## 1

### OFF

#### Interpretation—the aff must disclose the plan text, framework, and advantage area 30 minutes before the round. To clarify, disclosure can occur on the wiki or over message.

#### Violation—they didn’t

Graphical user interface, text, application

Description automatically generated

#### Vote neg for prep and clash—two internal links—a) neg prep—4 minutes of prep is not enough to put together a coherent 1nc or update generics—30 minutes is necessary to learn a little about the affirmative and piece together what 1nc positions apply and cut and research their applications to the affirmative b) aff quality—plan text disclosure discourages cheap shot affs. If the aff isn’t inherent or easily defeated by 20 minutes of research, it should lose—this will answer the 1ar’s claim about innovation—with 30 minutes of prep, there’s still an incentive to find a new strategic, well justified aff, but no incentive to cut a horrible, incoherent aff that the neg can’t check against the broader literature.

Tournament rules also prove no reasonability and is an independent voter because it’s a precondition to debating the tournament – you’re freeriding off of hertzig who is out here hosting a great tournament

Graphical user interface, text, application, email

Description automatically generated

A picture containing graphical user interface

Description automatically generated

#### Fairness is a voter—judge’s constitutive role is to evaluate the better debater which is impossible if the round’s skewed.  Education – voter

#### T is DTD – their abusive advocacy skewed the debate from the start B~ DTA is incoherent because we indict their advocacy

#### Use competing interps – (a) reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter, (b) collapses to competing interps – we justify 2 brightlines under an offense defense paradigm just like 2 interps.

#### No RVIs— (a) logic (b) baiting (c) topic education

Parsigm choice

## 2

### OFF

#### Interpretation: “Private entities” is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend that a subset of nations ban the appropriation of outer space.

#### Bare plurals imply a generic “rules reading” in the context of moral statements

Cohen 1 — (Ariel Cohen, Professor of Linguistics @ Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, PhD Computational Linguistics from Carnegie Mellon University, “On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars”. Journal of Semantics 18: 183-209, Oxford University Press, 2001, accessed 12-7-20, HKR-AM) \*\*BP = bare plurals

According to the rules and regulations view, on the other hand, generic sentences do not get their truth or falsity as a consequence of properties of individual instances. Instead, generic sentences are evaluated with regard to rules and regulations, which are basic, irreducible entities in the world. Each generic sentence denotes a rule; if the rule is in effect, in some sense (different theories suggest different characterizations of what it means for a rule to be in effect), the sentence is true, otherwise it is false. The rule may be physical, biological, social, moral, etc. The paradigmatic cases for which this view seems readily applicable are sentences that refer to conventions, i.e. man-made, explicit rules and regulations, such as the following example (Carlson 1995: 225):

(40) Bishops move diagonally.

Carlson describes the two approaches as a dichotomy: one has to choose one or the other, but not both. One way to decide which approach to choose is to consider a case where the behavior of observed instances conflicts with an explicit rule. Indeed, Carlson discusses just such a case. He describes a supermarket where bananas sell for $0.49/lb, so that (41a) is true. One day, the manager decides to raise the price to $1.00/lb. Immediately after the price has changed, claims Carlson, sentence (41a) becomes false and sentence (41b) becomes true, although the overwhelming majority of sold bananas were sold for $0.49/lb.

(41) a. Bananas sell for $0.49/lb.

b. Bananas sell for $1.00/lb.

Consequently, Carlson reaches the conclusion that the rules and regulations approach is the correct one, whereas the inductivist view is wrong.

While I share Carlson’s judgements, I do not accept the conclusion he draws from them. Suppose the price has, indeed, changed, but the supermarket employs incompetent cashiers who consistently use the old price by mistake, so that customers are still charged $0.49/lb. In this case, I think there is a reading of (41a) which is true, and a reading of (41b) which is false. These readings are more salient if the sentence is modified by expressions such as actually or in fact:

(42) a. Bananas actually sell for $0.49/lb.

b. In fact, bananas sell for $1.00/lb.

BP generics, I claim, are ambiguous: on one reading they express a descriptive generalization, stating the way things are. Under the other reading, they carry a normative force, and require that things be a certain way. When they are used in the former sense, they should be analysed by some sort of inductivist account; when they are used in the latter sense, they ought to be analysed as referring to a rule or a regulation. The respective logical forms of the two readings are different; whereas the former reading involves, in some form or another, quantification, the latter has a simple predicate-argument structure: the argument is the rule or regulation, and the predicate holds of it just in case the rule is ‘in effect’.

#### That outweighs—only our evidence speaks to how bare plurals are interpreted in the context of normative statements like the resolution. This means throw out aff counter-interpretations that are purely descriptive

#### Violation—they specified LEOs low in space

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Precision –any deviation justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 2] Predictable limits—specifying states offers huge explosion in the topic since they get permutations of hundreds of states. This is magnified by the fact that there are almost infinite private companies or types of appropriation

#### Topicality is a voting issue that should be evaluated through competing interpretations – it tells the negative what they do and do not have to prepare for

## Case

### NC – Sats

#### Commercial mining solves extinction from scarcity, climate, terror, war, and disease.

Pelton 17—(Director Emeritus of the Space and Advanced Communications Research Institute at George Washington University, PHD in IR from Georgetown).. Pelton, Joseph N. 2017. The New Gold Rush: The Riches of Space Beckon! Springer. Accessed 8/30/19.

