## 1

#### Interpretation: Appropriation is permanently taking property for exclusive use. Gorove 69:

Stephen Gorove, Interpreting Article II of the Outer Space Treaty, 37 Fordham L. Rev. 349 (1969). Available at: https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr/vol37/iss3/2

With respect to the concept of appropriation the basic question is what constitutes "appropriation," as used in the Treaty, especially in contradistinction to casual or temporary use. The term "appropriation" is used most frequently to denote the taking of property for one's own or exclusive use with a sense of permanence. Under such interpretation the establishment of a permanent settlement or the carrying out of commercial activities by nationals of a country on a celestial body may constitute national appropriation if the activities take place under the supreme authority (sovereignty) of the state. Short of this, if the state wields no exclusive authority or jurisdiction in relation to the area in question, the answer would seem to be in the negative, unless, the nationals also use their individual appropriations as cover-ups for their state's activities.5 In this connection, it should be emphasized that the word "appropriation" indicates a taking which involves something more than just a casual use. Thus a temporary occupation of a landing site or other area, just like the temporary or nonexclusive use of property, would not constitute appropriation. By the same token, any use involving consumption or taking with intention of keeping for one's own exclusive use would amount to appropriation.

#### Violation: space stations are not appropriation since 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.

## 2

#### Interpretation: The affirmative may not fiat the actions of private actors

#### Violation: Their plan is that private entities simply don’t appropriate, they do not advocate any legal changes to stop appropriation.

Prefer-

1. Object fiat – Private actor fiat allows the aff to fiat the object of the plan. They can wish away their harms by fiating that the agents causing them simply stop. This guts neg ground by robbing our ability to generate solvency deficits, CPs, or offense generated from the unanticipated consequences of the plan.
2. No logical decision maker – No actor could be faced with the choice of whether or not to do the plan, since it’s done by an indefinably large set of actors who share no institutional means for shared decision making. Destroys topic and real-world education by side stepping the relevant discussion of how organizations with the actual power to solve the issue ought to respond. Proven by the fact EVERY ONE of their “solvency advocate” cards are really suggesting that governments regulate lunar sites, not that private companies stop lunar activities.

#### 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

#### TEXT: The Outer Space Treaty ought to be amended to establish an international legal trust system governing outer space.

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 the UN approves the company plan of work, the country of the company assumes the role of co-trustee for the specific resource. Thus, as a cotrustee, countries must investigate whether all activities of their national companies are consistent with the plan of work authorised by the UN. These supervisory duties would be added to the responsibility of nations for all space objects that are launched within their territory.27 The UN, as main trustee, would oversee that countries are performing their duties. This model would be the ordinary one. There would be also an extraordinary model, in which the UN would be the only trustee. This model would be possible in two instances: when the country of the applicant for a private company is not technologically able to act as a trustee or when the applicant of the activity is a country itself. Furthermore, as stated previously, the beneficiaries of this trust are the countries of the world and their citizens; hence all mankind would take concrete profit from lease transactions and benefit sharing. The income from the sales, leases and benefit sharing can be distributed to mankind by financing international global goals, following a similar model of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals adopted by the United Nations in 2015, which addressed poverty, inequality, climate change, environmental degradation, and peace and justice. Finally, the International Legal Trust System would meet acceptance because every country would obtain benefit sharing to improve its living standard and space faring nations would rely on property rights.

#### The legal trust would incentivize investment in space while preventing conflict and ensuring sustainable development and the equitable distributions of resources.

Finoa ’20 – Ivan Finoa [Department of Law, University of Turin], “An international legal trust system to deal with the new space era,” 71st International Astronautical Congress (IAC) – The CyberSpace Edition, (12-14 October 2020). <<https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/66728932/_IAC_20_E7.VP.8.x58518_An_international_legal_trust_system_to_deal_with_the_new_space_era_BY_IVAN_FINO-with-cover-page-v2.pdf?Expires=1642044926&Signature=asvt6StaK5n9UnpXuJIlo4ziI839WzFYjDZy37bm70ObGy3vFJyHwWNGxhn2beze4QzYDPPX0pVEXAwYvDaINVNxN01Ify8YwG5loNRddlat-grf3iawic7KvwqPowxFe2GuemVvbB-KW8ZVBxigwS-gelSKIVy4KYR9UgiDrM6e6deEBnUTcULSwmsH-JdHNg13ytZ3vNVMMlxZW2MPOCRuB2WlOHdCLoC86VqafSoMwuec-d~Aisbgyt5F2vO-GjvI60bR7h2MSp0iT6P7apIDUUpHUsDGbvcdxp22HSxXdlvr7lSqtLnL5rKxujGDYq~R9B~WuGiorVL2hn74UQ__&Key-Pair-Id=APKAJLOHF5GGSLRBV4ZA>>CT

Considering the worsening climate change, in the future outer space might be our last Noah’s Ark. Now, humans must look to space as an opportunity to support growing resource requirements. Asteroids are rich in metals, which could be transported back to Earth. Unfortunately, the existing international legal framework discourages investments in the space economy. Once an enterprise invests billions of dollars in discovering and developing a mining site, it cannot claim any ownership because of the non-appropriation principle stipulated in Article 2 of the Outer Space Treaty (OST). Thus, other entities could legally access and exploit the same resource without any participation in the initial financial investment, increasing the risk of potential conflict. Bearing this in mind, the question arises, which legal regime could ensure effective allocation of resources, avoiding a chaotic space race to acquire valuable assets? The aim of this research is to argue that the first two articles of OST should be amended, to set up an international legal trust system which would guarantee different kinds of rights, dependently on the nature of the celestial body. E.g., property rights could be preferable to a lease over asteroids, as they could be exploited to their disappearance. This proposed system would be led by the United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs (UNOOSA), as the main trustee. The co-trustees would be the nations of the world. Prior to initiating any space activity, every entity would send a request to their national government. If all the legal parameters are respected, the nation would forward the operational request to the UNOOSA. In the case of acceptance, UNOOSA would record the permit on an international public registry. The country in which the company has been registered would investigate whether the activities of its national company are consistent with the permit. This would be the ordinary model. The extraordinary model would be when the applicant for the space activity is a state, then the trustee would be the UN. All lucrative activities would be subject to benefit-sharing. Finally, this research will demonstrate the valuable outcome of the International Legal Trust System and its advantages for all humankind. Private companies would rely on property rights, while the benefit-sharing could be used to finance the 17 Sustainable Development Goals adopted by the UN in 2015, which address peace, climate change, inequalities and poverty.

## 4

#### The private sector is essential for asteroid mining – competition is key and government development is not effective, efficient, or cheap enough. Thiessen 21:

Marc Thiessen, 6-1, 21, Washington Post, Opinion: SpaceX’s success is one small step for man, one giant leap for capitalism, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2020/06/01/spacexs-success-is-one-small-step-man-one-giant-leap-capitalism/

It was one small step for man, one giant leap for capitalism. Only three countries have ever launched human beings into orbit. This past weekend, SpaceX became the first private company ever to do so, when it sent its Crew Dragon capsule into space aboard its Falcon 9 rocket and docked with the International Space Station. This was accomplished by a company Elon Musk started in 2002 in a California strip mall warehouse with just a dozen employees and a mariachi band. At a time when our nation is debating the merits of socialism, SpaceX has given us an **incredible testament to the power of American free enterprise.** While the left is advocating unprecedented government intervention in almost every sector of the U.S. economy, from health care to energy, **today Americans are celebrating the successful privatization of space travel.** If you want to see the difference between what government and private enterprise can do, consider: It took a private company to give us the first space vehicle with touch-screen controls instead of antiquated knobs and buttons. It took a private company to give us a capsule that can fly entirely autonomously from launch to landing — including docking — without any participation by its human crew. It also took a private company to invent a reusable rocket that can not only take off but land as well. When the Apollo 11 crew reached the moon on July 20, 1969, Neil Armstrong declared “the Eagle has landed.” On Saturday, SpaceX was able to declare that the Falcon had landed when its rocket settled down on a barge in the Atlantic Ocean — ready to be used again. That last development will save the taxpayers incredible amounts of money. The cost to NASA for launching a man into space on the space shuttle orbiter was $170 million per seat, compared with just $60 million to $67 million on the Dragon capsule. The cost for the space shuttle to send a kilogram of cargo into to space was $54,500; with the Falcon rocket, the cost is just $2,720 — a decrease of 95 percent. And while the space shuttle cost $27.4 billion to develop, the Crew Dragon was designed and built for just $1.7 billion — making it the lowest-cost spacecraft developed in six decades. SpaceX did it in six years — far faster than the time it took to develop the space shuttle. ***The private sector does it better, cheaper, faster and more efficiently than government***. Why? Competition. Today, SpaceX has to compete with a constellation of private companies — including legacy aerospace firms such as Orbital ATK and United Launch Alliance and innovative start-ups such as Blue Origin (which is designing a Mars lander and whose owner, Jeff Bezos, also owns The Post) and Virgin Orbit (which is developing rockets than can launch satellites into space from the underside of a 747, avoiding the kinds of weather that delayed the Dragon launch). In the race to put the first privately launched man into orbit, upstart SpaceX had to beat aerospace behemoth Boeing and its Starliner capsule to the punch. It did so — for more than $1 billion less than its competitor. **That spirit of competition and innovation will revolutionize space travel in the years ahead.** Indeed, Musk has his sights set far beyond Earth orbit. Already, SpaceX is working on a much larger version of the Falcon 9 reusable rocket called Super Heavy that will carry a deep-space capsule named Starship capable of carrying up to 100 people to the moon and eventually to Mars. Musk’s goal — the reason he founded SpaceX — is to colonize Mars and make humanity a multiplanetary species. He has set a goal of founding a million-person city on Mars by 2050 complete with iron foundries and pizza joints. Can it be done? Who knows. But this much is certain: **Private-sector innovation is opening the door to a new era of space exploration**. Wouldn’t it be ironic if, just as capitalism is allowing us to explore the farthest reaches of our solar system, Americans decided to embrace socialism back here on Earth?

