### 1

#### Interpretation: LEO ends before outer space begins according to science and the Karman line is not an objective way to measure the beginning of outer space.

Sabine **Stanley, 20** - ("Low Earth Orbit: Troposphere and Stratosphere," Great Courses Daily, 7-9-2020, 1-16-2022https://www.thegreatcoursesdaily.com/low-earth-orbit-troposphere-and-stratosphere/)//AW

Even though low earth orbit includes all layers of the atmosphere, most of what people know from the atmosphere happens in the first two layers. Troposphere and stratosphere are the closest layers with the major amount of atmospheric mass. Low earth orbit somehow marks the beginning of outer space. The Karman line was a governmental attempt to mark the boundary between Earth and outer space, but they could not agree on an altitude. Thus, it ranges from 80 to 100 kilometers. What everyone agrees on are the layers of the atmosphere and their altitudes. The first layer is the troposphere. Learn more about how plate tectonics sets up life. What Is the Troposphere? The lowest layer of atmosphere is called the troposphere, with an average thickness of 10 kilometers, spread above the Earth’s surface. Everything known as ‘weather’ happens in this layer, namely, winds, thunderstorms, tornadoes, hurricanes, blizzards, and cloud formation. The troposphere is the lowest layer of the atmosphere, where weather happens, and 80% of the atmosphere’s mass is concentrated. (Image: BlueRingMedia/Shutterstock) The convective overturning of air results in all the weather phenomena. Besides, water goes through all its phases in the troposphere: vapor, rain, and snow. The ‘overturning’ is reflected in the name of this thin but dense layer: tropos is Greek for ‘turn’, referring to the overturning of air. Now, why does air overturn here? This is a transcript from the video series A Field Guide to the Planets. Watch it now, on Wondrium. Overturning in the Troposphere The overturning – vertical mixing – happens since the highest temperature of the troposphere is at the bottom. The average temperature on the surface is about 60°F, and it decreases down to an average of −75°F at the top. About 80% of the atmosphere’s mass is concentrated here. The troposphere ends with a boundary called the tropopause, where the next layer begins. Learn more about near-Earth asteroids and the asteroid belt. What is the Stratosphere? The stratosphere is the second-lowest layer of Earth’s atmosphere, starting at 10 kilometers above the surface. Unlike the troposphere, the temperature in the stratosphere increases with altitude. At the top, the temperature is around 32°F – almost 100 degrees higher than the bottom. However, the pressure decreases to one millibar, i.e., 1000 times less than the Earth’s surface pressure. The stratosphere ends at the stratopause. Does the higher temperature mean the stratopause is warm? Is the Stratosphere Warm? The higher temperature in the troposphere is the result of the Sun’s ultraviolet (or UV) radiation, trapped by ozone particles (O3). The famous ozone layer, where UV is absorbed, is located here. The highest concentration of ozone is at the lowest part of the stratosphere, but O3 can also be found up to the middle of the layer. Most of the radiated UV is absorbed by O3, breaking it into O2 and atomic oxygen (O). Next, O and O2 combine again and recreate O3. However, the absorbed energy does not create a warm environment, since the molecules are so far away from each other that collisions rarely happen. Hence, airplanes flying around this altitude need to create pressure inside the cabin and regulate the temperature. Learn more about Venus, the veiled greenhouse planet. Airplanes in the Stratosphere The cruising altitude for most commercial flights is around 39,000 feet or 12 kilometers above the surface. This means that airplanes fly in the lowest part of the stratosphere, above the weather and the turbulence it causes. The boundary of the two layers can be seen from the plane, as clouds do not enter the stratosphere. The air is too thin here, so airplane cabins are pressurized. Stratosphere is where most commercial planes fly, as the pressure is ideal for flying. (Image: Kost9/Shutterstock) Besides the commercial planes, NASA’s SOFIA also flies in the lower stratosphere. SOFIA: Stratospheric Observatory for Infrared Astronomy SOFIA is a Boeing 747 with a 100-inch telescope attached. It flies at 12 kilometers, above 99% of Earth’s atmosphere, and studies the solar system in the infrared part of the light spectrum. Transient phenomena, such as eclipses and occultations, are also studied best with SOFIA. Pluto and Saturn’s moon, Titan, was also studied by SOFIA from the stratosphere. Higher in the stratosphere, the air pressure is too low for typical airplanes to fly. Military jets and other planes that do fly at higher altitudes use their engine power to conduct the flight. However, scientific balloons are launched to collect data. The best location to do so is McMurdo Station in Antarctica, as the South Pole vortex keeps the balloons contained in a small area and does not let them fly away into the distance. It can be concluded that the first two layers of the atmosphere in the low Earth orbit are the ones humans make the most use of. Common Questions about Low Earth Orbit Q: Is low Earth orbit considered space? Low Earth orbit is the ‘circle’ around Earth’s atmosphere up to 2000 kilometers above the surface. The satellites and other human-made space objects also orbit in the low earth orbit. **The end of the orbit is the beginning of space**, where solar winds start, and the Earth’s atmosphere is too thin to be considered gas. Q: What does low Earth orbit mean? Low earth orbit extends up to 2000 kilometers above the surface. All the atmosphere layers reside in this area, with almost 80% of the mass concentrated in the lowest layer, the troposphere. The weather, winds and tornados, plane flights, and satellite orbits all occur in this 2000-kilometer-high zone before space characteristics dominate the environment.

#### Violation: Mega constellations are in the low earth orbit

Beyza Unal 2021, “Collision risks in outer space due to mega-constellations”, 10/08/2021, <https://www.orfonline.org/expert-speak/collision-risks-in-outer-space-due-to-mega-constellations/#:~:text=Mega%2Dconstellations%20are%20composed%20of,access%20even%20in%20remote%20areas>, ED

Mega-constellations are composed of several hundreds of highly networked satellites in low Earth orbit (LEO), and they are fundamental in providing uninterrupted communication through networks across the globe, enabling internet access even in remote areas. The space industry has shown great interest in mega-constellations due to their expected high return on capital invested. SpaceX, via its Starlink satellite internet constellations, has already [launched 60 satellites into low earth orbit in May 2021](https://www.geospatialworld.net/news/spacex-launches-60-starlink-satellites/#:~:text=On%20May%209%2C%20SpaceX%20Falcon,the%20company%20made%20into%20reusability.) It plans to launch thousands more in the coming years as part of its mega-constellation project. OneWeb, Amazon, and several other private space companies have similar ambitions.

#### Vote neg – two impacts:

#### They massively expand topic limits by allowing an aff that takes place anywhere in Earth’s atmosphere. That means that affs about weather balloons, missiles, school rocket projects, or airspace owned by governments could all be potential affs. Don’t let them say that they only expand it by a few thousand kilometers- our atmosphere is where most testing and air activities happen. There are more launches within our atmosphere than outside of it, so they more than double the topic prep burden.

#### Topic literature- our evidence is from a scientific source meant to clarify specifically whether or not the LEO is space from a scientific basis. Prefer it to semantic. It’s better for education because it forces the debaters to look at the substance behind the topic .

#### Drop the debater to preserve fairness and education – use competing interps – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation. No RVIs – they don’t get to win for following the rules.

### 2

#### Interpretation: The aff must defend the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust or a subset thereof

#### Violation: Mega Constellations aren’t appropriation.

#### Megaconstellations are not appropriation - they respect free use, are consistent with existing precedent for non-appropriation, are not stationary, and do not reflect the intent to appropriate.

Johnson 20 [Christopher D. Johnson, “The Legal Status of MegaLEO Constellations and Concerns About Appropriation of Large Swaths of Earth Orbit,” Handbook of Small Satellites, 2020-09-13, p.1337-1358] CT

5.2 No, This Is Not Impermissible Appropriation

An opposite conclusion can also be reasonably arrived at when approached along the following lines. The counter argument would assert that the deployment and operation of these global constellations, such as SpaceX’s Starlink, OneWeb, Kepler, etc., are aligned with and in full conformity with the laws applicable to outer space. These constellations are merely the exercise and enjoyment of the freedom of exploration and use of outer space and do not constitute any impermissible appropriation of the orbits that they transit.

5.2.1 Freedom of Access and Use Permits Constellations

Rather than being a violation of other’s rights to access and explore outer space, the deployment of these constellations is more correctly viewed as the exercise and restrict or impinge on other users of the space domain. Because due regard is therefore displayed for the space domain, and to the interests of others, these constellations do not prejudice or infringe upon the freedoms of use and exploration of the space domain and are therefore not occupation, or possession, much less appropriation.

