriculture is the most important sector of most African countries. Very high percentages of civilians in African countries live in rural areas. Those characteristics combined with low economic and state capacity make African, particularly sub-Saharan African countries the most vulnerable to climate change and civil instability. Africa experiences more civil conflict than other parts of the world, therefore, it is possible to argue that a lack of climate variability effect on civil conflict in Africa would make it unlikely to cause civil conflict in other parts of the world (Koubi et al., 2012). Secretary-General of the United Nations, Ban Ki-moon attributed the conflict in Darfur to an ecological crisis arising “at least in part from climate change” (Ki-moon, 2007). The Fourth Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change assessed that climate change will continue to worsen. As it does, it will increase food shortages, which may lead to conflict (AR4, 2007). The report also stated that forced displacement and rising social instability is the most likely result of food insecurity. This is almost exactly what happened in Syria. The first step towards conflict might be food riots, which often occur during a food shortage or when there is an unequal distribution of food. These are usually caused by food price increases, food speculation, transport problems, or extreme weather. In 1977, Egyptians became so desperate for food that they attacked shops, markets, and government buildings just to obtain bread and grain (Paveliuc-Olariu, 2013).

Moreover, civil war can create economic opportunities for certain groups, so they try to avoid resolving the conflict. Urban elites in Somalia profited tremendously off of internal conflict because of the absurd amount of foreign aid that was pumped into the country and then largely stolen (Shortland, Christopoulou, & Makatsoris, 2013). Once a country experiences a food shortage, it may lead to protests, riots, and violence. This all contributes to state instability, but it is not the state alone that suffers. If one country fails, it creates a crisis that could destabilize an entire region.

State Failure and the Threat to Regional Stability

Although fragile governments in developing countries are at a heightened risk for internal conflict that could topple them, that risk also threatens the country’s neighbors. After the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, Afghanistan found itself alone in regional trade. Without a guaranteed source of cereal, the government had to turn to Iran and Pakistan for support in order to avoid its own collapse (Clarke, 2000). Unlike Afghanistan, many other developing countries have been unable to work together on food and water security. Thirteen of the twenty-two members of the Arab League rank among the most water-scarce nations on the planet. Food cannot be grown without water. The majority of the world is engaged in some sort of agreement with neighboring countries to share water supplies, but thirty-seven countries still do not share their water resources (El Hassan, 2014). Lack of cooperation can cause civil as well as interstate conflict. South Sudan legally has no share of the Nile River and the effects of that lack of water access have been mass starvation and violence.

The effects of climate change, water shortages, and mass migrations have resulted in acute food insecurity not just in Syria, but across the region (El Hassan, 2014). Food insecurity, plus an increase in the prices of staple foods have destabilized much of the area. The Arab Spring was the beginning of multiple conflicts that have affected countries like Syria, Egypt, and Libya. In Syria, food insecurity resulted in mass violence and has now created an international crisis involving multiple world powers.

Food insecurity is such a threat to entire regions because people cannot live without food and people want to live. When a region experiences food scarcity and that population feels threatened by hunger, it will relinquish dependency on any political authority and take up arms in order to ensure its well-being (Paveliuc-Olariu, 2013). This is human survivalism. It is important for developing countries in areas that are at risk for food insecurity to formulate policy that ensures aid goes to the food insecurity hotspots so as to maintain stability.

South Sudan experienced what happens when countries do not work together to feed their people. After gaining its independence from Sudan in 2011, 360,000 South Sudanese refugees returned to the country. This influx of human beings, coupled with drought conditions exacerbated economic strain and drove food prices up. The increases were the result of trade restrictions between Sudan and South Sudan. The overall reason for the food crisis, however, was the government's preoccupation with fighting a political and quasi-ethnic civil war rather than negotiating fair access to the Nile River (Tappis et al., 2013). Because of South Sudan’s weak institutions, it has done little to address the food shortage. That inability to solve the problem fuels insurgent recruitment that continues the bloodshed in South Sudan. The conflict is keeping regional rivalries alive with Uganda, Kenya, Ethiopia, and Sudan; all of whom have attempted to intervene in South Sudan militarily to bring about stability (Council on Foreign Affairs 2016). Aside from South Sudan, multiple conflicts across Africa are consuming massive amounts of diplomatic, political, and humanitarian resources in a region that faces a multitude of threats.

South Sudan, Somalia, and Syria are all failing states that are experiencing huge food shortages, humanitarian crises, and most importantly, extreme civil violence. South Sudan is mired in a civil war. Somalia is controlled by warlords and terror organizations. Syria has both of those problems. Conflict has turned these countries into “breeding grounds of instability, mass migration, and murder” rather than sovereign states with a monopoly on violence and control over their borders (Rotberg, 2002). To be sure, failing states are a concern because of their ability to destabilize entire regions, but states at risk for failure are also very important. Countries like Pakistan that are politically unstable and have food and water shortages could result in uncontrollable civil upheaval (The Fund for Peace, 2016).

