# Harvard Round 2 1N

## 1

#### 1] Interp – Unjust refers to a negative action – it means contrary.

Black Laws No Date "What is Unjust?" <https://thelawdictionary.org/unjust/> //Elmer

Contrary to right and justice, or to the enjoyment of his rights by another, or to the standards of conduct furnished by the laws.

#### 2] Violation – The Aff is a positive action – it creates a new concept for Space i.e. the treating of Space as a “Global Commons”.

#### 3] Standards –

#### a] Precision – they eliminate a topical stasis point, justifying the aff talking about anything which explodes neg prep burden and nullifies any engagement. Nowhere does the resolution prescribe active action, so there’s no basis for reasonable negative ground – hold the line.

#### b] Limits – making the topic bi-directional explodes predictability – it means that Aff’s can both increase non-exist property regimes in space AND decrease appropriation by private actors – makes the topic untenable.

#### c] Ground – wrecks Neg Generics – we can’t say appropriation good since the 1AC can create new views on Outer Space Property Rights that circumvent our Links since they can say “UN agency” approach solves.

#### 4] TVA – just defend that space appropriation is bad.

#### a] Fairness is a voter – debate’s a game that requires fair evaluation and rigorous testing – otherwise we can’t test if your arguments are true

#### b] Topicality is Drop the Debater – it’s a fundamental baseline for debate-ability and we can’t get new 2nr da’s so the debate’s permanently skewed.

#### c] Use Competing Interps – 1] Topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical and 2] Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

#### d] No RVI’s - 1] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, 2] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and 3]

## 2

#### CP Text: “The UN ought to be entrusted with the sole authority to lease orbital slots for mega-constellations of satellites except for the use of solar based solar power.”

#### To Clarify, the UN shouldn’t be able to deny SBSP

#### Space-Based Solar Power (SBSP) is a megaconstellation, and it’s going to happen within 10 years in the squo. Aff banning private megaconstellations kills the necessary tech – David 21:

David, Leonard. 11/03/21 Space Solar Power’s Time May Finally Be Coming.”https://www.space.com/space-solar-power-research-advances DOA: Feb 19, 2022 // LHP BT + LHP PS