5.2.4 This Does Not Constitute Possession, or Ownership, or Occupation

The use of LEO by satellite constellations is substantially similar to the use of GSO, and therefore permissible. In each region, individual actors are given permission - either from a national administrator or from an international governing body (the ITU) via a national administer–to use precoordinated subsections of space. In a way that is overwhelmingly similar to the use of orbital slots in GSO, the placement of spacecraft into orbits in LEO or higher orbits does not constitute possession, ownership, or occupation of those orbits. This is because States (and their companies) have been occupying orbital slots in GSO for decades, and these uses of GSO have never been accused of “appropriating” GSO. The users have never claimed to be appropriating GSO, and their exercising of rights to use GSO is respected by other actors in the space domain. This is the same situation for other orbits, including LEO and other non-Geostationary orbits. And while GSO locations are relatively stable (subject to space weather and other perturbations, and require stationkeeping), spacecraft in LEO are actually moving through space and are not stationary, so it is even more difficult to see this use by constellations as occupation, much less appropriation. Moreover, Space Situational Awareness (SSA) and Space Traffic Management (STM) will allow other uses to use these orbits, and nothing about the use of any one user necessarily precludes others. Lastly, there is no intention by operators of constellations to exclusively occupy, must less possess or appropriate, these orbits. Would not the appropriation of outer space be an intentional, volutional act? No such intention can be found in the operators of global constellations.

#### Vote neg – two impacts:

#### Limits. Expanding the topic to anything that involves merely launching something into the atmosphere expands the topic into numerous new tech areas which undermines core neg prep.

#### Topic literature. Our definition has intent to define and exclude in the context of the OST, which is the core of all topic research and the only predictable source.

#### Drop the debater to preserve fairness and education – use competing interps – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation. No RVIs – they don’t get to win for following the rules.

### 3

#### Private companies ought not appropriate outer space except for space-based solar power projects.

#### SSP is viable and requires privatization.

Oberhaus 21 [DANIEL OBERHAUS, “Space Solar Power: An Extraterrestrial Energy Resource For The U.S.,” Innovation Frontier Project, August 18, 2021. <https://innovationfrontier.org/space-solar-power-an-extraterrestrial-energy-resource-for-the-u-s/>] CT

FUTURE OF SSP

The United States’ reluctance to pursue SSP can be attributed to a number of causes. In the 1970s and 80s, the exorbitant projected costs of an SSP station guaranteed that the project would not be pursued by NASA, the DOE, or the DOD. At the same time, the agency’s emphasis on developing nuclear space technologies — a trend that continues to this day — undermined enthusiasm for other ambitious energy projects like SSP. Finally, the fact that SSP is a space project meant to provide commercial levels of electrical power on Earth meant that it wasn’t obvious whether it fell within the purview of NASA or the DOE, and so both agencies were reluctant to allocate a substantial portion of their budget for its development. Today, the low cost of natural gas and renewables like wind and solar makes it seem challenging to justify a space energy project of this scale. But SSP offers several unique benefits as an energy resource, including its resiliency, its ability to provide flexible baseload power to geographically distant locations, its capacity to accelerate decarbonization directly by providing clean energy and indirectly by expediting the transition to off-world heavy industry, and its strategic benefits as a tool for diplomacy and national security. Given SSP’s benefits and the interest in the technology from most other space agencies, it’s puzzling that policymakers in the United States have not prioritized SSP R&D. The development of key technologies such as reusable rockets and thin film solar panels has finally made SSP economically and technically viable. But there is still a lot of fundamental research on SSP that needs to be done and it is in the United States’ national interest to begin this research program as soon as possible. So far, the only glimmer of hope for an American SSP program has come from the DOD’s efforts. In 2019, the Air Force Research Lab awarded a $100 million contract to Northrop Grumman as part of the new Space Solar Power Incremental Demonstrations and Research (SSPIDR) Project, which aims to develop hardware for in-orbit SSP experiments based on the design developed at Caltech.105 This is by far the United States’ largest federal expenditure on SSP R&D, but it is only a fraction of what will be required to build a large-scale SSP station and the specific technologies included in the SSPIDR program will not result in a system that could ever provide commercial power to civilians. SSP is a key tool for ensuring the prosperity and security of the United States in the latter half of the 21st century. It is imperative that NASA and the DOE prioritize the development of SSP. We believe the federal government should earmark approximately $1 billion for SSP research over the next five years with a special emphasis on advancing emerging technologies and in-space hardware demonstrations. Congress must take the first step in establishing a civilian SSP platform by directing NASA and the DOE to collaborate on a public-private initiative similar to NASA’s commercial crew program or its more recent commercial lunar payload services program. The directive must clearly delineate responsibilities between the agencies in order to avoid leadership paralysis that has stymied domestic SSP research in the past. Furthermore, a public-private program must be structured so that there is competition among multiple private companies, which must hit key milestones in order to continue receiving contracts. These contracts should be awarded with a fixed-price structure to avoid the massive cost overruns and delays that are typical of cost-plus contracts in the aerospace and defense sector. This is also an approach likely to find support among new launch providers and spacecraft manufacturers that have demonstrated the innovation that occurs when operating within the relative constraints of fixed price contracts. In fact, the main trade group for the aerospace sector has advocated for the increased use of fixed-price contracts in the past.106 Alternatively, it may be more efficient to establish a focused research organization (FRO) dedicated to SSP technologies to avoid delays associated with collaboration between two federal agencies on multi-year—and perhaps multi-decade—projects. FROs are independent entities that exist outside of national laboratories and universities. They are effectively a startup for basic research and deep technological development that requires large-scale engineering collaboration on technologies that may not yet have a market or are not readily monetizable.107 Recently, the U.S. Congress created five FRO-like centers in the DOE’s national labs as part of the National Quantum Initiative Act, which can serve as a framework for the creation of similar FROs dedicated to space solar power.108 While there are several approaches to a large-scale SSP system, we believe the most fruitful pathway is to focus on cost reduction over energy efficiency. This would prioritize highly modular systems similar to ALPHA, which benefit from the substantially reduced costs of mass manufacturing standardized components. We believe that it is possible to conduct a civilian SSP demonstration in low-Earth orbit within three years of the program’s start with less than $250 million in funding. The first phase of this program would involve conducting a series of ground tests with prototype systems over the course of about 18 months. Based on the results of this program, a system could be selected for an in-space demonstration capable of generating up to 300kw of power in low-Earth orbit. After a successful LEO demonstration mission, the next step would be to build a larger SSP system in mid-Earth orbit capable of producing commercial amounts of power (e.g., 1-10 MW). While this orbital altitude is not sufficient for maintaining the SSP system over a fixed spot on the Earth, it would stay on a fixed path so that it always passed over the same spots on the Earth. While the power from this MEO demonstrator would not be competitive with terrestrial electricity prices — we expect a cost of about $1/kwh — it would be a critical step toward proving the system’s ability to provide commercial power. We expect that the MEO demonstrator could be built and launched for approximately $1 billion. The success of the MEO demonstrator would lay the foundation for an SSP system in geostationary orbit that would be large enough to provide meaningful amounts of baseload power. We expect the initial version of this SSP system to be capable of delivering around 2 GW of solar energy to the surface. We expect that a 2 GW SSP system in geostationary orbit could be built for about $10 billion. Here we start to see the cost savings of mass manufacturing modular SSP components. This system would be capable of delivering more than 200 times more power than the MEO demonstrator for only 10 times the cost. We believe that a public-private SSP program jointly led by NASA and the DOE could result in a commercially viable SSP platform in geostationary orbit by the end of the decade. In addition to providing a critical pathway for SSP, it also has the potential to lead to substantial advancements in solar power and wireless power transmission technologies that would be useful on Earth. If policymakers do not take action on advancing domestic SSP capabilities soon, the United States will find itself losing its leadership position in space and increasingly vulnerable to natural and human-made disasters on the ground.

#### SSP solves warming. In the short term provides cheap, renewable, and flexible baseload power for on and off-world applications. It’s also key to transition heavy industry to space.

