## Framing

#### LINK FILTER – The affirmative does not stop the commercialization of space. Barring appropriation only limits the ownership of real property, use is still allowed. 100% of aff harms result from use, like the claiming of resources in space, not ownership of real estate.

Švec et al 20 [Martin Švec, Petr Boháček, and Nikola Schmidt, “Utilization of Natural Resources in Outer Space: Social License to Operate as an Alternative Source of Both Legality and Legitimacy,” Oil Gas Energy Law J, 2020. <https://planetary-defense.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/ov18-1-article17-notitle.pdf>] CT

2.2.1. Is the Utilization of Space Resources Implicitly Prohibited by the OST?

When the OST was drafted, exploitation of space resources was not considered feasible. Thus, the treaty does not contain any specific reference to space resource activities. However, silence of the OST does not necessarily imply unlawfulness of these activities. On the contrary, the freedom of exploration, use and access is one of the most fundamental principles of international space law. Art I of the OST reads: “Outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, shall be free for exploration and use by all States without discrimination of any kind, on a basis of equality and in accordance with international law, and there shall be free access to all areas of celestial bodies.“25 It is worth mentioning that France already in 1966, during the negotiations of the OST, emphasised that it is important to know exactly what is meant by the term ‘use’, and whether it is an equivalent to the term ‘exploitation’. 26 While there is a general consensus on the interpretation of the term “exploration” as referring to discovery activities of the space environment for scientific reasons, a large disagreement exists concerning the term ‘use’.27 In this context the Board of Directors of the International Institute of Space Law (IISL) hold that there is no international agreement whether the right of “free use” includes the right to take and consume nonrenewable natural resources, including minerals and water on celestial bodies.28 The authors of this article are of the opinion that the term “use” seems to be broad enough to encompass the exploitation of natural resources. Pursuant to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a treaty shall be interpreted in good faith in accordance with the ordinary meaning to be given to the terms of the treaty in their context and in the light of its object and purpose. First, the term “use” usually refers to both the non-economic and economic utilization and, thus, the use of outer space for economic ends can include exploitation with the objective of making economic profit.29 Second, the OST’s preamble reveals that the treaty does not aim to restrict the use of outer space, but rather to promote free exploration and use of outer space and the opposite interpretation would lead to an unnecessary impediment to the development of the uses of outer space.30 What is more, these conclusions may also be derived from the Moon Agreement. Although this agreement has been ratified only by 18 states, it may help understand the meaning of the international space law principles enshrined in the OST. The preamble of the Moon Agreement refers to the “benefits which may be derived from the exploitation of the natural resources of the moon and other celestial bodies,” and art 11 envisages the establishment of an international regime to govern the exploitation of natural resources of the Moon. In addition, Hobe argues, that specific uses are only excluded if they are explicitly excluded in other provisions of the OST, such as prohibition of certain military activities.31

2.2.2. Does the Utilization of Space Resources Contradict the Principle of NonAppropriation?

The principle of non-appropriation is one of the most fundamental rules regulating the exploration and use of outer space. Art II of the OST reads as follows: “Outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means.” As a consequence, outer space is generally understood as a res communis omnium, 32 in its legal characterisation similar to the law governing the high seas or the deep seabed. An analysis of these already existing regimes based on the non-appropriation principle reveals that an exploitation of natural resources is perfectly compatible with the principle of nonappropriation.33 Additionally, even the Moon Agreement suggests that the exploitation of the natural resources of the moon does not constitute a means of appropriation. In particular, art 11 of the Moon Agreement reiterates that outer space is not subject to national appropriation and it explicitly envisages the establishment of an international legal regime to govern the exploitation of space resources.34

#### The question of the resolution is not whether private activity in space is unjust, but rather GIVEN the reality of private use, whether private ownership of real estate in space ought to be allowed, or not. All of their advantages should be filtered by whether it proves that the private use of space without property rights is better than the use of space with property rights.

#### They claim the question is between private companies and the public, but this is impossible, as in our current society where private companies can appropriate things, the government is still in existence

## CP

#### *CP: States ought to permit the private appropriation of space by recognizing the right to property for natural persons in space*

#### The individual right to property is a basic human right that should be extended to space.

Faires 19 [Wes Faires, “The role of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in supporting space property rights,” The Space Review, August 5, 2019. <https://www.thespacereview.com/article/3771/1>] CT

A long-discussed issue has been the absence of provisions pertaining to private entities under the 1967 Outer Space Treaty. Interpretations in favor of private property rights hold that the purpose of Article II’s ban on “national appropriation” was to place a limitation on member nations’ attempts to exercise territorial and political sovereignty over any part of outer space: to restrict territorial disputes between countries from extending beyond Earth. Without an explicit prohibition of private property rights in the treaty, their development with respect to private entities is unencumbered. Opposition has fluctuated from the position that the prohibition of national appropriation in Article II served to exclude development of property rights for private citizens: without a national entity with the ability to “confer” or pass down property rights to “sub-national” citizens, forward progress is rendered impossible. There were later attempts to classify private citizens as “nationals” in order to apply to them the prohibition of ‘national appropriation’. The 1979 Moon Agreement places an explicit ban on property for a host of entities, including “natural persons,” until such time as an international regime can be formulated. Two nations, the United States and Luxembourg, have enacted legislation favorable to property and mineral rights regarding space resources. This was met with opposition from some in the international community, who called into question whether such unilateral acts were in and of themselves a violation of the non-appropriation principle of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty. Perhaps in the future, the concept of “property rights” will have evolved beyond the terrestrial concepts of ownership, sovereignty, and territorial acquisition, under a new treaty framework structured by private entities, developed outside the auspices of any nation-state or supranational regime. Until such time, what is needed is a base-level favorable affirmation of private property rights in outer space, one that serves as a foundation for their evolution beyond national borders and which is accepted across the board. To this end, the solution to 50 years of ambiguity regarding private property rights under the under the current UN Outer Space Treaty framework is found within the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), Article 17: (1) Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others. (2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property. -UN General Assembly. "Universal Declaration of Human Rights." United Nations, 217 (III) A,1948, Paris, Art. 17 The commercial space sector would welcome language favorable to private property rights in space, with specific emphasis on the re-affirmation of Article 17 as it pertains to property rights for private entities. Beyond Article 17, utilization of the UDHR as a default mechanism in situations where legislation is not yet developed can yield an immediate benefit for humanity. On the national level, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights can be seamlessly integrated into national space policy. Adoption of the UDHR into space policy by state parties to the Outer Space Treaty is essentially a reaffirmation of one of the fundamental principles of the United Nations, and can take place without litigation or implementation of new national legislation, and with no accusation of violation of “national appropriation.” In the international arena, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights can be seamlessly into to conducting legislative proceedings pertaining to outer space, given that: The overarching thematic priority for UNISPACE + 50 and beyond is “Sustainable Development in Space.” A critical aspect of this calls for ensuring the principles of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development are upheld. The 2030 Agenda is grounded in, and re-affirms, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (A/RES/70/1 para. 10, para. 19). The task at hand is to compel the United Nations Committee on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (UNCOPUOS) to commit to upholding the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Solidarity on such a core foundational UN principle as the UDHR solidifies reflection of Agenda 2030. I propose that UN Secretariat take this opportunity to move forward with Sustainable Development, and lead the way in incorporation the Universal Declaration of Human Rights into international space policy. It is time to recognize property rights as the universally declared human right that it is: “Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.” The definition of property and scope of the UDHR was not limited to any one definition or territory. The UDHR was intended from the outset to be universal: “It is not a treaty; it is not an international agreement […] It is a Declaration of basic principles of human rights and freedoms, to be stamped with the approval of the General Assembly by formal vote of its members, and to serve as a common standard of achievement for all peoples of all nations.” -Eleanor Roosevelt, “On the Adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights” December 9, 1948 Here in its 70th year of adoption, acceptance of the UDHR into space policy by the international community would be both timely and logical. It reaffirms adherence to a fundamental United Nations cornerstone, and provides an opportunity to strengthen the commitment to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. At a time when feasibility of extraction of minerals from celestial bodies is fast approaching, it is our responsibility to ensure that the transition occurs free of any terrestrial shackles. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights offers an acceptable foundational framework from which property rights can evolve off-planet, that can be embraced by the private sector, adopted across national levels, and upheld in the international arena