Are We Humans Doomed to Extinction? What will we do when Earth’s resources are used up by humanity? The world is now hugely over populated, with billions and billions crammed into our overcrowded cities. By 2050, we may be 9 billion strong, and by 2100 well over 11 billion people on Planet Earth. Some at the United Nations say we might even be an amazing 12 billion crawling around this small globe. And over 80 % of us will be living in congested cities. These cities will be ever more vulnerable to terrorist attack, natural disaster, and other plights that come with overcrowding and a dearth of jobs that will be fueled by rapid automation and the rise of artifi cial intelligence across the global economy. We are already rapidly running out of water and minerals. Climate change is threatening our very existence. Political leaders and even the Pope have cautioned us against inaction. Perhaps the naysayers are right. All humanity is at tremendous risk. Is there no hope for the future? This book is about hope. We think that there is literally heavenly hope for humanity. But we are not talking here about divine intervention. We are envisioning a new space economy that recognizes that there is more water in the skies that all our oceans. Th ere is a new wealth of natural resources and clean energy in the reaches of outer space—more than most of us could ever dream possible. There are those that say why waste money on outer space when we have severe problems here at home? Going into space is not a waste of money. It is our future. It is our hope for new jobs and resources. The great challenge of our times is to reverse public thinking to see space not as a resource drain but as the doorway to opportunity. The new space frontier can literally open up a “gold rush in the skies.” In brief, we think there is new hope for humanity. We see a new a pathway to the future via new ventures in space. For too long, space programs have been seen as a money pit. In the process, we have overlooked the great abundance available to us in the skies above. It is important to recognize there is already the beginning of a new gold rush in space—a pathway to astral abundance. “New Space” is a term increasingly used to describe radical new commercial space initiatives—many of which have come from Silicon Valley and often with backing from the group of entrepreneurs known popularly as the “space billionaires.” New space is revolutionizing the space industry with lower cost space transportation and space systems that represent significant cost savings and new technological breakthroughs. “New Commercial Space” and the “New Space Economy” represent more than a new way of looking at outer space. These new pathways to the stars could prove vital to human survival. If one does not believe in spending money to probe the mysteries of the universe then perhaps we can try what might be called “calibrated greed” on for size. One only needs to go to a cubesat workshop, or to Silicon Valley or one of many conferences like the “Disrupt Space” event in Bremen, Germany, held in April 2016 to recognize that entrepreneurial New Space initiatives are changing everything [ 1 ]. In fact, the very nature and dimensions of what outer space activities are today have changed forever. It is no longer your grandfather’s concept of outer space that was once dominated by the big national space agencies. The entrepreneurs are taking over. The hopeful statements in this book and the hard economic and technical data that backs them up are more than a minority opinion. It is a topic of growing interest at the World Economic Forum, where business and political heavyweights meet in Davos, Switzerland, to discuss how to stimulate new patterns of global economic growth. It is even the growing view of a group that call themselves “space ethicists.” Here is how Christopher J. Newman, at the University of Sunderland in the United Kingdom has put it: Space ethicists have offered the view that space exploration is not only desirable; it is a duty that we, as a species, must undertake in order to secure the survival of humanity over the longer term. Expanding both the resource base and, eventually, the habitats available for humanity means that any expenditure on space exploration, far from being viewed as frivolous, can legitimately be rationalized as an ethical investment choice. (Newman) On the other hand there are space ethicists and space exobiologists who argue that humans have created ecological ruin on the planet—and now space debris is starting to pollute space. Th ese countervailing thoughts by the “no growth” camp of space ethicists say we have no right to colonize other planets or to mine the Moon and asteroids—or at least no right to do so until we can prove we can sustain life here on Earth for the longer term. However, for most who are planning for the new space economy the opinion of space philosophers doesn’t really fl oat their boat. Legislators, bankers, and aspiring space entrepreneurs are far more interested in the views of the super-rich capitalists called the space billionaires. A number of these billionaires and space executives have already put some very serious money into enterprises intent on creating a new pathway to the stars. No less than five billionaires with established space ventures—Elon Musk, Paul Allen, Jeff Bezos, Sir Richard Branson, and Robert Bigelow—have invested millions if not billions of dollars into commercializing space. They are developing new technologies and establishing space enterprises that can bring the wealth of outer space down to Earth. This is not a pipe dream, but will increasingly be the economic reality of the 2020s. These wealthy space entrepreneurs see major new economic opportunities. To them space represents the last great frontier for enterprising pioneers. Th us they see an ever-expanding space frontier that offers opportunities in low-cost space transportation, satellite solar power satellites to produce clean energy 24h a day, space mining, space manufacturing and production, and eventually space habitats and colonies as a trajectory to a better human future. Some even more visionary thinkers envision the possibility of terraforming Mars, or creating new structures in space to protect our planet from cosmic hazards and even raising Earth’s orbit to escape the rising heat levels of the Sun in millennia to come. Some, of course, will say this is sci-fi hogwash. It can’t be done. We say that this is what people would have said in 1900 about airplanes, rocket ships, cell phones and nuclear devices. The skeptics laughed at Columbus and his plan to sail across the oceans to discover new worlds. When Thomas Jefferson bought the Louisiana Purchase from France or Seward bought Alaska, there were plenty of naysayers that said such investment in the unknown was an extravagant waste of money. A healthy skepticism is useful and can play a role in economic and business success. Before one dismisses the idea of an impending major new space economy and a new gold rush, it might useful to see what has already transpired in space development in just the past five decades. The world’s first geosynchronous communications satellite had a throughput capability of about 500 kb / s. In contrast, today’s state of the art Viasat 2 —a half century later— has an impressive throughput of some 140 Gb/s. Th is means that the relative throughput is nearly 300,000 greater, while its lifetime is some ten times longer (Figs. 1.1 and 1.2 ). Each new generation of communications satellite has had more power, better antenna systems, improved pointing and stabilization, and an extended lifetime. And the capabilities represented by remote sensing satellites , meteorological satellites , and navigation and timing satellites have also expanded their capabilities and performance in an impressive manner. When satellite applications first started, the market was measured in millions of dollars. Today commercial satellite services exceed a quarter of a billion dollars. Vital services such as the Internet, aircraft traffi c control and management, international banking, search and rescue and much, much more depend on application satellites. Th ose that would doubt the importance of satellites to the global economy might wish to view on You Tube the video “If Th ere Were a Day Without Satellites?” [ 2 ]. Let’s check in on what some of those very rich and smart guys think about the new space economy and its potential. (We are sorry to say that so far there are no female space billionaires, but surely this, too, will come someday soon.) Of course this twenty-fi rst century breakthrough that we call the New Space economy will not come just from new space commerce. It will also come from the amazing new technologies here on Earth. Vital new terrestrial technologies will accompany this cosmic journey into tomorrow. Information technology, robotics, artificial intelligence and commercial space travel systems have now set us on a course to allow us humans to harvest the amazing riches in the skies—new natural resources, new energy, and even totally new ways of looking at the purpose of human existence. If we pursue this course steadfastly, it can be the beginning of a New Space renaissance. But if we don’t seek to realize our ultimate destiny in space, Homo sapiens can end up in the dustbin of history—just like literally millions of already failed species. In each and every one of the five mass extinction events that have occurred over the last 1.5 billion years on Earth, some 50–80 % of all species have gone the way of the T. Rex, the woolly mammoth, and the Dodo bird along with extinct ferns, grasses and cacti. On the other hand, the best days of the human race could be just beginning. If we are smart about how we go about discovering and using these riches in the skies and applying the best of our new technologies, it could be the start of a new beginning for humanity. Konstantin Tsiokovsky, the Russian astronautics pioneer, who fi rst conceived of practical designs for spaceships, famously said: “A planet is the cradle of mankind, but one cannot live in a cradle forever.” Well before Tsiokovsky another genius, Leonardo da Vinci, said, quite poetically: “Once you have tasted flight, you will forever walk the earth with your eyes turned skyward, for there you have been, and there you will always long to return.” The founder of the X-Prize and of Planetary Resources, Inc., Dr. Peter Diamandis, has much more brashly said much the same thing in quite diff erent words when he said: “The meek shall inherit the Earth. The rest of us will go to Mars.” The New Space Billionaires Peter Diamandis is not alone in his thinking. From the list of “visionaries” quoted earlier, Elon Musk, the founder of SpaceX; Sir Richard Branson, the founder of Virgin Galactic; and Paul Allen, the co-founder of Microsoft and the man who financed SpaceShipOne, the world’s first successful spaceplane have all said the future will include a vibrant new space economy. Th ey, and others, have said that we can, we should and we soon shall go into space and realize the bounty that it can offer to us. Th e New Space enterprise is today indeed being led by those so-called space billionaires , who have an exciting vision of the future. They and others in the commercial space economy believe that the exploitation of outer space may open up a new golden age of astral abundance. They see outer space as a new frontier that can be a great source of new materials, energy and various forms of new wealth that might even save us from excesses of the past. Th is gold rush in the skies represents a new beginning. We are not talking about expensive new space ventures funded by NASA or other space agencies in Europe, Japan, China or India. No, these eff orts which we and others call New Space are today being forged by imaginative and resourceful commercial entrepreneurs. Th ese twenty-fi rst century visionaries have the fortitude and zeal to look to the abundance above. New breakthroughs in technology and New Space enterprises may be able to create an “astral life raft” for humanity. Just as Columbus and the Vikings had the imaginative drive that led them to discover the riches of a new world, we now have a cadre of space billionaires that are now leading us into this New Space era of tomorrow. These bold leaders, such as Paul Allen and Sir Richard Branson, plus other space entrepreneurs including Jeff Bezos of Amazon and Blue Origin, and Robert Bigelow, Chairman of Budget Suites and Bigelow Aerospace, not only dream of their future in the space industry but also have billions of dollars in assets. These are the bright stars of an entirely new industry that are leading us into the age of New Space commerce. These space billionaires, each in their own way, are proponents of a new age of astral abundance. Each of them is launching new commercial space industries. They are literally transforming our vision of tomorrow. These new types of entrepreneurial aerospace companies—the New Space enterprises—give new hope and new promise of transforming our world as we know it today. The New Space Frontier What happens in space in the next few decades, plus corresponding new information technologies and advanced robotics, will change our world forever. These changes will redefi ne wealth, change our views of work and employment and upend almost everything we think we know about economics, wealth, jobs, and politics. Th ese changes are about truly disruptive technologies of the most fundamental kinds. If you thought the Internet, smart phones, and spandex were disruptive technologies, just hang on. You have not seen anything yet. In short, if you want to understand a transition more fundamental than the changes brought to the twentieth century world by computers, communications and the Internet, then read this book. There are truly riches in the skies. Near-Earth asteroids largely composed of platinum and rare earth metals have an incredible value. Helium-3 isotopes accessible in outer space could provide clean and abundant energy. There is far more water in outer space than is in our oceans. In the pages that follow we will explain the potential for a cosmic shift in our global economy, our ecology, and our commercial and legal systems. These can take place by the end of this century. And if these changes do not take place we will be in trouble. Our conventional petro-chemical energy systems will fail us economically and eventually blanket us with a hydrocarbon haze of smog that will threaten our health and our very survival. Our rare precious metals that we need for modern electronic appliances will skyrocket in price, and the struggle between “haves” and “have nots” will grow increasingly ugly. A lack of affordable and readily available water, natural resources, food, health care and medical supplies, plus systematic threats to urban security and systemic warfare are the alternatives to astral abundance. The choices between astral abundance and a downward spiral in global standards of living are stark. Within the next few decades these problems will be increasingly real. By then the world may almost be begging for new, out of- the-box thinking. International peace and security will be an indispensable prerequisite for exploitation of astral abundance, as will good government for all. No one nation can be rich and secure when everyone else is poor and insecure. In short, global space security and strategic space defense, mediated by global space agreements, are part of this new pathway to the future.