Global Consequences of State Failure

Failing states and destabilized regions are not just a problem for the developing world. They are a very real concern for the United States and other developed countries as well. The Islamic State fed off of the Syrian Civil War and helped destabilize Iraq, Syria, Libya, and even Afghanistan and the Philippines. They have at also inspired terror attacks in Europe and the United States. They are a threat to both the developed and developing world. State instability allows them to recruit and train without government interference, which in turn allows them to plan attacks outside the region. An important source of income for the Islamic State has been agriculture from Iraq and Syria. While this revenue has received less media attention than oil extraction, it is still an important part of their economy (Jaafar & Woertz, 2016). It is also a key aspect of their political legitimacy because it allows them to feed their soldiers and those they control. Controlling some of the most fertile regions of the two countries has also helped the Islamic State starve off areas that have resisted them (Jaafar & Woertz, 2016). If Syria or Iraq are ever going to stabilize, those breadbaskets must be retaken and the food must reach the civilians in the cut off areas.

In the 20th century, state failure had few implications for international peace and security. Thanks to globalization, that is no longer the case. Failed states pose a threat to themselves, their neighbors, and the entire international community (Rotberg, 2002). Islamic State - inspired terror attacks in Belgium and France are a direct result of state collapse in Syria and Iraq. Preventing states from failing, rather than having to intervene militarily when they do, ought to be a top priority in the foreign policy of rich nations. Although the situations in Syria, Somalia, and South Sudan seem beyond repair, nation-building projects have had success in the past. Tajikistan, Lebanon, Cambodia, Kosovo and East Timor are all examples of relatively successful attempts to put failing states back on the right track (Rotberg, 2002). Developed countries must have the political will to ensure that people in developing countries are fed so that they remain pacified. It is often severe food insecurity that precedes ethnic or religious violence, as has been the case in South Sudan, therefore, adequate food is paramount to avoiding humanitarian crises that accompany ethnic and sectarian conflict (The Economist, 2016).

While it is true that many developed countries, especially the United States, are weary of providing so much financial aid and intervening militarily in war-torn, developing countries, it is imperative that the rich do not abandon the poor to a fate of internal destruction. Money must not be thrown blindly towards humanitarian crises and military intervention must be the last resort. Developed countries provided $1.4 billion for humanitarian aid in South Sudan in its first year of independence, but without specific conditions, that money went to kleptocrats rather than infrastructure projects or public services (The Economist, 2016).

Paying to help developing nations is expensive and will continue to be so. Afghanistan and Iraq are proof of that. But the war on terror, repeated military intervention, and humanitarian aid are expensive as well. In 2002, Robert Rotberg suggested that a new Marshall Plan was required for places like Afghanistan, the DRC, Sierra Leone, Somalia, and Sudan. If it is true that food and water security are the keys to keeping relative peace in new and developing countries and their collapse threatens the safety of the developed world, it seems logical that assisting those countries is wise.

In 1999, Susan L. Woodward argued that military leaders focus too much on force versus force combat rather than the issues of insurgency and terrorism in failed states. In 2017, military leaders have adjusted their strategies accordingly. Woodward believed that globalization made states less important, but their failure would still be felt around the world. Failed states cannot exercise their monopoly on violence and they cannot control their borders, thus threatening more than just the failed state (Woodward, 1999). Because state failure is so consequential, the United States military must continue to look into measures it can take to prevent it.

The Threat of the Future

Finally, the threats from food shortages in South Sudan, Somalia, Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria are important to the United States and the international community at large, but there is one country that, while it is not a failing state right now, could easily become one if the wealthy nations of the world do not ensure its stability. That country is Pakistan. The Fund for Peace ranked Pakistan as the 14th most fragile state in the world in 2016, giving it a “High Alert” designation for state failure (The Fund for Peace, 2016). Its Demographic Pressure Indicator was an 8.9 - 10.2 Although it improved by one-tenth of a point last year, its decade trend is worse by seven-tenths of a point and its five-year trend is worse by four-tenths of a point, suggesting that the food situation is actually worsening overall (The Fund for Peace, 2016). If internal conflict and potential state failure at its most basic level begins with food and water insecurity, then Pakistan could become a real problem very soon.

Considering the risk of state failure, Pakistan poses the greatest threat to the rest of the world because of the existence of nuclear weapons within the country. Pakistan is not a member of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, yet it has about 120 nuclear weapons. It also has a Shaheen 1A ballistic missile that can reach targets 550 miles away (Pakistan Defence, 2015). Should a food crisis arise in Pakistan that results in civil war and governmental collapse, those weapons could end up in the hands of a group that intends to use them maliciously as an act of terror. That prospect should be incentive enough for the developed countries to realize that they cannot and must not leave food insecure countries to devour themselves.

While it is difficult to argue that food insecurity immediately and directly causes civil conflict, there is no denying that people need food and water and will fight to survive. In South Sudan, ethnic and political armies fight one another. In Syria, rebels and government forces fight each other while also fighting the Islamic State. And in Somalia, warlords and their armies fight. The Syrian Civil War began six years ago after a water shortage forced thousands of migrants into urban centers. Developing countries tend to be most affected by climate change, poor governance, and food price increases. Therefore, they are the most prone to instability that may lead to outright violence. Without the wherewithal to handle civil conflict, these countries may become fragile or even failing states. Once that happens, they represent a threat not just in their region of influence, but the whole world. That is why the developed Western nations must pay attention and provide aid to the developing world in order to maintain stability. There will be more food crises in developing countries in the future, but if the North has the strength to continue aiding the South, perhaps it will be able to curb mass starvation and avoid the horrendous violence that consumes starving countries.