#### The CP protects individual property rights while solving case since the aff still applies to corporations.

#### The CP would expand the rights of individuals in space, from the mere right to use, to the full bundle of rights protected by private property.

Reinstein 99 ]Ezra J. Reinstein, “Owning Outer Space,” 20 Nw. J. Int'l L. & Bus. 59 (1999-2000). <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1500&context=njilb>] CT

IV. PROPOSAL: APPROPRJATIVE OWNERSHIP OF REAL PROPERTY

The ideal legal regime should create maximum incentives for efficient development of space, in recognition of the fact that the potential wealth in space will not drop into our laps. But as much as commercial development of space would benefit all mankind, it is just as important that the development be controlled. We must learn from mistakes of the past. Any legal regime should guard against inefficient exploitation, waste, and environmental despoliation. Furthermore, space should not become the next Wild West. Destruction and sabotage must be discouraged. My proposal, which will be developed throughout this essay, is to maximize incentives by giving developers comprehensive property rights. Humanity's welfare demands that we alter the current law to allow real estate ownership -- not just usufructary rights -- to those who would best develop land in space.7 The potential wealth of outer space, in the form of minerals, energy, living space, etc., doesn't do us any good unless we are able to harness it. And, as Jeffrey Kargel, a planetary scientist at the U.S. Geological Survey, has written, "if you want to cross the bridge into the 21st century of space [development], then space must pay its way and give private investors a handsome early return on investment.' 75 What do we mean by "ownership?" Property is commonly recognized as being a "bundle" of disparate rights regulating relations between people with respect to things. The bundle of rights can be unpacked. It includes: the right to possess, the right to use, the right to exclude, and the right to transfer.76 These rights are not on/off affairs; they can each be limited or expanded along a continuum. I use the term "ownership" to describe a state of affairs wherein a person has all four of these rights to their maximum extent with respect to a piece of property. Current space law ostensibly respects the right to use real property in space and to collect and own its fruits. Historically, this has been known as the usufructary right.77 But the current law doesn't even provide this right freely; it seems to be limited by several clauses of the Outer Space Treaty (e.g. use "for the benefit...of all countries").78 Nor does the OST recognize the right to exclude, as is evidenced by article I's prohibition on appropriating what it recognizes as being "the province of all mankind," the guarantee in the same article of "free access to all areas of celestial bodies," and article XII's requirement that "[a]ll stations [and] installations...shall be open to representatives of other States Parties to the Treaty on a basis of reciprocity." Likewise, as illuminated in the SpaceCorp hypothetical, the prohibition on appropriation seems to negate a long-term right of possession. Without the right to exclude or pos- sess, of course, a legal system need not provide the right to transfer real estate. Anyone else may simply help themselves. In sum, the OST demands that "[n]o State can obtain such possessions as will entitle it to claim ownership or sovereignty over them... There can be no exclusive appro- priation of [celestial bodies] and any part thereof as a result of their 'use'..." 79 Under current law, space cannot be owned. A new law of space real property must enliven and support all four rights that comprise ownership. First, there must be a right to permanent possession: barring some ex- traordinary circumstance or the enforcement of a judgment, no one should face dispossession of his real estate on Earth or in space. This rule supplies a needed measure of certainty, in two ways: (1) it's a definite rule and almost any such rule is better than the fogginess of the current regime, and (2) it moves the presumption away from public conversion of private lands, and therefore makes it clear that the OST's statement, that space development must be "for the benefit...of all countries," is a moral exhortation and not a loophole through which the United Nations can dispossess a private party of his site. Second, I suggest that the right to use be unlimited, except by environmental regulations and the developer's domestic law. This rule is a recognition that humanity's fortune is best enhanced not by a centralized command-and-control system, but by private development making market-driven decisions. Like the right to perpetual possession, the third right -- the right to exclude -- creates the certainty vital to an optimal investment environment. As noted, the current system precludes such a right, for it would certainly run afoul of the prohibition on appropriation and the requirement that there be "free access to all areas of celestial bodies. 80 Without the right to exclude, however, pioneer investors would be at the mercy of free riders. After investing countless hours in (or paying someone else for) a survey of the real estate, after setting up a mining colony at great expense, the pioneer would have no recourse if another party took advantage of the pioneer's research and began a copycat mine on the very same site. So the right to exclude must form a part of the new legal system. Finally, the right to transfer must accompany the rights of exclusion and perpetual possession. The Coase Theorem of economics tells us that, in a legal environment supportive of bargaining, property rights will be allocated to the party who values them most, i.e. the most efficient user of the property.81 When transaction costs are high enough to prevent bargaining, property rights only end up in the most productively efficient hands if the law happens to initially assign them that way.82 Without any right to transfer, transaction costs are infinite, and no bargaining can occur. In order to avoid the inevitably inefficient solutions of a command-and-control regime of property usage, the right to transfer -- alienability -- must be a part of our system.83 All these rights together -- possession, use, exclusion, and transfer -- make up ownership. And it is ownership that the modem law of space real property needs.

## Net Benefit

#### Space settlement is coming now and prevents inevitable extinction. Future settlers need protections and the rule of law.