#### Satellite loss shuts down global fracking

Les Johnson 13, Deputy Manager for NASA's Advanced Concepts Office at the Marshall Space Flight Center, Co-Investigator for the JAXA T-Rex Space Tether Experiment and PI of NASA's ProSEDS Experiment, Master's Degree in Physics from Vanderbilt University, Popular Science Writer, and NASA Technologist, Frequent Contributor to the Journal of the British Interplanetary Sodety and Member of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, National Space Society, the World Future Society, and MENSA, Sky Alert!: When Satellites Fail, p. 99-105

Energy, environment, farming, mining, land use. All of these areas and more are now inextricably linked to satellite data and would be devastated should that flow of data stop.

Environmental Monitoring

Oh how complacent we've become. We take for granted that we will have instant images from space showing a volcanic eruption somewhere in the South Pacific within hours of learning that it happened. When the BP oll spill happened in the Gulf of Mexico in 2010, satellite images were used in conjunction with aircraft and ships to monitor the extent and evolving nature of the spill (Figures 10.1 and 10.2).

The data were also used to direct the ships that were attempting to clean up the spill, to warn fishermen of areas in which it would be dangerous to fish, and to generally monitor the extent of the disaster. This is the type of data we get from space in a field known as remote sensing.

Remote sensing is, well, exactly what its name implies. With it, you gather data, or sense, usually in the form of electromagnetic radiation (light), remotely - that is, you are not physically touching what you are looking at. Satellite remote sensing began shortly after we began launching satellites and many industries are now totally dependent upon having the capability.

We use satellites, like the venerable Landsat series, to study the Earth m unprecedented detail. Since 1972, Landsat satellites have taken millions of high resolution images of the Earth's surface, allowing comprehensive studies of how the land has changed due to human intervention (deforestation, agriculture, settlement, etc.) and natural processes (desertification, floods, etc.).

The best way to understand how useful Landsat and similar data can be to governments at all levels is best illustrated by looking at 14then and now" photographs. For example, Africa's Lake Chad has been shrinking for 40 years, as the desert has encroached on this once plentiful inland freshwater lake. Forty years ago, there were about 15,000 square miles of water within the lake. Now, it is less than 500 square miles (Figure 10.3) [1].

And what is the practical side of this particular bit of information?

Governments use this type of satellite imagery to avoid human tragedy. Hundreds of thousands of people, if not millions, depend upon the waters of Lake Chad for agriculture, industry, and personal hygiene. With the lake going dry, how has this impacted on their livelihoods, their families, and their very lives?

The European Space Agency (ESA) is freely providing satellite data to developing countries as they search for new sources of drinking water. For example, ESA assessed data obtained from space over Nigeria to find over 90 new freshwater sources within that country. After ground teams visited the new sites, all were confirmed to contain fresh water. This was no accident. These were satellites with sensors developed for just such purposes in mind [2].

Desertification is but one example of changing climates affecting people's everyday lives. What about more direct observations of our impact on the planet? Figures 10.4 and 10.5 show the scarring of the Earth's surface as a result of surface mining in West Virginia. This is not a polemic against mining; rather, it is an observation that we can use satellite imagery to monitor such mining and be mindful of its impact on the environment.

Other than taking pictures of surface features, like lakes and open pit mines, how are satellites monitoring the Earth's changing climate? In just about every way, by: monitoring global land, sea, and atmospheric temperatures; measuring yearly average rainfall amounts just about everywhere on the globe; measuring glaciation rates; measuring sea surface heights; and more. Remote sensing is more than taking pictures of the Earth in the visible part of the spectrum. We can learn a great deal from looking at part of the spectrum that our eyes cannot see - but our instruments can.