## 1NC -Off

#### Counterplan: I endorse the entirety of the 1AC except for their use of the word “colonization.”

#### Discourse of “colonizing” space reproduces colonialism and colonial rhetoric no matter the context

Koren 20, Marina, staff writer at the Atlantic, The Atlantic, “No One Should ‘Colonize’ Space”, <https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2020/09/manifest-destiny-trump-space-exploration/612439/>, Accessed 2/5/21 VD

If language that marks space exploration as male territory can count out little girls, language that codes white can exclude people of color. Young Americans who dream of working for NASA someday—or for SpaceX or Blue Origin—could easily be deterred by terminology drawn from the country's colonial history. “Native kids, when they hear the words colonizing and pioneers and the frontier, that makes the hair on the back of their neck stand up,” says John Herrington, a retired NASA astronaut and the first enrolled member of a Native American tribe to go to space. In recent years, a movement has been growing to rethink the vocabulary that describes humankind's dreams for an off-Earth future, specifically to weed out language closely associated with colonialism. A popular argument against this effort points out that, unlike Earth, the other planets and moons of the solar system are uninhabited. If life exists on these worlds, it’s most likely in the form of tiny microbes, easily squashed under a spacesuited foot. What’s so bad about saying we should colonize Mars when there’s no one there anyway? Even if Martians aren’t going to protest our arrival, space exploration presents plenty of other opportunities for the exploitative dynamics of the colonial era to reemerge. Colonial-era travel spread invasive species across the planet; space-era travel could seed earthlings all over the solar system. Last year, for instance, an Israeli spacecraft crash-landed on the surface of the moon and spilled several thousand dehydrated tardigrades, microscopic animals that can survive extreme conditions. The creatures had been snuck aboard by a space entrepreneur who was only supposed to contribute a DVD-size compilation of human knowledge. “Technically, I’m the first space pirate,” he said when news of the stowaways was revealed, much to the horror of space lawyers and planetary-protection researchers. Connecting colonial language to space travel also helps shore up expansionist behavior on Earth: For the past six years in Hawaii, astronomers and local protesters have been locked in a standoff over the construction of a new telescope near the site of Mauna Kea, on land that native Hawaiians consider sacred. “It’s a real failure of imagination to just keep recycling really harmful language and saying that it doesn’t matter because space is somehow different,” says Lucianne Walkowicz, an astronomer at the Adler Planetarium, in Chicago, and the organizer of the 2018 Decolonizing Mars conference. “We are still human beings, even if we go to space.” If astronauts are the elite of space workers, in the future a less powerful class could form, and language associated with exploitation and domination could make those people that much more vulnerable. “The use of this language can give policy makers and decision makers excuses to do bad things because it’s in the name of these really lofty things,” Divya Persaud, a planetary scientist at University College London who has written about the meaning of language in space domains, told me. Asteroid miners, for instance, would be dependent on their faraway employers for health care, safe working conditions, and, quite literally, life support. Oversight can be dicey when your operations are millions of miles away from the only planet with regulatory agencies (that we know of). People are drawn to sweeping rhetoric, wrapped up in fate and higher purpose, because it offers romantic ways of thinking about places they’ve yet to visit. But bringing God into space exploration, as the concept of manifest destiny does, complicates the issue even further. “It does hurt. This idea of It’s provenance; it’s inspired by God—they are taking it out of a human aspect and saying, ‘Hey, we’re being led by something else, something that’s greater than we are,’” Herrington says. “Take ownership and responsibility for what you’re doing. Don’t say somebody else is making us do it.” The way past manifest destiny and other colonial-era language can be simple: Be specific. Just as crewed is a more accurate word than manned, other phrases could easily sub in for the more outdated ones. “Instead of trying to say ‘settlement on Mars’ or ‘colony on Mars,’ why don't we just say, ‘We sent 12 astronauts to Mars?’” Persaud said. Melvin, who is Black, suggested pitching space exploration as something to benefit all humankind, not just the United States. He’s seen Earth as it truly is, a borderless place set against the boundless darkness of space. “You’re watching the world below you while you’re breaking bread with French, German, Russian, Asian American, African American [astronauts]—people from all around the world working together as a team,” Melvin said. “And you know that if Yuri does something wrong, or I do something wrong, or Peggy does something wrong, we can all die.” American leaders have, at times, sold space exploration as an international effort, as a boon for all humankind, as a push for scientific discovery. But in the U.S.—and Russia and China and India and other spacefaring nations—space travel is still a nationalist project. This spring, when NASA launched astronauts from U.S. shores for the first time in nearly a decade, the agency’s leaders pointed out, over and over, that the job was done by “American astronauts on American rockets from American soil.” And the next people to go to the moon, NASA officials have emphasized, will be Americans, and so will the first visitors to Mars. Language matters. When presidents speak of the country’s spirit and its space program in the same breath, when they yoke America’s strength to its feats beyond Earth, they end up describing the nation both as it exists today and as they imagine it in the future. By borrowing from a time when the dominant philosophy staked out American land for white settlers at the expense of the people who already lived there, Trump shows his hand about whom he believes the future of this country is for, whether here on Earth or on worlds beyond.