#### Space regulation scares investors away and spills over to other space activities. The aff causes a spillover effect. Freeland 05

Steven Freeland (BCom, LLB, LLM, University of New South Wales; Senior Lecturer in International Law, University of Western Sydney, Australia; and a member of the Paris-based International Institute of Space Law). “Up, Up and … Back: The Emergence of Space Tourism and Its Impact on the International Law of Outer Space.” Chicago Journal of International Law: Vol. 6: No. 1, Article 4. 2005. JDN. <https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1269&context=cjil>

V. THE NEED FOR CELESTIAL PROPERTY RIGHTS? ¶ The fundamental principle of "non-appropriation" upon which the international law of outer space is based stems from the desire of the international community to ensure that outer space remains an area beyond the jurisdiction of any state(s). Similar ideals emerge from UNCLOS (in relation to the High Seas) as well as the Antarctic Treaty, 42 although in the case of the latter treaty, it was finalised after a number of claims of sovereignty had already been made by various States and therefore was structured to "postpone" rather than prejudice or renounce those previously asserted claims.43 In the case of outer space, its exploitation and use is expressed in Article I of the Outer Space Treaty to be "the province of all mankind," a term whose meaning is not entirely clear but has been interpreted by most commentators as evincing the desire to ensure that any State is free to engage in space activities without reference to any sovereign claims of other States. This freedom is reinforced by other parts of the same Article and is repeated in the Moon Agreement (which also applies to "other celestial bodies within the solar system, other than the earth")." Even though both the scope for space activities and the number of private participants have expanded significantly since these treaties were finalised, it has still been suggested that the nonappropriation principle constitutes "an absolute barrier in the realization of every kind of space activity., 4 ' The amount of capital expenditure required to research, scope, trial, and implement a new space activity is significant. To bring this activity to the point where it can represent a viable "stand alone" commercial venture takes many years and almost limitless funding. From the perspective of a private enterprise contemplating such an activity, it would quite obviously be an important element in its decision to devote resources to this activity that it is able to secure the highest degree of legal rights in order to protect its investment. Security of patent and other intellectual property rights, for example, are vital prerequisites for private enterprise research activity on the ISS, and these rights are specifically addressed by the ISS Agreement between the partners to the project and were applicable to the experiments undertaken by Mark Shuttleworth when he was onboard the ISS.46

#### Asteroid mining can happen with private sector innovation and is key to solve a laundry list of impacts--climate change, economic decline and asteroid collisions. Taylor 19

Chris Taylor [journalist], 19 - ("How asteroid mining will save the Earth — and mint trillionaires," Mashable, 2019, accessed 12-13-2021, https://mashable.com/feature/asteroid-mining-space-economy)//ML