Gesl 18 [Paul M. Gesl (Maj, USAF JD), “PREPARING FOR THE NEXT SPACE RACE: Legislation and Policy Recommendations for Space Colonies,” A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements for the Degree of MASTER OF OPERATIONAL ARTS AND SCIENCES (April 2018). <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/AD1053024.pdf>] CT

Why the United States Needs to Think About Space Colonization Now

The United States’ space policies under the previous two Presidential administrations have not matched the ambition of the commercial sector. The author has criticized the National Space Policies of both President Obama and George W. Bush as being too “Earth-Centric.”6 Based on the current state of technologies, it is easy to dismiss space colonization as, at best, a problem to worry about tomorrow and, at worst, mere science fiction. This is irresponsible. Reaching space is difficult. Colonizing it will be even more difficult; however, we cannot overlook it as a likely possibility. NASA viewed space colonization as an endeavor within humanity’s reach in the 1970s.7 Now it is beginning to take shape as a reality. In 2015 at the Pioneering Space National Summit, policy makers, industry leaders and advocates agreed that “The long term goal of the human spaceflight and exploration program of the United States is to expand permanent human presence beyond low-Earth orbit in a way that will enable human settlement and a thriving space economy. This will be best achieved through public-private partnerships and international collaboration (emphasis in original).”8 Additionally, there have been several attempts in Congress to pursue space settlement.9 Private industry appears to be taking the lead in this race. Elon Musk, the CEO of SpaceX intends to establish a colony of a million settlers on the surface of Mars.10 SpaceX is targeting the first manned missions to make this a reality to launch in 2024.11 Mr. Musk envisions the full colonization to take 40-100 years.12 Even if this timeline misses its ambitious deadline by a decade, humanity will be a multi-planetary species in many readers’ lifetimes. It is important to note that Mr. Musk recently stated that SpaceX is “building the first Mars, or interplanetary ship, and I think we’ll be able to do short trips, flights by first half of next year.”13 Even though he joked that the company might miss their timeline, his comments highlight that colonization is an issue that is fast approaching.14 Another factor to consider is that a legal framework needs to be developed before a Martian colony is at its full capacity. Mr. Musk envisions using SpaceX’s BFR to send approximately 100 people per flight to Mars.15 Additionally, SpaceX appears to be planning for humans living on the lunar surface in their Moon Base Alpha.16 SpaceX is not alone in their ambitions. United Launch Alliance (ULA) published their plans to expand the population of humans living and working in space. Their Cis-lunar 1,000 framework is a 30-year plan to develop the cis-lunar economy and grow the population of humans living and working in space from six to 1,000.17 Space colonization is more important to our species than the economic benefits of a space economy and the conquests of exploration. The current world population is 7.4 billion people.18 According to the World Wildlife Foundation and the Global Footprint Network, “the equivalent of 1.7 planets would be needed to produce enough natural resources to match our consumption rates and a growing population.”19 The problem will likely grow worse as the population of the planet continues to grow. According to the United Nations, the Earth’s population will grow to over 11 billion people by 2100.20 Based partially on this, “Prof [Stephen] Hawking said it was only a matter of time before the Earth as we know it is destroyed by an asteroid strike, soaring temperatures or over-population.”21 Hawking further stated that, “When we have reached similar crisis in or (sic.) history there has usually been somewhere else to colonise (sic.). Columbus did it in 1492 when he discovered the new world. But now there is no new world. No Eutopia (sic.) around the corner. We are running out of space and the only places to go are other worlds.”22 The late Professor Hawking is not alone in his view, the National Space Society observed the benefits of expanding into space. “Outer space holds virtually limitless amounts of energy and raw materials, which can be harvested for use both on Earth and in space. Quality of life can be improved directly by utilization of these resources and also indirectly moving hazardous and polluting industries and/or their waste products off planet Earth.”23 These are just several of the many compelling reasons to colonize space advocated by groups such as the National Space Society and the Space Frontier Foundation.24 ULA appears to be taking steps to meet their ambitions for the future. ULA announced the first step towards making their Cis-lunar 1,000 vision a reality. In October 2017, they announced a partnership with Bigelow Aerospace to launch a habitat to low lunar orbit.25 The launch is expected to be completed before the end 2022.26 Some feel that colonization is going to happen, no matter what governments do.27 If colonization is going to happen, then it is in the United States’ best interest to develop a legal framework that supports the efforts and protects our citizens who will travel to and live in these habitats. This is important for several reasons. First, private corporations appear to have an interest in colonizing space, so it is in humanity’s future whether the government is involved nor not. However, governments can take actions that will accelerate things.28 Second, it is in the best interest of the United States’ economy to support commercial companies that are expanding into space. Third, if the United States does not create a favorable legal framework for space colonization, someone else will. Finally, as humanity expands away from the surface of the Earth, it is important to create a free society based on the principles of the Rule of Law rather than some other form of government, or an anarchistic company town.

#### Space settlement with private appropriation is better than settlement without appropriation.

### 1 Tyranny

#### Absent legally enforced personal rights, like property, space settlements are likely to be dominated by tyrannical governments or corporations. Turns case.

Cockell 08 [Charles S. Cockell (Center for Earth, Planetary, Space and Astronomical Research – Open University, Milton Keynes), “AN ESSAY ON EXTRATERRESTRIAL LIBERTY,” JBIS, VOL. 61, pp. 255-275, 2008. <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Charles-Cockell/publication/258317782_An_Essay_on_Extraterrestrial_Liberty/links/0c96053053a02cfb24000000/An-Essay-on-Extraterrestrial-Liberty.pdf>] CT

6. EXTRATERRESTRIAL LIBERTY

For Berlin [20], ‘negative’ liberty meant the pursuit of individual liberty by removing those mechanisms that exert control over one’s actions. Western liberal democracies pursue, for the most part, philosophies of negative liberty, by attempting to reduce the role of government in individual lives. A restricted sphere of negative liberty is created by tyrannies, in which encroachment into the lives of individuals reduces the number and scope of activities in which people consider themselves free, or at least able to make decisions that can be implemented independently of the State. Of course, by retreating into a core set of activities in which one is completely free, one is in the process of relinquishing liberty, as the scope of free actions is voluntarily reduced. This is in itself a form of slavery. Societies where the scope of negative liberty is reduced can be described as more enslaved, even if the people there may not describe themselves as such, because they have in fact escaped State slavery by retreating from those very activities in which control is exerted.