#### **Our reexamination of rhetoric is uniquely good to resolving forms of white dominance**

Billings 15, Linda Billings is a major consultant to NASA in programs such as astrobiology and the planetary defense coordination office. She was a research professor at George Washington University and holds a PhD in mass communications. August 1st, 2015. “The Inexcusable Jingoism of American Spaceflight Rhetoric”, <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-inexcusable-jingoism-of-american-spaceflight-rhetoric/> accessed by apark 2/5/20

Rhetoric matters. More than 30 years of my own observations, along with results from public opinion surveys over at least as many years, indicate that the community of American human exploration advocates is predominantly white and male. The rhetoric of frontier conquest and exploitation may appeal to this demographic, but I doubt it has much allure more broadly. Women constitute half of the world's population. A majority of people on Earth are not American, or European, or “white.” In my many years of critiquing the American rhetoric of manifest destiny, non-Americans have repeatedly told me that they are baffled, if not offended, by this rhetoric. Other spacefaring nations take a more pragmatic approach to plans for space. In his foreword to the European Space Directory 2015, European Space Agency director general Jean-Jacques Dordain wrote that the aim of his agency is to “maintain its role as one of the world-leading space institutions, addressing its key relationships with its partners and its efficiency.” The Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency's slogan is “explore to realize,” expressing “our philosophy of becoming an agency of realizing a safe and affluent society.” At a time when the U.S. needs to be building sustainable partnerships with other nations to continue exploring space, “USA, Number One!” is not a good way to start productive conversations. In a 2012 paper Jacques Blamont, a founding director of the French space agency CNES, argued that people are losing interest in the human exploration of space “because spacefaring nations, and especially the USA, have clung on to outmoded cold war ways of thinking about it. The US attitude of ‘command’ over its international partners will no longer work.” It is time for human spaceflight space advocates to reexamine their rhetoric—to think about what these words mean to the vast variety of people who are not American, not white, not male, and not interested in moving to Mars.

## 1NC -Off

#### JCPOA passes now –

Reuters 2/18 [(Reuters) “Iran nuclear deal could be agreed very soon, EU official says” Reuters, 2/18/2022. https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/iran-nuclear-deal-could-be-agreed-very-soon-eu-official-says-2022-02-18/] BC

BRUSSELS:

A senior European Union official said on Friday that a US-Iranian deal to revive Iran's 2015 nuclear agreement was close but success depended on the political will of those involved.

"I expect an agreement in the coming week, the coming two weeks or so," the EU official said. "I think we have now on the table text that are very, very close to what is going to be the final agreement," the official said.

Reuters reported on Feb 17 details of a possible deal negotiated by envoys from Iran, Russia, China, Britain, France, Germany, the European Union and United States.

"Most of the issues are already agreed. But as a principle in this kind of negotiations, nothing is agreed until everything is agreed. So we still have...some questions, some of them rather political and difficult to agree," the official said.

The official said a deal was necessary as Iran's sensitive uranium enrichment programme was moving ahead quickly. Iran has always denied it is seeking nuclear weapons.

"On the ground they are advancing very much at a speed that is not compatible with the long-term survival of the JCPOA," the official said, referring to the Joint Comprehensive

#### Space diplomacy directly trades off with nonproliferation agreements – finite manpower, money, and political will within the AVC

Johnson-Freeze 16 [(Joan, Professor and former Chair of National Security Affairs at the US Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island) “Space Warfare in the 21st Century: Arming the Heavens,” Cass Military Studies, 11/8/2016] JL

 \*The plan is legislated in the AVC (same bureau of the State Department that’s concerned with the JCPOA)

Proactive policymaking takes commitment, manpower, and money. A quick look at the money and manpower devoted to diplomacy in the US State and Defense departments compared to the resources available for the hardwareproducing military–industrial complex efforts described in Chapter 5 is enlightening. The Assistant Secretary of State for Arms Control, Verification, and Compliance (AVC) leads space-related diplomacy in the State Department. The AVC Bureau is responsible for “all matters related to the implementation of certain international arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreements and commitments; this includes staffing and managing treaty implementation commissions.”34 The AVC arms control portfolio includes nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons and all related issues. The AVC section charged with space issues is the Office of Emerging Security Challenges; this office also handles missile defense issues and the promotion of transparency, cooperation, and building confidence regarding cybersecurity. As of financial year 2013, AVC had a budget of $31.2 million and 141 employees35 to be active participants and leaders in all of these issues.

By way of comparison, the Space Security and Defense Program, a joint program of the DoD and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) was programmed for a similar budget amount in financial year 2015: $32.3 million. That program is described as a “center of excellence for options and strategies (materiel, non-materiel, cross-Title, cross-domain) leading to a more resilient and enduring National Security Space (NSS) Enterprise.”36 A majority of SSDP funding is allocated to the development of offensive space control strategies. So basically, the same budget is allocated for all US global space diplomacy efforts as for an in-house Pentagon think tank to devise counterspace strategies.

Within the Pentagon, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Space Policy is charged with all issues related to space policy, including diplomacy. The responsibilities of the Space Policy office are to:

• Develop policy and strategy for a domain that is increasingly congested, competitive, and contested

• Implement across DoD — plans, programs, doctrine, operations — and with the IC and other agencies

• Engage with allies and other space-faring countries in establishing norms and augmenting our capabilities.37

The breadth of those responsibilities, which includes reviewing space acquisitions, means that there may be only a handful of individuals actually engaged in multilateral diplomatic efforts, acting, for example, as advisors to diplomatic discussions such as those through the United Nations. Additionally, the expanse of the Pentagon results in a chain of command that makes organizational competition for attention to subject matter challenging at best. The Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Space Policy reports to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense, who then reports to the Principle Deputy Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Global Security, who then reports to the Under Secretary of Defense for Defense Policy. There are also a multitude of space players in other governmental organizations to coordinate and contend with, particularly within the Air Force and intelligence communities. Personnel are spread thin.