How much, exactly? We’re only just beginning to guess. [Asterank](http://www.asterank.com/), a service that keeps track of some 6,000 asteroids in NASA’s database, prices out the estimated mineral content in each one in the current world market. More than 500 are listed as “>$100 trillion.” The estimated profit on just the top 10 asteroids judged “most cost effective” — that is, the easiest to reach and to mine, subtracting rocket fuel and other operating costs, is around $1.5 trillion.¶ Is it ours for the taking? Well, here’s the thing — we’re taking it already, and have been doing so since we started mining metals thousands of years ago. Asteroid strikes are the only reason rare metals exist in the Earth’s crust; the native ones were all sucked into our planet’s merciless iron core millions of years ago. Why not go to the source?¶ As a side project, space mining can grab water from the rocks and comets — water which, with a little processing makes rocket fuel. Which in turn makes even more currently unimaginable space operations possible, including ones that could give the planet all the energy it needs to avert climate catastrophe. Cislunar space — the bit around us and the moon, the local neighborhood, basically — is about to get very interesting.¶ It’s hard, even for the most asteroid-minded visionaries, to truly believe the full scope of this future space economy right now. Just as hard as it would have been in 1945, when an engineer named Vannevar Bush first proposed [a vast library of shared knowledge that people the world over would access via personal computers](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Memex), to see that mushroom into a global network of streaming movies and grandmas posting photos and trolls and spies who move the needle on presidential elections. ¶ No technology’s pioneer can predict its second-order effects.¶ The space vision thing is particularly difficult in 2019. Not only do we have plenty of urgent problems with democracy and justice to keep us occupied, but the only two companies on the planet to have gone public with asteroid-mining business plans, startups that seemed to be going strong and had launched satellites already, were just bought by larger companies that are, shall we say, less comfortable executing on long-term visions.¶ Planetary Resources was founded in 2012 in a blaze of publicity. Its funding came from, among others, Larry Page, Eric Schmidt, Ross Perot, and the country of Luxembourg. It had inked an orbital launch deal with Virgin Galactic. And it was sold last October to a blockchain software company. (To 21st century readers, this paragraph would look like I’m playing tech world mad libs.)¶ In January, the other company, Deep Space Industries, also partly funded by Luxembourg (way to get in the space race, Luxembourg!), was sold to Bradford Space, owned by a U.S. investment group called the American Industrial Acquisition Corporation. Maybe these new overlords plan on continuing their acquisitions' asteroid mining endeavors rather than stripping the companies for parts. Both companies have been notably silent on the subject. “The asteroid mining bubble has burst,” [declared The Space Review](http://www.thespacereview.com/article/3633/1), one of the few online publications to even pay attention.¶ That’s also to be expected. After all, anyone trying to build Google in 1945 would go bankrupt. Just as the internet needed a half-dozen major leaps forward in computing before it could even exist, space industry needs its launch infrastructure.¶ Currently, the world’s richest person and its most well-known entrepreneur, Jeff Bezos and Elon Musk, respectively, are working on the relatively cheap reusable rockets asteroid pioneers will need. (As I was writing this, Bezos announced in an email blast that one of his New Shepherd rockets had flown to space and back five times like it was nothing, delivering 38 payloads for various customers while remaining entirely intact.) ¶ Meanwhile, quietly, Earth’s scientists are laying the groundwork of research the space economy needs. Japan’s Hayabusa 2 spacecraft has been in orbit around asteroid Ryugu for the last year and a half, learning everything it can. (Ryugu, worth $30 billion according to Asterank, is the website's #1 most cost-effective target.) The craft dropped [tiny hopping robot rovers](https://www.space.com/41941-hayabusa2-asteroid-rovers-hopping-tech.html) and a [small bomb](https://www.space.com/japan-hayabusa2-asteroid-bomb-video.html) on its target; pictures of the small crater that resulted were released afterwards.¶ Officially, the mission is to help us figure out how the solar system formed. Unofficially, it will help us understand whether all those useful metals clump together at the heart of an asteroid, as some theorize. If so, it’s game on for asteroid prospectors. If not, we can still get at the metals with other techniques, such as optical mining (which basically involves sticking an asteroid in a bag and drilling with sunlight; sounds nuts to us, but [NASA has proved it in the lab](https://www.nasa.gov/directorates/spacetech/niac/2017_Phase_I_Phase_II/Sustainable_Human_Exploration/)). It’ll just take more time.¶ Effectively, we’ve just made our first mark at the base of the first space mineshaft. And there’s more to come in 2020 when Hayabusa 2 returns to Earth bearing samples. If its buckets of sand contain a modicum of gold dust, tiny chunks of platinum or pebbles of compressed carbon — aka diamonds — then the Duchy of Luxembourg won’t be the only deep-pocketed investor to sit up and take notice.¶ The possibility of private missions to asteroids, with or without a human crew, is almost here. The next step in the process that takes us from here to where you are? Tell us an inspiring story about it, one that makes people believe, and start to imagine themselves mining in space. How would you explain the world-changing nature of the internet to 1945? How would you persuade them that there was gold to be mined in Vannevar Bush’s idea? You’d let the new economy and its benefits play out in the form of a novel.¶ As Hayabusa dropped a bomb on Ryugu, Daniel Suarez was making the exact same asteroid the target of his fiction. Suarez is a tech consultant and developer turned New York Times bestselling author. His novels thus far have been techno-thrillers: his debut, [Daemon](https://www.amazon.com/dp/B003QP4NPE/ref=dp-kindle-redirect?_encoding=UTF8&btkr=1), a novel of Silicon Valley’s worst nightmare, AI run rampant, made more than a million dollars.¶ So it was a telling shift in cultural mood that Suarez’s latest thriller is also a very in-depth description of — and thinly-disguised advocacy for — asteroid mining. In [Delta-v](https://www.amazon.com/Delta-v-Daniel-Suarez-ebook/dp/B07FLX8V84/ref=sr_1_1?crid=UMNUUSR3NCBX&keywords=delta-v&qid=1556930756&s=digital-text&sprefix=delta-v%2Cdigital-text%2C204&sr=1-1), published in April, a billionaire in the 2030s named Nathan Joyce recruits a team of adventurers who know nothing about space — a world-renowned cave-diver, a world-renowned mountaineer — for the first crewed asteroid mission.¶ Elon Musk fans might expect this to be Joyce’s tale, but he soon fades into the background. The asteroid-nauts are the true heroes of Delta-v. Not only are they offered a massive payday — $6 million each for four years’ work — they also have agency in key decisions in the distant enterprise. Suarez deliberately based them on present-day heroes. The mission is essential, Joyce declares, to save Earth from its major problems. First of all, the fictional billionaire wheels in a fictional Nobel economist to demonstrate the actual truth that the entire global economy is sitting on a [mountain of debt](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-247-trillion-global-debt-bomb/2018/07/15/64c5bbaa-86c2-11e8-8f6c-46cb43e3f306_story.html?noredirect=on&utm_term=.5fb3ff1155d9). It has to keep growing or it will implode, so we might as well take the majority of the industrial growth off-world where it can’t do any more harm to the biosphere.¶ Secondly, there’s the climate change fix. Suarez sees asteroid mining as the only way we’re going to build [solar power satellites](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Space-based_solar_power). Which, as you probably know, is a form of uninterrupted solar power collection that is theoretically more effective, inch for inch, than any solar panels on Earth at high noon, but operating 24/7. (In space, basically, it’s always double high noon). ¶ The power collected is beamed back to large receptors on Earth with large, low-power microwaves, which researchers think will be harmless enough to let humans and animals pass through the beam. A space solar power array like [the one China is said to be working on](https://www.forbes.com/sites/scottsnowden/2019/03/12/solar-power-stations-in-space-could-supply-the-world-with-limitless-energy/#2d3f78a54386) could reliably supply 2,000 gigawatts — or over 1,000 times more power than the largest solar farm currently in existence. ¶ “We're looking at a 20-year window to completely replace human civilization's power infrastructure,” Suarez told me, citing the report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change on the coming catastrophe. Solar satellite technology “has existed since the 1970s. What we were missing is millions of tons of construction materials in orbit. Asteroid mining can place it there.”¶ The Earth-centric early 21st century can’t really wrap its brain around this, but the idea is not to bring all that building material and precious metals down into our gravity well. Far better to create a whole new commodities exchange in space. You mine the useful stuff of asteroids both near to Earth and far, thousands of them taking less energy to reach than the moon. That’s something else we’re still grasping, how relatively easy it is to ship stuff in zero-G environments. ¶ Robot craft can move 10-meter boulders like they’re nothing. You bring it all back to sell to companies that will refine and synthesize it in orbit for a myriad of purposes. Big pharma, to take one controversial industry, would [benefit by taking its manufacturing off-world](https://medium.com/fitch-blog/why-is-big-pharma-interested-in-the-space-economy-c078ac1bf67c). The molecular structure of many chemicals grows better in microgravity.¶ The expectation is that a lot of these space businesses — and all the orbital infrastructure designed to support them — will be automated, controlled remotely via telepresence, and monitored by AI. But Suarez is adamant that thousands if not millions of actual human workers will thrive in the space economy, even as robots take their jobs in old industries back on Earth.¶ “Our initial expansion into space will most likely be unsettled and experimental. Human beings excel in such environments,” he says. “Humans can improvise and figure things out as we go. Robots must be purpose-built, and it's going to take time and experience for us to design and build them.”¶ Which is another way startups back on Earth will get rich in the new economy: designing and building those robots, the nearest thing to selling picks and shovels to prospectors in the space gold rush. Thousands of humans in space at any one time will also require the design and construction of stations that spin to create artificial gravity. Again, this isn’t a great stretch: Using centrifugal force to simulate gravity in space was first proposed by scientists in the 19th century. NASA has had workable designs for spinning cislunar habitats called [O’Neill cylinders](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/O%27Neill_cylinder) since the 1970s. We just haven’t funded them. ¶ But the trillionaires clearly will.¶ In short, Suarez has carefully laid out a vision of the orbital economy that offers something for everyone in our divided society. For Green New Deal Millennials, there’s the prospect of removing our reliance on fossil fuels at a stroke and literally lifting dirty industries off the face of the planet. For libertarians and other rugged individualists, there’s a whole new frontier to be developed, largely beyond the reach of government. ¶ For those who worry about asteroids that could wipe out civilization — though luckily, [this isn't likely to happen any time soon](https://mashable.com/article/armageddon-asteroid-threat) — here is a way for humanity to get proficient in moving them out of the way, fast. Indeed, the National Space Society has offered [a proposal](https://space.nss.org/technologies-for-asteroid-capture-into-earth-orbit/) to capture the asteroid Aphosis (which is set to miss Earth in the year 2029, but [not by a very comfortable margin](https://www.space.com/asteroid-apophis-2029-flyby-planetary-defense.html)), keep it in orbit, and turn it into 150 small solar-power satellites, as a proof of concept. ¶ For the woke folks who care about the bloody history of diamond production, there’s the likelihood that space mining would wipe out Earth’s entire diamond industry. “They will be found in quantities unattainable on Earth,” claims Suarez, with good reason. We are starting to discover that there is more crystalized carbon in the cosmos than we ever suspected. Astronomers have identified one [distant planet made entirely of diamond](https://www.nationalgeographic.com/science/phenomena/2014/06/24/diamond-the-size-of-earth/); there may be more, but they are, ironically, hard to see. ¶ We don’t have diamond planets in our solar system (and we can’t do interstellar missions), but we do have diamond-studded asteroids. Mine them for long enough and you will wear diamonds on the soles of your shoes.¶ For investors and entrepreneurs, there is the thrill of racing to be the first member of the four-comma club. ([Neil deGrasse Tyson believes that the first trillionaire will be an asteroid mining mogul](https://www.nbcnews.com/science/space/neil-degrasse-tyson-says-space-ventures-will-spawn-first-trillionaire-n352271); Suarez isn’t sure whether they’ll be the first, but he suspects that asteroid mining “will mint more trillionaires than any industry in history.”) ¶ For the regular guy or gal with a 401K, there’ll be a fast-rising stock market — inflated not by financial shenanigans this time, but an actual increase in what the world counts as wealth.¶ For workers, there is the promise of sharing in the untold riches, both legally and otherwise. It would be hard to stop miners attaining mineral wealth beyond their paycheck, under the table, when your bosses are millions of miles away. Then there’s the likelihood of rapid advancement in this new economy, where the miners fast gain the knowledge necessary to become moguls.¶ “After several tours in space working for others, perhaps on six-month or year-long contracts, it's likely that some workers will partner to set up their own businesses there,” says Suarez. “Either serving the needs of increasing numbers of workers and businesses in space, marketing services to Earth, or launching asteroid mining startups themselves.” All in all, it’s starting to sound a damn sight more beneficial to the human race than the internet economy is. Not a moment too soon. I’ve written encouragingly about asteroid mining several times before, each time touting the massive potential wealth that seems likely to be made. And each time there’s been a sense of disquiet among my readers, a sense that we’re taking our rapacious capitalist ways and exploiting space.¶ Whereas the truth is, this is exactly the version of capitalism humanity has needed all along: the kind where there is no ecosystem to destroy, no marginalized group to make miserable. A safe, dead space where capitalism’s most enthusiastic pioneers can go nuts to their hearts’ content, so long as they clean up their space junk. ¶ ([Space junk](https://mashable.com/category/space-junk) is a real problem in orbital space because it has thousands of vulnerable satellites clustered closely together around our little blue rock. The vast emptiness of cislunar space, not so much.)¶ And because they’re up there making all the wealth on their commodities market, we down here on Earth can certainly afford to focus less on growing our stock market. Maybe even, whisper it low, we can afford a fully functioning social safety net, plus free healthcare and free education for everyone on the planet.¶ It’s also clearly the area where we should have focused space exploration all along. If we settle on Mars, we may disturb as-yet-undiscovered native bacteria — and as the character Nathan Joyce shouts at a group of “Mars-obsessed” entrepreneurs in Delta-V, Mars is basically filled with toxic sand and is thus looking increasingly impossible to colonize. (Sorry, Mark Watney from The Martian, those potatoes would probably kill you.)