The crucial point is that the sphere within which negative liberty is possible is necessarily constrained by the environmental conditions under which one exists. The more extreme the environmental conditions, the fewer social activities can occur without collective oversight. More saliently, the people themselves may actually request such oversight, to protect their safety from others who would abuse it, with the resulting dangers. Some of these systems of monitoring can be found in societies on Earth. We cannot drive automobiles without safety checks. Our water must be passed through treatment works— life support systems if you will—that ensure that what we are drinking is safe. Indeed, even in some of the most mature terrestrial democracies, a remarkable quantity of basic consumables and resources come to us through systems of compliance overseen by the State. This is a form of control that most people accept because we consider it in our interest. We do not usually see such invasions of our liberty as tyranny, but rather as benevolent actions by the State to ensure our safekeeping. But they are incursions nevertheless, and while democracy is functioning such oversights need not necessarily concern us; or at least they do not worry most of the public, who are more concerned with having fresh water than more abstract thoughts about the allowable extent to which the State should have influence over their water quality.

In extraterrestrial environments, spacesuits, water quality, food production, habitat pressurisation and so on and so forth will be subject to regulation by corporations or the State. As on Earth, perhaps many of these incursions will be regarded as acts of beneficence b. y the State in the interests of safety, and will be willingly accepted. But one fact is undeniable: the extent of negative liberty must be less in extraterrestrial environments than on Earth, and quite significantly less. Even the air will be subject to quality controls and checks. Forms and permissions will be associated with the very act of breathing. No philosophy of advancing the domain of negative liberty, no clever sophistry, can change this truth, which is brought into being by basic survival needs.

An undeniable effect will be to expand the opportunities for tyranny. Where the mechanisms for central control are necessarily enlarged in their scope and diversity, a greater number of levers exist, and enable individuals and organisations to exert control and assume power. A reduction in negative liberty does not necessarily imply greater tyranny, but it certainly makes it possible. In extraterrestrial environments, where centralised interventions must be frequent, how much weaker is freedom and how much easier is tyranny to enforce? We cannot know the answers until we undertake the experiment, but we can be fairly sure that the qualitative answer must be ‘more easily’.

More insidiously, the restriction of the borders of negative liberty, caused by the apparent need to protect individuals from the irresponsible actions of others, can itself be perpetuated as a form of liberty. The use of alcohol in extraterrestrial environments is one example. On Earth, the excessive use of alcohol may result in broken windows and arrests, but once the windows are repaired little damage has been done to society as a whole. Hence, although there is a negative social collective impact of excessive alcohol use, the prohibition of alcohol consumption of any kind is generally regarded as an infringement of civil liberties that the public will not tolerate. This is why, of course, attempts to do exactly this in the past have been met by black marketeering. But in extraterrestrial environments, a broken window may imply depressurisation, and the instant death of many individuals. The potential impact on society of the irresponsible and thoughtless actions of individuals is greater, and it might seem justifiable to restrict greatly, or even prohibit, the civil liberty of alcohol use, in the interests of collective safety.

This principle can be applied to many diverse social interactions that could be construed as threatening people, and the prevention of which can be advanced as the protection of individual and social freedom through the process of restricting negative liberty.

Liberty encompasses the freedom that individuals have to actively pursue their own objectives (‘positive liberty’ sensu Berlin). An obvious mechanism by which this becomes practical is the creation of social mechanisms and institutions through which the ‘active’ pursuit of this ‘positive’ sense of liberty is made possible, for example the welfare State. Organisations established to act as conduits for the free expression of different points of view, or to act as means to achieve practical objectives, are not always liberal. Even in some of the most developed democracies, societies and organisations may become dominated by elite closed circles of people, and media channels may be influenced by moguls who use outlets to perpetuate specific corporate views. What prevents these incursions into the structures of liberty from descending into wholesale tyranny? In reality, very little. The subversion of democratic States, or States on the verge of democracy, into societies more reminiscent of dictatorships has many historical precedents. The principal mechanisms that allow individual freedom to triumph over the slide towards tyranny include the legally agreed freedoms that individuals have to establish competition against dominating organisations, and the culture that ensures that the freedom to create organisations is not then abused to destroy the very democratic organisations that guarantee that freedom.

In a society in which the freedom to organise and assemble institutions is protected by law, those organisations that distort and alter their environments, or the information they propagate, are likely to be usurped by institutions that reflect a different style of thinking, by the process of individual choice. However, these alternative visions can only be effective, and one can only assert them over the prevailing opinions with confidence, when one has sufficient information to be confident of their likely veracity. On Earth, to express many ideas and counter-opinions one does not need supreme confidence in the truth. If one’s opinion turns out to be in error one gives up, accepts the viewpoint of the adversary and continues one’s life. These opportunities to challenge, however, are central to the power of the individual to confront institutions.

But there is one social situation in which the individual’s power is markedly reduced, even rendered completely ineffective against a collective body. Health and safety is one of the most effective levers of social influence and justified coercion, because it invokes the protection of people confronted with life and death situations. Consider, for example, an oxygen supply system on the Moon. The authority that runs such a system might seek control over a political dissenter by threatening to move him or her and their family to a new zone of habitation, on the grounds that the oxygen supply to their habitat is faulty. By doing this, they will remind these individuals who is in control of their survival, and coerce them through fear into mitigating their dissent, thereby creating a more malleable individual and reducing the challenge to collective authority.

Governing organisations have access to a vast realm of information that no single individual can hope to have [21]. They know, for example, about the oxygen demand, its rate of supply, the pipes that supply it, the maintenance history of the oxygen producing machines, and so on and so forth. For an individual to declare that the intention of the authority to move them to another habitat is for controlling political purposes, he or she must also have access to all such information, which they can then use to demonstrate that there is no safety concern. If they do not have access to this information, then it becomes a simple task for the authorities to portray them as dishonourable individuals inveighing against the hard work of other individuals who are working to secure their individual safety and the security of society [22]. They can be then be ostracised, and their general behaviour will be treated as disingenuous. However, to have access to all the information to convincingly uphold a complaint is never possible, because an individual can never know whether they are missing a single crucial fact that makes all the difference to their safety. Even armed with what they perceive to be all the information available, the individual is faced with a choice between allowing an incursion on their home and liberty, or taking the risk that their presumption of having full information is correct. Faced with such a choice, the individual is likely to opt for the former in the interests of caution, particularly in an environment where the other choice may imply death from a failed oxygen system. In the extreme case, this first course of action would be further reinforced in a particularly coercive, venal society where the individual might even be convinced of the capability of the authorities to engineer the failure of their oxygen system and their death, in order to crush dissent, even if their complaint was in fact justified.

The end point of this process, when applied across many activities in life, is a colony of automatons performing tasks for an extraterrestrial authority, with their freedom reduced to a withered core of activities in the most private confines of their habitats. Extraterrestrial environments make such an endpoint not merely a possible outcome, but a likely one.