US government-wide space diplomacy needs a mandate, manpower, and a supporting budget. Diplomacy, especially multilateral diplomacy, can be timeconsuming, manpower-intensive, and frustrating; and patience is not a strong American virtue. The recent experience in the UN LTS Working Group is emblematic of everything that causes the United States to shun multilateralism. Under the auspices of this group, countries had worked in good faith over the past five years to develop technical guidelines as reciprocal constraints, as insisted upon by the developing countries when they rejected the ICOC. Yet group success appeared thwarted at the February 2016 meeting of the LTS Working Group by one country, Russia.

#### Iranian proliferation goes nuclear – causes regional war and spurs proliferation cascades across the Middle East

Chilton and Hoshovsky 20 – [(Kevin, led U.S. Strategic Command and has participated in the Jewish Institute for National Security of America’s Generals and Admirals Program; Harry, policy analyst at JINSA’s Gemunder Center for Defense and Strategy) "Avoiding a nuclear arms race in the Middle East," Defense News, 2-13-2020, https://www.defensenews.com/opinion/commentary/2020/02/13/avoiding-a-nuclear-arms-race-in-the-middle-east/] TDI

This raises two immediate concerns. First, **should Iran race for the bomb, it is** almost inevitable that the United States and/or Israel will take preventative military action **to stop it from crossing that fateful threshold**. This could easily spiral into a regional war as Iran activates its various proxy forces against the United States and its allies.

Second, **an Iranian nuclear breakout attempt could** spur a proliferation cascade throughout the Middle East, **beginning with Saudi Arabia.**

Mohammed bin Salman, **the Saudi crown prince, openly stated in 2018 that if Iran developed nuclear weapons**, Riyadh would quickly “follow suit.” **One suggested approach would see Saudi Arabia purchase a nuclear power reactor from a major supplier like South Korea and then build a reprocessing plant that would yield enough weapons-grade plutonium in five years**.

A half-decade delay isn’t optimal, however, when the goal is achieving nuclear deterrence quickly. Thus, there is the so-called Islamabad option.

This refers to Riyadh’s role in financing Pakistan’s nuclear weapons program and an alleged commitment from Islamabad that it would repay the favor. While Pakistani and Saudi officials have denied any such understanding, **there is the possibility that the two could work out an arrangement where Islamabad could deploy some of its nuclear arsenal on Saudi soil following a successful Iranian breakout.**

Although this maneuver would draw sharp, international criticism, in theory, it would allow Riyadh to remain in good standing vis-a-vis the nuclear nonproliferation treaty. Nevertheless, Pakistan might not be willing to play spoiler against a nuclearized Iran. If it is, Middle Eastern geopolitics would become extremely unstable.

**If Saudi Arabia acquires nuclear weapons**, many believe Turkey would follow suit. Last September, Turkish President Recep Tayyip **Erdogan declared that he “cannot accept” the argument from Western nations that Turkey should not be allowed to attain nuclear weapons.** In 1958, Charles de Gaulle proclaimed that a nation without nuclear weapons “does not command its own destiny”; two years later, France tested its first bomb. Erdogan’s comments echo those earlier remarks and raise the possibility that Ankara could become the second NATO member to leave the alliance’s nuclear umbrella in favor of its own independent arsenal.

#### Nuclear war causes extinction – famine and climate change

Starr 15 [(Steven, Director of the University of Missouri’s Clinical Laboratory Science Program and a senior scientist at the Physicians for Social Responsibility) “Nuclear War, Nuclear Winter, and Human Extinction,” Federation of American Scientists, 10/14/2015] DD

While it is impossible to precisely predict all the human impacts that would result from a nuclear winter, it is relatively simple to predict those which would be most profound. That is, a nuclear winter would cause most humans and large animals to die from nuclear famine in a mass extinction event similar to the one that wiped out the dinosaurs.

Following the detonation (in conflict) of US and/or Russian launch-ready strategic nuclear weapons, nuclear firestorms would burn simultaneously over a total land surface area of many thousands or tens of thousands of square miles. These mass fires, many of which would rage over large cities and industrial areas, would release many tens of millions of tons of black carbon soot and smoke (up to 180 million tons, according to peer-reviewed studies), which would rise rapidly above cloud level and into the stratosphere. [For an explanation of the calculation of smoke emissions, see Atmospheric effects & societal consequences of regional scale nuclear conflicts.]

The scientists who completed the most recent peer-reviewed studies on nuclear winter discovered that the sunlight would heat the smoke, producing a self-lofting effect that would not only aid the rise of the smoke into the stratosphere (above cloud level, where it could not be rained out), but act to keep the smoke in the stratosphere for 10 years or more. The longevity of the smoke layer would act to greatly increase the severity of its effects upon the biosphere.

Once in the stratosphere, the smoke (predicted to be produced by a range of strategic nuclear wars) would rapidly engulf the Earth and form a dense stratospheric smoke layer. The smoke from a war fought with strategic nuclear weapons would quickly prevent up to 70% of sunlight from reaching the surface of the Northern Hemisphere and 35% of sunlight from reaching the surface of the Southern Hemisphere. Such an enormous loss of warming sunlight would produce Ice Age weather conditions on Earth in a matter of weeks. For a period of 1-3 years following the war, temperatures would fall below freezing every day in the central agricultural zones of North America and Eurasia. [For an explanation of nuclear winter, see Nuclear winter revisited with a modern climate model and current nuclear arsenals: Still catastrophic consequences.]

