### 1

#### Interpretation: private entities is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend that the appropriation of outer space by a subset of private entities is unjust.

Nebel 19 Jake Nebel [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs.] , 8-12-2019, "Genericity on the Standardized Tests Resolution," Briefly, https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/08/12/genericity-on-the-standardized-tests-resolution/ SM

Both distinctions are important. Generic resolutions can’t be affirmed by specifying particular instances. But, since generics tolerate exceptions, plan-inclusive counterplans (PICs) do not negate generic resolutions. Bare plurals are typically used to express generic generalizations. But there are two important things to keep in mind. First, generic generalizations are also often expressed via other means (e.g., definite singulars, indefinite singulars, and bare singulars). Second, and more importantly for present purposes, bare plurals can also be used to express existential generalizations. For example, “Birds are singing outside my window” is true just in case there are some birds singing outside my window; it doesn’t require birds in general to be singing outside my window. So, what about “colleges and universities,” “standardized tests,” and “undergraduate admissions decisions”? Are they generic or existential bare plurals? On other topics I have taken great pains to point out that their bare plurals are generic—because, well, they are. On this topic, though, I think the answer is a bit more nuanced. Let’s see why. 1.1 “Colleges and Universities” “Colleges and universities” is a generic bare plural. I don’t think this claim should require any argument, when you think about it, but here are a few reasons. First, ask yourself, honestly, whether the following speech sounds good to you: “Eight colleges and universities—namely, those in the Ivy League—ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions. Maybe other colleges and universities ought to consider them, but not the Ivies. Therefore, in the United States, colleges and universities ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions.” That is obviously not a valid argument: the conclusion does not follow. Anyone who sincerely believes that it is valid argument is, to be charitable, deeply confused. But the inference above would be good if “colleges and universities” in the resolution were existential. By way of contrast: “Eight birds are singing outside my window. Maybe lots of birds aren’t singing outside my window, but eight birds are. Therefore, birds are singing outside my window.” Since the bare plural “birds” in the conclusion gets an existential reading, the conclusion follows from the premise that eight birds are singing outside my window: “eight” entails “some.” If the resolution were existential with respect to “colleges and universities,” then the Ivy League argument above would be a valid inference. Since it’s not a valid inference, “colleges and universities” must be a generic bare plural. Second, “colleges and universities” fails the upward-entailment test for existential uses of bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Lima beans are on my plate.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some lima beans on my plate. One test of this is that it entails the more general sentence, “Beans are on my plate.” Now consider the sentence, “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” (To isolate “colleges and universities,” I’ve eliminated the other bare plurals in the resolution; it cannot plausibly be generic in the isolated case but existential in the resolution.) This sentence does not entail the more general statement that educational institutions ought not consider the SAT. This shows that “colleges and universities” is generic, because it fails the upward-entailment test for existential bare plurals. Third, “colleges and universities” fails the adverb of quantification test for existential bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Dogs are barking outside my window.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some dogs barking outside my window. One test of this appeals to the drastic change of meaning caused by inserting any adverb of quantification (e.g., always, sometimes, generally, often, seldom, never, ever). You cannot add any such adverb into the sentence without drastically changing its meaning. To apply this test to the resolution, let’s again isolate the bare plural subject: “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” Adding generally (“Colleges and universities generally ought not consider the SAT”) or ever (“Colleges and universities ought not ever consider the SAT”) result in comparatively minor changes of meaning. (Note that this test doesn’t require there to be no change of meaning and doesn’t have to work for every adverb of quantification.) This strongly suggests what we already know: that “colleges and universities” is generic rather than existential in the resolution. Fourth, it is extremely unlikely that the topic committee would have written the resolution with the existential interpretation of “colleges and universities” in mind. If they intended the existential interpretation, they would have added explicit existential quantifiers like “some.” No such addition would be necessary or expected for the generic interpretation since generics lack explicit quantifiers by default. The topic committee’s likely intentions are not decisive, but they strongly suggest that the generic interpretation is correct, since it’s prima facie unlikely that a committee charged with writing a sentence to be debated would be so badly mistaken about what their sentence means (which they would be if they intended the existential interpretation). The committee, moreover, does not write resolutions for the 0.1 percent of debaters who debate on the national circuit; they write resolutions, at least in large part, to be debated by the vast majority of students on the vast majority of circuits, who would take the resolution to be (pretty obviously, I’d imagine) generic with respect to “colleges and universities,” given its face-value meaning and standard expectations about what LD resolutions tend to mean.