Shown in Figure 10.6 is a composite image of the Earth's surface showing the average land-surface temperature at night. The data came from two NASA satellites, Terra and Aqua, as they orbit the Earth in a polar orbit. (This means that they circle the Earth from top to bottom, passing over both the North and South Poles with each complete orbit.) Terra's orbit is such that it passes from the north to the south across the equator in the morning; Aqua passes south to north over the equator in the afternoon. Taken together, they observe the Earth's surface in its entirety every two days. Data sets such as this exist for just about any day of the year and can show either night-time lows or daytime highs.

By looking in different parts of the spectrum, like the infrared light discussed above, we can make observations as described in Table 10.1.

Pollution Monitoring

As emerging countries industrialize, they also become polluters. Many of these countries are not exactly forthright about releasing air-pollution details to the media, so much of our awareness of the rising pollution there is anecdotal - typically m the form of stories told by people who have visited these countries and seen the extreme pollution at first hand. This, by the way, is not exactly scientific.

Using satellites, and not relying on either the governments in question or second-hand stories, we can accurately assess the pollution levels there and elsewhere. Using satellite images to measure the amount of light absorbed or blocked by fine particulates in the atmosphere, otherwise known as air pollution, you can determine not only what the airborne pollutant might be, but also its size. And, by looking at the overall light blockage, an accurate estimate of the amount of pollution in the air can also be made. Recent studies show that many of these countries are covered in a pollution cloud that countries in the developed world would deem extremely harmful. And how do we know this with scientific certainty? From satellite measurements.

Energy Production

The recent boom in the production of shale oil in the United States and elsewhere is due in large part to the identification and geolocation of promising geologic formations for test drilling and fracking. "Fracking" is a somewhat new term that comes from the phrase "hydraulic fracturing". In fracking, massive amounts of previously unusable reservoirs of oil and natural gas are released for capture, sale, and transport from deposits deep within the Earth - many located at least a mile below the surface. In the United States alone, there may be as much as 750 trillion cubic feet of natural gas within shale deposits releasable by fracking [3]. How do energy companies know where to look for these deposits? In large part, by analyzing satellite imagery.

According to Science Daily (26 February 2009), a new map of the Earth's gravitational field based on satellite measurements makes it much less resource intensive to find new oil deposits. The map will be particularly useful as the ice melts in the oil-rich Arctic regions. The easy-to-find oilfields have already been found. To fuel the growing world economy, those harder-to-find deposits must be located and tapped - which is why satellite imagery is so important. Take away this and other satellite-dependent techniques of oil and gas exploration and the world economy will feel the impact through higher oil and natural gas prices.

#### Fracking makes extinction inevitable---try-or die to shut it off

Rev. Mac Legerton 18, Co-Founder and Executive Director of the Center for Community Action, Member of the Board of Directors of the NC Climate Solutions Coalition, Member of the Board of Directors of the Windcall Institute, “Will The U.S. Blaze A Trail To Mass Extinction?”, APPPL News, 1/15/2018, https://www.apppl.org/news/will-the-u-s-blaze-a-trail-to-mass-extinction/

As an elder, I now realize that there is even a greater threat to humanity and life on Earth than nuclear war—though, unlike a nuclear exchange, this threat is a slow-motion catastrophe. Can you guess what it is? Here’s a clue: it is something with which most people don’t have a personal relationship. Tragically, some persons remain in total denial of its validity, much less its present danger. And that’s the problem – that’s why this threat needs to be more seriously addressed on the local, state, national, and international level.

What is it? It’s the slow-motion but rapidly growing catastrophe of climate change. There’s now good news amidst this seemingly overwhelming challenge. But the answer may surprise you. Today we know what is the #1 preventable cause of climate change. It’s not coal, it’s not nuclear, and it’s not oil and gasoline. It’s actually the use of the very fuel that is touted as being cleaner, greener, and cheaper than all the rest. This fuel is called “Natural Gas”.

Let’s start with its name – “Natural Gas”. What is “natural gas”? There’s actually nothing “natural” about it when it is forcibly extracted from the ground through hydraulic fracturing, commonly known as “fracking”. When something is forcibly ruptured from deep within the earth with the use of toxic chemicals, the last name you would use for it is “natural”.

Fracking disrupts the geologic fault lines causing earthquakes, uses millions of gallons of fresh water that becomes permanently poisoned by unknown, cancer-producing chemicals added to it, creates air pollution during the drilling process, increases the risk of injury and explosions, raises major health risks to both people and place in close proximity to it, and changes the nature of both neighborhoods and landscapes. Fracking also leaves a massive carbon footprint of drilling wells as deep as 8,000 feet and then drilling horizontally over 10,000 feet; On top of all this, it leaks major amounts of gas into the environment.

So, what is this gas? It is 90-95% methane gas which is a hydrocarbon compound made up of one carbon atom and four hydrogen atoms (CH4). It releases carbon into the atmosphere and produces carbon dioxide (C02) just like coal does when it is burned. Methane is not its trace element–it is its undisputed compound of this fossil fuel product. If a compound is 90-95% of a product, it makes sense to call it by that name. Doesn’t it? Well, actually not if you want people to believe and think that it is something that it is not. It is un-natural methane gas produced under massive and highly toxic pressure and hazardous conditions.

Now that we know what this gas is, what does it do to the atmosphere and climate that is so dangerous? This hydrocarbon has properties that block the radiation of heat from Earth’s surface 100 times more effectively than CO2 (released from burning coal) during its first 10 years of release and 86 times more effectively in its first 20 years. Because of the climate emergency underway, the first 10 or 20 years matter most.

When utility companies and the larger fossil fuel companies state that they are committed to lowering carbon emissions, this just isn’t true. They are radically escalating the most dangerous and worst of all fossil fuels in relation to its impact on the climate. Now the industry wants to expand production of methane gas all over the world by calling it “the most environmentally friendly fossil fuel”and a “bridge fuel” that we can safely use until we transition to 100% renewable energy sources.

Why would a major business industry want to call its product by another name? Perhaps for the same reason that the tobacco industry did not like the term “coffin nails” or “cancer sticks” for cigarettes. Honestly, there’s a striking similarity between what are called cigarettes and natural gas. When both were produced and named, their harm was not fully known. Once the industries promoting them learned of their significant harm, they did everything they could to hide this knowledge from the public. They even hired scientists to deny their dangers. The tobacco industry was eventually sued, the truth was acknowledged, and billions of dollars were paid out in the tobacco settlement.

This same scenario that occurred with the tobacco industry needs to occur with methane gas and the fossil fuel industry. The major difference in these two scenarios is that that this fossil fuel product doesn’t just threaten the lives of individuals who voluntarily breathe it in – it threatens the lives of not only every human being, but also all life on the planet. The outcome of this scenario needs to be a moratorium and eventual end to all use of methane gas as an energy source. For the sake of all of us, our communities, and world, the sooner the better. This abomination is different. There is no time to waste.