This attack on liberty is made possible because the pursuit of individual safety can be made an unchallengeable requirement of a ‘free’ society [23]. Freedom from instantaneous death caused by the external environment is the common freedom on which all individuals should converge, and any social structure or plan that brings people closer to that reality must surely be praiseworthy? The removal of other freedoms to achieve the safety of society is excusable. From this position, the environment can itself become the instrument of positive liberty. In this way, and in a rather unique way, encroachment on freedom of thought and movement, in the interests of ensuring the protection of the freedom of the individual against the lethality of the environment, can be transformed into a justifiable and universalisable doctrine of control [24].

Unfortunately this approach receives succour from every major tradition of social philosophy that we know on Earth. From Grotius to J.S. Mill, the right to self-preservation has been considered the core of individual liberties [25], a point beyond which no State may go, and which every individual has the right to take it upon him or herself to secure—indeed, such a notion has even been referred to as a ‘natural law’ [26]. Even Hobbes’ view of the necessity of sovereign control [27] turns on the right of each individual in a fight to preserve themselves. It is possible to spend much of one’s life on Earth without undue concern for self-preservation. Apart from those unfortunate individuals who confront a burglar or gang, most people will not actually come face to face with the need to infringe others’ rights to self-preservation. Fortunately, although the right to self-preservation is theoretically an unchallengeable right of all people, it remains, in a civil society, one sufficiently protected by the laws, and by regulations against various street crimes that might infringe self-preservation.

If, as has been traditional on the Earth, the right to selfpreservation is also held to be a basic right of all people in extraterrestrial environments, then the keys to despotism are handed over to those in control of society. Self-preservation is threatened on a day-to-day basis by the lethality of the environment. In such an environment, each individual does indeed represent a much greater threat to every other individual than on the Earth, because unpredictable and criminal actions against the infrastructure represent a continuously present and potentially catastrophic threat to self-preservation. The authorities therefore have the excuse to implement draconian systems of control to protect the right of every individual to self-preservation. Worse than this, however, the people will voluntarily, in exercising their right to selfpreservation, and to protect themselves, accept more farreaching control over the lives of others [28]. Where death is a more likely outcome of criminal action, the Hobbesian State of nature, and the tendency to vigorously guard against it, becomes a more tangible reality [29].

#### Property rights are the essential building blocks of a fully inclusive and functional government. Turns case since they envision a democratically governed space that is impossible without appropriation.

UNDP ’08 - Working Group on Property Rights, 2008, 'Empowering the Poor Through Property Rights', in Making the Law Work for Everyone Volume II, Commission on Legal Empowerment of the Poor, United Nations Development Programme, New York, pp. 63-128 <https://www.mercatus.org/system/files/ch2.pdf> AT

This transition has reduced global poverty substantially, but as outlined above, billions of people around the world still lack secure property rights, which hinders their economic, political and social security. In order to examine how poverty can best be relieved, and why access to property rights is fundamental to the empowerment of the poor, it is necessary to identify building blocks of a fully-functional property system. Such a system operates in the following four ways:

1) As a system of rules that defines the bundle of rights and obligations between people and assets.15 Property ownership creates ties that bind individual citizens together through the formation of networks of economic and legal rights and corresponding obligations. The credible enforcement of these rights and obligations requires a judicial mechanism that allows for equitable, transparent and efficient dispute resolution.

2) As a system of governance. Property systems are a central facet of state functionality, and as such are an important measurement of fiduciary and administrative effectiveness. The institutional order of the state is based on technical rules and relationships which define interactions between stakeholders, ranging from direct ownership of land to promulgation of rules that govern security of land and house tenure, land planning, zoning, taxing and other aspects of property management. Technological innovation, which has radically reduced the cost of information, has generated the possibility for further transparency and accountability in property systems as an instrument of governance.

3) As a functioning market for the exchange of assets. A fully functional property system allows land, houses, moveable property, equity shares, and ideas to be transformed into assets to be bought and sold at rates determined by market forces. This subjects the exchange of property to a level of transparency and accountability, and allows for the development of financial mechanisms — including credit 67 and insurance — to facilitate transactions and improve economic outcomes. Land, houses and moveable property can thus be leveraged, and assets transformed from static investments into capital which can be bought and sold. However, property rights are a necessary but not sufficient precondition for the development of these financial mechanisms; they also develop through partnership between the market, special funds targeted at access to finance, and the state.

4) As an instrument of social policy. In the absence or failure of the market, the state often plays a direct role in addressing the needs of the poor. The state has at its disposal instruments that can be used to endow its citizens with assets as they relate to property, such as public housing, low interest loans and the distribution of state land. Such instruments help to overcome natural competition for assets. The state also supports social cohesion through the development of co-ownership of infrastructure and services by government and the citizen, supporting the equilibrium between individual and collective interests. Provision of infrastructure by the state critically affects the value and desirability of assets, and can therefore fundamentally affect opportunities for the poor.

### 2 Conflicts and Predation

#### A future in space is literally unthinkable without private property rights. No one could be secure in their possessions.

Wasser & Jones 08 [Alan Wasser & Douglas Jobes, “Space Settlements, Property Rights, and International Law: Could a Lunar Settlement Claim the Lunar Real Estate It Needs to Survive,” 73 J. Air L. & Com. 37 (2008). <https://scholar.smu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1159&context=jalc>] CT
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The falsehood of the proposition that the Outer Space Treaty prohibits ownership of private property on the Moon13 can be further demonstrated by carrying it to its logical conclusion. Imagine the Moon has been settled for a century. Hundreds of thousands of people live there. Ships to and from various parts of the Earth and Mars come and go from the main Lunar space port every hour. Will those hundreds of thousands of Lunar citizens still do without any private property rights because of the two-centuryold Outer Space Treaty? Will no one own the land where they or their grandfathers-built their homes and factories? Will no one ever own the land where that space port's giant terminal buildings stand? Even if that restrictive view of the Outer Space Treaty were to prevail, sooner or later, and probably as soon as possible, Lunar colonists would most certainly decide to scrap it and start claiming ownership of the land they occupy." 9 Whether or not the settlement is recognized as a government, it will certainly acquire many of the attributes of a government, like deciding which of its citizens owns what. At that point, the governments of the Earth will have to decide what to do. Go to war against the Lunar colonists over it? Of course not. They will spend endless hours in legal wrangling about it, but in the end, they will have no choice but to acquiesce to some sort of reasonable Lunar property regime. The U.S., and every other nation on Earth, will eventually have to agree to accept and/or recognize the settlement's claims.

#### Terrestrial examples prove. Absent enforceable property rights, the poor are subject to deprivation, abuse, predation, and conflict. Turns case since without property rights, the power of the rich to exploit the rest of society increases.