Oberhaus 21 [DANIEL OBERHAUS, “Space Solar Power: An Extraterrestrial Energy Resource For The U.S.,” Innovation Frontier Project, August 18, 2021. <https://innovationfrontier.org/space-solar-power-an-extraterrestrial-energy-resource-for-the-u-s/>] CT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

What is often left unsaid in discussions about extraterrestrial industrialization and deep space settlement is how to supply the energy needed for large scale infrastructure projects. Nuclear energy has long been the power source of choice for deep space missions.2 This is largely because nuclear power systems can operate for decades without intervention and in locations where there is limited or non-existent sunlight. But nuclear energy is limited in its ability to scale and also creates serious health hazards for near-Earth operation.3 In this paper, we make the case for space-based solar power (SSP) megaprojects as relatively low-cost, scalable, renewable, and always-on power source for on-and-off world applications. Although SSP is a space-based energy asset, it has the potential to rapidly accelerate decarbonization on Earth while also fulfilling space exploration priorities. SSP is a decades-old idea that has only recently become economically viable due to the rapidly falling costs of space access and technological advancements such as higher efficiency electronics, low-cost mass-production of modular space systems like satellites, robotic in-space construction, and wireless power transmission. NASA, the Department of Energy, and several other research agencies have conducted in-depth studies and limited experiments on SSP, but the development of this energy resource was hindered by unfavorable economics. Things have changed and it is time to reconsider SSP as a valuable tool in the nation’s decarbonization strategy. This paper shows how the development of SSP can serve several national imperatives at once. In space, it can provide a renewable and cost-effective source of energy for moon bases and deep space missions. SSP can also provide a valuable source of energy — both electric and thermal — for industrial processes in cislunar space. This will facilitate the transition of heavy industry from Earth to space, which will mitigate carbon emissions in the medium-to-long term on Earth. Critically, SSP will have a massive impact on terrestrial greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the near term through wireless energy transfer from space to Earth. This is SSP’s original “killer app,” and multiple studies have shown that SSP can meet a substantial portion of Earth’s energy needs. Unlike terrestrial solar power, SSP is always on. It can provide solar power rain or shine, day or night. It is also flexible and can be quickly redirected to ground stations in geographically distant locations to meet rapidly changing energy needs. The dream for SSP is to have a source of clean baseload energy that’s available regardless of weather, location, or time of day. The baseload is the minimum electrical energy demand on a grid, which has historically been provided by power stations that are able to generate large and relatively constant amounts of energy. But as more renewables penetrate the grid and create fluctuations in electric supply, the base load power stations of the future must be flexible enough to rapidly ramp up and down to meet the evolving supply and demand dynamics of the grid. Much like the advent of GPS, a robust SSP capacity would have profound geopolitical implications. China is investing heavily in SSP and plans to have the first operating SSP plant in orbit by the end of the decade.4 The Department of Defense (DOD) is also pursuing SSP research for military applications. Notably, the Air Force Research Laboratory recently created a $100 million program to advance key SSP technologies.5 This paper concludes that the U.S. must allocate substantially more human and financial capital to SSP as part of its national security, domestic energy, and space exploration strategies.

#### Solving warming is not all-or-nothing – every additional fraction of a degree is irreversible and costs millions of lives—prefer IPCC assessments that are the gold standard for warming consensus.

David Wallace-Wells 19 [National Fellow at New America. He is deputy editor of New York Magazine, where he also writes frequently about climate and the near future of science and technology, including his widely read and debated 2017 cover story on worst-case scenarios for global warming], *The Uninhabitable Earth: A Story of the Future* (Kindle Edition: Allen Lane, 2019), pg. 8-30, beckert

* Every degree key – each bit 🡪 hundreds of millions of lives
* IPCC🡪best ev b/c conservative estimate + still really big impact
* Now key – not reversible, feedback loops 🡪 speeds up later