#### Loss of satellites will shut down terrestrial mining

Les Johnson 13, Deputy Manager for NASA's Advanced Concepts Office at the Marshall Space Flight Center, Co-Investigator for the JAXA T-Rex Space Tether Experiment and PI of NASA's ProSEDS Experiment, Master's Degree in Physics from Vanderbilt University, Popular Science Writer, and NASA Technologist, Frequent Contributor to the Journal of the British Interplanetary Society and Member of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, National Space Society, the World Future Society, and MENSA, Sky Alert!: When Satellites Fail, p. 105

Resource Location

Looking for rare minerals to be mined for our many gadgets, household appliances, and industrial machines? Soil type is often a strong indicator of whether or not underground deposits of metals and minerals are located. By using satellite data to identify promising surface structural features and different soil types, mining companies can better identify promising mining locations, wasting less time and effort in finding the best places to obtain much-needed industrial resources. Without satellite images, the finding and assessment of promising new mines would grind to a halt as the industries retooled back into the days of much slower and labor-intensive field surveys (but without GPS!).

#### Amazon mining will cause extinction

Charito Ushiñahua 11, Anthropologist Working for the Preservation of Indigenous Amazonian Cultures, “Yanomami Indians: The Fierce People?”, http://www.amazon-indians.org/yanomami.html

A mineralogical survey of the northern Amazon by the Brazilian government in 1975 revealed the presence of gold ore in the Roraima region of Brazil. By the early 1980's, miners in search of gold began invading the Yanomami territory in Brazil and by 1987 it had become a full-fledged gold rush. Over 30,000 prospectors entered Yanomami lands and established over a hundred clandestine mining operations. The resulting massacres and diseases brought by these invaders is estimated to have caused the death of over 2,000 Yanomami. One of the problems with gold mining is the environmental destruction it causes. In order to separate gold from rocks and soil, mercury is used. Mercury in the rivers and streams bio-accumulates and permeates the entire ecosystem. The mercury accumulates in predators and hunters (such as the Yanomami) higher up the food chain and creates a neurotoxin that causes birth defects and abnormal child development. The Yanomami have had increased child mortality rates while their birth rates have declined putting their very existence into risk. Moreover, malaria increased in the area due to the stagnant pools left by the miners that increase the mosquito populations that are vectors of the disease. Some have estimated that malaria is responsible for the deaths of about 13% of the Yanomami population every year. However, the negative influence of the miners extends beyond physical health. Their introduction of alcohol and other western goods has had an immense negative effect on Yanomami society itself.

In response to the crisis created by the gold miners, in 1992 the Yanomami territory was protected by the Brazilian government by creating a federal indigenous reserve. However, the gold miners were not happy about the creation of the reserve and in July, 1993, a group of miners tried to exterminate an entire village in what has become to be known as the "Haximu Massacre." At lease 16 Yanomami were killed in what many have called genocide. Some of the miners were tried and convicted and after numerous appeals on the 7th of August, 2006 the Brazilian Supreme Federal Court reaffirmed that the crime known as the Haximu Massacre and upheld the ruling sentencing the miners to 19 years in prison for genocide. However, to this day there is political pressure by the mining industry to reduce the Yanomami territory and allow commercial mining operations on their lands.

In the year 2000, a journalist named Patrick Tierney published a book called, "Darkness in El Dorado," and accused anthropologist Napoleon Chagnon and his colleague geneticist James Neel of numerous misdeeds, among them intentionally creating an epidemic of measles among the Yanomami people in order to study the effects of natural selection on primitive societies. Tierney states that the resulting epidemic caused the death of hundreds of Yanomami. Incredibly, Tierney charged that the experiments were funded by the US Atomic Energy Commission, who sought to model the societal consequences of mass mortality caused by nuclear war. In addition to the measles epidemic, Tierney charged that Chagnon mischaracterized the Yanomami as "The Fierce People" when in fact it was Chagnon who was causing the violence by introducing enormous amounts of western goods such as machetes into the Yanomami society, thus stimulating warfare over the introduced goods. Tierney also accused Chagnon of fraud by staging films, such as "The Axe Fight" that he helped produce. The journalist charged that the anthropologist prescripted the films and that they were not spontaneous as portrayed.

Tierney's book caused an uproar in the anthropological community and the American Anthropological Association (AAA) got involved in the debate. In fact, the AAA convened a special commission to investigate the allegations against Chagnon and Neel. The report by the AAA issued in May, 2002 exonerated the anthropologist and geneticist from causing a measles epidemic among the Yanomami. Nonetheless, the AAA criticized some aspects of Chagnon's research, including his portrayal of the Yanomami as "The Fierce People," and his bribing of Venezuelan officials. However, the AAA debate was not over and three years later in June, 2005 they rescinded the acceptance of the 2002 report.

As someone who is working to support indigenous people, I would like to point out that over the many years since publishing his first book on the Yanomami (whose revenues made him a millionaire), Chagnon has failed to bring significant aid to the Yanomami people. In fact, he sought to damage the indigenous movement by publicly criticizing Davi Kopenawa, a Yanomami activist who helped establish the Yanomami reserve in Brazil. One might ask if it was proper behavior for an anthropologist to hurt the efforts of an indigenous Amazonian activist attempting to defend his people. Interestingly, the Yanomami leader Davi Kopenawa has predicted the destruction of the entire human race if the Amazon Rainforest is destroyed. Kopenawa states, "The forest-land will only die if it is destroyed by whites. Then, the creeks will disappear, the land will crumble, the trees will dry and the stones of the mountains will shatter under the heat. The xapiripë spirits who live in the mountain ranges and play in the forest will eventually flee. Their fathers, the shamans, will not be able to summon them to protect us. The forest-land will become dry and empty. The shamans will no longer be able to deter the smoke-epidemics and the malefic beings who make us ill. And so everyone will die." Many ecologists seem to agree with Kopenawa, believing that the Amazon Rainforest are the "lungs of the Earth" and that if the Amazon is destroyed, it will cause a global ecological disaster resulting in the eventual destruction of the human race.

#### Antarctic mining causes conflict---goes nuclear

David W. Floren 1, J.D. from the University of Oregon, “Antarctic Mining Regimes: An Appreciation of the Attainable”, Journal of Environmental Law and Litigation, Fall, Volume 16, Number 2, 467-513

Concern for the quality of the environment provides a great reason for a mining moratorium, but additional justifications exist. Critics of CRAMRA worry about Antarctica becoming a "scene [or] object of international discord." n221 Largely ignored in the ATS debate is the real danger an introduction of mining and fossil fuel facilities and infrastructure would pose to the integrity of the peacekeeping goals of the ATS. n222 Such facilities and their transportation mechanisms (pipelines, tankers, etc.) will be important targets for destruction or seizure during any armed conflict involving any nation reliant on Antarctic mineral and fossil fuel resources. Article I bans, "inter alia, any measures of a military nature, such as the establishment of military bases and fortifications, the carrying out of military maneuvers, as well as the testing of any type of weapons." n223 Although mining qua mining is clearly not military in nature, the simple existence of mining facilities necessarily entails certain consequences. The history of armed conflict shows the increasingly vital role played by mineral and energy resource facilities in sustaining wartime economies. n224 Such facilities have always been selected as priority targets in military planning and strategy sessions, and the absence of major civilian targets in Antarctica further emphasizes the focus on mining facilityes. Target status is inseparable from the existence of productive mining and fossil fuel facilities, n225 and target priority grows with [\*504] distance from large human population centers. n226 Compounding this problem is the possibility that nuclear weapons might be used. The remoteness and inaccessibility of targets in the AT Area, n227 combined with the tiny number of anticipated human casualties boosts the likelihood that tactical nuclear weaponry would be engaged to achieve top military priorities, despite AT obligations n228 and other international accords discouraging their use. n229