Nuclear winter would cause average global surface temperatures to become colder than they were at the height of the last Ice Age. Such extreme cold would eliminate growing seasons for many years, probably for a decade or longer. Can you imagine a winter that lasts for ten years?

The results of such a scenario are obvious. Temperatures would be much too cold to grow food, and they would remain this way long enough to cause most humans and animals to starve to death.

Global nuclear famine would ensue in a setting in which the infrastructure of the combatant nations has been totally destroyed, resulting in massive amounts of chemical and radioactive toxins being released into the biosphere. We don’t need a sophisticated study to tell us that no food and Ice Age temperatures for a decade would kill most people and animals on the planet.  Would the few remaining survivors be able to survive in a radioactive, toxic environment?

## Case

#### Public space tourism thumps—they will fill in mass launch means black carbon and UV impacts are inevitable

Seedhouse 18 [Erik, editor at the Encyclopedia Britannica, “Space Tourism” https://www.britannica.com/explore/space/space-tourism/]

Space tourism, recreational space travel, either on established government-owned vehicles such as the Russian Soyuz and the International Space Station (ISS) or on a growing number of vehicles fielded by private companies. Since the flight of the world’s first space tourist, American businessman Dennis Tito, on April 28, 2001, space tourism has gained new prominence as more suborbital and orbital tourism opportunities have become available. Orbital space tourism The advent of space tourism occurred at the end of the 1990s with a deal between the Russian company MirCorp and the American company Space Adventures Ltd. MirCorp was a private venture in charge of the space station Mir. To generate income for maintenance of the aging space station, MirCorp decided to sell a trip to Mir, and Tito became its first paying passenger. However, before Tito could make his trip, the decision was made to deorbit Mir, and—after the intervention of Space Adventures Ltd.—the mission was diverted to the ISS. Tito, who paid $20 million for his flight on the Russian spacecraft Soyuz TM-32, spent seven days on board the ISS and is considered the world’s first space tourist. However, given the arduous training required for his mission, Tito objected to the use of the word tourist, and since his flight the term spaceflight participant has been more often used to distinguish commercial space travelers from career astronauts.

#### No extinction – it takes 12 degrees without adaptation

Farquhar et al 17 [Sebastian Farquhar (PhD Candidate in Philosophy at Oxford and Project Manager at Future of Humanity Institute), John Halstead (climate activist and one of the co-founders of 350 Indiana-Calumet), Owen Cotton-Barratt (PhD in pure mathematics at Oxford. Previously worked as an academic mathematician and as Director of Research at the Centre for Effective Altruism), Stefan Schubert (Researcher at Department of Experimental Psychology at University of Oxford), Haydn Belfield (Associate Fellow at the Leverhulme Centre for the Future of Intelligence. He has a background in policy and politics, including as a Senior Parliamentary Researcher to a British Shadow Cabinet Minister, as a Policy Associate to the University of Oxford’s Global Priorities Project, and a degree in Philosophy, Politics and Economics from Oriel College, University of Oxford), Andrew Snyder-Beattie (Director of Research at the Future of Humanity Institute at Oxford, Holds degrees in biomathematics and economics and is currently pursuing a PhD in Zoology at Oxford), Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance, Global Priorities Project (Bostrom’s Institute), 2017-01-23, https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf] TDI

The most likely levels of global warming are very unlikely to cause human extinction.15 The existential risks of climate change instead stem from tail risk climate change – the low probability of extreme levels of warming – and interaction with other sources of risk. It is impossible to say with confidence at what point global warming would become severe enough to pose an existential threat. Research has suggested that warming of 11-12°C would render most of the planet uninhabitable,16 and would completely devastate agriculture.17 This would pose an extreme threat to human civilisation as we know it.18 Warming of around 7°C or more could potentially produce conflict and instability on such a scale that the indirect effects could be an existential risk, although it is extremely uncertain how likely such scenarios are.19 Moreover, the timescales over which such changes might happen could mean that humanity is able to adapt enough to avoid extinction in even very extreme scenarios. The probability of these levels of warming depends on eventual greenhouse gas concentrations. According to some experts, unless strong action is taken soon by major emitters, it is likely that we will pursue a medium-high emissions pathway.20 If we do, the chance of extreme warming is highly uncertain but appears non-negligible. Current concentrations of greenhouse gases are higher than they have been for hundreds of thousands of years,21 which means that there are significant unknown unknowns about how the climate system will respond. Particularly concerning is the risk of positive feedback loops, such as the release of vast amounts of methane from melting of the arctic permafrost, which would cause rapid and disastrous warming.22 The economists Gernot Wagner and Martin Weitzman have used IPCC figures (which do not include modelling of feedback loops such as those from melting permafrost) to estimate that if we continue to pursue a medium-high emissions pathway, the probability of eventual warming of 6°C is around 10%,23 and of 10°C is around 3%.24 These estimates are of course highly uncertain. It is likely that the world will take action against climate change once it begins to impose large costs on human society, long before there is warming of 10°C. Unfortunately, there is significant inertia in the climate system: there is a 25 to 50 year lag between CO2 emissions and eventual warming,25 and it is expected that 40% of the peak concentration of CO2 will remain in the atmosphere 1,000 years after the peak is reached.26 Consequently, it is impossible to reduce temperatures quickly by reducing CO2 emissions. If the world does start to face costly warming, the international community will therefore face strong incentives to find other ways to reduce global temperatures.