There is almost no chance we will avoid that scenario. The Kyoto Protocol achieved, practically, nothing; in the twenty years since, despite all of our climate advocacy and legislation and progress on green energy, we have produced more emissions than in the twenty years before. In 2016, the Paris accords established two degrees as a global goal, and, to read our newspapers, that level of warming remains something like the scariest scenario it is responsible to consider; just a few years later, with no single industrial nation on track to meet its Paris commitments, two degrees looks more like a best-case outcome, at present hard to credit, with an entire bell curve of more horrific possibilities extending beyond it and yet shrouded, delicately, from public view.28 For those telling stories about climate, such horrific possibilities—and the fact that we had squandered our chance of landing anywhere on the better half of that curve—had become somehow unseemly to consider. The reasons are almost too many to count, and so half-formed they might better be called impulses. We chose not to discuss a world warmed beyond two degrees out of decency, perhaps; or simple fear; or fear of fearmongering; or technocratic faith, which is really market faith; or deference to partisan debates or even partisan priorities; or skepticism about the environmental Left of the kind I’d always had; or disinterest in the fates of distant ecosystems like I’d also always had. We felt confusion about the science and its many technical terms and hard-to-parse numbers, or at least an intuition that others would be easily confused about the science and its many technical terms and hard-to-parse numbers. We suffered from slowness apprehending the speed of change, or semi-conspiratorial confidence in the responsibility of global elites and their institutions, or obeisance toward those elites and their institutions, whatever we thought of them. Perhaps we felt unable to really trust scarier projections because we’d only just heard about warming, we thought, and things couldn’t possibly have gotten that much worse just since the first Inconvenient Truth; or because we liked driving our cars and eating our beef and living as we did in every other way and didn’t want to think too hard about that; or because we felt so “postindustrial” we couldn’t believe we were still drawing material breaths from fossil fuel furnaces. Perhaps it was because we were so sociopathically good at collating bad news into a sickening evolving sense of what constituted “normal,” or because we looked outside and things seemed still okay. Because we were bored with writing, or reading, the same story again and again, because climate was so global and therefore nontribal it suggested only the corniest politics, because we didn’t yet appreciate how fully it would ravage our lives, and because, selfishly, we didn’t mind destroying the planet for others living elsewhere on it or those not yet born who would inherit it from us, outraged. Because we had too much faith in the teleological shape of history and the arrow of human progress to countenance the idea that the arc of history would bend toward anything but environmental justice, too. Because when we were being really honest with ourselves we already thought of the world as a zero-sum resource competition and believed that whatever happened we were probably going to continue to be the victors, relatively speaking anyway, advantages of class being what they are and our own luck in the natalist lottery being what it was. Perhaps we were too panicked about our own jobs and industries to fret about the future of jobs and industry; or perhaps we were also really afraid of robots or were too busy looking at our new phones; or perhaps, however easy we found the apocalypse reflex in our culture and the path of panic in our politics, we truly had a good-news bias when it came to the big picture; or, really, who knows why—there are so many aspects to the climate kaleidoscope that transforms our intuitions about environmental devastation into an uncanny complacency that it can be hard to pull the whole picture of climate distortion into focus. But we simply wouldn’t, or couldn’t, or anyway didn’t look squarely in the face ﻿of the science. This is not a book about the science of warming; it is about what warming means to the way we live on this planet. But what does that science say? It is complicated research, because it is built on two layers of uncertainty: what humans will do, mostly in terms of emitting greenhouse gases, and how the climate will respond, both through straightforward heating and a variety of more complicated, and sometimes contradictory, feedback loops. But even shaded by those uncertainty bars it is also very clear research, in fact terrifyingly clear. The United Nations’ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) offers the gold-standard assessments of the state of the planet and the likely trajectory for climate change—gold-standard, in part, because it is conservative, integrating only new research that passes the threshold of inarguability. A new report is expected in 2022, but the most recent one says that if we take action on emissions soon, instituting immediately all of the commitments made in the Paris accords but nowhere yet actually implemented, we are likely to get about 3.2 degrees of warming, or about three times as much warming as the planet has seen since the beginning of industrialization—bringing the unthinkable collapse of the planet’s ice sheets not just into the realm of the real but into the present.29, 30 That would eventually flood not just Miami and Dhaka but Shanghai and Hong Kong and a hundred other cities around the world.31 The tipping point for that collapse is said to be around two degrees; according to several recent studies, even a rapid cessation of carbon emissions could bring us that amount of warming by the end of the century.32 The assaults of climate change do not end at 2100 just because most modeling, by convention, sunsets at that point. This is why some studying global warming call the hundred years to follow the “century of hell.”33 Climate change is fast, much faster than it seems we have the capacity to recognize and acknowledge; but it is also long, almost longer than we can truly imagine. In reading about warming, you will often come across analogies from the planetary record: the last time the planet was this much warmer, the logic runs, sea levels were here. These conditions are not coincidences. The sea level was there largely because the planet was that much warmer, and the geologic record is the best model we have for understanding the very complicated climate system and gauging just how much damage will come from turning up the temperature by two or four or six degrees. Which is why it is especially concerning that recent research into the deep history of the planet suggests that our current climate models may be underestimating the amount of warming we are due for in 2100 by as much as half.34 In other words, temperatures could rise, ultimately, by as much as double what the IPCC predicts. Hit our Paris emissions targets and we may still get four degrees of warming, meaning a green Sahara and the planet’s tropical forests transformed into fire-dominated savanna.35 The authors of one recent paper suggested the warming could be more dramatic still—slashing our emissions could still bring us to four or five degrees Celsius, a scenario they said would pose severe risks to the habitability of the entire planet. “Hothouse Earth,” they called it.36 Because these numbers are so small, we tend to trivialize the differences between them—one, two, four, five. Human experience and memory offer no good analogy for how we should think of those thresholds, but, as with world wars or recurrences of cancer, you don’t want to see even one. At two degrees, the ice sheets will begin their collapse, 400 million more people will suffer from water scarcity, major cities in the equatorial band of the planet will become unlivable, and even in the northern latitudes heat waves will kill thousands each summer.37, 38 There would be thirty-two times as many extreme heat waves in India, and each would last five times as long, exposing ninety-three times more people.39 This is our best-case scenario. At three degrees, southern Europe would be in permanent drought, and the average drought in Central America would last nineteen months longer and in the Caribbean twenty-one months longer. In northern Africa, the figure is sixty months longer—five years. The areas burned each year by wildfires would double in the Mediterranean and sextuple, or more, in the United States. At four degrees, there would be eight million more cases of dengue fever each year in Latin America alone and close to annual global food crises.41 There could be 9 percent more heat-related deaths.40 Damages from river flooding would grow thirtyfold in Bangladesh, twentyfold in India, and as much as sixtyfold in the United Kingdom. In certain places, six climate-driven natural disasters could strike simultaneously, and, globally, damages could pass $600 trillion—more than twice the wealth as exists in the world today. Conflict and warfare could double. Even if we pull the planet up short of two degrees by 2100, we will be left with an atmosphere that contains 500 parts per million of carbon—perhaps more. The last time that was the case, sixteen million years ago, the planet was not two degrees warmer; it was somewhere between five and eight, giving the planet about 130 feet of sea-level rise, enough to draw a new American coastline as far west as I-95.42 Some of these processes take thousands of years to unfold, but they are also irreversible, and therefore effectively permanent. You might hope to simply reverse climate change; you can’t. It will outrun all of us. This is part of what makes climate change what the theorist Timothy Morton calls a “hyperobject”—a conceptual fact so large and complex that, like the internet, it can never be properly comprehended.43 There are many features of climate change—its size, its scope, its brutality—that, alone, satisfy this definition; together they might elevate it into a higher and more incomprehensible conceptual ﻿category yet. But time is perhaps the most mind-bending feature, the worst outcomes arriving so long from now that we reflexively discount their reality. Yet those outcomes promise to mock us and our own sense of the real in return. The ecological dramas we have unleashed through our land use and by burning fossil fuels—slowly for about a century and very rapidly for only a few decades—will play out over many millennia, in fact over a longer span of time than humans have even been around, performed in part by creatures and in environments we do not yet even know, ushered onto the world stage by the force of warming. And so, in a convenient cognitive bargain, we have chosen to consider climate change only as it will present itself this century. By 2100, the United Nations says, we are due for about 4.5 degrees of warming, following the path we are on today.44 That is, farther from the Paris track than the Paris track is from the two-degree threshold of catastrophe, which it more than doubles. As Naomi Oreskes has noted, there are far too many uncertainties in our models to take their predictions as gospel.45 Just running those models many times, as Gernot Wagner and Martin Weitzman do in their book Climate Shock, yields an 11 percent chance we overshoot six degrees.46 Recent work by the Nobel laureate William Nordhaus suggests that better-than-anticipated economic growth means better than one-in-three odds that our emissions will exceed the U.47N.’s worst-case “business as usual” scenario. In other words, a temperature rise of five degrees or possibly more. The upper end of the probability curve put forward by the U.N. to estimate the end-of-the-century, business-as-usual scenario—the worst-case outcome of a worst-case emissions path—puts us at eight degrees. At that temperature, humans at the equator and in the tropics would not be able to move around outside without dying.48 In that world, eight degrees warmer, direct heat effects would be the least of it: the oceans would eventually swell two hundred feet higher, flooding what are now two-thirds of the world’s major cities; hardly any land on the planet would be capable of efficiently producing any of the food we now eat; forests would be roiled by rolling storms of fire, and coasts would be punished by more and more intense hurricanes; the suffocating hood of tropical disease would reach northward to enclose parts of what we now call the Arctic; probably about a third of the planet would be made unlivable by direct heat; and what are today literally unprecedented and intolerable droughts and heat waves would be the quotidian condition of whatever human life was able to endure.49, 50, 51, 52 We will, almost certainly, avoid eight degrees of warming; in fact, several recent papers have suggested the climate is actually less sensitive to emissions than we’d thought, and that even the upper bound of a business-as-usual path would bring us to about five degrees, with a likely destination around four.53 But five degrees is nearly as unthinkable as eight, and four degrees not much better: the world in a permanent food deficit, the Alps as arid as the Atlas Mountains.54 Between that scenario and the world we live in now lies only the open question of human response. Some amount of further warming is already baked in, thanks to the protracted processes by which the planet adapts to greenhouse gas. But all of those paths projected from the present—to two degrees, to three, to four, five, or even eight—will be carved overwhelmingly by what we choose to do now. There is nothing stopping us from four degrees other than our own will to change course, which we have yet to display. Because the planet is as big as it is, and as ecologically diverse; because humans have proven themselves an adaptable species, and will likely continue to adapt to outmaneuver a lethal threat; and because the devastating effects of warming will soon become too extreme to ignore, or deny, if they haven’t already; because of all that, it is unlikely that climate change will render the planet truly uninhabitable. But if we do nothing about carbon emissions, if the next thirty years of industrial activity trace the same arc upward as the last thirty years have, whole regions will become unlivable by any standard we have today as soon as the end of this century. ﻿A few years ago, E. O. Wilson proposed a term, “Half-Earth,” to help us think through how we might adapt to the pressures of a changing climate, letting nature run its rehabilitative course on half the planet and sequestering humanity in the remaining, habitable half of the world.55 The fraction may be smaller than that, possibly considerably, and not by choice; the subtitle of his book was Our Planet’s Fight for Life. On longer timescales, the even-bleaker outcome is possible, too—the livable planet darkening as it approaches a human dusk. It would take a spectacular coincidence of bad choices and bad luck to make that kind of zero earth possible within our lifetime. But the fact that we have brought that nightmare eventuality into play at all is perhaps the overwhelming cultural and historical fact of the modern era—what historians of the future will likely study about us, and what we’d have hoped the generations before ours would have had the foresight to focus on, too. Whatever we do to stop warming, and however aggressively we act to protect ourselves from its ravages, we will have pulled the devastation of human life on Earth into view—close enough that we can see clearly what it would look like and know, with some degree of precision, how it will punish our children and grandchildren. Close enough, in fact, that we are already beginning to feel its effects ourselves, when we do not turn away. ﻿It is almost hard to believe just how much has happened and how quickly. In the late summer of 2017, three major hurricanes arose in the Atlantic at once, proceeding at first along the same route as though they were battalions of an army on the march.56 Hurricane Harvey, when it struck Houston, delivered such epic rainfall it was described in some areas as a “500,000-year event”—meaning that we should expect that amount of rain to hit that area once every five hundred millennia.57 Sophisticated consumers of environmental news have already learned how meaningless climate change has rendered such terms, which were meant to describe storms that had a 1-in-500,000 chance of striking in any given year. But the figures do help in this way: to remind us just how far global warming has already taken us from any natural-disaster benchmark our grandparents would have recognized. To dwell on the more common 500-year figure just for a moment, it would mean a storm that struck once during the entire history of the Roman Empire. Five hundred years ago, there were no English settlements across the Atlantic, so we are talking about a storm that should hit just once as Europeans arrived and established colonies, as colonists fought a revolution and Americans a civil war and two world wars, as their descendants established an empire of cotton on the backs of slaves, freed them, and then brutalized their descendants, industrialized and postindustrialized, triumphed in the Cold War, ushered in the “end of history,” and witnessed, just a decade later, its dramatic return. One storm in all that time, is what the meteorological record has taught us to expect. Just one. Harvey was the third such flood to hit Houston since 2015.58 And the storm struck, in places, with an intensity that was supposed to be a thousand times rarer still. That same season, an Atlantic hurricane hit Ireland, 45 million were flooded from their homes in South Asia, and unprecedented wildfires tilled much of California into ash.59, 60 And then there was the new category of quotidian nightmare, climate change inventing the once-unimaginable category of obscure natural disasters—crises so large they would once have been inscribed in folklore for centuries today passing across our horizons ignored, overlooked, or forgotten. In 2016, a “thousand-year flood” drowned small-town Ellicott City, Maryland, to take but one example almost at random; it was followed, two years later, in the same small town, by another.61 One week that summer of 2018, dozens of places all over the world were hit with record heat waves, from Denver to Burlington to Ottawa; from Glasgow to Shannon to Belfast; from Tbilisi, in Georgia, and Yerevan, in Armenia, to whole swaths of southern Russia.62 The previous month, the daytime temperature of one city in Oman reached above 121 degrees Fahrenheit, and did not drop below 108 all night, and in Quebec, Canada, fifty-four died from the heat.63 That same week, one hundred major wildfires burned in the American West, including one in California that grew 4,000 acres in one day, and another, in Colorado, that produced a volcano-like 300-foot eruption of flames, swallowing an entire subdivision and inventing a new term, “fire tsunami,” along the way.64, 65, 66 On the other side of the planet, biblical rains flooded Japan, where 1.2 million were evacuated from their homes.67 Later that summer, Typhoon Mangkhut forced the evacuation of 2.45 million from mainland China, the same week that Hurricane Florence struck the Carolinas, turning the port city of Wilmington briefly into an island and flooding large parts of the state with hog manure and coal ash.68, 69, 70 Along the way, the winds of Florence produced dozens of tornadoes across the region.71 The previous month, in India, the state of Kerala was hit with its worst floods in almost a hundred years.72 That October, a hurricane in the Pacific wiped Hawaii’s East Island entirely off the map.73 And in November, which has traditionally marked the beginning of the rainy season in California, the state was hit instead with the deadliest fire in its history—the Camp Fire, which scorched several hundred square miles outside of Chico, killing dozens and leaving many more missing in a place called, proverbially, Paradise.74 The devastation was so complete, you could almost forget the Woolsey Fire, closer to Los Angeles, which burned at the same time and forced the sudden evacuation of 170,000. It is tempting to look at these strings of disasters and think, Climate change is here. And one response to seeing things long predicted actually come to pass is to feel that we have settled into a new era, with everything transformed. In fact, that is how California governor Jerry Brown described the state of things in the midst of the state’s wildfire disaster: “a new normal.”75 The truth is actually much scarier. That is, the end of normal; never normal again. We have already exited the state of environmental conditions that allowed the human animal to evolve in the first place, in an unsure and unplanned bet on just what that animal can endure. The climate system that raised us, and raised everything we now know as human culture and civilization, is now, like a parent, dead. And the climate system we have been observing for the last several years, the one that has battered the planet again and again, is not our bleak future in preview. It would be more precise to say that it is a product of our recent climate past, already passing behind us into a dustbin of environmental nostalgia. There is no longer any such thing as a “natural disaster,” but not only will things get worse; technically speaking, they have already gotten worse. Even if, miraculously, humans immediately ceased emitting carbon, we’d still be due for some additional warming from just the stuff we’ve put into the air already. And of course, with global emissions still increasing, we’re very far from zeroing out on carbon, and therefore very far from stalling climate change. The devastation we are now seeing all around us is a beyond-best-case scenario for the future of warming and all the climate disasters it will bring. ﻿What that means is that we have not, at all, arrived at a new equilibrium. It is more like we’ve taken one step out on the plank off a pirate ship. Perhaps because of the exhausting false debate about whether climate change is “real,” too many of us have developed a misleading impression that its effects are binary. But global warming is not “yes” or “no,” nor is it “today’s weather forever” or “doomsday tomorrow.” It is a function that gets worse over time