The sun never sets in space. **The idea of** harvesting solar energyvia power-beaming satelliteshas therefore long intrigued researchers looking for ways to feed an energy-ravenous [Earth](https://www.space.com/54-earth-history-composition-and-atmosphere.html). That reflection has fomented for decades but is now garnering new looks all over the world: Technologists in the U.S. and China, experts in Japan and researchers within the European Space Agency and the United Kingdom Space Agency are all working to make space-based solar power a reality. Related: [Solar power stations in space could be the answer to our energy needs](https://www.space.com/solar-power-stations-in-space-could-be-the-answer-to-our-energy-needs.html) History machine Peter Glaser, the father of the solar power satellite concept. (Image credit: Arthur D. Little Inc.) The idea of wireless power transmission dates back to [Nikola Tesla](https://www.livescience.com/45950-nikola-tesla-biography.html) near the end of the 19th century. Fast-forwarding to 1968, the notion of a solar power satellite was detailed and patented by U.S. space pioneer Peter Glaser. He blueprinted a novel way to collect energy from sunlight using solar cells and beam down an energetic muscle of microwaves to receiving antennas ("rectennas") on Earth. Those microwaves could then be converted to electrical energy and supplied to the power grid. Then, in the mid-1970s, microwave power transmission experiments in the tens of kilowatts were successfully conducted at the Goldstone Deep Space Communications Complex in California, a facility of NASA's [Jet Propulsion Laboratory](https://www.space.com/16952-nasa-jet-propulsion-laboratory.html). And this "power trip" doesn't stop there.The Space Solar Power Incremental and Demonstrations Research (SSPIDR) project is designed to beam power from space to Earth. SSPIDR consists of several small-scale flight experiments that will mature technology needed to build a prototype solar power distribution system. (Image credit: Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL)) Impressive **advances Over the past decade,** researchers have made impressive advances **that** increase **the** likelihood **that space solar power (**SSP**)** will be realized during the next decade, said John Mankins, president of Artemis Innovation Management Solutions of Santa Maria, California. His view: the longstanding vision for SSP as a sustainable energy alternative should be revisited in light of such recent advances.Bolstering that outlook is a set of key perspectives, Mankins told Space.com. "Climate change is really going to be a disaster. Nations are committed to go [carbon net-zero](https://www.livescience.com/climate-report-net-zero.html) … and they have no idea how to do it."**The** rapidly unfolding value of "NewSpace**" is also** reshaping the landscape of 21st century space activities**, he added. "Two of the biggest hurdles to the realization of SSP have always been the cost of launch and the cost of hardware**," said Mankins. "Add flight rate, and all of a sudden you're looking at numbers always talked about for solar power satellites."Related: [What is climate change?](https://www.livescience.com/climate-change.html) Megaconstellations **Another** recent change isthedawn of the megaconstellations, Mankins added. **That's** exemplified by SpaceX's [Starlink](https://www.space.com/spacex-starlink-satellites.html) broadband network**, a** mass-production effort that now cranks out 30 tons of satellites a month**. SpaceX is on course to potentially manufacture 40,000 satellites within five years, and launch all of them. "The path to low-cost hardware has been shown," Mankins said. "It's modular and mass-produced. The hurdles of less-expensive launch and lowering hardware costs have been overcome.**"Mankins said that the economics of SSP concepts in the near term, within the next decade, have never been more viable. He flagged advances in space launch capabilities; progress in robotics for space assembly, maintenance and servicing systems; and the growth in various component technologies, such as high-efficiency solid state power amplifiers. **As a result, SSP is ready to see the light of day,** Mankins said.Astroelectricity An early entrant in focusing on understanding the energy policy needed and establishment of SSP is James Michael Snead, president of the Spacefaring Institute. He's adopted the use of the term "astroelectricity" to describe the transmitted electrical power produced by SSP systems.In looking at what he terms the "[coming age of astroelectricity](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5E-0NYnAaUA)," he sees a world needing a replacement for oil and natural gas, the two primary sources of energy currently maintaining an industrial standard of living. Snead envisions a world in the year 2100 where about 20% of electrical power comes from terrestrial nuclear and renewables, with 80% supplied by astroelectricity."Just as the military, economic and diplomatic control of Middle East oil has substantially influenced world events for the past 80 years, the control of space solar power platforms will come to dominate outer space activities this century," Snead told Space.com. Wanted: high-priority leadershipIf SSP becomes a reality later this century, Snead said, the U.S. military will be required to protect and defend these new sources of national energy security just as it guards oil infrastructure in the Persian Gulf today."While some people are developing SSP concepts that would be launched from the Earth and autonomously assembled in geostationary Earth orbit, I do not see this as a successful proposition," said Snead. He believes that building the thousands of SSP platforms needed requires a substantial [space industrialization effort](https://www.space.com/nasa-low-earth-orbit-iss-commercialization.html) involving more than a million people in space by the end of the century. The starting point, Snead said, will be establishing the enabling "astrologistics" infrastructure operating throughout the Earth-moon system. He stressed that those astrologistics require high-priority U.S. Air Force — not [Space Force](https://www.space.com/42089-space-force.html) — leadership to draw upon nearly a century of human flight/operational logistics experience and expertise.That is necessary to manage industry's efforts to design and build the required new human spaceflight systems, with a clearly needed emphasis on safety and effectiveness, Snead said. As these new military astrologistics capabilities begin, Snead contends, commercialization of these capabilities will extend these safety and operational benefits to support the coming space industrial revolution needed to undertake SSP. "This is exactly what happened to enable U.S. airline manufacturers to dominate the airline and air cargo industry for decades. It is a successful model to now replicate in space — a model that neither NASA nor the U.S. Space Force can effectively execute," Snead said. The U.S. Naval Research Laboratory’s Paul Jaffe holds a module designed for space solar power investigations in front of a customized vacuum chamber used to test the device. (Image credit: NRL/Jamie Hartman) 'Performing like a champ' While new artwork, economic plots and conceptual SPS thinking and visions flow, there's an in-space technology experiment already underway. On its latest mission, which launched in May 2020, the Space Force's robotic [X-37B space plane](https://www.space.com/25275-x37b-space-plane.html) is toting the Photovoltaic Radio-frequency Antenna Module Flight Experiment (PRAM-FX), a Naval Research Laboratory (NRL) investigation into transforming solar power into radio-frequency microwave energy. The focus of that X-37B investigation is not establishing an actual power-beaming link, but more on appraising the performance of sunlight-to-microwave conversion. "It is performing like a champ," said Paul Jaffe, an NRL electronics engineer working on power beaming and solar power satellites. "We are getting data regularly, and that data is exceeding our expectations," he told Space.com. [PRAM-FX](https://www.space.com/x-37b-space-plane-solar-power-beaming) is principally made out of commercial parts, not "space-grade" hardware. "The fact that it is continuing to operate and give us positive results is quite encouraging," Jaffe said. Commercial parts are mass-produced, while many space-grade parts are one-offs. Solar power satellites, like those envisioned in high Earth orbit, would have thousands of elements made out of similar components being tested onboard the X-37B, Jaffe said. [The US Space Force's secretive X-37B space plane: 10 surprising facts](https://www.space.com/x-37b-military-space-plane-surprising-facts) Space-based solar power could help the UK achieve net-zero emissions by 2050, according to a leading British systems, engineering and technology company. (Image credit: Frazer-Nash Consultancy) Making the economics work There's much more work ahead, of course. "The big strike against space solar power has always been making the economics work. People who have looked at the idea seriously do understand that, from a physics standpoint, there is no reason you couldn't do it," Jaffe said. "With mass production of space hardware, and with the cost reduction of space access, it is more plausible that it could work," he added. "I would caution against excessive optimism … but also point out that things are changing. There are a lot of encouraging developments." SPS will assuredly be compared to a "levelized cost of energy" metric, Jaffe concluded. "There's just not enough data to come up with a levelized cost of energy basis for space solar power. It's premature. What you are seeing now is laying the foundation for that sort of evaluation." Clear, affordable path To that end, Mankins of Artemis Innovation Management Solutions has rolled out SPS-ALPHA ("Solar Power Satellite by means of Arbitrarily Large Phased Array"), a design he showcased at the 72nd International Astronautical Congress, which was held from Oct. 25 to Oct. 29 in Dubai, United Arab Emirates. Detailing a business model and step-by-step SSP roadmap, he feels the concept promises a clear, affordable path to deploying a critically needed new energy option. "**I believe you could have operational solar power satellites to scale within a decade,"** Mankins said. That possibility, combined with the fact that multiple nations are eying SSP as a promising power generation system of the future, begs a question: Is there a solar power satellite race afoot? It is close to that, Mankins said. "I think it has to be cooperation among friends and allies. But I think it's very likely to end up being competition with China. The longer we wait with regard to the urgency of policies on [climate change](https://www.space.com/climate-change-dimming-earth), the more likely it is we're going to miss the boat." Mankins is a 26-year veteran of assessing SSP and the technologies required. "The moment has come," he said. "I think the right answer is really clear: We need to just go do it."