#### Warming causes extinction.

Bill McKibben 19, Schumann Distinguished Scholar at Middlebury College; fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; holds honorary degrees from 18 colleges and universities; Foreign Policy named him to their inaugural list of the world’s 100 most important global thinkers. "This Is How Human Extinction Could Play Out." Rolling Stone. 4-9-2019. https://www.rollingstone.com/politics/politics-features/bill-mckibben-falter-climate-change-817310/

Oh, it could get very bad. In 2015, a study in the Journal of Mathematical Biology pointed out that if the world’s oceans kept warming, by 2100 they might become hot enough to “stop oxygen production by phyto-plankton by disrupting the process of photosynthesis.” Given that two-thirds of the Earth’s oxygen comes from phytoplankton, that would “likely result in the mass mortality of animals and humans

## 5

#### CP Text: The appropriation of outer space is unjust except in the case of the US.

#### Chinese investments are catching up and the US needs private companies to maintain space dominance – Chinese space heg risks extinction. Autry and Kwast 19:

Greg Autry, Steve Kwast {Greg Autry is a clinical professor of space leadership, policy, and business at Arizona State University’s Thunderbird School of Global Management. He served on the 2016 NASA transition team and as the White House liaison at NASA in 2017. He is the chair of the Safety Working Group for the U.S. Federal Aviation Administration’s Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee. Steve Kwast is a Lieutenant General and commander of Recruiting, Training, Educating and Development for the Air Force. He is an astronautical engineer and Harvard Fellow in Public Policy., }, 19 - ("America Is Losing the Second Space Race to China," Foreign Policy, 8-22-2019, https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/08/22/america-is-losing-the-second-space-race-to-china/)//marlborough-wr/

The current U.S. space defense strategy is inadequate and on a path to failure. President Donald Trump’s vision for a Space Force is big enough. As he said on [June 18](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-meeting-national-space-council-signing-space-policy-directive-3/), “It is not enough to merely have an American presence in space. We must have American dominance in space.” But the Air Force is not matching this vision. Instead, the leadership is currently focused on incremental improvements to existing equipment and organizational structures. Dominating the vast and dynamic environment of space will require revolutionary capabilities and resources far deeper than traditional Department of Defense thinking can fund, manage, or even conceive of. Success depends on a much more active partnership with the commercial space industry— and its disruptive capabilities. U.S. military space planners are preparing to repeat a conflict they imagined back in the 1980s, which never actually occurred, against a vanished Soviet empire. Meanwhile, China is executing a winning strategy in the world of today. It is burning hard toward domination of the future space markets that will define the next century. They are planning infrastructure in space that will control 21st-century telecommunications, energy, transportation, and manufacturing. In doing so, they will acquire trillion-dollar revenues as well as the deep capabilities that come from continuous operational experience in space. This will deliver space dominance and global hegemony to China’s authoritarian rulers. Despite the fact that many in the policy and intelligence communities understand exactly what China is doing and have been trying to alert leadership, Air Force leadership has convinced the White House to fund only a slightly better satellite command with the same leadership, while sticking a new label onto their outmoded thinking. A U.S. Space Force or Corps with a satellite command will never fulfill Trump’s call to dominate space. Air Force leadership is demonstrating the same hubris that Gen. George Custer used in convincing Congress, over President Ulysses S. Grant’s better experience intuition, that he could overtake the Black Hills with repeating rifles and artillery. That strategy of technological overconfidence inflamed conflict rather than subduing it, and the 7th Cavalry were wiped out at the Battle of the Little Bighorn. The West was actually won by the settlers, ranchers, miners, and railroad barons who were able to convert the wealth of the territory itself into the means of holding it. They laid the groundwork that made the 20th century the American Century and delivered freedom to millions of people in Europe and Asia. Of course, they also trampled the indigenous people of the American West in their wake—but empty space comes with no such bloody cost. The very emptiness and wealth of this new, if not quite final, frontier, however, means that competition for resources and strategic locations in cislunar space (between the Earth and moon) will be intense over the next two decades. The outcome of this competition will determine the fate of humanity in the next century. China’s impending dominance will neutralize U.S. geopolitical power by allowing Beijing to control global information flows from the high ground of space. Imagine a school in Bolivia or a farmer in Kenya choosing between paying for a U.S. satellite internet or image provider or receiving those services for free as a “gift of the Chinese people.” It will be of little concern to global consumers that the news they receive is slanted or that searches for “free speech” link to articles about corruption in Western democracies. Nor will they care if concentration camps in Tibet and the Uighur areas of western China are obscured, or if U.S. military action is presented as tyranny and Chinese expansion is described as peacekeeping or liberation. China’s aggressive investment in space solar power will allow it to provide cheap, clean power to the world, displacing U.S. energy firms while placing a second yoke around the developing world. Significantly, such orbital power stations have dual use potential and, if properly designed, could serve as powerful offensive weapons platforms. China’s first step in this process is to conquer the growing small space launch market. Beijing is providing nominally commercial firms with government-manufactured, mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles they can use to dump launch services on the market below cost. These start-ups are already [undercutting](https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/04/02/beijing-is-taking-the-final-frontier-space-china/) U.S. pricing by 80 percent. Based on its previous success in using dumping to take out U.S. developed industries such as solar power modules and drones, China will quickly move upstream to attack the leading U.S. launch providers and secure a global commercial monopoly. Owning the launch market will give them an unsurmountable advantage against U.S. competitors in satellite internet, imaging, and power. The United States can still build a strategy to win. At this moment, it holds the competitive advantage in every critical space technology and has the finest set of commercial space firms in the world. It has pockets of innovative military thinkers within groups like the [Defense Innovation Unit](https://www.diu.mil/news-events), under Mike Griffin, the Pentagon’s top research and development official. If the United States simply protects the intellectual property its creative minds unleash and defend its truly free markets from strategic mercantilist attack, it will not lose this new space race. The United States has done this before. It beat Germany to the nuclear bomb, it beat the Soviet Union to the nuclear triad, and it won the first space race. None of those victories was achieved by embracing the existing bureaucracy. Each of them depended on the president of the day following the only proven path to victory in a technological domain: establish a small team with a positively disruptive mindset and empower that team to investigate a wide range of new concepts, work with emerging technologies, and test innovative strategies. Today that means giving a dedicated Space Force the freedom to easily partner with commercial firms and leverage the private capital in building sustainable infrastructure that actually reduces the likelihood of conflict while securing a better economic future for the nation and the world.

## Case

### Uv

DTA not the debater

### t/l

#### VOTE NEG ON PRESUMPTION: Their plan text says that private entities shouldn’t replace the ISS, but their own cards says that a new alternative that is a public private partnership will replace the ISS in the status quo.

#### The aff doesn’t do anything because there is no private entity that is going to replace the international space system

#### Blue origin is going to put up a space station, but that’s not replacing the ISS, that’s just a new station

#### Circumvention – how do you classify whether something is meant to replace the space station?

#### Nonuq – if the ISS is healthy then it wont be replaced as per their card

#### their entire impact scenario is predicated on the existence of public private partnerships but their own ev says that its happening anyway. So theres nothing about private entities putting up space stations that does anything

#### the cp solves – legal trust is space multilateralism so solves the entire aff scenario 100%

#### If space stations are good for research, we should allow more people to do research on them.

#### Since the aff has no impact, any risk that more research is good should be a reason to negate

#### 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.

#### Private space travel helps solve global warming.

Robin George **Andrews, 19** - ("Can Spaceflight Save the Planet?," Scientific American, 9-6-2019, 12-16-2021https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/can-spaceflight-save-the-planet/)//AW