### 4

#### TEXT: The Outer Space Treaty ought to be amended to establish an international legal trust system governing megaconstellations. Solves overuse and all their impacts.

Finoa 21 [Ivan Finoa (Department of Law University of Turin), “Building a New Legal Model for Settlements on Mars,” A. Froehlich (ed.), Assessing a Mars Agreement Including Human Settlements, Studies in Space Policy 30, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-65013-1_7>]CT

7.5 A Proposal for an International Legal Trust System

Since several legal and policy issues may arise from the actual legal framework, a new international legal regime for outer space shall: (a) Provide for property rights or a lease allocation system, both incentivising investments in the space sector. The system would be supervised and led by the United Nations (UN) through the United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs (UNOOSA). (b) Establish the rule of law in outer space. A laissez faire system could turn into anarchy whereby countries and companies could race to grab as many resources as possible bringing considerable potential conflict. (c) Recognise outer space as common heritage of mankind, instead of res communis.24 (d) Provide a sustainable exploitation of celestial bodies, to avoid the uncontrolled production of space debris or to prevent the complete exhaustion of the celestial bodies’ masses or their natural orbits.25 The United Nations should manage the ordered and sustainable economic development in outer space for the present and future generations. (e) Prevent the militarisation of outer space and favours the international collaboration, which are the same aims of the Outer Space Treaty’ drafters. (f) Consider the weak points of the Moon Agreement which led to nations’ refusal to sign. Only a widely accepted agreement would have the power of law in the international context.

The abovementioned requirements could be met by establishing an international Legal Trust System (ILTS). A trust is an arrangement that assigns assets to one or more trustees that will manage them in the interest of one or more beneficiaries. The latter may include the trustee or the settlor.26 Translated in the ILTS, mankind would assume the role of settlor and beneficiary of the outer space resources. The UNOOSA would act as main trustee of outer space resources and trading property rights and leases to companies and countries. The rights over the celestial bodies or over its resources would depend on the nature of the celestial body itself. For example, property rights are preferable to a lease over asteroids, as they could just disappear after the exploitation. Both leases and property rights can be provided over lands and mining sites on Mars. Leases or defeasible titles are preferable for some land mass on those celestial bodies which could hypothetically be used by humankind pending an Earth disaster. In the case of lucrative activities, such as mining, companies will choose whether to get the exclusive use over the resource through payment of the lease or through annual payment linked to net proceeds or to production charges.

7.6 The Functioning of the International Legal Trust System

When a company is interested in leasing or buying an outer space resource, before starting any operations, it must send a plan of work to the United Nations. The plan of work shall include all the details of the activity that would be carried out; it shall be consistent with pre-established parameters of sustainability and shall not interfere with other space activities. If =

### 5

#### Starlink is key to global internet access.

John Koetsier {journalist, analyst, author, and speaker}, 20 - ("Elon Musk’s 42,000 StarLink Satellites Could Just Save The World," Forbes, 1-9-2020, https://www.forbes.com/sites/johnkoetsier/2020/01/09/elon-musks-42000-starlink-satellites-could-just-save-the-world/?sh=85866264c2cd)//marlborough-wr/

Elon Musk’s other company, SpaceX, is building Starlink, a global communications constellation that could approach a [staggering 42,000 satellites](https://www.forbes.com/sites/johnkoetsier/2019/12/20/apple-building-satellite-to-iphone-tech-spacex-launching-42000-satellites-2--2--/#5d1ee85668a7). And it could be all that stands between us and a fragmented world living in virtually — and actually — different realities. How? World War II can tell us the answer. In the early 1940s a tyrannical power using fake news, hate speech, military might and hegemonic power controlled most of Europe: the Nazis. They controlled public life, news and local economies. Resistance groups dotted the European mainland, with one lifeline for non-official communication from free countries: radio. As such, radios were [contraband](https://www.theholocaustexplained.org/life-in-nazi-occupied-europe/occupation-case-studies/) and confiscated. One of the activities the allies undertook to support resistance fighters was shipping in radios for communication and outside news. Today, radios aren’t at risk of being confiscated. And as a cloud-delivered service, hijacking the internet happens largely out of public sight, in servers and routers that enable services like Netflix and the BBC and Facebook and Google. It’s called [splinternet](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Splinternet), and it’s the ongoing division of a worldwide interconnected internet into separate and isolatable fiefdoms, each of which can be controlled and managed so that governing powers can control what their populations see. The Great Firewall of China is the most well-known example, but Iran, Syria and Vietnam also control significant portions of the internet for their populations. Russia just [completed technology](https://www.pcmag.com/news/371347/russia-is-about-to-disconnect-from-the-internet-what-that-m) to wall off its internal networks, servers and internet users from the wider internet. And India, in its attempt to control unrest following its anti-Muslim citizenship law, has employed a particularly heavy-handed approach: simply [blocking](https://www.tellerreport.com/news/2019-12-27---india--new-internet-outages--protesters-back-on-the-street-.ryrh4IhQyI.html) the internet entirely. (One unintended result: contractors in India can’t reach their employers in the U.S.) Another country, United Arab Emirates, took a different approach: outlawing all messengers [except one that it built a digital backdoor into: Totok](https://www.forbes.com/sites/johnkoetsier/2019/12/23/top-50-social-app-in-usa-outed-as-spying-tool-for-united-arab-emirates-apple-and-google-delete-it/#5790934b7291). However it happens, it allows governments to control what people see, read and hear from outside sources — and censor what their own people say. Starlink can change all of that. Elon Musk recently revealed [details](https://twitter.com/elonmusk/status/1214548764054216704?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E1214548764054216704&ref_url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.digitaltrends.com%2Fcool-tech%2Felon-musk-reveals-what-youll-need-to-connect-to-his-internet-satellites%2F) about how people will access StarLink. It will be incredibly simple, and it will enable access to the relatively free global internet from anywhere on the planet. What that means is that anyone can access the internet from anywhere. Chinese citizens will be able to access Google and information about Tiananmen Square. Russian citizens will be able to see external analysis of Putin’s financial dealings if even Russia blocks outside sources. Indian protesters can’t be cut off from the internet. Of course, governments will make the Starlink Terminal illegal. But