#### Loss of satellites shuts down drones

Daniel Ventre 11, Engineer for CNRS and Researcher for CESDIP, Cyberwar and Information Warfare, p. 198-199

The introduction of cyberspace operations is part of a specific context; a major evolution in the operation environment and the nature of the conflicts, which make irregular wars the rule, and make regular actors the exception to the rule. But the battle against unconventional, non-state governed, irregular actors raises specific problems: there are multiple actors, unpredictable at that, who do not abide by the same rules. New orders in conflicts are imposing the implementation of an ever more important need for information, and information collection and processing. Networks now have an incredible importance. The document refers to the growing threats against American heritage: the USA is a target and the increasing amount of attacks against their networks is indeed the proof of this. There are many obstacles which need to be removed before they can achieve real superiority and freedom to act, especially as vulnerable points may originate within the very operations of the armed forces. An example of this is the vulnerability of using products (software and hardware), commercial products (off-the-shelf), and sometimes even foreign products123. This brings to mind the fact that the US Air Force uses commercial, even foreign, applications for its cyberspace operations.

Information space extends to space124, particularly via communication and observation satellites125. Satellites are the keystone to the cyberspace and communication systems, but also the security system: monitoring (Echelon network is the symbol), observation, communication. These are at the heart of the C4ISR systems, without which a concept such as network-centric warfare could not exist. There would be no drones without satellites. It is even a question of extending the Internet to extra-atmospheric space. Projects in this vein (Interplanetary Networks) were being formed in the 1990s, but ran into several technical difficulties (delays in important transmissions due to high distances and costs) [GEL 06]. NASA dedicates a few pages on its website to this project126. The development of communication systems based on the infrastructures in extra-atmospheric space will also raise questions for legal, geopolitical and geostrategic domains: questions of seizing this space, questions of regulation of human activity in this space, of sovereignty, new territoriality and independence.

#### Drone prolif is inevitable and causes global nuclear war

Dr. Michael C. Horowitz 19, Professor of Political Science at University of Pennsylvania, NDT Champion from Emory University, PhD in Government from Harvard University, Adjunct Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security, “When Speed Kills: Autonomous Weapon Systems, Deterrence, and Stability”, 5/2/2019, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=3348356

Thus, the reason to deploy autonomous systems would have to be their reliability and effectiveness rather than signaling. And giving up human control to algorithms in a crisis that could end with global nuclear war would require an extremely high level of perceived reliability and effectiveness. Few things are more important to militaries in crisis situations than informational awareness and control over decisions, and there might be fear that autonomous systems are prone to accidents.

This counterfactual illustrates that the development and deployment of lethal autonomous weapon systems by national militaries, if it occurs, is unlikely to have simple, easy, and linear consequences. Instead, human factors, including the psychological desire for control and organizational politics, will strongly shape how militaries think about developing and using LAWS. This will not just influence the potential for arms races in peacetime, but deterrence and wartime stability due to the organizational processes militaries implement for the deployment and use of autonomous systems on the battlefield.

This paper draws on research in strategic studies and examples from military history to assess how LAWS could influence the development and deployment of military systems, including arms races, crisis stability, and wartime stability, especially the risk of escalation. It also discusses the potential for arms control. It focuses on these questions through the lens of key characteristics of LAWS, especially the potential for increased operational speed and, simultaneously, less human control over battlefield choices. One of the primary attractions of autonomous systems, even compared to remotely piloted systems, is the potential to operate at machine speed. Another potential benefit is the possibility of machine-like accuracy in following programming, but that comes with a potential downside: the loss of control and the accompanying risk of accidents, adversarial spoofing, and miscalculation. Even if LAWS malfunction at the same rate as humans in a given scenario, the ability of operators to control the impact of those malfunctions may be lower, which could make LAWS less predictable on the battlefield. The paper then examines how these issues interact with the large uncertainty parameter associated with AI-based military capabilities at present, both in terms of the range of the possible and the opacity of their programming.

The results highlight several critical issues surrounding the development and deployment of LAWS.1 First, the desire to fight at machine speed with autonomous systems, while making a military more effective in a conflict, could increase crisis instability. As countries fear losing conflicts faster, it will generate escalation pressure, including an increased incentive for first strikes. Second, in addition to the actual risk of accidents and miscalculation from LAWS, the fear of accidents and losing control of autonomous systems could limit the willingness of militaries to deploy them, particularly since many militaries are conservative when it comes to emerging technologies and have high standards for system reliability. Third, the dual-use, or even general purpose, character of the basic science underlying many autonomous systems will make the technology hard to control, giving many countries and actors access to basic algorithms, though whether this is described as diffusion, proliferation, or an arms race will depend on political dynamics as much as anything.

Finally, multiple uncertainty parameters concerning lethal autonomous weapon systems could exacerbate security dilemmas. Uncertainty over the range of the possible concerning the programming of lethal autonomous weapon systems will increase fear of those systems in the near term, making restraint less likely for competitive reasons. Moreover, the inherent differences between remotely piloted systems and LAWS at the platform level come from software, not hardware. There is arguably an inherent opacity to lethal autonomous weapon systems. If an arms race over lethal autonomous weapon systems occurs, it will likely be because of worse-case assumptions about capability development by potential adversaries.

What is Autonomy or Artificial Intelligence?

Artificial intelligence is the use of computing power, in the form of algorithms, to conduct tasks that previously required human intelligence.2 Artificial intelligence in this context is best thought of as an umbrella technology or enabler, like the combustion engine or electricity. Military applications of artificial intelligence are potentially broad – from image recognition for surveillance to more efficient logistics to battle management.3 These include both non-kinetic applications, including in the cyber realm, as well as kinetic applications.4 One potential application of artificial intelligence is through armed autonomous systems that could be deployed on the battlefield, or what are most popularly called lethal autonomous weapon systems or lethal autonomous weapon systems. This differs from remotely-piloted systems where a human, though at a distance, still operates a given vehicle or system.