#### It applies to private entities:

#### Upward entailment test – spec fails the upward entailment test because saying that one company’s appropriation is bad does not entail that all companies’ appropriation is bad

#### Adverb test – adding “usually” to the res doesn’t substantially change its meaning

#### Vote neg:

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

#### 2] Limits—specifying a type of appropriation offers huge explosion in the topic since they get permutations of hundreds of governments, specific companies, and different sectors in the world.

#### 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

#### Hypothetical neg abuse doesn’t justify aff abuse, and theory checks cheaty CPs

#### No RVIs—it’s their burden to be topical.

### 2

#### 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.

### 3

#### Current law is not a barrier to space settlement.

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

Existing Legal Framework for Space Colonies

In 1967, the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (OST) entered into force.43 This document, which is over 50 years old, was drafted when space issues were very different, yet it is still the primary binding international law on space activities. The OST places several limitations on potential colonization; however, it does not forbid the activity.

The first hurdle to a potential colony is Article II of the OST. “Outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means.”44 One could argue that this would prevent any colonization. In fact, some do just that. Attorney Michael Listner, who founded Space Law and Policy Solutions, views this article as a non-starter for colonization efforts. “When a private citizen makes a claim to private, real property, basically, that’s saying the United States is making a claim as well, because of that continuing jurisdiction, the U.S. government always has.”45 The publication theoutline.com, relying on an interview with Listner,took this one step further, arguing that this means “any base or settlement on Mars would have to be free to use by anyone who can travel there. A person can’t just set up a colony, claim independence, and create rules that restrict access to it.”46 However, Lister’s interpretation is incorrect as it is too strict an interpretation of the language. Theoutline.com appears to take the interpretation to an untenable conclusion that is not supported by the evidence. Even though this position is not credible, it is important to discuss because as the United States moves towards colonization, it will face similar criticisms from opponents. Article II of the OST was not written to ban establishing a colony on a celestial body. Instead it was written to prevent a country from claiming a celestial body, such as the moon, as their own sovereign territory. This more permissive interpretation is supported by other provisions of the OST.

The OST contains language that supports establishing colonies. Article IV, while generally a prohibitive Article, states, “The use of any equipment or facility necessary for peaceful exploration of the Moon and other celestial bodies shall also not be prohibited.”47 If this leaves any doubt, Article XII likely clears up the confusion.

All stations, installations, equipment and space vehicles on the Moon and other celestial bodies shall be open to representatives of other States Parties to the Treaty on a basis of reciprocity. Such representatives shall give reasonable advance notice of a projected visit, in order that appropriate consultations may be held and that maximum precautions may be taken to assure safety and to avoid interference with normal operations in the facility to be visited.48

This Article establishes two important facts under the treaty. First, space colonization is acceptable under the OST. A colony easily fits within the definition of a station or installation. Quite simply, if the drafters of the OST intended to prevent States from establishing colonies, they would have most certainly done so in uncertain terms. Second, a State can establish a colony either unilaterally, or with a selected group of international partners. The visits discussed in Article XII would not be necessary if every colony needed to be open to the international community. This also eviscerates claims like those cited by theoutline.com, discussed above. If any colony were open to any party that could reach it, the visits by representatives in Article XII would be nonsensical. Looking at these details in the language of the entire treaty is important, because without it, one could argue that Article I in the OST would prevent a State from establishing a colony. If a space colony established by a single State would deny other states free access to an area of a celestial body (namely the area where the colony is established), then facilities would be banned outright. However, Article XII directly undercuts this weak argument.