#### Free internet is crucial to the promotion of democracy. Pirannejad 17:

Ali Pirannejad {Department of Public Administration, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran; Faculty of Technology, Policy and Management, Delft University of Technology, Delft, Netherlands, }, 17 - ("Can the internet promote democracy? A cross-country study based on dynamic panel data models," Taylor &amp; Francis, 4-1-2017, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02681102.2017.1289889?journalCode=titd20)//marlborough-wr/>

In the age of information revolution, information and communication technologies are penetrating all levels of societies and are also influencing the political aspect of each country by providing some facilities such as the Internet and web technologies. Democracy, as a universal value and a political system, is also well known and has an important role in the sublimation of the human societies. This study attempts to examine the effect of Internet extension on democracy promotion by using a panel consisting of 122 countries covering the period from the year 2000 to 2014. In order to estimate the effect, and also to deal with the endogeneity and autocorrelation problems, the dynamic panel data models are employed in the study. The results of estimation models indicate that Internet extension has a significantly positive effect on democracy promotion during the period. In the end, some ideas for further research are presented.

#### Democracy Promotion is key to prevent great power war – we’re on the brink.

Gat 11 (Azar- the Ezer Weizman Professor of National Security at Tel Aviv University, 2011, “The Changing Character of War,” in The Changing Character of War, ed. Hew Strachan and Sibylle Scheipers, p. 30-32)

Since 1945, the decline of major great power war has deepened further. Nuclear weapons have concentrated the minds of all concerned wonderfully, but no less important have been the institutionalization of free trade and the closely related process of rapid and sustained economic growth throughout the capitalist world. The communist bloc did not participate in the system of free trade, but at least initially it too experienced substantial growth, and, unlike Germany and Japan, it was always sufﬁciently large and rich in natural resources to maintain an autarky of sorts. With the Soviet collapse and with the integration of the former communist powers into the global capitalist economy, the prospect of a major war within the developed world seems to have become very remote indeed. This is one of the main sources for the feeling that war has been transformed: its geopolitical centre of gravity has shifted radically. The modernized, economically developed parts of the world constitute a ‘zone of peace’. War now seems to be conﬁned to the less-developed parts of the globe, the world’s ‘zone of war’, where countries that have so far failed to embrace modernization and its pacifying spin-off effects continue to be engaged in wars among themselves, as well as with developed countries.¶ While the trend is very real, one wonders if the near disappearance of armed conﬂict within the developed world is likely to remain as stark as it has been since the collapse of communism. The post-Cold War moment may turn out to be a ﬂeeting one. The probability of major wars within the developed world remains low—because of the factors already mentioned: increasing wealth, economic openness and interdependence, and nuclear deterrence. But the deep sense of change prevailing since 1989 has been based on the far more radical notion that the triumph of capitalism also spelled the irresistible ultimate victory of democracy; and that in an afﬂuent and democratic world, major conﬂict no longer needs to be feared or seriously prepared for. This notion, however, is fast eroding with the return of capitalist non-democratic great powers that have been absent from the international system since 1945. Above all, there is the formerly communist and fast industrializing authoritarian-capitalist China, whose massive growth represents the greatest change in the global balance of power. Russia, too, is retreating from its postcommunist liberalism and assuming an increasingly authoritarian character.¶ Authoritarian capitalism may be more viable than people tend to assume. 8 The communist great powers failed even though they were potentially larger than the democracies, because their economic systems failed them. By contrast, the capitalist authoritarian/totalitarian powers during the ﬁrst half of the twentieth century, Germany and Japan, particularly the former, were as efﬁcient economically as, and if anything more successful militarily than, their democratic counterparts. They were defeated in war mainly because they were too small and ultimately succumbed to the exceptional continental size of the United States (in alliance with the communist Soviet Union during the Second World War). However, the new non-democratic powers are both large and capitalist. China in particular is the largest player in the international system in terms of population and is showing spectacular economic growth that within a generation or two is likely to make it a true non-democratic superpower.¶ Although the return of capitalist non-democratic great powers does not necessarily imply open conﬂict or war, it might indicate that the democratic hegemony since the Soviet Union’s collapse could be short-lived and that a universal ‘democratic peace’ may still be far off. The new capitalist authoritarian powers are deeply integrated into the world economy. They partake of the development-open-trade-capitalist cause of peace, but not of the liberal democratic cause. Thus, it is crucially important that any protectionist turn in the system is avoided so as to prevent a grab for markets and raw materials such as that which followed the disastrous slide into imperial protectionism and conﬂict during the ﬁrst part of the twentieth century. Of course, the openness of the world economy does not depend exclusively on the democracies. In time, China itself might become more protectionist, as it grows wealthier, its labour costs rise, and its current competitive edge diminishes.¶ With the possible exception of the sore Taiwan problem, China is likely to be less restless and revisionist than the territorially conﬁned Germany and Japan were. Russia, which is still reeling from having lost an empire, may be more problematic. However, as China grows in power, it is likely to become more assertive, ﬂex its muscles, and behave like a superpower, even if it does not become particularly aggressive. The democratic and non-democratic powers may coexist more or less peacefully, albeit warily, side by side, armed because of mutual fear and suspicion, as a result of the so-called ‘security dilemma’, and against worst-case scenarios. But there is also the prospect of more antagonistic relations, accentuated ideological rivalry, potential and actual conﬂict, intensiﬁed arms races, and even new cold wars, with spheres of inﬂuence and opposing coalitions. Although great power relations will probably vary from those that prevailed during any of the great twentieth-century conﬂicts, as conditions are never quite the same, they may vary less than seemed likely only a short while ago.

## Case

### Space Debris

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

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

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

#### Debris creates deterrence by raising the bar for conflict – international norms fail

Miller 7/31 [(Gregory, Chair of the Department of Space Power at the Air Command and Staff College, Ph.D. in Political Science from The Ohio State University) “Deterrence by Debris: The Downside to Cleaning up Space,” Space Policy, 7/31/2021] JL

The danger of kinetic strikes increasing orbital debris is a common theme in the literature, but the positive deterrent effects of some debris are often overlooked. The debris resulting from destroyed satellites, or other space objects, creates a deterrent effect on actors who might otherwise violate international norms and strike at objects in space, either to test their capabilities or as an act of hostilities. This is not deterrence in the traditional sense, of one actor publicly threatening punishment in response to another actor’s unwanted actions. It is not deterrence by denial since the attacker is not damaged and may even achieve its objective. Nor is it deterrence by punishment because the debris itself does not threaten to punish the attacker’s country. But debris can increase the future costs to the aggressor, even if their initial attack succeeds, and thus it has a similar restraining effect on certain behavior. Like the automated response of the U.S. tripwire in West Germany, the threat that debris can pose to state interests acts as a form of deterrence, at least to prevent some actors from taking certain types of actions. Removing the danger of debris will weaken that restraint and thus weaken deterrence, making ASAT tests and hostile actions in space more likely.

Several factors may deter a state from launching kinetic tests or striking against an adversary’s interests in space. For one thing, if a state’s adversary has similar capabilities to destroy objects in space, deterrence would be a function of not wanting to escalate tensions. Although international law only explicitly prohibits states from placing weapons of mass destruction in orbit, international space law, like the Outer Space Treaty [30], does provide a framework for addressing the activities of one state that lead to the damage of another state’s property. Likewise, there are international norms (informal but expected rules of behavior) against the weaponization of space. But these norms seem to be in decline [31], and such norms only deter a state from engaging in certain types of behavior if the state cares about following norms, if it cares about how states perceive its behavior, or if it believes other states are willing to enforce the norms. The beauty of debris as a deterrent is that it does not rely on the enforcement of norms or the credibility of states to succeed.