What is a lethal autonomous weapon system? While simple to describe on first glance, and easy to understand in the extreme – an armed humanoid robot with extremely broad programming making decisions about engaging in warfare – drawing the line between a lethal autonomous weapon system and other weapon systems is complex. In Directive 3000.09, published in 2012, the US Department of Defense defines an autonomous weapon as “A weapon system that, once activated, can select and engage targets without further intervention by a human operator.”5 What it means to select and engage a target is not entirely clear, however. For example, homing munitions, which have existed since World War II, select and engage targets, according to a common sense understanding of the terms.6

Exactly what functions are autonomous also matters. A system could have automatic piloting, for example, that flies or drives a platform to a target, but still have complete human control over the use of the weapon. That would be a system with a high level of automation, though not a lethal autonomous weapon system according to most perspectives. Heather Roff measures the level of autonomy in a weapon system based on three subcomponents: self-mobility, self-direction, and self-determination. This helps distinguish systems where there might be autonomy concerning the best way a missile should get to a target, but the target itself is designated by a person fromsystems where an algorithm might be making higher-level engagement decisions.7 There are already some applications of limited machine autonomy in military systems, with the most prominent example being the automatic mode present on many Close-In Weapon Systems (CIWS), such as the Phalanx, used to defend ships and incoming missiles from attack.8

This article will not resolve the definitional debate surrounding lethal autonomous weapon systems, which is still ongoing in meetings of the Group of Governmental Experts focused on lethal autonomous weapon systems in the United Nations Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. Provisionally, this article adopts the Scharre and Horowitz definition that a lethal autonomous weapon system is “[A] weapon system that, once activated, is intended to select and engage targets where a human has not decided those specific targets are to be engaged.”9 However, moving beyond the close cases (e.g. particular types of missile guidance systems) and considering those weapon systems that clearly use machine intelligence to search for, select, and/or engage targets can help clarify what is at stake in this debate in the first place.10 After all, if most militaries most of the time would not have any need for lethal autonomous weapon systems, or those systems have significant disadvantages relative to remotely-piloted military robotics or soldiers on the battlefield, the stakes are lower. In contrast, if the integration of machine intelligence with military systems could give countries or violent non-state actors a significant advantage in how they employ force, it becomes even more crucial to engage the topic.

It is important to note that this article does not address concerns about existential risk related to artificial general intelligence – the fear that a superintelligence could decide to destroy the human race, either because it decides humans are malign or because humans program it to achieve a goal it can only accomplish by destroying humans.11 The existential risk issue associated with artificial intelligence is not necessarily closely coupled to military applications of artificial intelligence. If a super-intelligent machine learning system has the ability to take over human society in the interest of a goal – any goal – whether autonomous systems at much smaller orders of magnitude already exist in military systems will likely be unimportant. The super-intelligent system would simply create what it needed.

Why Invest in Autonomous Systems?

Militaries are already increasing their investments in remotely-piloted robotic systems. From UAVs such as the MQ-9 Reaper (United States) to uninhabited surface vehicles (USVs) such as the Guardium (Israel) to uninhabited ground vehicles (UGV) such as Platform-M (Russia), militaries around the world are investing in remotely piloted platforms, some of which can carry weapons. In these systems, human control over the use of force is not fundamentally different from the use of force with inhabited systems. In some cases, such as the MQ-9 Reaper, the sensor system a drone pilot uses to launch a weapon might even be the same sensor system a pilot in the cockpit of an inhabited fighter uses. Using remotely piloted systems gives militaries the ability to reduce the risk to their own soldiers while still projecting power in similar ways to how they used force previously.12 The first places militaries are likely to use kinetic lethal autonomous weapon systems include relatively “clear” environments such as air-to-air combat or naval combat, especially in geographic arenas where civilians are extremely unlikely to be present.13

#### No space war – prefer data over political rhetoric

Klimas interviewing Weeden 18 [Brian Weeden, smart space guy. Is the space war threat being hyped? August 3, 2018. https://www.politico.com/story/2018/08/03/space-war-threat-hype-force-760781]

There’s been increasing rhetoric...about the militarization of space and the potential for conflicts on Earth to extend into space. That’s driven in part by reports about anti-satellite testing in Russia and China...The report really grew out of our frustration at the level of publicly available information on this topic.

A lot of what you get are public statements from military leadership or politicians, or sometimes news articles talking about something and it’s really hard to get down to details and...sort through what might be real, what might be hype. Our goal was to dig into the open source material and see what we could determine from a factual standpoint was really going on -- what types of capabilities were being developed and how might they be used in a future conflict.

Ultimately we hoped that would lead to a more informed debate about what U.S. strategy should be to address those threats.

What sort of feedback have you gotten so far?

A lot of the feedback has been either informal or private because a lot of the issues we talk about, people in the government research using classified materials. So it’s difficult for them to give detailed feedback.

In general, the feedback we’ve gotten has been pretty positive. People have said they like the fact that this sort of stuff is being put in the public domain and encouraged us to continue.

Were your findings better or worse than the picture public discourse paints?

In general, it’s a little bit better. A lot of political rhetoric and news stories focus on the most extreme examples, so using kinetic weapons to blow up satellites. While there is research and development going on to develop those capabilities, what we found is there’s yet to be any publicly-known example of them being used.

What is being used and what seems to be of the most utility are the non-kinetic things, like jamming and cyber attacks. The good news is we have yet to see the most destructive kinetic attacks that can cause really harmful long-term damage to the space environment, but unfortunately we are seeing non-kinetic attacks being used, and that’s likely to continue.

#### MAD checks space escalation – nuclear response and debris

Bowen 18 [Bleddyn Bowen, Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Leicester. The Art of Space Deterrence. February 20, 2018. https://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/commentary/the-art-of-space-deterrence/]

Fourth, the ubiquity of space infrastructure and the fragility of the space environment may create a degree of existential deterrence. As space is so useful to modern economies and military forces, a large-scale disruption of space infrastructure may be so intuitively escalatory to decision-makers that there may be a natural caution against a wholesale assault on a state’s entire space capabilities because the consequences of doing so approach the mentalities of total war, or nuclear responses if a society begins tearing itself apart because of the collapse of optimised energy grids and just-in-time supply chains. In addition, the problem of space debris and the political-legal hurdles to conducting debris clean-up operations mean that even a handful of explosive events in space can render a region of Earth orbit unusable for everyone. This could caution a country like China from excessive kinetic intercept missions because its own military and economy is increasingly reliant on outer space, but perhaps not a country like North Korea which does not rely on space. The usefulness, sensitivity, and fragility of space may have some existential deterrent effect. China’s catastrophic anti-satellite weapons test in 2007 is a valuable lesson for all on the potentially devastating effect of kinetic warfare in orbit.

#### Mutual dependence on space infrastructure prevents war

Triezenberg 17 [Bonnie Triezenberg is a senior engineer at RAND. Previously, she was the senior technical fellow at the Boeing Company, specializing in agile systems and software development. She received a B.S. in aerospace engineering from the University of Michigan, an M.S. in systems science from the University of California-Los Angeles, and a Ph.D. in policy analysis from the Pardee RAND Graduate School. Deterring Space War. 2017. https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/rgs\_dissertations/RGSD400/RGSD400/RAND\_RGSD400.pdf]

The above discussion suggests that a likely means to achieve deterrence of acts of war in outer space is to increase civilian dependence on space to support day-to-day life—if everyone on earth is equally dependent on space, no one has an incentive to destroy space. Largely by accident, this dependence appears to have, in fact, occurred. The space age was born in an age of affluence and rapid economic expansion; space quickly became a domain of international commerce as well as a domain of national military use. Space assets and the systems they enable have transformed social, infrastructure and information uses perhaps more visibly than they have transformed military uses. In fact, in the current satellite database published by the Union of Concerned Scientists, of the 1461 satellites in orbit 40% support purely commercial ventures, while only 16% have a strictly military use.46 The first commercial broadcast by a satellite in geo-synchronous orbit was of international news between Europe and the United States.47 The first telephony uniting the far flung islands of Indonesia was enabled by satellite48. Those of us who are old enough remember the 1960s “magic” of intercontinental phone calls and international “breaking news” delivered by satellite. Today, most social and infrastructure uses of space are taken for granted - even in remote locales of Africa, people expect to be able to monitor the weather, communicate seamlessly with colleagues and to find their way to new and unfamiliar locations using the GPS in their phones. All of us use space every day.49 These unrestricted economic and social uses of space may be the best deterrent, making everyone on all sides of combat equally dependent on space and heightening the taboo against weaponizing space or threatening space assets with weapons.