It is important to note that the OST equally applies to commercial entities. Private corporations are currently leading the way in planning for space colonization. A company that did not sign, or even exist when the OST was signed, is still bound by its provisions. Article VI establishes that these entities have to conform to the treaty, and more importantly that “the appropriate State Party to the Treaty” must both authorize and supervise these companies. 49 While not binding, the United Nations has spoken on the matter.

Space activities should require authorization by a competent national authority; such authority or authorities, as well as the conditions and procedures for granting, modifying, suspending and revoking the authorization, should be set out clearly within the regulatory framework; States might employ specific procedures for the licensing and/or for the authorization of different kinds of space activities.”50

These two citations together indicate that the United States must authorize and supervise the activities of commercial companies operating in space. If those activities include colonization, then legislation must appropriately supervise it.

#### But, non-appropriation makes space settlement impossible.

Kerkonian 17 [Aram Daniel Kerkonian (Institute of Air and Space Law Faculty of Law, McGill University Montréal, Quebec), “The Legal Aspects of Permanent Human Settlement on Celestial Bodies,” A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Masters of Laws (LLM) (Oct 2017). <https://escholarship.mcgill.ca/downloads/tq57nt396>] CT

Article II prohibits the appropriation of outer space, simultaneously limiting and preserving the rights afforded under Article I: States are limited from claiming ownership or securing property rights in space thereby preserving for all other States the general freedom to use and explore. As the “non-appropriation” principle, Article II prevents an entity from claiming ownership over a particular spot in space, a plot of land on a celestial body or even an orbit around a moon151; while exploration and use are permitted, ownership is prohibited. Therefore, regardless of the scope of use or degree of reliance on a particular phenomenon of outer space, an entity cannot claim an individual benefit permanently. As a result, the USSR could not claim the orbit in which Sputnik made its maiden voyage152, the USA could not claim the Sea of Tranquility as its territory after planting its flag on the Moon153 nor could the equatorial countries exclude others from using the geostationary orbit located approximately 36,000 km above their territories154.

Although the OST does not define “appropriation” 155, the prohibition outlined in Article II must be understood to limit not only explicit claims of property or ownership but also, what can be called, “appropriation by action” – an activity that, without ever claiming to do so, appropriates outer space through its indirect consequences. An appropriate understanding of appropriation, therefore, becomes vital when determining whether proposed new and emerging technologies (such as permanent human settlement or space mining) may appropriate outer space, in one way or another, without ever claiming to do so.156 Although a truly meaningful investigation into the definition of appropriation is outside the scope of this thesis, moving forward without a useful conceptualization would be imprudent; therefore, a brief investigation into the drafting parties’ motivations for including the non-appropriation principle is warranted.

During Article II’s deliberations, many State representatives announced their support of the non-appropriation principle as a way of ensuring space activities would not undermine the general objectives of the OST (that outer space serve the interest of all States and not just the State undertaking a particular activity). Specifically, there was a desire that outer space not devolve into another domain of exploitation and imperialism, as had the New World and Africa during the fifteenth through nineteenth centuries.157 As Judge Manfred Lachs reminds: “Need one recall how frequently the practices of dividing and disposing of lands and whole continents led to conflict and strife? The lesson should have been learnt.”158 Indeed, for many of the negotiating parties the lesson had been learned. Rather poignantly, the years in which such space-related discussions were taking place were also a period of great decolonization and independence, with States acutely aware and hyper-prescient of the consequences of imperialism.

Since there is no evidence that space harbours other life forms, some have argued that mimicking the imperialism of the past in space would not result in harm as it did on Earth. What must be remembered, however, is that imperialism generates great inequality aside from the fact that it often subjugates certain classes. Ambitious territorial landgrabs in space, currently only possible for developed space-faring States, would cement economic advantages far into the cosmos and further exacerbate the inequality amongst nations on Earth. This will be the case regardless of whether alien civilizations exist. There is no question that space affords humanity great opportunity – what is questionable is how such opportunity will be distributed.159 Prohibiting appropriation was one method chosen by the negotiating parties to ensure the satisfaction of the OST’s underlying objective that space activities benefit all of humanity and not simply those with exploitative capabilities.160