#### No Ozone Impact.

Ridley 14 (Matthew White Ridley, BA and PhD in Zoology from Oxford. “THE OZONE HOLE WAS EXAGGERATED AS A PROBLEM,” *Rational Optimist*, 9/25/14, <http://www.rationaloptimist.com/blog/the-ozone-hole-was-exaggerated-as-a-problem.aspx>) dwc 19

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

#### Disease won’t causes extinction

Barratt 17 Owen Cotton-Barratt 17, et al, PhD in Pure Mathematics, Oxford, Lecturer in Mathematics at Oxford, Research Associate at the Future of Humanity Institute, 2/3/2017, Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance, https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf

For most of human history, natural pandemics have posed the greatest risk of mass global fatalities.37 However, there are some reasons to believe that natural pandemics are very unlikely to cause human extinction. Analysis of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) red list database has shown that of the 833 recorded plant and animal species extinctions known to have occurred since 1500, less than 4% (31 species) were ascribed to infectious disease.38 None of the mammals and amphibians on this list were globally dispersed, and other factors aside from infectious disease also contributed to their extinction. It therefore seems that our own species, which is very numerous, globally dispersed, and capable of a rational response to problems, is very unlikely to be killed off by a natural pandemic. One underlying explanation for this is that highly lethal pathogens can kill their hosts before they have a chance to spread, so there is a selective pressure for pathogens not to be highly lethal. Therefore, pathogens are likely to co-evolve with their hosts rather than kill all possible hosts.39

#### Cap solves poverty—

Pethokoukis 18 [(James, Senior Fellow; Editor, AEIdeas Blog; and DeWitt Wallace Chair) “Ending poverty by ‘ending capitalism’ is absolute nonsense. Just so, so wrong,” AEI, 10/18/18. <https://www.aei.org/economics/ending-poverty-by-ending-capitalism-is-absolute-nonsense-just-so-so-wrong/>] RR

First of all, the median income of the bottom 20 percent of households is up more than 70 percent since 1979 in real terms, according to the CBO. More to the point, poverty in America has declined considerably since LBJ declared a War on Poverty in 1964. Like other advanced capitalist economies, the United States redistributes some of its massive, market-generated wealth to improve living standards at the bottom. According to the Census Bureau’s Supplemental Poverty Measure — which unlike the official poverty measure takes into account key safety net programs such as the Earned Income Tax Credit and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program — the poverty rate fell to 13.9 percent in 2017 from 26 percent in 1967. There’s even better news when one looks at “consumption-based” poverty measures, which calculates what a family consumes instead of how much income it earns. The work of visiting AEI scholar Bruce Meyer (along with his colleague James Sullivan) finds consumption-based poverty is more like 3 percent. Here is a relevant bit from a recent podcast chat we had:

Pethokoukis: Correct me if I have the numbers wrong, but if you look at just the official poverty rate measure you hear about in the news, since 1980 it seems kind of flat. But if you look at consumption, poverty has gone down fairly considerably. Is that right?

Meyer: Yes, so one of the statistics that I like least and I think is most misleading is the poverty rate. The official poverty rate says that we are at the same level of poverty now as we were in the 70s, which just does not fit.

Pethokoukis: So the Great Society failed, we spent all this money and poverty is no better.

Meyer: That’s essentially what the official statistics say, but you shouldn’t believe them for two main reasons. First, the official statistics don’t count much of what we’ve done to reduce poverty; so the official statistics look at pre-tax money income which omits the earned income tax credit, which omits food stamps, it omits housing benefits, it omits Medicaid. So, it gives you a very distorted

picture of how those at the bottom are doing.

The second big reason that the official poverty statistic completely misleads the people taking them at face value is that the thresholds above which you have to be to not be poor go up too fast over time because they are indexed to inflation in a way that overstates the effects of inflation.

And you can see that again if you look at material circumstances in more objective ways of those at the bottom. If you look at the housing conditions of the bottom 20% of the income distribution, they look like the housing conditions of the middle class 30 years ago. So, the rates of air conditioning, central air conditioning, of washers and dryers in the apartment, have gone way up. The incidents of peeling paint, of water leaks in the ceiling or in the pipes, and the like have gone way down.

Pethokoukis: When I think about the house I grew up in, it was about half the size of my current house, it had no air conditioning, and I remember the leaks in the ceilings. I certainly am sure that my parents considered us a solidly middle-class household. But I guarantee if I drove by that house with my kids, they would say, “We didn’t know you were so poor.”

Meyer: I think that’s exactly right. I think that’s what a lot of us can see in how our lives have changed, but the official statistics don’t really reflect that, in significant part because of the overstatement of inflation and because of the omission of in-kind transfers and other government benefits.

And if Teen Vogue doesn’t understand what’s happening in the US, maybe it’s really too much to ask that it understand global trends, like the historic massive reduction in global poverty over recent decades. (Most Americans have no idea.) Over the past 30 years, the share of our fellow humans living in extreme poverty has decreased to 21 percent from 52 percent. That’s a billion fewer people in extreme poverty, largely in China and India. The Economist magazine — a publication quite willing to address flaws in the world’s capitalist economies — has put it this way:

The world’s achievement in the field of poverty reduction is, by almost any measure, impressive. . . . Most of the credit, however, must go to capitalism and free trade, for they enable economies to grow — and it was growth, principally, that has eased destitution. The world now knows how to reduce poverty. A lot of targeted policies — basic social safety nets and cash-transfer schemes help. So does binning policies like fuel subsidies to Indonesia’s middle class and China’s hukou household-registration system that boost inequality.