#### SBSP key to solve climate change – Katete 21:

Katete, Esthere. (December 17 2021) “Space-Based Solar Power: The Future Source of Energy?”https://www.greenmatch.co.uk/blog/2020/02/space-based-solar-power Feb 19, 2022 // LHP BT + LHP PS

Space-based solar power (SBSP) involves collecting the sun’s energy in space, and then wirelessly transmitting it to Earth. There are several [advantages to solar energy](https://www.greenmatch.co.uk/blog/2014/08/5-advantages-and-5-disadvantages-of-solar-energy). Although expensive, it **is** **a** great source of [clean energy](https://www.greenmatch.co.uk/blog/clean-energy) that has the capacity to provide more energythan the world consumes **or is predicted to consume in the future**. A space-based solar power technological process includes using [solar panels](https://www.greenmatch.co.uk/solar-energy/solar-panels) to collect solar energy in space with reflectors or inflatable mirrors that direct solar radiation onto solar panels, and then beaming it on Earth through a microwave or laser. The energy is then received on Earth via a microwave antenna (a rectenna). **According to the** [**National Space Society**](https://space.nss.org/space-solar-power/)**,** space-based solar power **has the** potential to dwarf all the other sources of energy combined**. They argue that space-based solar power can provide large quantities of energy** with very little negative environmental impact**. It can also** solve our current energy and greenhouse gas emissions problems**.** The infographic below highlights information about space-based solar power, current related trends, and what different countries are doing in terms of research and funding. Current Global Energy Consumption and Trends **The** world’s energy consumption is only growing. According to a report by the University of Oxford’s Our World in Data, on the global primary energy consumption, the current world consumption is over 160,000 TWh annually. Solar energy contributes only 585 TWh. Although there is an increase in renewable energy solutions, investments, and usage, oil, coal, and gas still generate more than 80% of the global energy that is consumed - with solar energy generating less than 1%. Between 2004 and 2015, investments in renewable energy increased by 600% from £36.2 billion (US$46.7 billion) to £220.6 billion (US$284.8 billion). Current predictions indicate that the world population will reach [9.7 billion by 2050](https://www.un.org/development/desa/en/news/population/world-population-prospects-2019.html). With the increase in population, the world energy consumption is also predicted to grow by 50% by 2050. In addition, climate change impacts are accelerating. Although we generate a big percentage of the world energy from fossil fuels, fossil fuels contribute significantly to the increase of climate change. **Comparatively,** solar energy is the [safest source of energy](https://ourworldindata.org/uploads/2020/02/Safest-source-of-energy.png) today - though it still only contributes a small percentage of the global energy production. The death rates from solar production are 1,230 times lower than coal, and it has one of the lowest CO2 emissions, at 5g CO2 eq per kWh. Why Space-Based Solar Power? Space-based solar power has several benefits; unlike solar panels on our roofs that can only generate electricity during the day, space-based solar power can generate continuous electricity, 24 hours a day, 99% of the year. This is because, unlike Earth, the space environment does not have night and day, and the satellites are in the Earth's shadow for only a maximum of 72 minutes per night. **Space-based solar panels can generate** 2,000 gigawatts of power constantly. This is **40 times more energy than a solar panel would generate on Earth annually**. This is also several folds higher than the [efficiency of solar panels](https://www.greenmatch.co.uk/blog/2014/11/how-efficient-are-solar-panels) today. **What’s more, is that space-based** solar power would generate [0% greenhouse gas emissions](https://space.nss.org/space-solar-power/) unlike other alternatives **energy like nuclear, coal, oil, gas, and ethanol**. The current source of energy that generates the lowest CO2 is nuclear power, which generates CO2 of 5g CO2 eq per kWh. **Space-based solar power** generates almost 0% hazardous waste to our environment **compared to nuclear power**. Why Are We Not There Yet? While space-based solar power is an innovative concept, we are not able to fully launch a system into space yet. Launching a space-based solar system is very expensive. In fact, the cost is estimated to be about 100 times too high to compete with current utility costs. One of the causes of the high costs is the high cost of launching the panels to space, which is mostly due to the high mass per watt generated by the current solar panels. In other words, the solar panels are currently too heavy per watt generated to make it feasible. Currently, the cost of launching in space is estimated to be £7,716 per kilogram - approximately £154 per watt. In comparison to the cost that homeowners pay today, which is approximately £2 per watt peak, the cost in space is extremely high to be competitive. In UK homes, the [installation cost of solar panels](https://www.greenmatch.co.uk/blog/2014/08/what-is-the-installation-cost-for-solar-panels) can be as low as £1.5 per watt. Other reasons for high costs include the overall high transport costs to space. This is because transporting all other materials that are needed to space would require many space shuttle launches, and these space shuttles are currently not reusable. So, not only is the launch of solar panels themselves expensive, but the additional materials needing to be transported is also expensive. A lot of research and engineering is still ongoing to find the most feasible way to launch space-based solar panels and launch systems, at a lower cost. The environment out in space also has several hazards that could cause damage to the solar panels. These include space debris and extreme solar radiation, which could degrade the solar panels up to 8 times faster than panels installed on Earth. Finally, there is a potential of wasting large amounts of energy when transporting or during transmission from space to Earth. Therefore, scientists and engineers must continue their R&D efforts to ensure little to no energy is lost during the process. Current SBSP Projects and Progress The key players in SBSP include China, the US, and Japan, who have shown progress in terms of technology advancements, partnerships, and launch plans. China is already progressing to launch into space. The China Aerospace Science and Technology Corporation plans to launch small to medium solar satellites in the stratosphere that can harness energy in space between 2021 and 2025. China also plans to generate one megawatt of energy from space-based solar panels by 2030, and to be operating a commercially viable solar space station by 2050. In the US, there are ongoing partnerships and investments. For example, a $100 million partnership between Northrop Grumman and U.S. Air Force Research Laboratory has been established to provide advanced technology for SBSP. Also in the US, a $17.5 million collaboration between Northrop Grumman Corporation and Caltech was set up to develop the space solar power project called ‘The Space Solar Power Initiative’. The initiative’s goal was to develop scientific and technological innovations that would enable a space-based solar power system generate electricity at a cost comparable to current sources of electricity. There has been ongoing research and technological advancements. In the US, the development of the SPS-ALPHA Mark-II concept is underway. This, if successful, would enable construction of huge platforms in space that can remotely deliver tens of thousands of megawatts of electricity to Earth, using wireless power transmissions. This will also enable delivery of affordable power to Earth and on space missions. In addition, progress is being made to build reusable launch systems. Success in this will lower the cost of transport to space and overall cost of space-based solar power. An example is SpaceX, that is currently working on reusable launch vehicles that can be used for transport to space. In Japan, researchers successfully transmitted electric power wirelessly using microwaves. Researchers transformed 1.8 kW of electric power into microwaves and accurately transmitted it into a receiver that was 55 metres away. This was a technological advancement towards bringing SBSP closer to reality. Japan also made space-based solar systems part of its future space exploration vision. Future Outlook for SBSP Fossil fuels are finite and can eventually run out. According to predictions, oil and natural gas could run out in 50 years and coal production in 115 years. With ongoing research and investments, there is a high possibility that space-based solar power is the viable [future of solar power](https://www.greenmatch.co.uk/blog/2015/01/the-future-for-solar-power-in-the-uk). If the cost of space-based solar power can be lowered, it is likely to be a major source of sustainable energy that cannot diminish. Major players like China, who already have timelines of implementing the technology in space, may be able to provide some key learnings for future improvements in the technology.