The appropriation of outer space, therefore, can be accomplished by an activity that results in the same kinds of consequences as private ownership – exclusive use, profiting, unilateral decision making, etc. While such characteristics are necessarily true of certain activities (such as orbital positions 161), they are temporary and often available for someone else to use nearly simultaneously. A human settlement, with its notable permanence in a particular location, is neither temporary nor can it be used by multiple users concurrently – once established, its location will be restricted to other users.162 The general argument that space is vast (and so a single settlement site will not reduce the available real estate or subsequent users can simply choose another suitable site) undercuts the reality that space, while expansive, offers certain irreplaceable advantages depending on location.163 Notwithstanding, any realistic permanent human settlement will necessarily require affixing its structures to the ground, thereby appropriating that specific area in favour of the structure’s owner. In discussing this position, Judge Lachs reiterates that all activities in space ought to be for the benefit of all countries and Dr. Nicolas Matte draws the conclusion that: “moveable objects ‘attached to celestial bodies become immovables’, which grants the State to which they belong a right to the ‘soil’ of celestial bodies or at least a right to the surface’. Thus it is contended that ‘we arrive at an ownership… by technical and industrial occupation, without giving it a name.”164 Both Judge Lachs and Dr. Matte warned against State appropriation of celestial bodies to avoid the ever-present conflicts on Earth caused by similar situations.

In an attempt to get around this prohibition on national appropriation, some private enterprise proponents developed a nuanced argument focussing on the inclusion of the word “national” to claim that private, non-governmental entities were not prohibited from appropriating outer space and celestial bodies.165 Indeed, a plain language, straightforward reading of Article II suggests that since only national sovereignty is listed as a prohibited ground, other forms of appropriation may be permitted. Notwithstanding that Article VI makes it clear that States are responsible for their private entities’ space activities (thus if a private entity claimed sovereignty, their State would be responsible and thereby violate Article II), most delegates participating in the negotiations of Article II were of the opinion that it prohibited both public and private appropriation.166 This remains the consensus today.167 Plainly, the appropriation of outer space by private entities would have similar consequences as State appropriation – imperialistic exploitation conducted by SpaceX is still imperialistic exploitation. Therefore, arguments that claim private entities can appropriate outer space are legally invalid.

The conclusion, therefore, seems to be that any permanent human settlement would necessarily appropriate the celestial body upon which it is located and therefore violate Article II. Although there is no denying that States or private entities can establish stations or installations in space, the intention and permanence of the structures may give rise to an activity that violates international law.168 However, if the settlement activity were undertaken in a particular manner (as will be explored more thoroughly in Chapter 165 “ 3, an interpretation of Article II, in light of the object and purpose of the overall treaty, may justify its violation.

#### **Ukrainian companies are working technology that is key to lunar basing. UATV 19**

UATV, 19 - ("Will Ukraine Build a Lunar Lander?," 11/20/19, accessed 2-6-2022, https://uatv.ua/en/will-ukraine-make-lunar-lander/)//ML