UNDP ’08 - Working Group on Property Rights, 2008, 'Empowering the Poor Through Property Rights', in Making the Law Work for Everyone Volume II, Commission on Legal Empowerment of the Poor, United Nations Development Programme, New York, pp. 63-128 <https://www.mercatus.org/system/files/ch2.pdf> AT

Growing Slums and Legal VoidsAt least a third of the world’s poor live in irregular settlements without coherent legal protection of their assets. Population and urban settlement growth projections predict an aggravation of the problem. The UN Human Settlements Programme holds that over the next 25 years more than 2 billion urban dwellers could be added to the close to 1 billion now living in slums, with some 2.825 billion requiring housing and urban services by 2030. If no action is taken most of this growth will occur outside the legally protected sector.37 The consequences of the exclusion of the poor as a result of rapid urbanisation and modernisation are being acutely manifested around the world. In the final analysis, among all the causal factors for displacement, first and foremost is lack of security of tenure for the poor, who have no enforceable property rights or access to justice.

Dire Consequences and Missed Development Opportunities

Without enforceable property rights, residents of informal settlements are often subject to forceful eviction. They must fend for themselves or pay bribes to local landlords to defend their right to occupy land, protect it from harmful encroachment, and settle disputes. Lack of protection, of tenure and of legal leverage for economic activity, decreases productivity. It leads to social exclusion, reproduced over generations and visible in the spatial segregation of the poor in the urban housing environment. Environmental and behavioural degradation is closely linked to the vicious circles perpetuated by faltering property rights systems which fail the poor and slow down the development of society at large. Residents in extra-legal settlements have no legitimate way to transfer a home to a family member or heir nor to rent or sell to another. Illegal black land markets emerge and abusive practices become prevalent. Due to a lack of property rights guarantee, many assets in developing nations are not fungible. The poor and their potential business partners have no criteria to establish or realise the potential of their assets. There is no clear reciprocity for holding each other accountable and no sufficient basis to protect transactions or to pool assets. with others. For the national economy, extra-legality sets off a cycle of disinvestment in housing; it represents a lost opportunity to stimulate productive economic activity.

Rural Poverty and Property Rights

Despite continuing urbanisation, two-thirds of the poor live in rural areas. Ninety-five percent live in China, South Central Asia and Sub Saharan Africa. Together these rural poor account for around half the world’s total poor. Rural Land Relations and Extreme Poverty Insufficient land to live on, and insecure access or rights over land, are well recognised factors in sustaining poverty.38 Rural landlessness is often the best predictor of extreme poverty and hunger. Inadequate rights regarding land often result in entrenched poverty and are significant impediments to rural development and to alleviation of hunger.39 Elimination of the causes of tenure insecurity is thus imperative for fighting poverty.

Rural Land Relations and Armed Conflict

Conflict over rural land ownership and access is almost always near the centre of armed civil conflict.40 With various degrees of prominence, war over land access has been a driver, such as between the land rights of farmers and pastoralists (Burkina Faso), citizens and strangers (Côte d’Ivoire), indigenous and proto-colonial groups (Namibia, Liberia, Mozambique), and ethnic groups (Rwanda, Burundi, Sudan, Uganda). Essentially, it is about conflicts of interest — and legal rights — between the rural rich and rural poor. Not surprisingly, attention to the legal rights of the majority of poor is often an early platform of post-conflict reforms, most recently in Sudan and Liberia,41 quite aside from the need to address conflict-induced land losses and occupations.42

#### Democide – Empirically, murder by tyrannical governments is the biggest impact. It outweighs war and cap. There is a direct relationship between the lack of personal freedom and democide.

Wayman 17 summarizing Rummel [Wayman F.W. (2017) Rummel and Singer, DON and COW. In: Gleditsch N. (eds) R.J. Rummel: An Assessment of His Many Contributions. SpringerBriefs on Pioneers in Science and Practice, vol 37. Springer, Cham. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-54463-2_9>] CT

At Rummel’s website, the dominant theme is that power kills (http://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/). As he began one of his books (Rummel, 1994: 1), ‘Power kills; absolute power kills absolutely. This new Power Principle is the message emerging from my previous work on the causes of war and from this work on genocide and government mass murder … The more power a government has, the more it can act arbitrarily.’

A major supporting idea is the term regime, as operationalized by Rummel (1995) and used as the organizing principle for his datasets on ‘democide—genocide and mass murder’ (Rummel, 1998: 1). This idea of a regime is important to his work because there is a lot of variation from regime to regime in the regime’s amount of power, and also in the number of people the regime kills. And Rummel’s dominant theme is that those two characteristics of a regime (power and deaths) co-vary. In my own ordinary language, a regime is a type of government controlling a state apparatus. As Rummel (1995: 9) says, ‘The changes from the Kaiser monarchy to the Weimar Republic to Hitler’s rule … give us three different German regimes. … I count 432 distinct state regimes during the period from 1900 to 1987’. Hence, there would be the czarist regime in Russia until 1917, and then the communist regime from 1917 to 1991. Between February and October 1917, there should I think be a transition period and transitional regime (under Kerensky). Individual rulers, such as general secretaries Stalin, Khrushchev, and Brezhnev, and their governments, do not represent distinct regimes of their own, but instead are all leaders, successively, of different administrations in the communist regime.

To me, Rummel’s (1983) article made the first really convincing case for the inter-liberal or inter-democratic peace. I have since challenged thousands of people, from classrooms to conferences where I am speaking, to name any other proposition in the social sciences that is surprising or counter-intuitive, and that has (according to its advocates at least) no exceptions. No one has ever been able, in my presence, to name such a proposition—other than Rummel’s.

The COW Project generated the data for the bulk of the hypothesis tests in IR for decades (Wayman & Singer, 1990: 247–248). And ‘realist theory informed 90% of the hypotheses tested by IR scholars up to the 1970s’ (Walker, 2013: 148). It was a bit of a shock that an anti-realist hypothesis, the inter-democratic peace, had produced such a paradigm-shattering result. Sadly, I never heard Singer say a good word about Rummel’s studies confirming the inter-democratic peace hypothesis. Rummel had used COW data on wars, plus other people’s data on democracy, Liberalism, and freedom of nations, to contradict one of Singer’s claims (namely, Singer’s contention that the inter-democratic peace was based on too few cases and too flawed in other ways to be taken to be true; Small & Singer, 1976). Deciphering Singer’s true position on this is complicated. When Geller & Singer (1998) produced a literature review of scientific studies of international conflict, while they did caution that the evidence is ‘not indisputable’, they did acknowledge that ‘the evidence in the area of the joint freedom proposition is consistent and cumulative. Democratic dyads are less likely to engage in war than are non-democratic pairs’ (Geller & Singer, 1998: 87–88). But on the other hand, on his own at his weekly COW seminar, Singer was much more skeptical about the inter-democratic peace. So it is not surprising that, four years after Geller & Singer’s assessment, one of Singer’s students, Henderson (2002) wrote a book that constituted an attack on the democratic peace literature. In the opening paragraph, Henderson says, ‘It struck me as strange that one of the doyen of the behavioral revolution would be such an avid critic of what some scholars hail as the closest thing to an empirical law in the field’.