#### Warming causes extinction - Xu 17:

Yangyang Xu 17, Assistant Professor of Atmospheric Sciences at Texas A&M University; and Veerabhadran Ramanathan, Distinguished Professor of Atmospheric and Climate Sciences at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego, 9/26/17, “Well below 2 °C: Mitigation strategies for avoiding dangerous to catastrophic climate changes,” Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, Vol. 114, No. 39, p. 10315-10323 Team purchased PDF, DOA Feb 19, 2022

We are proposing the following extension to the DAI risk categorization: warming greater than 1.5 °C as “dangerous”; warming greater than 3 °C as “catastrophic?”; and warming in excess of 5 °C as “unknown??,” with the understanding that changes of this magnitude, not experienced in the last 20+ million years, pose **existential threats** to a majority of the population. The question mark denotes the subjective nature of our deduction and the fact that catastrophe can strike at even lower warming levels. The justifications for the proposed extension to risk categorization are given below. From the IPCC burning embers diagram and from the language of the Paris Agreement, we infer that the DAI begins at warming greater than 1.5 °C. Our criteria for extending the risk category beyond DAI include the potential risks of climate change to the physical climate system, the ecosystem, human health, and **species extinction**. Let us first consider the category of catastrophic (3 to 5 °C warming). The first major concern is the issue of **tipping points**. Several studies (48, 49) have concluded that 3 to 5 °C global warming is likely to be the threshold for tipping points such as the collapse of the western Antarctic ice sheet, shutdown of deep water circulation in the North Atlantic, dieback of Amazon rainforests as well as boreal forests, and collapse of the West African monsoon, among others. While natural scientists refer to these as **abrupt and irreversible climate changes**, economists refer to them as catastrophic events (49). Warming of such magnitudes also has **catastrophic human health effects**. Many recent studies (50, 51) have focused on the direct influence of extreme events such as heat waves on public health by evaluating exposure to heat stress and hyperthermia. It has been estimated that the likelihood of extreme events (defined as 3-sigma events), including heat waves, has increased 10-fold in the recent decades (52). Human beings are extremely sensitive to heat stress. For example, the 2013 European heat wave led to about 70,000 premature mortalities (53). The major finding of a recent study (51) is that, currently, about 13.6% of land area with a population of 30.6% is exposed to deadly heat. The authors of that study defined deadly heat as exceeding a threshold of temperature as well as humidity. The thresholds were determined from numerous heat wave events and data for mortalities attributed to heat waves. According to this study, a 2 °C warming would double the land area subject to deadly heat and expose 48% of the population. A 4 °C warming by 2100 would subject 47% of the land area and almost 74% of the world population to deadly heat, which could pose **existential risks to humans** and mammals alike unless massive adaptation measures are implemented, such as providing air conditioning to the entire population or a massive relocation of most of the population to safer climates. Climate risks can vary markedly depending on the socioeconomic status and culture of the population, and so we must take up the question of “dangerous to whom?” (54). Our discussion in this study is focused more on people and not on the ecosystem, and even with this limited scope, there are multitudes of categories of people. We will focus on the poorest 3 billion people living mostly in tropical rural areas, who are still relying on 18th-century technologies for meeting basic needs such as cooking and heating. Their contribution to CO2 pollution is roughly 5% compared with the 50% contribution by the wealthiest 1 billion (55). This bottom 3 billion population comprises mostly subsistent farmers, whose livelihood will be severely impacted, if not destroyed, with a one- to five-year megadrought, heat waves, or heavy floods; for those among the bottom 3 billion of the world’s population who are living in coastal areas, a 1- to 2-m rise in sea level (likely with a warming in excess of 3 °C) poses **existential threat** if they do not relocate or migrate. It has been estimated that several hundred million people would be subject to famine with warming in excess of 4 °C (54). However, there has essentially been no discussion on warming beyond 5 °C. Climate change-induced species extinction is one major concern with warming of such large magnitudes (>5 °C). The current rate of loss of species is ∼1,000-fold the historical rate, due largely to habitat destruction. At this rate, about 25% of species are in danger of extinction in the coming decades (56). Global warming of 6 °C or more (accompanied by increase in ocean acidity due to increased CO2) can act as a major force multiplier and **expose** as much as **90% of species to** the dangers of **extinction** (57). The bodily harms combined with climate change-forced species destruction, biodiversity loss, and threats to water and food security, as summarized recently (58), motivated us to categorize warming beyond 5 °C as unknown??, implying the possibility of **existential threats**. Fig. 2 displays these three risk categorizations (vertical dashed lines).