The planet is warming, the oceans are acidifying, the Amazon is burning down, and plastic is snowing on the Arctic. Humanity’s environmental devastation is so severe, experts say, that a global-scale ecological catastrophe is already underway. Even those holding sunnier views would be hard-pressed to deny that our global footprint is presently less a light touch and more a boot stamping on Earth’s face. Against this dark background, one might ask if spending lavish sums to send humans to other worlds is a foolhardy distraction—or a cynical hedge against life’s downward spiral on this one. Spaceflight, however, has the potential to be more than just a planetary escape hatch for eccentric billionaires. Whether in today’s Earth-orbiting spacecraft or the outposts that may someday be built on the moon and Mars, to exist beyond Earth, we must somehow replicate all of our planet’s life-giving essentials off-world. Technologies that recycle practically everything—that make water, air and food as renewable and self-sustaining as possible—are essential for current and future human spaceflight. Then again, we already know how we are jeopardizing the planet and what needs to be done about it. “We have almost all of the tools we need to live sustainably right here, right now,” says Kate Marvel, a climate scientist at Columbia University and NASA. “Our failure to address climate change is not just because we’re interested in space.” Similarly, spaceflight alone cannot save Earth, but that does not mean it solely aids and abets naive dreams of leaving our planet behind. ADVERTISEMENT TIN CAN AGRICULTURE Astronauts need technological innovations to survive in space, but in the past, those solutions have been somewhat temporary—think of NASA’s crewed Apollo missions to the moon, which maxed out at just more than 12 days in duration. Change is afoot: the Trump administration now wants boots on the moon by 2024. Luke Roberson, senior principal investigator for flight research at NASA’s Kennedy Space Center, says the agency is pursuing sustainable architecture on the lunar surface as early as 2028—the sort requiring technology to provide long-term, regenerating caches of food, air and water. Some of this tech may not remain in space. After all, a surprising number of inventions funded or designed by space agencies have been transferred to the commercial sector. These include several ecology-focused projects, including one to make sustainable oil and another that uses LED color combinations, or “light recipes,” to trigger different styles of crop growth. Growing crops in space is anything but trivial. But, says Gioia Massa, a plant scientist at NASA, technologies such as specialized lighting and advanced sensors are of vital importance onboard the International Space Station (ISS), where experiments such as the Veggie system showcase energy-efficient food production. The system’s use of LEDs for plant growth was a concept conceived by NASA-funded research in the 1980s. That tech, Massa says, is now saving a lot of energy for indoor agriculture. NASA has also worked with Florikan, a company that developed a fertilizer whose polymer coating allows for a controlled, slow release of nutrients. It is designed to reduce the runoff of fertilizer into the environment, which can cause ecological havoc. This fertilizer is being used in space, Massa says, and it has demonstrated its ability to enhance plant growth on the ISS. These products, tweaked for continued use in space, are also being marketed to commercial greenhouse owners. Some eco-friendly innovations result from NASA simply trying to be environmentally responsible, says Daniel Lockney, who oversees the agency’s technology transfer efforts. Building spacefaring equipment on Earth is a dirty business, with fuels, paints, solvents and other toxic materials threatening to infiltrate the natural environment. That is why NASA has developed emulsified zero-valent iron (EZVI), a material that adheres to chlorinated solvents in groundwater. When dirty launchpads are scrubbed with potent chemicals, EZVI helps clean them up afterward. Beyond the launchpad, the compound has entered routine use at chemical-manufacturing plants and severely polluted Superfund sites across the country. ADVERTISEMENT A supply of potable water is also paramount for both spacefarers and surface dwellers. And water pollution happens to contribute to the deaths of millions every year, so any tech that could help nix that tragedy would be welcome. Lockney points to the microbial check valve as a solid example of how NASA can assuage this issue. Originally developed for the agency’s fleet of space shuttles, a more advanced version of the system now passively stops harmful microbes in wastewater from swimming back into potable-water reservoirs onboard the ISS. Other versions are at work right here on Earth, keeping water clean with minimal energy in areas with dirty water and without electricity access, as well as in dentists’ offices. (Remember the liquid you swish around in your mouth after a dental examination? That water is often purified by the very same valve to minimize the risk of oral infections.) Roberson and Melanie Pickett, a postdoctoral research fellow at NASA, both work on water-purification systems for spaceflight, including on the ISS. Wastewater there is typically broken down with chemical concoctions. “But that chemistry isn’t sustainable,” Roberson says, because it requires regular refills via resupply missions from Earth. He and Pickett are now designing systems harnessing plants and microbes to recycle waste more sustainably, and these approaches may eventually help redesign toilets and septic tanks on Earth. Sign up for Scientific American’s free newsletters. Sign Up As is the case for water, it is far from easy to make breathable air a limitless resource in space. Up on the ISS, oxygen is traditionally extracted from water that has to be brought from Earth, which is costly and wasteful. As of 2018, the European Space Agency (ESA) is changing that status quo with its new Advanced Closed Loop System, which scrubs the Space Station’s environs of carbon dioxide and, in the process, siphons out oxygen to replenish supplies of breathable air while saving water at the same time. Although on a far larger scale and with somewhat different operational requirements, carbon-capture systems are probably needed on Earth as part of a larger mix to slow down the pace of climate change. Technology developed for use in orbit may inform plans to do the same on our planet. ADVERTISEMENT SERENDIPITOUS SPIN-OFFS Not leaving anything to waste is the underlying principle of many of these innovations. In space, Massa says, waste must be seen as a resource, not something to mindlessly discard. That is part and parcel of so-called closed-loop systems: if such a system is perfect, all its components are recycled, and nothing is ejected from it as waste. Just think of sealed terraria, in which miniature plant ecosystems thrive by themselves for decades with no outside intervention. The Micro Ecological Life Support System Alternative (MELiSSA) project strongly abides by that ideal. Featuring a constantly tweaked “pilot plant” test facility in Barcelona, the target of this ESA-led endeavor is to create a self-sustaining, biologically driven closed-loop life-support system. The pilot plant, whose compartments attempt to degrade waste and use photosynthesis to clean the air, provide oxygen and produce food, employs a cohort of rats as astronaut stand-ins to see how effective the system could be at sustaining a crew for months at a time. Several generations of rats have been used, and so far, there have been zero casualties. Some MELiSSA-derived experiments, such as the photosynthesis-powered oxygen- and edible-biomass-making ARTEMISS, are being flown up to the ISS to see how they fare. The project, started in 1989, is intended to mature into a system capable of sustaining a human crew on a long-duration interplanetary voyage by the mid-2020s. In the meantime, its spin-offs are already showing promise, says Christophe Lasseur, head of MELiSSA at ESA. For instance, its urine-recycling tech could eventually be deployed in remote places and disaster sites to provide potable water in a cost-effective manner, with minimal environmental impact, obviating the need for porting in supplies of clean water from far afield. Lofty ideals are one thing, but the proof, as always, is in the pudding. Not all innovative ideas may become a reality, and for those that do, their development and transference from space to Earth hardly happen overnight. Roberson explains that his own inventions take, on average, seven to 10 years to be commercialized. MELiSSA is considered to be a 50-year effort. ADVERTISEMENT Patience is certainly a virtue. “There’s a serendipity to it,” Lockney says. “Just like we know that water is wet, we know that investment in these new missions will yield inventions that are of benefit to all of humankind.” If anything, these innovations underline why investment in basic R&D can be so worthwhile. “The really cool thing about science is that you really don’t know what’s going to come out of it,” Marvel says. After all, no one thought the World Wide Web would come out of the same journey that led to the Large Hadron Collider. Lengthy engineering timescales and unpredictability aside, spaceflight has already resulted in a range of effective (if not game-changing) eco-friendly by-products for consumers. So why do they remain so relatively unknown? Chad Anderson, CEO of venture capitalist group Space Angels, suspects that it partially comes down to poor marketing. Technology transfer from space-related R&D, Anderson says, has sparked significant innovations not only in eco-friendly products but also in the broader fields of transportation, health care and communications. The problem is that space agencies are not effectively communicating such success stories to the general public. “Space companies are notoriously bad at talking about what they are doing,” Anderson says. Some efforts to combat this situation, Anderson says, are ironically emblematic of the overarching problem. Consider NASA’s in-house publication, Spinoff, which the space agency has used to highlight successful technology transfers since 1976. Despite that pedigree, Anderson says, the magazine remains a very technical, relatively inaccessible periodical that very few people actually read, let alone know about. To boost public engagement and recognition, Anderson recommends making more explicit and personally relatable linkages between spaceflight research and its impacts on our everyday lives. ADVERTISEMENT HONEY, I SHRUNK THE PLANET In any event, these eco innovations are welcome, but we should not rely on technological solutions to save us. Earth is already livable, Marvel says, and we should not aspire to live in tin cans. Fortunately, some research projects help us understand our planet, as well as improving our ability to survive in space. Take the famous Biosphere 2 facility in Arizona. It was initially the site of a pioneering 1990s experiment that locked men and women in a habitat sealed off from the rest of the world to see how they and the environment within developed over the course of two years. (Earth is dubbed “Biosphere 1.”) Although most remembered for plummeting oxygen levels that endangered the inhabitants and required outside intervention, the Biosphere 2 experiment was more successful than people may recall; it led to a better understanding of Earth’s life-support systems and a cornucopia of scientific papers. Indeed, that was the project’s original purpose: to improve our understanding of Earth’s various systems so that we might become “better stewards, overall, of the planet,” says John Adams, current deputy director of the facility, which is now owned and operated by the University of Arizona. Today the facility consists of several model ecosystems, ranging from realistic rain forests to ocean environments. By controlling the elements within these ecosystems, scientists can understand how the real-world equivalents operate—and can be perturbed—in isolation. At the same site but not part of the original Biosphere 2 experiment, one can find the Landscape Evolution Observatory (LEO), which consists of three massive structures build on a hillside of volcanic basalt that, in many respects, resembles Mars’s terrain. Peter Troch, the science director of Biosphere 2, explains that LEO can be used to understand how to turn a lifeless landscape into something that could sustain biology. “Typically, the physical and the biological worlds are stitched together outside, and it’s really difficult to unstitch them, understand the dynamics and stitch them back together,” Adams says. Experiments such as LEO permit this ecological dissection. While having clear implications for understanding off-world habitats, Troch says, insights from this work could also aid the restoration of some of Earth’s most degraded ecosystems. “Between space and ground activities, we are trying to solve the same problems,” says Daniele Laurini, ESA’s head of exploration systems. Comprehending Earth, however, is paramount. “If we can’t understand [Earth’s] systems—those we live on and among and depend on—how can we think that we’re ever going to re-create anything that’s going to support us?” Adams asks. Space tech certainly plays a key role and not just when it comes to life-support systems. After all, satellites have allowed us to watch the planet in remarkable detail over several decades, a game-changing tool for atmospheric and environmental scientists, Marvel says. But if we do not ensure Earth remains a livable world for many—a crisis we can already capably address—what would be the point in aiming for the stars? We may want to produce oxygen to breathe on Mars and grow salads to eat on the moon, but “Earth does all these things for us” already, Massa says. Perhaps, she speculates, the troubles of living in space might make people better appreciate the things we take for granted back home.