With both nations and private companies announcing plans to build permanent Moon bases in the near future, Ukrainian rocket company Yuzhnoye wants to build a lunar lander-hopper to scout out a good spot.¶ Yuzhnoye showed off a one-fifth scale model of its planned lunar lander-hopper at this year’s [Dubai Airshow](https://www.bbc.com/news/business-50422795) – which started last Sunday (Nov. 17) and will continue until Thursday (Nov.21).¶ Were a full-scale – 1,715 kilogram (without payload) model – successfully developed, Yuzhnoye says it would be able to do quite a lot of stuff.¶ The primary thing Yuzhnoye is offering is a vehicle that could actually land on the moon. While that may seem like a given for a so-called “lander,” in fact, it’s no small feat.¶ This year, both the private Israeli company [SpaceIL](https://eng.uatv.ua/beresheet-spacecraft-crashes-moon/) and the [Indian government](https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/chandrayaan-3-plans-indicate-failures-in-chandrayaan-2/articleshow/72128771.cms) tried and failed to land on the moon. However, the Dnipro-based Yuzhnoye Design Office, which was born in the Soviet Union and used to make intercontinental ballistic missiles during the Cold War, can market its deep history in the rocket and satellite business.¶ Beyond landing, its partly solar-powered design could carry a variety of scientific instruments such as a camera that could shoot panoramic photographs of the moon using different spectrums of light – a feature invaluable for scientists attempting to understand the composition of the materials the lunar lander-hopper would observe. It would also be able to drill into Moon regolith, the dusty layer of materials on the moon’s surface. It could measure radiation levels, lunar soil gases, and search for ice – likely a necessary feature for lunar settlement.¶ Furthermore, using Yuzhnoye’s RD840 engines, the vehicle would also be able to travel across the moon via an up-to-20-kilometer “hop.”¶ Whether the space industry will kick off in Ukraine remains to be seen, but if newly-elected Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky has his way, then it will. In October, at a meeting with Brazilian President Jair Bolsonaro in Japan, [Zelensky raised the prospect of reigniting stalled plans](https://eng.uatv.ua/ukraine-help-brazil-develop-get-space/) -where Yuzhnoye would partner with Brazil to build rockets that could launch satellites from Brazil’s Alcantara Launch Center, which, being near the equator is an ideal spot for launching geostationary satellites.

#### Ukraine is cooperating over building a lunar base

Illia Ponomarenko., 20 - (journalist for kyiv post, "Ukraine joins NASA's Moon colonization project," KyivPost, Nov. 13, 2020, accessed 2-6-2022, https://www.kyivpost.com/technology/ukraine-joins-nasas-moon-colonization-project.html)//ML

Ukraine’s National Space Agency has signed an agreement to join the NASA-led space exploration and colonization project Artemis, becoming the ninth nation to join the international endeavor to get humans back to the Moon by 2024.¶ By signing up, Ukraine agreed to respect the program’s strictly peaceful nature. Additionally, the Artemis activities must be carried out in a transparent way, and all participants are obliged to seek full interoperability of their technologies, to share newly-gained scientific data, and to render all available assistance in case of emergencies, the Ukrainian Space Agency said early on Nov. 13.¶ Joining the $35-billion, U.S.-led and -funded program was among the top priorities for the Ukrainian Space Agency’s director, Volodymyr Usov.¶ [In an interview with the Kyiv Post in April](https://www.kyivpost.com/ukraine-politics/space-agency-head-we-have-3-years-to-save-ukraine-as-space-exploring-nation.html), he said that Ukrainian engineers at the Dnipro-based Pivdenne design bureau were ready to introduce a lunar industrial base project as well as numerous technological solutions for lunar orbital stations and transport communications between the Moon’s surface, orbital stations, and the Earth.¶ In August, the Ukrainian Space Agency also [joined the Moon Village, an international project to popularize lunar exploration and colonization](https://www.kyivpost.com/ukraine-politics/ukraine-joins-international-moon-exploration-project.html).¶ “This is important for Ukraine,” Usov was quoted as saying on Nov. 13. “Because we will be able to get our own projects running in cooperation with the world’s top space agencies… Ukrainian projects have already become part of a global plan of Moon colonization by the International Space Exploration Coordination Group (a NASA-led forum of over 20 national space agencies).”¶ “And in a logical way, we want to continue exercising our scientific potential as part of the Artemis project.”¶ The Artemis program was launched in 2017 with the ultimate goal of completing a piloted landing on the Moon’s south pole region. If successful, the project would bring astronauts to the Earth’s natural satellite for the first time since the completion of the Apollo program in 1972.¶ In the longer run, the project is expected to establish the first constant habitable base on the Moon, which could be a launchpad for piloted spaceflights to Mars.