## 3

#### Competition in space between private entities lowers costs and barriers of entry for other companies increasing technological innovation. The aff links, cus the AC assumes private entities have hard incentives and space is profitable to make mega constellations

Lizzy Gurdus, FEB 27 **2021**, CNBC, “Private companies such as SpaceX are driving costs down for everyone in the space race, says man behind UFO ETF”, [https://www.cnbc.com/2021/02/27/private-companies-like-spacex-are-driving-industry-costs-down-ceo.html] ahs ja DOA: Feb 19, 2022

Private space companies are paving the industry’s path to profits, says the man behind the Procure Space ETF (UFO). By taking part in the rapidly developing “space race,” billionaire-backed entities such as Elon Musk’s SpaceX and Jeff Bezos’s Blue Origin are lowering costs across the board, ProcureAM CEO Andrew Chanin told CNBC’s “ETF Edge” this week. “They’re able to get the cost of launch down and that’s going to allow more companies to send things into outer space cheaper,” Chanin said in the Wednesday interview. “They’re really opening up the entire environment for space companies and future would-be space companies to lower those barriers of entry.” They’re also lowering costs for government-sponsored space programs by competing amongst themselves for NASA contracts, Chanin said. “They’re actually freeing up more of NASA’s budget to be able to invest in other areas of space, he said. “This competition I think is very healthy. Not necessarily every company’s going to be a winner, but hopefully this competition can drive down prices and also let the best technologies win.” NASA now also has contracts with more than 300 publicly traded U.S. companies, said Chanin, whose UFO ETF counts Loral Space & Communications and Gilat Satellite Networks as its top two holdings. “It’s not just necessarily a pure-play space company that might get a contract,” the CEO said. “It’s really opening up opportunities for everyone.” That’s why it’s important to look beyond name recognition in this particular area of investing, Matthew Bartolini, State Street’s head of SPDR Americas research, said in the same “ETF Edge” interview. State Street offers the SPDR S&P Kensho Final Frontiers ETF (ROKT), the first space ETF to hit the market. The fund’s top three holdings are Maxar Technologies, Virgin Galactic and Aerojet Rocketdyne. Bartolini recommended “to not just look at the high-flying names like SpaceX or Blue Origin that are in the private markets, but showcase what companies in the public markets help supply them.” Aerojet Rocketdyne, which defense giant Lockheed Martin is buying in hopes of competing with private space companies, played a key role in Blue Origin’s New Shepard rocket launch, Bartolini said. “You can see the derivative effects of a private company impacting the public markets just from that one example of Lockheed and Aerojet,” he said. “It helps underscore the opportunity that you’re seeing in space.” As space companies embrace greater efficiency, more government support and more commercial applications on Earth in areas such as satellite technology, that opportunity is likely to grow and continue to filter into public markets, Bartolini said. Morgan Stanley has said the global space industry could produce revenues of over $1 trillion by 2040. Current global revenues are roughly $350 billion. UFO and ROKT both fell by more than 1% on Friday. UFO is up over 14% year to date, while ROKT is up nearly 2%.

#### This innovation is occurring in the squo – the aff plan will only harm progress

Seetha Raghava, August 4th **2021**, UFC TODAY, “The Impact of Innovation in the New Era of Space Exploration”, [https://www.ucf.edu/news/the-impact-of-innovation-in-the-new-era-of-space-exploration/] ahs ja DOA: Feb 19, 2022

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.

#### Strong Innovation solves Extinction.

Matthews 18 Dylan Matthews 10-26-2018 “How to help people millions of years from now” <https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/26/18023366/far-future-effective-altruism-existential-risk-doing-good> (Co-founder of Vox, citing Nick Beckstead @ Rutgers University)//Re-cut by Elmer DOA: Feb 19, 2022

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.

## Case

#### OV on Solvency: The ITU Sucks and doesn’t solve the aff, they say they’ll intrust it with power by making it a part of the UN, but it already is.