Instead, Singer seemed more interested in the international or interstate system. While Waltz (1979: 94) defined ‘international political structures in terms of states’, Singer spoke of ‘the national state as level of analysis’ (Singer, 1961: 82–89). Thus, whereas Waltz writes of a system whose basic units are sovereign states, Singer ends up with two systems: an inter-state system and an international system. The international system consists of entities that have an international political goal (including … state creation or survival), engage in international political behavior (including inter-state or extra-state conflict, alliances, trade, or international organizations), or engage in political behavior that has international consequences (such as civil wars). The [international] system … includes … terrorist groups (Sarkees & Wayman, 2010: 27).

Nested within this international system is the interstate system, beginning in 1816, distinguished in terms of ‘recurring international interactions between and among the interstate system members’ (Sarkees & Wayman, 2010: 16). Singer’s COW data are organized around a focus on state system membership. Basically, between 1816 and 1919 an entity is a state system member if it has 500,000 people or more and is diplomatically recognized at an adequate level by Britain and France, while after 1919 it is a state if it is a League of Nations or UN member or has 500,000 people and diplomatic recognition by two major powers. (Note that ‘state’ becomes a short-hand for ‘state system member’; Bremer & Ghosn, 2003.)

Much confusion results from the short-hand expressions ‘state’ and ‘system’. ‘Whenever the word “system” was used without a modifier, Singer & Small were referring to the interstate system’ (Sarkees & Wayman, 2010: 16). Likewise, the ‘states’ whose characteristics are listed in the COW datasets are not the population of states, but the population of state system members.

Singer’s most widely-cited explanatory articles on interstate war are probably Deutsch & Singer (1964) and Singer, Bremer & Stuckey (1972). Both operate at the system level of analysis. It may be that Singer’s devotion to the interstate system is part of what made him reluctant to embrace the inter-democratic peace. As he said in another widely-cited article, the international system level of analysis ‘almost inevitably requires that we postulate a high degree of uniformity in the foreign policy codes of our national actors’, and ‘the system-oriented approach tends to produce a sort of “black box” or “billiard ball” concept of national actors’. This is consistent with his foreign policy instincts, which were loath to attribute ‘white hats’ to the ‘free world’ and ‘black hats’ to the Soviet Union, in the assigning of blame for the dangers to world peace in the Cold War era. Singer’s posture was very different from Rummel’s, with Rummel in favor of Reagan’s foreign policy and against détente. In these Cold War contexts, Singer may have been uncomfortable with Rummel’s summary that ‘freedom preserves peace and life’.

Singer wrote ‘it is evident that my research and teaching has unambiguously been problem-driven’, and ‘for reasons that I struggle to articulate, the problem has been, and remains, that of war’ (Singer, 1990: 2). The COW Project was founded by him at the University of Michigan in 1963, the year after the world nearly was destroyed, had the Cuban Missiles Crisis gone badly. International war attracted Singer’s best efforts at finding the ‘causes of war and conditions of peace’ (1990: 3). As he and Small put it, their focus is a ‘preoccupation with the elimination of international war and the possible role of solid explanatory knowledge in that enterprise’ (Small & Singer, 1982: 17). The first COW war handbook, Wages of War (Singer & Small, 1972) was consequently limited to international wars. Karl Deutsch subsequently convinced Singer that there was a need for a comparable list of civil wars. This led to a new handbook, Resort to Arms: International and Civil Wars, 1816–1980, presenting a ‘comprehensive list that will enhance … study of civil wars’ (Small & Singer, 1982: 204). The civil war list is accompanied with a cautionary note, ‘International war remains our major concern … A research assault on [explanation of] civil war … is clearly a task better left to others’ (Small & Singer, 1982: 17). Consequently, the COW project had many datasets (such as the Militarized Interstate Dispute dataset) on the correlates of interstate war, but nothing comparable on the civil war data. Nevertheless, the publication of the civil war data was a valuable contribution to studies of civil war, and was also a step toward the full delineation of the totality of modern war. This was followed, in the third COW handbook (Sarkees & Wayman, 2010) with a definition and list of non-state wars, completing the full reckoning of the patterns of war in the past two centuries. Also, the focus of Singer on international war was somewhat vindicated by his co-authored article revealing that, over the time since the Congress of Vienna, inter-state wars had resulted in 32 million battle deaths, intra-state wars only 18 million (Sarkees, Wayman & Singer, 2003).

Critics often ask if the COW project has a state-centric bias. A more subtle and I think effective line of inquiry is to ask why the COW project has emphasized state-system-membership rather than simple sovereignty and independence as the defining characteristic of the state. This can cause confusion. For example, a number of non-state wars, including the main phase of one of the deadliest wars in history, the Taiping Rebellion, have been fought in areas that would be considered to be states by students of comparative politics. This and other related difficulties have led pioneers outside the COW project (Gleditsch, 2004; Fazal, 2007), as well as Singer’s successor at the COW Project (Bremer & Ghosn, 2003) to propose various revisions and expansions of the concept of the state, to go beyond the COW state membership definition. These difficulties and challenges continue to provide important frontiers for research on war and the state in coming years.

In contrast to Singer, Rummel seems to me to have taken a more inductivist, practical approach to states and similar entities. On his website, powerkills.com, one finds a focus on killing, even of one person. The perpetrators are often leaders of totalitarian states, such as Mao, but can also be rebel leaders (the young Mao) or a king (Leopold of Belgium) who controls what some call a colony (the Belgian Congo) but Rummel calls Leopold’s personal property. The unit of analysis becomes the regime and regime-like power-centers such as Leopold’s Congo or Mao’s rebel territory.

Rummel (1986) concluded that ‘War isn’t this century’s biggest killer’. As he said then, ‘About 35,654,000 people have died in this century’s international and domestic wars, revolutions, and violent conflicts. … The number of people killed by totalitarian or extreme authoritarian governments already far exceeds that for all wars, civil and international. Indeed, this number already approximates the number that might be killed in a nuclear war’. He itemized 95 million killed by communist governments, but only ‘831,000 killed by free democratic governments’. Those killed by free democratic governments were always foreigners:

In no case have I found a democratic government carrying out massacres, genocide and mass executions of its own citizens … Absolutist governments (those that Freedom House would classify as not free) are not only many times deadlier than war, but are themselves the major factor causing war and other forms of violent conflict. They are a major cause of militarism. Indeed, absolutism, not war, is mankind’s deadliest scourge of all. In light of all this, the peaceful, nonviolent fostering of civil liberties and political rights must be made mankind’s highest humanitarian goal … because freedom preserves peace and life (Rummel, 1986).