#### **Space Settlement is coming now and prevents inevitable extinction. Settlement requires private industry and rule of law.**

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

Why the United States Needs to Think About Space Colonization Now

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

#### **An extinction event is inevitable, unpredictable, and the risk is growing. Space settlement is the only solution and it requires a thriving private space industry including orbital installations, mining, and tourism.**

Hertzler and Rench 16 [Kevin Hertzler and Rebecca McCauley Rench (PhD), “GLOBAL EXTINCTION or a Space-Industrial Complex,” Potomac Institute for Policy Studies (2016). <https://www.potomacinstitute.org/steps/images/PDF/Articles/HertzlerSTEPS_2016Issue3.pdf>] CT

Yet, the bigger existential threat of annihilation of all humanity, by nuclear holocaust or natural forces, is currently considered too remote to be taken seriously. The geological record has preserved the rise and decline of many species throughout earth’s history, whether their extinctions were the result of asteroid impacts, volcanic activity, solar flares, or gamma ray bursts from distant star systems. To think humanity above the historical trends of the universe is conceited and illogical. Perhaps it is time to reconsider the annihilation threat and to entertain the need for an off-Earth sustainable colony.

Humanity might not get a second chance at survival. The idea of an extinction event has long been fuel for science fiction writers, and is exemplified in the novel by Neal Stephenson entitled Seveneves. 3 In Seveneves, humanity will be wiped out on Earth within two years unless nations collaborate to put a small group of astronauts and scientists on the International Space Station in hopes they survive and repopulate the planet. Science fiction has been known to become science fact, both in ways that are beneficial to society, and in ways that have negative consequences. A study of threats and a dystopian future is also inculcated into academia, with Niklas Bostrom, the founder of the “Future of Humanity Institute,” as a recognized leader. While the risk in any given year might be quite small, there is almost certainly an eventual global extinction event. With a growing population and the speed of destructive technological advancements, the annual risk of humanity’s downfall may be increasing. When the inevitable is presented as a certain future, or happens before we can react, what will be humanity’s last collective thought? Given our current technological prowess, perhaps the time to take action is now. During a Wall Street Journal All Things Digital conference,4 Elon Musk said:

Either we spread Earth to other planets, or we risk going extinct. An extinction event is inevitable and we’re increasingly doing ourselves in.

World renown physicist Steven Hawking agrees and recently told a gathering at the Big Think:5

I believe that the long-term future of the human race must be in space. It will be difficult enough to avoid disaster on planet Earth in the next hundred years, let alone the next thousand, or million. The human race shouldn’t have all its eggs in one basket, or on one planet. Let’s hope we can avoid dropping the basket until we have spread the load.

The timing and the nature of this event remains truly unknown. Predictions suggest an existential event may come from space or be the product of our own hand, but we will likely remain ignorant of the cause until its near arrival. What we do know is that if humanity is still inhabiting only one planet, our unique life stories will be tragically and permanently erased. Thus, we confront the realization of the likelihood of a global extinction event that we have absolutely no control over, that we currently have no defense for, and no plans to escape from. We are deluded into believing that since an extinction event is rare, it can not occur in our lifetime. Consider the attitude expressed in the Jet Propulsion Laboratory’s Near Earth Object program’s website6 which states:

On an average of every several hundred thousand years or so, asteroids larger than a kilometer could cause global disasters … No one should be overly concerned about an Earth impact of an asteroid or comet. The threat to any one person from auto accidents, disease, other natural disasters and a variety of other problems is much higher than the threat from [Near Earth Objects] NEOs. Over long periods of time, however, the chances of the Earth being impacted are not negligible so that some form of NEO insurance is warranted. At the moment, our best insurance rests with the NEO scientists and their efforts to first find these objects and then track their motions into the future. We need to first find them, then keep an eye on them.

However, what will our response be if we find an NEO larger than a kilometer that is on a collision course with Earth? A database is not an insurance policy and leaves open the issue of an appropriate response. Currently, our only real hope lies with mitigation strategies predicated on intercepting7 or redirecting8 NEO objects. The former suggests using a robotic spacecraft that is weighted or carries a nuclear explosive and the latter will redirect the NEO object with a robotic spacecraft. However, as NASA states in their “Asteroid and Comet Watch” website9 a response requires decades of warning time if the NEO object is larger that a few hundred meters.