<https://theconversation.com/theres-a-parking-crisis-in-space-and-you-should-be-worried-about-it-83479> DOA: Feb 19, 2022

Finding a parking spot in space **Orbital slots** – the “parking spots” of space – **are allocated** to telecom operators via national administrations (such as the UK’s OFCOM) **by the** [**International Telecommunications Union**](https://www.esoa.net/cms-data/positions/Sats_ITU.pdf) **(ITU**). **There is no cost for an orbital slot, but allocation is on a first-come, first-served basis**. **If an operator’s competitor files by just a day before them, then they have priority**. **Although the allocation of a slot does not come with an ownership right to the areas of space**, it does grant an operator [exclusive rights](https://illinoislawreview.org/wp-content/ilr-content/articles/2013/4/Trapp.pdf) to the resource for the lifetime of its satellite (usually [15 years](https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/978-1-4419-7671-0_5.pdf)). **Typically, the operators then keep refiling for the slot and replace old satellites with new ones. So, for all practical purposes, they keep the orbital slot indefinitely. This blocks other players in the market, who are left to beg, buy or lease if they need a slot that has already been allocated.** Historically, buying or leasing orbital slots involved the exchange of significant sums of money. In 1988, for example, the Kingdom of Tonga auctioned five of its six orbital slots for [US$2m](http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/jalc62&div=16&g_sent=1&casa_token=LJW-zPGoOqcAAAAA:uEE_nRrecuO4MHMZSYuUO4GIQ0cDDVe-dmLNp9on94q8hpjR0JECR_aSrGF2aGFLsKxwpukpAw&collection=journals) per year, since the capacity exceeded its own requirement. This equated to a daily cost to the buyer of the slot of approximately US$5,480, which makes hospital car parking fees seem relatively [cheap](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-birmingham-39802331) in comparison. The ITU is now far more rigorous in its checks to avoid cases such as this. They try to ensure that there are “genuine” intentions for orbital slots. Nevertheless, **satellite operators regularly file for more slots than they can physically use, claiming they are insuring against** [**risk of failure**](http://www.agcs.allianz.com/insights/expert-risk-articles/covering-space-risks/)**. In reality, they apply for these slots to obstruct their competitors from accessing them – or use them as bargaining chips to trade for more favourable slots.** Empty spaces **This means that lots of the parking spots in space are not actually being used, obstructing future operators and countries from entering the market**. **Consequently, the ITU have recently stipulated that operators have five years to bring a satellite into use (with a maximum two-year extension) before their parking spot expires. But because operators are not financially penalised for an eventual no-show of their satellite, in fact they still have nothing to lose by keeping empty spots**. **This is particularly worrying given how overcrowded the geostationary orbit is becoming**. The finite number of geostationary slots pushes telecommunications operators to pack as much as they can into their parking spots, stacking a number of different antennae onto a single satellite to increase capacity. But there is only so far such an approach can take you. One [UK-based operator](http://spaceflight101.com/spacecraft/o3b/) is also exploring the possibility of launching its telecom satellites into medium Earth orbit. This innovative approach is disregarded by other operators because of the high levels of radiation and the complexities resulting from the higher speed of the medium-Earth-orbit. **So the only real way for operators to overcome these restrictions is to** [**buy other telecommunications companies**](http://spacenews.com/36546satmex-acquisition-gives-eutelsats-latin-america-presence-a-jolt-of/)**. This limit on parking therefore means that there are an increasingly small number of telecommunication operators in the market. As such, calls for a complete overhaul of the** [**regulatory framework**](http://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/spacelaw/treaties/introregistration-convention.html)**, which was written in 1975, are growing. Currently, your satellite television provider is likely to be dependent on a single operator that has rights to the space above your home – and this is not helping the cost of your monthly bill.**

#### Advantage

#### -- AND OVERVIEW ADVANTAGE THEY CANT SOLVE IF ALL THESE SATELITES WILL JUST GET COOPTED BY STATE AND STILL GO INTO OUTER SPACE

#### [1] Boley and Byers 21: --A] Non unique, 10,000 satelites will barely influence the hundreds of thousands of satelites and space debris that already exist.Thousands of satellites and a half-million objects in space now and only 15 collisions have ever happened.

**Mark Albrecht and Paul Graziani of Space news in 2016** [Mark Albrecht and Paul Graziani, 5-9-2016, "Op-ed," SpaceNews, [https://spacenews.com/op-ed-congested-space-is-a-serious-problem-solved-by-hard-work-not-hysteria/]//DDPT](https://spacenews.com/op-ed-congested-space-is-a-serious-problem-solved-by-hard-work-not-hysteria/%5d//DDPT) DOA: Feb 19, 2022