### Conflict Turn

#### 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.

#### Competition in space increases cooperation and decreases conflict.

Cobb 20 [Whitman, Cobb, Wendy N.. Privatizing Peace : How Commerce Can Reduce Conflict in Space, Taylor & Francis Group, 2020. ProQuest Ebook Central, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/marlboroughschool-ebooks/detail.action?docID=6228909>.] CT

The value of competition

As noted in the first chapter, a subsidiary argument offered here is that, even if a space race should break out, military or civilian in nature, competition is not necessarily a bad thing. Much of the technological development noted previously that arose from space investment came at the height of the space race as both the US and the USSR were pouring billions of dollars into a race to the moon. The race itself had a civilian face with a military undertone, but its benefits were on the whole, positive. No overt military conflict arose, there was a significant investment in research, development, and technology, and the two space powers realized that they needed some sort of international framework to preserve their ability to operate in space. Both of these elements continue to be present today.

First, the increased threat of conflict in space could, coming as it does with an increased number of public and private actors and a greater economic threat, impress upon space participants the need to reign in dangerous actions and rhetoric. While it took an atmospheric nuclear test on the part of the Soviets to encourage both the US and USSR to come to the table in the 1960s, increasing awareness of economic and military dependence and the consequences arising from conflict in space could increase the enthusiasm to pursue new international agreements. For its part, the US military increasingly recognizes the dangers and the need to mitigate them, however, mitigation efforts have largely concentrated on offensive rather than defensive capabilities. 59 A focus on offensive weapons can only aggravate the situation and there are still significant technological hurdles in developing on-orbit offensive weapons. As such, a move away from such rhetoric, like Johnson-Freese argues for, is necessary.

Competition can also increase technological capabilities and those technological capabilities can in turn enable cooperation.

### Multilat

#### Their card does not say p3 is the only way to invigorate multilat. THE OTHER EXAMPLE IS A PRIVATE COMPANY. Marlborough reads yellow:

Smith ’18 [Milton, Air Force Academy graduate with a doctorate in air and space law, Skip is a former Air Force JAG who held several significant leadership positions during his Air Force career, including director of space law at Space Command and chief of air and space law for the Air Force. He also served in Geneva as the legal advisor of the 50-person U.S. Delegation at the ITU Conference on the Geostationary Satellite Orbit. A past chair of the Colorado Space Business Roundtable, Skip is on the board of the International Institute of Space Law. He has served as an adjunct professor of space law at the University of Colorado Law School, the George Washington University Law School, and currently teaches commercial space law at the University of Denver Law School. Regarded as a leader in the field, Skip has received numerous honors, including the Lifetime Achievement Award from the International Institute of Space Law. Skip was selected to author the United States chapter in the inaugural edition of the “Space Law Review,” a series published by The Law Reviews. He is the author of six space-related law review articles and of a book on the international regulation of satellite communication. Skip speaks nationally and internationally on commercial space law issues., “Op-ed | P3 or not P3: What can space ventures learn from terrestrial infrastructure projects?”, 04-19-2018, Space News, https://spacenews.com/op-ed-p3-or-not-p3-what-can-space-ventures-learn-from-terrestrial-infrastructure-projects/]//pranav

P3s for space projects, however, have generally been fairly simple agreements involving one public entity and one private entity. Future large space activities such as privatizing the International Space Station and establishing a cislunar Deep Space Gateway and a base on the moon, will require far more complex contractual arrangements and international participation. International participation is best exemplified by the ISS. The program has a complex legal structure based on an intergovernmental agreement signed by the government partners, four memoranda of understanding between NASA and other cooperating space agencies, and numerous bilateral implementing arrangements between space agencies. In many respects, the ISS has been a tremendous success and it is now facing issues of what to do next. Privatization using a P3 structure is one option. Another example: Sierra Nevada Corp. has teamed with the UN Office for Outer Space Affairs in a type of international P3 where the Dream Chaser spaceplane will be used by countries to fly payloads or experiments. Mark Sirangelo, executive vice president of SNC Space Systems stated: “The benefits of a joint mission between government and private organizations on a level of this scale is incalculable.” Hopefully, it will open up the space arena to many governments otherwise unable to participate. As space activities and investments mature, we must look to industries like construction and finance for lessons on major P3 projects. All involve large sums of capital and allocation of risk. To have people living and working in space will take P3 leverage of the government budget with commercial collaboration. In evaluating P3s, the space industry should carefully review P3 experience on many large infrastructure projects and evaluate best practices and lessons learned. Typical infrastructure P3 projects have included airports, toll roads, higher education facilities, water projects, telecommunications, energy and utilities. Europe, Canada and Australia have outpaced the United States in their use of P3s for infrastructure projects. The largest P3 project is the Channel Tunnel between England and France, now known as the Eurotunnel. It cost about $25 billion, took eight years to build, and was financed by private debt and sales of shares in a private company formed to build and maintain the tunnel under a long-term management contract. Although the project experienced significant financing problems during construction, it has certainly provided great benefit. The U.S. is catching up and is turning more toward P3s for infrastructure projects because of the limited availability of federal, state and local government funding for necessary projects. The Trump administration infrastructure plan released in February outlines many new incentives and initiatives to facilitate $1.5 trillion in infrastructure investment over a 10-year period. Bootstrapping a $200 billion federal investment into $1.5 trillion will be challenging. The plan seeks to accomplish this by using investment from state and local governments, other public agencies, and substantial private investment including P3s. If P3s can help remedy vast infrastructure problems, perhaps P3s can also accomplish wonders for space projects, particularly if there is international support. A full P3 project involves a partnership among all phases of a project from design-build construction and finance to operations and maintenance. Developing an equitable allocation of risks among partners over many decades is probably the most challenging task. Thanks to the vast number of P3 projects around the world, there has been considerable analysis of the various types of P3 projects. The commonly recognized P3 best practices generally include things such as: appropriately preparing, creating a shared vision, understanding the partners, clarifying long-term risks and rewards, establishing effective decision-making processes, negotiating fair and reasonable contracts that will withstand decades of implementation, and finding the right champion. That last one can be the most difficult since large projects tend to take many years to plan and implement. Politicians and administrators often have a limited shelf life. Policies, including National Space Policies, often change with new administrations.

#### Government sector will inevitably militarize space

**Shamas & Holden, 2019**, Victor Shamas &, Oslo Metropolitan University, Work Research Institute (AFI), Oslo, Norway; Thomas Holden, Independent scholar, Oslo, Norway, 2019, Palgrave Communications, One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space, https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9

On the other hand**, outer space still remains firmly within the domain of the state and is likely to do so for the foreseeable future, with the likely continued importance of military uses of satellite technology and the weaponization of Earth’s orbit**—crucially, the Outer Space Treaty only prohibits nuclear arms and other ‘weapons of mass destruction' in space, not conventional weapons, such as ballistic missiles.