#### Use or lose is wrong – It’d be irrational AND never be contemplated by any state.

Kroenig 18 Matthew Kroenig, Associate Professor in the Department of Government and the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown, The Logic of American Nuclear Strategy: Why Strategic Superiority Matters, Oxford UPress, pp. 137-142

The second, and more common, argument as to why nuclear superiority might be destabilizing is because the state in the position of nuclear inferiority (in this case, America’s adversaries) may feel “use ’em or lose ’em” (UELE) pressures, but this argument also withers under interrogation.26

According to strategic stability theorists, a US nuclear advantage increases the danger of nuclear war because the inferior opponent may fear that its nuclear arsenal is vulnerable to a first strike. Rather, than wait for the adversary (in this case the United States) to move first and wipe out, or seriously blunt, its strategic forces, the argument goes, the inferior state may decide to intentionally launch a nuclear war early in a crisis in order to avoid suffering a disarming first strike. This is the logic most often invoked by strategic stability theorists when they claim that US nuclear advantages are destabilizing. This is also the precise problem identified and inspired by Wohlstetter’s basing studies.

Use ’em or lose ’em enjoys a certain superficial plausibility, but, upon closer inspection, there are two fundamental reasons why the logic simply does not hold up. First, it ignores the fact that the superior state retains a healthy ability to retaliate. So, even if the inferior state is worried about having its nuclear weapons eliminated in a first strike, the decision to launch its nuclear weapons first as a coping mechanism would be a decision to intentionally launch a nuclear war against a state with at least a secure, second-strike capability. This means that even if the inferior state launches its nuclear weapons first, it will be virtually guaranteed to suffer devastating nuclear retaliation. Moreover, given that it is in a situation of extreme inferiority (so extreme that it might even be vulnerable to a preemptive nuclear strike), this would mean intentionally launching a devastating nuclear war that will likely turn out much worse for itself then for its opponent. It would simply be irrational for a state to intentionally launch a nuclear war against a state with an assured retaliatory capability.

Let us consider a concrete example. The United States maintains nuclear superiority over China, as we have seen in previous chapters. Strategic stability theorists want us to believe that if the United States takes additional steps to further enhance its superiority, then China would face even greater temptations to launch a nuclear first strike against the US homeland in the event of a serious crisis. In other words, strategic stability theorists hold that China would be so worried about losing a devastating nuclear war against United States that it would intentionally choose to start a devastating nuclear war against the United States. The argument does not make sense.

### Ozone

#### No solvency - Nonunique—governments can still send satellites to space

#### space tech helps mitigate effects of climate change.

**ESA, 10** - ("Space technology helps mitigate climate change," ESA, 5-1-2010, 12-17-2021https://www.esa.int/Applications/Telecommunications\_Integrated\_Applications/Technology\_Transfer/Space\_technology\_helps\_mitigate\_climate\_change)//AW

Space technologies have led to a number of inventions that benefit the environment and save energy. Satellite-based systems are reducing vehicles’ carbon dioxide emissions, remote-sensing technology is making wind turbines more efficient, and information from weather satellites is helping solar cells to produce more energy. These are just some examples of how spin-offs from space technology and satellite services can make a difference. Over the years, ESA’s Technology Transfer Programme and its Business Incubation Centres have fostered and supported many innovative technologies and business ideas that contribute to new services and products to mitigate climate change. Space tech for renewable energy To maximise the amount of electricity from new wind turbines, the French company Leosphere developed a small instrument to measure wind speed and direction from the ground up to heights of 200 metres. The ‘lidar’ technology is similar to that which ESA will use on its Aeolus satellite to provide global observations of wind profiles from space. ESA’s expertise from this mission was important for Leosphere and was used to improve their instrument during the company’s start-up phase at ESA’s Business Incubation Centre (BIC) in Noordwijk, the Netherlands. More instruments based on the same technology have followed and these are now being used in more than 100 countries. By using data from weather satellites, ‘SolarSAT’ from Italian company Flyby can accurately predict the power output of photovoltaic power plants. This information is used to design improved systems and quickly identify faults in operating photovoltaic plants – faults that can reduce energy production by more than 10% a year. This system has already been installed on several photovoltaic systems in Italy. Space sensors reduce emissions from heating systems Miniaturised ceramic gas sensor technology, developed originally for measuring oxygen levels around spacecraft reentry vehicles, is now being used in systems that accurately control heater combustion, one of the major sources of pollutants. “It can reduce exhaust gases that are harmful for the environment and ensure that heating systems work at an optimum level. It also reduces fuel consumption by 10–15%,” explained Rainer Baumann from TU Dresden. Supported by ESA’s Technology Transfer Programme and its partner MST, this technology is now used by the German company ESCUBE in systems controlling industrial heaters. Satellite data reduces car emissions Conventional satnav systems help people to find their way. Now, several innovators have come up with interesting developments that use the same information to reduce fuel consumption and pollution by cars. Repeated rapid acceleration and abrupt braking increases the fuel consumption of even the greenest car. Alex Ackerman and Yossef Shiri have developed the intelligent GreenDrive system that combines information on the type of car, its location and the road conditions to advise the driver on the most economical driving style to use: when to accelerate, when to brake and when to keep the speed constant. On average, this can result in a 15–25% fuel saving. Another system proposed by Prof. Gerhard Güttler for the European Satellite Navigation Competition is Galileo-Ecodrive. This uses data on a road’s geodetic height profile provided by satnav systems to optimise the operation of auxiliary devices such as electricity generators, air conditioning, power steering, the deep freezers used on trucks for perishable goods and the moveable parts of a cement mixer –devices that consume up to 20% of the fuel. This could amount to savings of up to 2 billion litres a year across Europe, avoiding the emission of 5 million tonnes of carbon dioxide. Changing lifestyles A reduction in harmful emissions requires a change in our habits, and for this more awareness is needed. Andreas Zachariah from the UK has developed a helpful system called Carbon Diem to track carbon footprints in real time. The concept is to help reduce global warming by making people more aware of their carbon footprint, encouraging them to change their mode of travel. Carbon Diem runs on a mobile phone. “The beauty of our system is that it’s easy, when you make the effort to walk instead of taking the car you can immediately see the result which should encourage you to stick with it,” says Mr Zachariah. ESA’s Technology Transfer Programme Office (TTPO) The main mission of the TTPO is to facilitate the use of space technology and space systems for non-space applications and to demonstrate the benefit of the European space programme to European citizens. The office is responsible for defining the overall approach and strategy for the transfer of space technologies, including the incubation and funding of start-up companies using space technologies and satellite services, at the Agency’s four Business Incubation Centres in Europe.

#### Space exploration and research is crucial to solving ozone

Greg **Autry 19**, 7-20-2019,( Greg Autry is an American space policy expert, educator, entrepreneur and author. He is a Clinical Professor of Space Leadership, Business and Policy at the Thunderbird School of Global Management at Arizona State University. He serves as Chair of the Safety Working Group on the COMSTAC.) "Space Research Can Save the Planet—Again," Foreign Policy, https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/07/20/space-research-can-save-the-planet-again-climate-change-environment/