There are over a half million pieces of human-made material in orbit around our planet. Some are the size of school buses, some the size of BB gun pellets. They all had a function at some point, but now most are simply space debris littered from 100 to 22,000 miles above the Earth. Yet, all behave perfectly according to the laws of physics. Many in the space community have called the collision hazard caused by space debris a crisis. Popular culture has embraced the risks of collisions in space in films like Gravity. Some participants have dramatized the issue by producing graphics of Earth and its satellites, which make our planet look like a fuzzy marble, almost obscured by a dense cloud of white pellets meant to conceptualize space congestion. Unfortunately, for the sake of a good visual, satellites are depicted as if they were hundreds of miles wide, like the state of Pennsylvania (for the record, there are no space objects the size of Pennsylvania in orbit). Unfortunately, this is the rule, not the exception, and almost all of these articles, movies, graphics, and simulations are exaggerated and misleading. Space debris and collision risk is real, but it certainly is not a crisis. So what are the facts? On the positive side, space is empty and it is vast. At the altitude of the International Space Station, one half a degree of Earth longitude is almost 40 miles long. That same one half a degree at geostationary orbit, some 22,000 miles up is over 230 miles long. Generally, we don’t intentionally put satellites closer together than one-half degree. That means at geostationary orbit, they are no closer than 11 times as far as the eye can see on flat ground or on the sea: That’s the horizon over the horizon 10 times over. In addition, other than minute forces like solar winds and sparse bits of atmosphere that still exist 500 miles up, nothing gets in the way of orbiting objects and they behave quite predictably. The location of the smallest spacecraft can be predicated within a 1,000 feet, 24 hours in advance. Since we first started placing objects into space there have been 11 known low Earth orbit collisions, and three known collisions at geostationary orbit. Think of it: 135 space shuttle flights, all of the Apollo, Gemini and Mercury flights, hundreds of telecommunications satellites, 1,300 functioning satellites on orbit today, half a million total objects in space larger than a marble, and fewer than 15 known collisions. Why do people worry?

[2] Turner 20: --A] the aff cant solve, banning satelites means no one gets access

#### [3] Boley and Byers 2: --A] The math is wrong, empirically disproven with the Albrecht and Graziani evidence, if the chances were that high then collisions would be higher –B] Debris crashes and Kessler syndrome is overrated, space is just way too big

**Daniel von Fange writes in 2017** [Daniel von Fange, 5-21-2017, "Kessler Syndrome is Over Hyped”, http://braino.org/essays/kessler\_syndrome\_is\_over\_hyped/]//DDPT DOA: Feb 19, 2022

Kessler Syndrome is overhyped. A chorus of online commenters great 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.

#### [4] Mecklin 3: --A] Public satelites can be militiarzied, in fact they already are –B] Cargo routes are packed in the ocean, you don’t see Amazon with aircraft carriers –C] The US military has more funding that almost EVERY private entity means if anyone is gonna have the tech it will be public entites, especicially with the new Space Force

#### [5] Breen 18: --A] the Von Fange evidence is specific to low earth orbit, proves little risk of collision –B] THIS CARD PROVES THE ENTIRE AC non unique, READ IT, Its about normal satelites, including public ones, triggering war between GOVERNMENTS not companies

#### [6] Johnson-Freese 17: --A] There evidence is hypothetical, we have empirics. No escalation from satellite attacks, past instances prove, Dr. Eric Zarybnisky writes in 2018

Eric J. Zarybnisky 18, MA in National Security Studies from the Naval War College, PhD in Operations Research from the MIT Sloan School of Management, Lt Col, USAF, “Celestial Deterrence: Deterring Aggression in the Global Commons of Space”, 3/28/2018, https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1062004.pdf DOA: Feb 19, 2022

PREVENTING AGGRESSION IN SPACE

While deterrence and the Cold War are strongly linked in the public’s mind through the nuclear standoff between the United States and the Soviet Union, the fundamentals of deterrence date back millennia and deterrence remains relevant. Thucydides alludes to the concept of deterrence in his telling of the Peloponnesian War when he describes rivals seeking advantages, such as recruiting allies, to dissuade an adversary from starting or expanding a conflict.6F6 Aggression in space was successfully avoided during the Cold War because both sides viewed an attack on military satellites as highly escalatory, and such an action would likely result in general nuclear war.7F7 In today’s more nuanced world, attacking satellites, including military satellites, does not necessarily result in nuclear war. For instance, foreign countries have used high-powered lasers against American intelligence-gathering satellites8F8 and the United States has been reluctant to respond, let alone retaliate with nuclear weapons. This shift in policy is a result of the broader use of gray zone operations, to which countries struggle to respond while limiting escalation. Beginning with the fundamentals of deterrence illuminates how it applies to prevention of aggression in space.

#### Plan/Solvency

#### [1] Johnson: --A] The plan means private appropraiton is unjust, only public entitites have access to outer space, anything else is inherently non T –B] IF individual satelites take up place in space, they are appropriation too –C] They can’t solve any impacts, if they still allow private entites to put up megaconstellations they especially don’t solve

#### [2] Eymork 12: --A] Agreements get violated all the time, especially by the US: International Law violations happen all the time, the United States CONSTANTLY violates, proves NO escalation from breaking international law, XINHUA 21

“Facts on U.S. Breaching International Rules.” Xinhua, 20 Apr. 2021, http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2021-04/20/c\_139893941.htm?scrlybrkr=66a9b7be. DOA: Feb 19, 2022