#### Multilateralism can’t stop conflict

Bordachev 13 (Timofei, Doctor of Political Science, is the Director of the Center for Comprehensive International and European Studies at the Higher School of Economics, “Political Tsunami Hits Hard,” 6/30, http://eng.globalaffairs.ru/number/Political-Tsunami-Hits-Hard-16054)

The financial crisis in the United States, which in 2008 went global, and the continuing efforts by countries around the world to fight its effects have highlighted four most important tendencies in international affairs. First, pretty obvious is the conflict between the growing economic unity of the world and its worsening political fragmentation. The rise of sovereign ambitions and attempts to address all problems at the national level has come into conflict with financial and economic globalization and exacerbates crisis trends. Second, democratization in international politics and greater independence of individual states play an ever greater role. This “in-depth unfreezing” for the first time manifested itself in China’s soaring global ambitions and in the national interests and requests of other Asian countries. Turkey, a stable ally of the West in NATO and a EU aspirant waiting patiently in the antechamber, is trying on the guise of a regional power ever more often. In the meantime, the need for taking into account the ever larger range of opinions quickly erodes the international institutions that emerged in the Cold War era. This is seen not just in the sphere of security: the United Nations efficiency has largely fallen victim to the first phase of the global geopolitical catastrophe of the 1990s. Third, the growing international weight of the new countries and attempts by the old-timers, who won the Cold War, to preserve the hard-won status quo bring back the conservative interpretations of such terms as “sovereignty” and “sovereign rights.” Not only the leaders of new-comers to world politics, or the United States, traditionally concerned about its sovereignty, but quite respectable heads of European states, too, start talking about the protection of national interests. Finally, military power is ever more frequently employed by major powers as a tool to address foreign policy issues. EU countries and the United States used force and threats to use force back at the time when they were getting their hands on the assets of the former USSR. However, they were faced with a very limited set of tasks then. It never occurred to anyone in the West to say in 1999 that the purpose of NATO’s operation against Yugoslavia was to force Slobodan Milosevic to resign or, still worse, to put him to death by some untraditional way of hanging. The need for using military force with or without reason merely confirms that the international community has no other means to prevent the emergence or escalation of conflicts.

#### States will always act in their own interests

Gray 7 (Colin S. Gray, Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies within the Department of Politics and International Relations at the University of Reading, 6/11/07, War, Peace, and International Relations, p. 277)

What is known with confidence about this most vital, yet variable, condition known as peace? Strategic history suggests strongly that peace cannot be constructed by means of institutional engineering. Such construction can be useful to polities that wish to use it. Institutions and procedures that facilitate communication, perhaps improve mutual understanding, and provide mechanisms for interstate arbitration have roles to play on behalf of order. But those roles will be fulfilled only when the political players are prepared to negotiate and compromise. There is nothing magically transformative about participation in international institutions. States, as well as other security communities that generally are not represented in the UN, frequently prefer to act unilaterally, or with allies, in defence of their vital interests. In most of those situations, international political architecture and its norms and procedures can be of only limited value for international order. The existence of the UN facilitates multinational efforts to contain, limit and even halt a war, should the belligerent parties agree to be contained, limited and prevented from fighting to a finish. The story was the same for the Concert System in the nineteenth century and the League of Nations in the twentieth. The functioning of such institutions must reflect their political contexts. They have been as helpful for international order as their leading members would permit. An international institution constructed to advance the prospects for good order and peace can be used or abused on behalf of disorder and war. States can behave in the UN in such a way as to block decisions for collective action to suppress disorderly behaviour. International institutions, with the UN as the prime example, cannot themselves contribute in a vital way to a more orderly world. Rather, they should be viewed as the faithful products of world order and disorder. States determined to cooperate will use the good offices and fora of those institutions. States determined upon conflict will use them as an arena for propaganda and coalition-building and, if need be, will employ their rules to paralyse the international community. Michael Howard explains why world peace cannot be constructed by the invention, or reform, of institutions: The establishment of a global peaceful order thus depends on the creation of a world community sharing the characteristics that make possible domestic order, and this will require the widest possible diffusion of those characteristics by the societies that already possess them. World order cannot be created simply by building international institutions and organizations that do not arise naturally out of the cultural disposition and historical experience of their members. Their creation and operation require at the very least the existence of a transnational elite that not only shares the same cultural norms but can render those norms acceptable within their own societies and can where necessary persuade their colleagues to agree to the modifications necessary to make them acceptable. (Howard, 2001: 105) This is a fair summary of historical experience. Just as peace cannot be constructed by ingenious institution-building, nor can it be mandated by law, custom or norms. When obedience to those restraints is predicted to work towards results sharply contrary to states’ national interests, they will be ignored.

#### Multilateralism fails—*diverging interests* and a *lack of faith* guarantee cooperation is at best superficial

Heribert Dieter 14, Senior Associate at the German Institute for International and Security Affairs, Non-Resident Senior Fellow, Chongyang Institute for Financial Studies, Visiting Professor for International Political Economy at Zeppelin University, Doctorate in Political Science and Economics, Free University of Berlin, 1/31/14, The G-20 and the Dilemma of Asymmetric Sovereignty – Why Multilateralism Is Failing in Crisis Prevention, International Relations and Security Network, <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/Digital-Library/Articles/Detail/?lng=en&id=176145>

Yet, tightening the rules for financial market regulation is not the only field where the G-20 is failing. Despite the mantra-like repetition of memoranda of understanding, the trade ministers of the G-20 have not been able to overcome their conflicts of interest and reach a settlement in the Doha Round of the World Trade Organization (WTO). What are the reasons for this failure?Although the G-20 managed to prevent a revival of protectionist measures on a broad front in the midst of the crisis, there is a large gap between the announcements of the G-20 and quantifiable results in trade policy. There is not one final communiqué that lacks a clear statement stressing the importance of the WTO and the necessity to conclude the Doha Round. Nonetheless, the reality of trade policy looks very different. All the states that are preventing the conclusion of the Doha Round through their vetoes are members of the G-20.

Despite there being little public information available on the reasons for the deadlock in the Doha Round, it is known that the US, Brazil, and China are blocking its conclusion. The emerging economies Brazil and China oppose the US’s demand for the complete elimination of tariffs on industrial goods. Conversely, the US resists the request to comprehensively abandon subsidies to the agricultural sector.Thus, the Doha Round is not concluded because three important members of the G-20 no longer believe in multilateral solutions and would rather engage in preferential agreements. For experts in the field of international trade, this is a paradox. There is a broad consensus that a single rulebook for international trade would facilitate economic growth and contribute to a worldwide increase in prosperity. This, however, cannot be said for the currently popular free trade agreements. So why are the countries in the G-20 incapable of further developing the common rules for international trade? One explanation is the lack of a hegemonic power that is willing to guarantee compliance with the rules of the game, but at the same time establish a system that provides member countries with sufficient economic benefits. In any event, this is how the postwar economy emerged: The US enforced the system of Bretton Woods and made sure that the participation in this economic regime remained attractive. Of course, the Bretton Woods regime never was a truly global system, since member countries of the Council on Mutual Economic Assistance did not participate. Still, within the bipolar order of the Cold War, the US managed to keep the system open and stable.¶ After the collapse of the USSR and the following short-lived “unipolar moment” (Charles Krauthammer) of complete hegemony of the US, the multilateral order was being advanced until 1995, the founding year of the WTO. Since the turn of the millennium and the parallel emergence of a multipolar order, nearly all attempts to organize cooperation without hegemony (Bob Keohane) have failed. The present multipolar world is characterized by superficial cooperation. Global Governance, whether in policies to prevent further climate change or in economic policy, remains on hold. Even worse: The world is returning to regulation on the level of the nation-state and non-cooperation. The American political scientist Ian Bremmer refers to the resulting situation as “G-Zero,” an era in which groups such as the G-20 will no longer play a vital role. The negative perception of the international division of labor¶ Apparently, there is no such thing as an identity of interests of individual states, as assumed by the advocates of global regulation and global governance. In other words: The gap between the preferences of individual states is widening rather than narrowing. However, governments must respect the preferences of their societies in the formulation of policies if they do not wish to lose legitimacy. Then again, the different preferences of societies are the immediate result of severely diverging perceptions of the international division of labor. Even in the G-20, individual societies have very different perceptions of the effects of globalization and its economic effects.¶ In Europe and the US, many people are increasingly critical of the international division of labor, if not outright hostile to globalization. According to a number of surveys, only about one-fifth to one-third of the respondents in OECD countries see greater opportunities than risks in globalization. Even in Germany, numerous politicians and citizens have been critical of globalization, although Germany strongly benefits from open markets and the resulting intensification of international trade.¶ Without a political anchoring in the member states, the G-20 has no future¶ The unfavorable perceptions of globalization and the outlined asymmetric sovereignty have resulted in a standstill in the G-20. Instead of a further development of the multilateral order, at best the status quo will be preserved. This is why we can expect nothing substantial – at least in terms of economic policy and financial regulation – from the G-20 summit in St. Petersburg on September 5 and 6. The structural impediments to successful financial regulation and trade policies on a supranational level cannot be overcome by the heads of government and state of the G-20. At least there is some hope in those areas where the countries of the G-20 have identical interests. This applies primarily to measures to close down tax loopholes. In 2008, ambitious expectations of a comprehensive reorganization of international trade relations through the G-20 were raised. Unfortunately, the G-20 cannot and will not deliver on crisis prevention. Today, more modest goals will have to be set. The key obstacle to success in the further development of global rules in trade and finance can be found in the G-20 societies themselves. Perceptions about globalization need to be addressed by policy makers at the national level, as do the widespread reservations about the international division of labor in the OECD countries. If societies continue to show diverging preferences, the development of comprehensive global economic governance in the G-20 will be all but impossible.