We needed Sputnik to motivate our resolve for the domination of space. The mental contrast of one day dreaming about space travel through science fiction, and then seeing it live on television in the living room, stimulated our imaginations. President Kennedy’s speech inspired a nation and the decade-long pursuit that saw a surge in academic scholarship and technological advances. There are many technologies and spinoffs10 woven into the fabric of the world culture that owe their birth to that speech and subsequent technology development.

Can we expect the development of a humanity insurance policy before a crisis begins? It might require funding of NASA at levels similar to the 1960s, when we successfully landed men on the moon. It might require the development of a space-industrial complex that could help drive future economic growth. It might require that we spread out to other planets and achieve Earth independence to stave off global human extinction, even on our watch. It does require that we take the threat, and its inevitability, seriously and devote resources to preventing our extinction.

The ancient seafarers were motivated to take risks for the sake of curiosity and the desire for exploration and resources.11 The drive to leave the planet and set up colonies is similar: There is the allure, the curiosity, the adventure, and the insurance. It could, and should, be an international effort justified based on the purpose of planning for the preservation of humanity.

Certain plans are underway. Mars One is a nonprofit organization that promotes its plans for a Mars settlement within fifteen years.12 Elon Musk’s company SpaceX is reportedly developing plans to send large numbers of people to Mars.13 And NASA recently released a comprehensive strategy14 that leverages nearterm space activities with a comprehensive capability development culminating in an independent human presence on Mars. The NASA plan, at a minimum, would provide a future with a sustainable presence for humanity in deep space and provide an answer to many global extinction scenarios. Some of these plans are more logistically feasible than others, but all demonstrate the ambition of a select sect of humanity interested in pursuing off-Earth colonization. This strategy is well reasoned and has the potential to save humanity as well as provide a much needed economic boost by creating a space-industrial complex with the nascent private-public partnerships15 for mining asteroids, manufacturing propellant on the moon, creating fuel depots, and launching humans into space. The spinoff technologies would fuel real job growth as evidenced by the Apollo program of the 1960s. Rather than a short lived event to win a space race, this modern space age will be designed as a sustained effort in human space colonization. The current roadblocks preventing this strategy from moving forward are budgets, political priorities, and the changeable public interests; the exact same denouement of the moon landings over 40 years ago. An article posted on the Washington Post website by Joel Achenbach made the following observation:16

At the moment NASA can’t even get an astronaut to the International Space Station without buying a seat on a Russian rocket. A new NASA space capsule that was conceived in 2005 likely won’t be ready until 2023, according to NASA’s latest estimate, and it’s built for 21-day missions, not for trips to Mars.

The same article quotes Doug Cooke, a former NASA associate administrator as saying:

There needs to be more of a plan for actually getting there [Mars]. You can’t have a flatline budget indefinitely and think you’re going to put all of this together by 2030.

We must support the mission of human space exploration and colonization with both our interests as well as our national budget priorities if we want any hope of surviving the inevitable existential global extinction event.

## Case

#### No solvency—all of their internal links are to arms sales for Ukrainian military equipment, not

#### Vote neg on presumption—none of their ev is about appropriation

### Adv 1

#### 1] No US or NoKo strike – neither side can advantageously escalate

Friedman 3/5/19 [George Friedman, founder and chairman of Geopolitical Futures, U.S. geopolitical forecaster, and strategist on international affairs. After Hanoi: North Korea, the US and Japan. March 3, 2019. <https://www.realclearworld.com/articles/2019/03/05/after_hanoi_north_korea_the_us_and_japan_112981.html>]

The Hanoi talks ended in deadlock. Both sides – represented by U.S. President Donald Trump and North Korean leader Kim Jong Un – showed their anger by refusing to shake hands. The media labeled the talks a failure. But I’ve been involved in a number of negotiations in my life, and I see this as a normal part of the process. At some point, all parties will take positions designed to test the other side’s hunger for a deal, and prudent negotiators know that showing hunger can be devastating. So, ending the negotiation, particularly with a show of anger, is routine. At the same time, mutual rejection can be genuine, and now each side is trying to figure out how serious the other is. Establishing that you are prepared to walk away from the table is important – but sometimes the deal falls apart as a result.