But the biggest poverty-reduction measure of all is liberalizing markets to let poor people get richer. That means freeing trade between countries (Africa is still cruelly punished by tariffs) and within them (China’s real great leap forward occurred because it allowed private business to grow). Both India and Africa are crowded with monopolies and restrictive practices. Many Westerners have reacted to recession by seeking to constrain markets and roll globalization back in their own countries, and they want to export these ideas to the developing world, too. It does not need such advice. It is doing quite nicely, largely thanks to the same economic principles that helped the developed world grow rich and could pull the poorest of the poor out of destitution.

You’ll find none of the above in the Teen Vogue piece, which means they’ve missed the story. Totally. Modern advanced economies — whether America, Sweden, the UK, or Germany — combine market-driven economies with social safety nets of one flavor or another. The result is high living standards and a low poverty level. But you can’t redistribute wealth without creating it. And that is what innovation-driven capitalism has done really well for the past two centuries. I would urge Teen Vogue editors and reporters to read “Factfulness: Ten Reasons We’re Wrong About the World–and Why Things Are Better Than You Think” by the late Hans Rosling, a fantastic book which examines all the ways in which very smart people are getting so many important things so very wrong — including poverty. Hard to believe this story has been up since April without any apparent modification.

#### Commercial space is key to tech innovation – progress at the margins and spinoff tech change global information networks

Joshua Hampson 17, 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.

#### Space exploration encourages healthcare innovations- solves diseases

Donoviel 19 (Dorit Donoviel, 7-19-2019, "Space exploration is reinventing healthcare," [20+ years leadership experience as executive director of R&D overseeing diverse areas of biomedical research from basic to applied science, drug discovery, and technology development. Executing a multi-million dollar national research portfolio of grants addressing the plethora of physiological and behavioral challenges of humans in space. Executive Director, Translational Research Institute for Space Health at Baylor College of Medicine] The Hill, https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/453853-space-exploration-is-reinventing-healthcare) TDI

Though many do not realize it, humans have been living and working in space continuously for the past two decades. The conditions of spaceflight have accelerated our ability to study progressive degenerative diseases. This novel paradigm of understanding human physiology under the stresses of living in space holds great promise for new sources of medical breakthroughs for Earth.

Although astronauts are carefully selected to be exceptionally healthy and exhibit peak physical and mental performance, after only four to six months in space, they can develop numerous medical conditions. Without appropriate exercise, they lose bone and muscle mass. They become prone to developing kidney stones. Their hearts become deconditioned. Their blood vessels stiffen. A subset of astronauts develop a swelling of the optic nerve and possibly an increase in pressure on the brain. Even dormant viruses become activated, alongside changes to the immune system. There is a sense of urgency to solve these problems if we are to send humans to Mars and return them safely in the next decade or two.

This is why NASA is investing in cutting-edge research for human health and performance including high-risk high-reward approaches funded through the Translational Research institute for Space Health (TRISH). Supporting potentially ground-breaking innovations requires a leap of faith in the right direction.

Keeping astronauts healthy during deep space exploration missions — where there are no hospitals and no medical specialists — requires a different paradigm for healthcare. Astronauts are typically engineers and scientists, and only occasionally physicians. On the way to Mars, when communications with Earth will be limited, they could be forced to act as both patients and healthcare providers. If a medical condition is allowed to progress when they are millions of miles away from Earth, the situation could become catastrophic.

Therefore, astronauts will need to detect even the most subtle changes in their own health status early enough to prevent disease. This requires a healthcare paradigm of predicting, preventing and mitigating ailments by intervening early.

This means enabling monitoring, diagnostic and therapeutic medical capabilities that are simple to use, safe, robust and miniaturized. Additionally, what will work in a small spacecraft in the hands of an engineer is also likely to work in a community clinic with limited resources. Or even in our homes. This different approach to healthcare can help save lives and reduce costs — at a global level.

Space demands the best in healthcare innovations, focusing on prevention and early intervention using smart, creative solutions. On a mission to Mars, blood tests will be done in a matter of minutes, by the patient, on a single drop of blood. A trained and adaptive computer algorithm will track health status based on a variety of physiological parameters and alert astronauts when important deviations from normal become evident.

Automated eye exams will be performed by the astronauts on themselves and images will be analyzed by a computer for changes. Customized medications will be tailor-made for the patient on the spot. If a minor medical procedure is required, the caregiver will learn and practice beforehand using augmented reality tools and software simulations adjusted for zero-gravity.

Kidney stones will be found early and treated quickly and painlessly using ultrasound to “push” them out of the kidney so they can be cleared naturally with urination. Sleep and mood will be improved using sound stimulation and health will be improved by individualized diets which will be enriched with high-nutrient plants grown efficiently within a small footprint. Most importantly, all these advances have clear and important applications on Earth.

Space exploration has already yielded hundreds of inventions that filled our arsenal for fighting diseases. To land women and men on Mars and return them healthy, we must reinvent healthcare. The positive consequences of this work will impact all of humanity. The spirit of Apollo is alive and well in space health research today. And for science, medicine and technology pioneers, our most important work is still ahead.