#### That’s uniquely seen as not escalatory – military planning proves

Wright et al 5 [David Wright is a nationally known expert on the technical aspects of nuclear weapons policy, missile defense systems, missile proliferation, and space weapons. Dr. Wright was a senior research analyst with the Federation of American Scientists and served as an SSRC-MacArthur fellow at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government. PhD in Physics from Cornell. Laura Grego is a senior scientist in the Global Security Program at the Union of Concerned Scientists. Lisbeth Gronlund was an SSRC-MacArthur Foundation fellow in international peace and security at the University of Maryland. The Physics of Space Security. 2005. https://www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/legacy/assets/documents/nwgs/physics-space-security.pdf]

Temporary and reversible interference with a satellite system is likely to be less provocative than destructive attacks. Such interference can, in some cases, be plausibly deniable. And it would not damage the space environment by generating debris. These techniques seem to be favored by military planners in the United States and elsewhere. Moreover, temporary interference with a satellite’s mission, particularly over one’s own territory, is likely to be perceived as defensive and legitimate in a way that permanently disabling the satellite would not.

### NC – Hacking

#### The risk of cyberattack is one in 3 billion – assumes every warrant

* No desire
* Can’t steal material – guards and chase
* Don’t have scientists
* No blueprints
* Takes over a year – that whole time, risk of being infiltrated and shut down is high
* No loose nukes exist
* Built-in mechanisms to auto-disable the bomb if tampered with
* Terrorists prefer conventional weapons
* The risk is one in 3 billion

**Mueller 10** (John, professor of political science at Ohio State, Calming Our Nuclear Jitters, Issues in Science and Technology, Winter, http://www.issues.org/26.2/mueller.html)

Politicians of all stripes preach to an anxious, appreciative, and very numerous choir when they, like President Obama, proclaim atomic terrorism to be “the most immediate and extreme threat to global security.” It is the problem that, according to Defense Secretary Robert Gates, currently keeps every senior leader awake at night. This is hardly a new anxiety. In 1946, atomic bomb maker J. Robert Oppenheimer ominously warned that if three or four men could smuggle in units for an atomic bomb, they could blow up New York. This was an early expression of a pattern of dramatic risk inflation that has persisted throughout the nuclear age. In fact, although expanding fires and fallout might increase the effective destructive radius, the blast of a Hiroshima-size device would “blow up” about 1% of the city’s area—a tragedy, of course, but not the same as one 100 times greater. In the early 1970s, nuclear physicist Theodore Taylor proclaimed the atomic terrorist problem to be “immediate,” explaining at length “how comparatively easy it would be to steal nuclear material and step by step make it into a bomb.” At the time he thought it was already too late to “prevent the making of a few bombs, here and there, now and then,” or “in another ten or fifteen years, it will be too late.” Three decades after Taylor, we continue to wait for terrorists to carry out their “easy” task. In contrast to these predictions, terrorist groups seem to have exhibited only limited desire and even less progress in going atomic. This may be because, after brief exploration of the possible routes, they, unlike generations of alarmists, have discovered that the tremendous effort required is scarcely likely to be successful. The most plausible route for terrorists, according to most experts, would be to manufacture an atomic device themselves from purloined fissile material (plutonium or, more likely, highly enriched uranium). This task, however, remains a daunting one, requiring that a considerable series of difficult hurdles be conquered and in sequence. Outright armed theft of fissile material is exceedingly unlikely not only because of the resistance of guards, but because chase would be immediate. A more promising approach would be to corrupt insiders to smuggle out the required substances. However, this requires the terrorists to pay off a host of greedy confederates, including brokers and money-transmitters, any one of whom could turn on them or, either out of guile or incompetence, furnish them with stuff that is useless. Insiders might also consider the possibility that once the heist was accomplished, the terrorists would, as analyst Brian Jenkins none too delicately puts it, “have every incentive to cover their trail, beginning with eliminating their confederates.” If terrorists were somehow successful at obtaining a sufficient mass of relevant material, they would then probably have to transport it a long distance over unfamiliar terrain and probably while being pursued by security forces. Crossing international borders would be facilitated by following established smuggling routes, but these are not as chaotic as they appear and are often under the watch of suspicious and careful criminal regulators. If border personnel became suspicious of the commodity being smuggled, some of them might find it in their interest to disrupt passage, perhaps to collect the bounteous reward money that would probably be offered by alarmed governments once the uranium theft had been discovered. Once outside the country with their precious booty, terrorists would need to set up a large and well-equipped machine shop to manufacture a bomb and then to populate it with a very select team of highly skilled scientists, technicians, machinists, and administrators. The group would have to be assembled and retained for the monumental task while no consequential suspicions were generated among friends, family, and police about their curious and sudden absence from normal pursuits back home. Members of the bomb-building team would also have to be utterly devoted to the cause, of course, and they would have to be willing to put their lives and certainly their careers at high risk, because after their bomb was discovered or exploded they would probably become the targets of an intense worldwide dragnet operation. Some observers have insisted that it would be easy for terrorists to assemble a crude bomb if they could get enough fissile material. But Christoph Wirz and Emmanuel Egger, two senior physicists in charge of nuclear issues at Switzerland‘s Spiez Laboratory, bluntly conclude that the task “could hardly be accomplished by a subnational group.” They point out that precise blueprints are required, not just sketches and general ideas, and that even with a good blueprint the terrorist group would most certainly be forced to redesign. They also stress that the work is difficult, dangerous, and extremely exacting, and that the technical requirements in several fields verge on the unfeasible. Stephen Younger, former director of nuclear weapons research at Los Alamos Laboratories, has made a similar argument, pointing out that uranium is “exceptionally difficult to machine” whereas “plutonium is one of the most complex metals ever discovered, a material whose basic properties are sensitive to exactly how it is processed.“ Stressing the “daunting problems associated with material purity, machining, and a host of other issues,” Younger concludes, “to think that a terrorist group, working in isolation with an unreliable supply of electricity and little access to tools and supplies” could fabricate a bomb “is farfetched at best.” Under the best circumstances, the process of making a bomb could take months or even a year or more, which would, of course, have to be carried out in utter secrecy.