The first glimpse humanity got of the world from above was transformative. In 1968, the U.S. astronaut William Anders returned from circling the moon in Apollo 8 with a photograph. It was a simple snapshot of the Earth, the whole Earth, rising above the desolate lunar surface. But it was also momentous, representing the very first time anyone had gotten far enough away to view how fragile the world was. The contrast between the lone blue-and-green marble and the cold emptiness of space was beautiful and shocking. As Anders later remarked, “We came all this way to explore the moon, and the most important thing is that we discovered the Earth.” Anders’s Earthrise photo provided conservationists with the iconic illustration they needed. On April 22, 1970, 20 million people turned out for the largest civic event in U.S. history: Earth Day. Today conservationists and other critics are more likely to see space programs as militaristic splurges that squander billions of dollars better applied to solving problems on Earth. These well-meaning complaints are misguided, however. Earth’s problems—most urgently, climate change—can be solved only from space. That’s where the tools and data already being used to tackle these issues were forged and where the solutions of the future will be too. Space research has already been critical in averting one major environmental disaster. It was NASA satellite data that revealed a frightening and growing hole in the ozone layer over the South Pole, galvanizing public concern that, in 1987, produced the Montreal Protocol: the first international agreement addressing a global environmental problem. Since then, thanks to worldwide restrictions on damaging chlorofluorocarbons, the ozone situation has stabilized, and a full planetary recovery is expected. As this case showed, space can provide the vital information needed to understand a problem—and a surprising range of ways to solve it. Climate change is a poster child for the critical role of space data. Trekking across the globe to measure ice sheets with drills and gauge sea temperatures from the sides of ships is an expensive, slow, and insufficient way to assay the state of the planet. Satellites operated by NASA, the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and an increasing number of commercial firms provide a plethora of multispectral imaging and radar measurements of developments such as coral reef degradation, harmful plankton blooms, and polar bears negotiating thinning ice. Much of the technology involved in observing the Earth today was initially developed for probes sent to explore other planets in our solar system. IT WAS NASA SATELLITE DATA THAT REVEALED A FRIGHTENING AND GROWING HOLE IN THE OZONE LAYER OVER THE SOUTH POLE, GALVANIZING PUBLIC CONCERN THAT, IN 1987, PRODUCED THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL: THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT ADDRESSING A GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEM. Indeed, understanding the evolution of other planets’ climates is essential for modeling possible outcomes on Earth. NASA probes revealed how, roughly 4 billion years ago, a runaway greenhouse gas syndrome turned Venus into a hot, hellish, and uninhabitable planet of acid rain. Orbiters, landers, and rovers continue to unravel the processes that transformed a once warm and wet Mars into a frigid, dry dust ball—and scientists even to conceive of future scenarios that might terraform it back into a livable planet. Discovering other worlds’ history and imagining their future offers important visions for climate change mitigation strategies on Earth, such as mining helium from the moon itself for future clean energy. Spinoff technologies from space research, from GPS to semiconductor solar cells, are already helping to reduce emissions; the efficiency gains of GPS-guided navigation shrink fuel expenditures on sea, land, and air by between 15 and 21 percent—a greater reduction than better engines or fuel changes have so far provided. Modern solar photovoltaic power also owes its existence to space. The first real customer for solar energy was the U.S. space program; applications such as the giant solar wings that power the International Space Station have continually driven improvements in solar cell performance, and NASA first demonstrated the value of the sun for powering communities on Earth by using solar in its own facilities. Promisingly, space-based solar power stations could overcome the inconvenient truth that wind and solar will never get us anywhere near zero emissions because their output is inherently intermittent and there is, so far, no environmentally acceptable way to store their power at a global scale, even for one night. Orbital solar power stations, on the other hand, would continually face the sun, beaming clean power back through targeted radiation to Earth day or night, regardless of weather. They would also be free from clouds and atmospheric interference and therefore operate with many times the efficiency of current solar technology. Moving solar power generation away from Earth—already possible but held back by the current steep costs of lifting the materials into space—would preserve land and cultural resources from the blight of huge panel farms and save landfills from the growing problem of discarded old solar panels. Sustainable energy advocates in the U.S. military and the Chinese government are actively pursuing space-based solar power, but just making solar cells damages the environment due to the caustic chemicals employed. Space technology offers the possibility of freeing the Earth’s fragile biosphere and culturally important sites from the otherwise unavoidable damage caused by manufacturing and mining. The U.S. start-up Made in Space is currently taking the first steps toward manufacturing in orbit. The company’s fiber-optic cable, produced by machinery on the International Space Station, is orders of magnitude more efficient than anything made on Earth, where the heavy gravity creates tiny flaws in the material. Made in Space and others are eventually planning to build large structures, such as solar power stations, in space. As these technologies develop, they will augment each other, bringing costs down dramatically; space manufacturing, for instance, slashes the cost of solar installations in space. MINING THE SOLAR SYSTEM COMES WITH ITS OWN POTENTIAL IMPACTS, BUT EXTRACTING RESOURCES FROM DISTANT AND LIFELESS WORLDS IS CLEARLY PREFERABLE TO THE CONTINUED DEGRADATION OF THE EARTH. Eventually, firms will be able to supply endeavors in space with materials from the moon and asteroids, avoiding the cost and environmental impact of lifting them into orbit. Mining the solar system comes with its own potential impacts, but extracting resources from distant and lifeless worlds is clearly preferable to the continued degradation of the Earth. Perhaps the most powerful role space can play is as inspiration. Space tourism might seem like a frivolity for the rich, but it can be so much more. I’ve spent some time with astronauts, and they all report that seeing the Earth without borders and observing its fragile atmosphere shook them to their core, inspiring in them a powerful sense of connection and respect for the environment. As Andrew Newberg, a neuroscientist and physician who has studied this “overview effect,” put it, “You can often tell when you’re with someone who has flown in space. It’s palpable.” Subjecting thousands of the world’s wealthiest and most powerful individuals to a transcendent experience couldn’t hurt—especially if less wealthy Earthlings soon get a chance to follow them. The leaders of the biggest space firms are already thinking way beyond tourism. Tory Bruno, the CEO of United Launch Alliance, envisions a future in which a thousand or more people work in Earth and moon orbits. These people would build stations, conduct research, and produce goods for use in space and on Earth. The Amazon mogul Jeff Bezos imagines a spacefaring civilization that keeps our home planet pristine and protected, as a sort of national park, while dirty extractive and manufacturing processes take place in orbital facilities. SpaceX’s Elon Musk wants to transform Mars back into the healthy world it once was and then fill it with life-forms from Earth—including a significant human population. Some experts have mocked this idea. But experts also lampooned Musk’s plans for reusing rocket boosters and building a high-performance electric car for the masses. The fact is that while some of the plans described by Musk, Bezos, and others might seem utopian or hubristic, given the realities of climate change, humanity needs hope. A future that concentrates only on managing apocalypse, without offering the potential for something better, is no future at all. In the worst scenario, our precious blue-and-green marble will end up looking like its neighbors Venus or Mars simply because we chose not to learn from them.

### Asteroids

#### The risk of a catastrophic asteroid is extremely low – best data proves it’s a 1 in 70 million chance.

**Siegel ‘15** – (Ethan, professor of astronomy at Lewis/Clark College, NASA columnist, October 5 2015, “NASA Wakes Up: Saving Earth From Killer Asteroids Is A Waste,” Forbes, http://www.forbes.com/sites/ethansiegel/2015/10/05/nasa-wakes-up-saving-us-from-killer-asteroids-is-a-waste/)

The answer to the first question — should we be monitoring what’s out there — is *yes*, but not with the urgency so many advocate. And to the second question — should we be prepping the defenses — the answer is *not likely*. We may get some very smart, very famous people arguing counter to this, but even smart people fall prey to a common human fallacy: risk estimation when the odds are low but the consequences are great. There are three things to consider here: Common asteroid strikes. These are the twice-a-year variety, and realistically, even if they hit over a populated area, they’re likely to cause as much property damage as a modest tornado, and fewer fatalities. We’re talking millions of dollar in damage, tops, and we have yet to record an asteroid-related death here on Earth. So that’s not consequential. City-killer asteroids. These *could* be bad. Tunguska-level events are similar in scale to the strike that created Meteor Crater (Barringer Crater) in Arizona. These may happen as frequently as once per century, but nearly 90% of the time, they fall over a completely unpopulated area. Even if they do happen to be over a large city — like London, New York or Tokyo — those strikes will be incredibly rare: only occurring once every 100,000 years or so. Species-ending strikes. This — if it happened — would be the big one. All human life on Earth would end, with a total of (as of today) around seven billion human casualties. Even though this only happens once every 100,000,000 years or so, the consequences are tremendous. So with all of this taken into account, what are *your* odds of dying in an asteroid strike in any given year? About 1-in-70,000,000. On average, that means approximately 100 people will die of an asteroid strike in a given year: less than die in earthquakes, tornadoes, volcanoes, hurricanes, floods or by lightning strike. In its quest to map hazardous asteroids and defend Earth from them, the Sentinel mission was hoping to raise $450 million, and then partner with NASA to launch its satellites for tracking purposes. They’ve [fallen well short of their goal](http://motherboard.vice.com/read/nasa-has-cut-off-the-group-that-wants-to-save-us-from-killer-asteroids), and NASA is terminating the partnership indefinitely due to missed deadlines. Normally, I’ll take any excuse to increase excitement and funding for space exploration, but I’m happy to see resources diverted elsewhere. There’s a whole Universe out there to explore, and a whole planet that we can all work to improve. Defending us from asteroids, from a reasonable cost-benefit analysis, simply isn’t worth the investment, statistically. There are real dangers to Earth (and to the humans on it) facing us today, but asteroids aren’t one of them. If our species sticks around for another few thousand years, it will be time to make that investment. But until then? We’ve got a planet to save, and an entire Universe to discover.

#### Their studies are biased – no one’s died from an asteroid.

Bennett ‘