### Space war

#### No space war and terrestrial conflict turns it

Luke Penn-Hall 15, Analyst at The Cipher Brief, M.A. from the Johns Hopkins School for Advanced International Studies, B.A. in International Relations and Religious Studies from Claremont McKenna College, “5 Reasons “Space War” Isn’t As Scary As It Sounds”, The Cipher Brief, 8/18/2015, https://www.thecipherbrief.com/article/5-reasons-%E2%80%9Cspace-war%E2%80%9D-isn%E2%80%99t-scary-it-sounds

The U.S. depends heavily on military and commercial satellites. If a less satellite-dependent opponent launched an anti-satellite (ASAT) attack, it would have far greater impact on the U.S. than the attacker. However, it’s not as simple as that – for the following reasons: 1. An ASAT attack would likely be part of a larger, terrestrial attack. An attack on space assets would be no different than an attack on territory or other assets on earth. This means that no space war would stay limited to space. An ASAT campaign would be part of a larger conventional military conflict that would play out on earth. 2. Every country with ASAT capabilities also needs satellites. While the United States is the most dependent on military satellites, most other countries need satellites to participate in the global economy. All countries that have the technical ability to play in this space – the U.S., Russia, China and India - also have a vested interest in preventing the militarization of space and protecting their own satellites. If any of those countries were to attack U.S. satellites, it would likely hurt them far more than it would hurt the United States. 3. Destruction of satellites could create a damaging chain reaction. Scientists warn that the violent destruction of satellites could result in an effect called an ablation cascade. High-velocity debris from a destroyed satellite could crash into other satellites and create more high-velocity debris. If an ablation cascade were to occur, it could render certain orbital levels completely unusable for centuries. 4. Any country that threatened access to space would threaten the global economy. Even if a full-blown ablation cascade didn’t occur, an ASAT campaign would cause debris, making operating in space more hazardous. The global economy relies on satellites and any disruption of operations would be met with worldwide disapproval and severe economic ramifications. 5. International Prohibits the Use of ASAT Weapons. Several international treaties expressly prohibit signatory nations from attacking other countries’ space assets. It is generally accepted that space should be treated as a global common area, rather than a military domain. While it remains necessary for military planners to create contingency plans for a, space war it is a highly unlikely scenario. All involved parties are incentivized against attacking. However, if a space war did occur, it would be part of a larger conflict on Earth. Those concerned about the potential for war in space should be more concerned about the potential for war, period.

#### No Russia escalation or miscalc

Simon Saradzhyan 19, MPA from Harvard University, Founding Director of Russia Matters, Assistant Director of the U.S.-Russia Initiative to Prevent Nuclear Terrorism at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, “How High Is Risk of Nuclear War Between Russia and US?”, Russia Matters – Blog of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard University, 8/6/2019, https://www.russiamatters.org/blog/how-high-risk-nuclear-war-between-russia-and-us

The scenario Moniz and Nunn outline is not without contestable points. For instance, even if Russia’s early warning system—which includes not only over-the-horizon Daryal and Voronezh radar systems, but also satellites—issues a false alert due to a cyber-attack, Russia’s S-400 and other air defense systems’ radars would remain functioning. These radars, which operate independently of Russia’s System of Warning of Missile Attack (SPRN), are capable of detecting targets up to 600 kilometers away, which would enable their crews to verify if an air attack is evolving east of Berlin or Warsaw. As important, neither of the scenarios for use of nuclear weapons, which are described in Russia’s current military doctrine, align with Moniz’s and Nunn’s scenario. The 2014 document states that “the Russian Federation shall reserve the right to use nuclear weapons” in two scenarios (or a combination of the two). One is “in response to the use of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction against it and/or its allies.” The other is “the event of aggression against the Russian Federation with the use of conventional weapons when the very existence of the state is in jeopardy.” The scenario Moniz and Nunn describe does not feature use of weapons of mass destruction by NATO against Russia or its allies, nor can NATO air strikes on the Kaliningrad exclave, located more than 900 kilometers away from Moscow, qualify as a situation that jeopardizes the very existence of the Russian state. In fact, the authors themselves point out that the proposition that Russia plans to use nukes for purposes of “escalating to de-escalate” is “often denied by Russian officials and academics.” Russian experts are not the only ones who are skeptical of the de-escalation proposition. For instance, Dr. Olga Oliker, one of America’s leading experts on Russian nuclear posture, has presented evidence showing why Russia’s so-called de-escalation strategy is likely a “non-existent problem.” Also, if we were to define risk as a combination of probability and consequences, then the latter would have been graver in the 1980s, when the combined number of U.S. and Russian nuclear weapons peaked, according to the Federation of American Scientists.

#### No miscalc or escalation

James Pavur 19, Professor of Computer Science Department of Computer Science at Oxford University and Ivan Martinovic, DPhil Researcher Cybersecurity Centre for Doctoral Training at Oxford University, “The Cyber-ASAT: On the Impact of Cyber Weapons in Outer Space”, 2019 11th International Conference on Cyber Conflict: Silent Battle T. Minárik, S. Alatalu, S. Biondi, M. Signoretti, I. Tolga, G. Visky (Eds.), <https://ccdcoe.org/uploads/2019/06/Art_12_The-Cyber-ASAT.pdf>

A. Limited Accessibility Space is difficult. Over 60 years have passed since the first Sputnik launch and only nine countries (ten including the EU) have orbital launch capabilities. Moreover, a launch programme alone does not guarantee the resources and precision required to operate a meaningful ASAT capability. Given this, one possible reason why space wars have not broken out is simply because only the US has ever had the ability to fight one [21, p. 402], [22, pp. 419–420]. Although launch technology may become cheaper and easier, it is unclear to what extent these advances will be distributed among presently non-spacefaring nations. Limited access to orbit necessarily reduces the scenarios which could plausibly escalate to ASAT usage. Only major conflicts between the handful of states with ‘space club’ membership could be considered possible flashpoints. Even then, the fragility of an attacker’s own space assets creates de-escalatory pressures due to the deterrent effect of retaliation. Since the earliest days of the space race, dominant powers have recognized this dynamic and demonstrated an inclination towards de-escalatory space strategies [23]. B. Attributable Norms There also exists a long-standing normative framework favouring the peaceful use of space. The effectiveness of this regime, centred around the Outer Space Treaty (OST), is highly contentious and many have pointed out its serious legal and political shortcomings [24]–[26]. Nevertheless, this status quo framework has somehow supported over six decades of relative peace in orbit. Over these six decades, norms have become deeply ingrained into the way states describe and perceive space weaponization. This de facto codification was dramatically demonstrated in 2005 when the US found itself on the short end of a 160-1 UN vote after opposing a non-binding resolution on space weaponization. Although states have occasionally pushed the boundaries of these norms, this has typically occurred through incremental legal re-interpretation rather than outright opposition [27]. Even the most notable incidents, such as the 2007-2008 US and Chinese ASAT demonstrations, were couched in rhetoric from both the norm violators and defenders, depicting space as a peaceful global commons [27, p. 56]. Altogether, this suggests that states perceive real costs to breaking this normative tradition and may even moderate their behaviours accordingly. One further factor supporting this norms regime is the high degree of attributability surrounding ASAT weapons. For kinetic ASAT technology, plausible deniability and stealth are essentially impossible. The literally explosive act of launching a rocket cannot evade detection and, if used offensively, retaliation. This imposes high diplomatic costs on ASAT usage and testing, particularly during peacetime. C. Environmental Interdependence A third stabilizing force relates to the orbital debris consequences of ASATs. China’s 2007 ASAT demonstration was the largest debris-generating event in history, as the targeted satellite dissipated into thousands of dangerous debris particles [28, p. 4]. Since debris particles are indiscriminate and unpredictable, they often threaten the attacker’s own space assets [22, p. 420]. This is compounded by Kessler syndrome, a phenomenon whereby orbital debris ‘breeds’ as large pieces of debris collide and disintegrate. As space debris remains in orbit for hundreds of years, the cascade effect of an ASAT attack can constrain the attacker’s long-term use of space [29, pp. 295– 296]. Any state with kinetic ASAT capabilities will likely also operate satellites of its own, and they are necessarily exposed to this collateral damage threat. Space debris thus acts as a strong strategic deterrent to ASAT usage.