# Case

#### Russia and China will circumvent

**Bahney and Pearl 19** [Benjamin Bahney and Jonathan Pearl, 3-26-2019, "Why Creating a Space Force Changes Nothing," BENJAMIN BAHNEY and JONATHAN PEARL are Senior Fellows at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory’s Center for Global Security Research and contributing authors to [Cross Domain Deterrence: Strategy in an Era of Complexity](https://archive.md/o/Hlbi1/https:/www.amazon.com/Cross-Domain-Deterrence-Strategy-Era-Complexity/dp/0190908653). Foreign Affairs, [https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/space/2019-03-26/why-creating-space-force-changes-nothing accessed 12/10/21](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/space/2019-03-26/why-creating-space-force-changes-nothing%20accessed%2012/10/21)] Adam

As Russia and China continue to push forward, U.S. policymakers may be tempted to use treaties and diplomacy to head off their efforts entirely. This option, although alluring on paper, is simply not feasible. Existing treaties designed to limit military competition in space have had little success in actually doing so. The 1967 Outer Space Treaty bans parties from placing nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction in space, on the moon, or on other celestial bodies, but it has no formal mechanism for verifying compliance, and places no restrictions on the development or deployment in space of conventional antisatellite weapons. Even if it were possible to convince Moscow and Beijing of the benefits of comprehensive space arms control, existing technology makes it extremely difficult to verify compliance with the necessary treaty provisions—and without comprehensive and reliable verification, treaties are toothless. Moreover, regulating the development and deployment of antisatellite weapons is extremely difficult, both because they include such a broad and diverse range of technologies and because many types of antisatellite weapons can be concealed or explained away as having some other use. Unsurprisingly, Russia and China’s draft Treaty on the Prevention of Placement of Weapons in Space, which they have been pushing for several years now, has an unenforceable definition of what constitutes a “weapon” and does nothing at all to address ground-based antisatellite weapons development.

#### Space commercialization is a strong constraint on conflict – solves space war

Wendy N. Whitman **Cobb 20**, is currently an associate professor of strategy and security studies at the US Air Force's School of Advanced Air and Space Studies, 7-21-2020, "Privatizing Peace: How Commerce Can Reduce Conflict in Space," Routledge & CRC Press, <https://www.routledge.com/Privatizing-Peace-How-Commerce-Can-Reduce-Conflict-in-Space/Cobb/p/book/9780367337834> // AAli

By the end of the twentieth century, scholars zeroed in on the democratic peace theory which attempts to explain why democracies do not go to war with other democracies and why, in some analyses, they seem to be more prone to peace in general than non-democracies. Similar to the golden arches, what is it about democracy that seems to induce such peacefulness? Academics have proposed everything from the nature of mediating institutions to the restraint of public opinion, to trade relations. While these variations will be explored further in Chapter 3, of interest here are the versions that focus explicitly on trade, commercial ties, and capitalism. Along these lines, Erik Gartzke argues, "peace ensues when states lack differences worthy of costly conflict."31 If the costs of conflict are too high, then states should be more unlikely to engage in it. To this end, economic globalization can provide the means through which costs are raised. “The integration of world markets not only facilitates commerce, but also creates new interests inimical to war. Financial interdependence ensures that damage inflicted on one economy travels through the global system, afflicting even aggressors."32 Focusing his analysis primarily on the influence of capitalism, Gartzke's findings suggest that states with markets more closely tied to the global economy are far less likely to experience a militarized dispute.

In thinking about the space environment today, there are obvious principles of capitalism at work. However, China, a major spacefaring state that has been making capitalist reforms, arguably remains far from a true capitalist country. This is especially true in their space industry which is heavily subsidized by the state and almost wholly integrated with China's military.34 Many other states continue to subsidize space activities heavily as well. A better approach through which to examine conflict in space is presented by an offshoot of the capitalist peace which is termed the commercial peace. The commercial peace thesis emphasizes the role of trade and the connections made through it to explain a lack of conflict. Han Dorussen and Hugh Ward write:

Trade is important not only because it creates an economic interest in peace but also because trade generates 'connections' between people that promote communication and understanding.... Based on these ideas, the flow of goods between countries creates a network of ties and communication links. If two countries are more embedded in this network, their relations should be more

peaceful 35

Given the interconnectedness of the global economy to space-based assets, a version of the commercial peace thesis can be used to argue that the chance of conflict in space is less than is commonly understood or recognized precisely because of the extent to which the global economy has become dependent on space-based assets.

To understand this argument, consider a scenario in which Russia, in preparation for a new assault on Eastern Europe, attacks a key US military satellite with the purpose of disrupting and disabling military communications in Europe. This action would conceivably enable the Russians to undertake their attack under more favorable conditions and prevent a quicker response from America and its allies. However, if the satellite was attacked via an ASAT that kinetically destroyed the US satellite, the debris cloud created from the attack could have disastrous consequences beyond military communications Much like the movie Gravity, the debris cloud could cause a chain reaction, hitting and ~~disabling~~ dismantling other satellites that would in turn disrupt civilian communications, business transactions, and perhaps even Russian military satellites. The economic effects of lost satellites would not be restricted to one country alone; the global economic consequences in terms of lost property (satellites), lost transactions, and financial havoc would echo throughout the world, including in Russia itself. Finally, the attack on one satellite could even ultimately endanger the ISS and its inhabitants, several of which are Russians. Destruction of the ISS would negate billions of dollars in investment from not just Russia, but other countries that have participated in it including Japan, Italy, and Canada. Therefore, an attack on a US military satellite would not just be an attack on one but an attack on all.

While the previous scenario highlights several reasons why it would not be in Russia's best interest to attack a US satellite, this book argues that the economic argument is both the strongest and the most restraining especially as space becomes more congested, competitive, contested, and commercialized. The emergence of private space companies enhances this argument. "In the commercial sector, companies need reliability and legal enforcement mechanisms if they are going to operate profitably in a shared environment."36 In order to foster the growing area of space commercialization, companies must be assured that the activities they undertake in space will be protected in some way or, at a minimum, allowed to proceed to the extent where they can reap the profit. This could be done through international organizations that would provide some sort of space traffic control, but the likelihood of a major international breakthrough on rules regarding space is unlikely in the near term. Therefore, actors must rely on the protections afforded them by an increasingly globalized economy that is ever more dependent on space-based assets.

#### 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.

1. CP solves entire aff. 2 reasons
   1. Individuals cannot militarize space
   2. Changes in ILaw are not violations, which is the link to their aff