BEIJING, April 20 (Xinhua) -- Indulging in the superiority as the world's superpower, the United States habitually claims itself as the "defender of international law", blames unscrupulously other countries and slaps arbitrary sanctions on them under the pretext of safeguarding international rules. However, the United States in fact makes its selfish political gains first and puts its national law above international laws. The self-righteous country willfully breaks treaties and withdraws from international organizations, changing like a weathercock. Under the pretense of democracy and human rights, Washington constantly interferes in other countries' internal affairs, blatantly wages wars to encroach upon other countries' sovereignty, flagrantly undermines international order, and poses a grave threat to international security. What the U.S. has done has severely violated international rules including the United Nations (UN) Charter. The U.S. attempt to press other countries to "abide by rules" is in fact nothing but force them to yield to a unipolar world order dominated by the United States. 1.INTERFERENCE IN OTHER COUNTRIES' INTERNAL AFFAIRS, VIOLATING OTHER COUNTRIES' SOVEREIGNTY ◆ The principle of non-interference in other countries' internal affairs is an important principle of the UN Charter and the basic norm governing international relations. However, the U.S. government, under the guise of so-called democracy and human rights, has long interfered in China's internal affairs on issues related to ideology, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Xinjiang and Tibet. Through arm sales to and official contacts with Taiwan, and with statements or acts that connive at "Taiwan independence", the U.S. government has been creating obstacles to the reunification of the two sides of the Taiwan Strait. After China resumed exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, the United States colluded with a fraction of opposition forces in Hong Kong and incited social unrest there. It also wantonly smeared China's policy of governance in Xinjiang, as well as the central government's counter-terrorism and de-extremism efforts in the region, viciously slandered Xinjiang's human rights situation, and imposed unilateral sanctions on related Chinese individuals and entities. Lawrence Wilkerson, chief of staff of former U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell, personally admitted that the so-called Xinjiang Uygur issue is nothing but a strategic plot of the United States to destabilize and contain China from the inside. ◆ Being a co-sponsor of the 1267 counter-terrorism committee of the UN Security Council to list the East Turkestan Islamic Movement (ETIM) as a terrorist organization, the U.S. flip-flopped on the UN designation in November 2020 by removing the ETIM from its list of terrorist organizations, and brazenly whitewashed the terror group. For years, the United States has been providing shelter to forces like the so-called "pro-democracy movement," the ETIM and Falun Gong, which have conspired to destabilize China. U.S. politicians also met with people from those forces for multiple times as a gesture of endorsement, which exposed their real purpose of meddling with China's internal affairs in the name of "democracy and freedom." ◆ It is an international consensus that the principle of state sovereignty applies to cyberspace. But the United States, with its advantage in information technology and cyber military power, has time and again intruded and attacked other countries' cyber systems, which violated their sovereignty. In June 2013, the PRISM scandal systematically revealed the fact that the United States had long been hacking into other countries' network systems, and conducting massive network surveillance and espionage. ◆ The United States and other Western countries have been preaching and peddling the so-called system of freedom and democracy by promoting "color revolutions" across the world. The Arab Spring backed and engineered by the U.S. has created continuous turmoil in many countries in West Asia and North Africa. The United States has also long been carrying out intelligence infiltration and subversive activities in Venezuela, Panama and many Middle East countries, and has assisted opposition forces in those countries to plot coups, which seriously interfered in other countries' internal affairs. ◆ The United States is a signatory to international conventions such as the Hague Evidence Convention (also known as the Convention on the Taking of Evidence Abroad in Civil or Commercial Matters), the United Nations Convention Against Corruption and the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime. It has also ratified 69 criminal judicial assistance treaties with foreign countries. However, under the pretext of avoiding low efficiency and excessive restrictions in judicial assistance procedures, the United States established a subpoena ad testificandum system through domestic legislation and judicial precedents to conduct frequent extraterritorial evidence collections, which has been exercised via the Patriot Act Subpoenas and the Bank of Nova Scotia Subpoenas, and seriously undermined the judicial sovereignty and legal dignity of other countries. ◆ Since the COVID-19 pandemic broke out, there have been a number of abusive lawsuits in the United States seeking compensation from the Chinese government for the COVID-19 impact. According to international law experts, the U.S. courts' acceptance of these lawsuits against the Chinese government violated the principle of sovereign equality of states enshrined in the UN Charter and the principle of sovereign immunity in international law, and gravely infringed on China's national sovereignty and dignity.

#### [3] Perishing 19: --A] This cant solve any of their impacts, if we send satelites up for 4 years or so they could still be prone to collision under the aff, making clean up impossible –B] No warrant for how we can just pick up satelites and take them back down –C] Appropriation isn’t defined here, the card doesn’t define appropriation so prefer mine, they don’t link to leasing, proves they are not topical here either and link to the t standards again

#### Appropriation

**Bohm 13** [JEFF BOHM, Chief Judge. In re Cowin, 492 B.R. 858 (Bankr. S.D. Tex. 2013).] TDI

1. Application of the Facts in the Instant Disputes to Embezzlement under Section 523(a)(4) (i) "The Debtor appropriated funds." **"Appropriation" is defined as "the exercise of control over property; a taking of possession."** BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 98 (7th ed. 1999). In connection with its analysis under the TTLA in section C.2.b., supra, this Court has determined that the Debtor appropriated the excess proceeds from the foreclosure sales of the Countrywide Property, the Chase Property, and the WMC Property that rightfully belonged to the Plaintiffs. Not only did the Debtor control the disposition of the excess proceeds via the WCL and Dampkring Deeds of Trust, but he ensured that the proceeds were deposited to Perc and TRH, entities controlled by his co-conspirator Allan Groves. Thus, the first element is satisfied. (ii) "The appropriation was for the Debtor's use or benefit." This element does not require a showing that the Debtor himself personally benefitted by the amounts that the Plaintiffs were damaged. For example, in affirming a bankruptcy court's decision that a debt was nondischargeable due to embezzlement under section 523(a)(4), the Sixth Circuit stated:

#### [4] Hickman 2: --A] Crossapply every arg prior on perishing –B] crossapply the Xinhua 21 evidence

#### [5] Van Fossen 99: --A] no warrant for why microstates wont engage in international law –B] The plan cant solve