Where Things Stand

War with North Korea is not a good option for the U.S. There’s the danger of artillery fire close to Seoul, the uncertainty of the location of North Korea’s nuclear weapons, and the U.S. aversion to the idea of getting bogged down in another war this century. North Korea, on the other hand, knows that one thing that would trigger a U.S. pre-emptive nuclear strike would be to develop weapons that can reach the U.S., and it wants to avoid such a strike at all costs. So, this failed negotiation leaves a reality in which war is not likely, giving both sides room for obstinacy.

#### 3] No North Korean threat—Kim’s rational and their ev’s biased

Jonathan C. **Jobe, Ph.d. 19**, of Crescent Valley, is a retired educator and a veteran of the U.S. Air Force., “COLUMN: North Korea not a threat unless threatened”, <https://www.duncanbanner.com/oklahoma/opinion/column-north-korea-not-a-threat-unless-threatened/article_a63c250b-c8a1-5e8b-8875-177fa577ff56.html>. Rez

In point of fact, the threat from North Korea is more a fabrication by those who think we should always be at war with someone (anyone) and constantly threatening other countries as the basis for our foreign policy.

North Korea may be somewhat of a threat to Japan and South Korea and China and Russia, but **is not a threat of any kind to the** **U**nited **S**tates.

The **North Koreans are very backward militarily and politically**, and are different from the South Koreans only because China and the U.S. drew a line more or less along the 38th parallel and called it a day in 1954 after three years of bloody war, rather than continue to fight and slaughter hundreds of thousands more Chinese troops at a time.

And unlike all of the “experts” on Korea who have never lived there or even met a Korean in person, I lived in South Korea for three years, traveled in North Korea as part of a South Korean diplomatic contingent, and also married into the Korean aristocracy. Of course, that doesn’t make me an expert on Korea, either, but it does give me some factual basis and background for my opinions on the country.

The first thing you need to understand about North and South Korea is that it is, and always has been, a single country, with a single people, speaking a single language – and had a single history prior to the Korean War. And every South Korean had relatives living in North Korea for two reasons.

First, the Korean peninsula has been more or less unified since about 1900, when the Japanese invaded the country and occupied it until they were ejected by the U.S. in 1945. Before that, there existed three separate kingdoms on the peninsula that were closely affiliated. Then, for the brief period from 1945 to 1950, it was a free country with aspirations to become Westernized and democratic. China was unable to allow that, and tried to annex it by force in 1950.

The other reason every South Korean has relatives in the North is because when the Korean War was ending, everyone in the North who was able fled southward to avoid living under the thumb of Mao and the Communist Chinese. Families were divided and have until recently not even been able to speak to each other, much less meet and spend time with their relatives. So there is no incentive for the North to attack t

he South or anyone else unless goaded into war by others. Of course, the North would love to annex the South, just as China annexed Hong Kong and for the same economic reasons: Democracy breeds wealth and plenty for a society, while Communism must rely on taking and redistributing what others have earned.

In sum, North Korea only poses a threat when threatened, and for that reason will never agree to relinquish its nuclear weapons. Kim saw what happened to Gaddafi in Libya when that leader gave up his nuclear program, and has no intention of being murdered by his own subjects the same way that Gaddafi was.

### Adv 2

#### 1] Biden thumps – he backs down to Russia and hasn’t even sent Ukraine military aid

Lake 12/17 Eli Lake (Eli Lake is a columnist covering national security and foreign policy. He was the senior national security correspondent for the Daily Beast and covered national security and intelligence for the Washington Times, the New York Sun and UPI.), 12-17-2021, "Who’s Appeasing Putin Now?," Bloomberg, <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2021-12-17/who-s-appeasing-putin-now-biden-policy-on-ukraine-shows-weakness> mvp

Eleven months into Biden’s presidency, that harder line has yet to emerge. In the current crisis in Ukraine, for example, Biden and his administration have told Putin that there will be devastating sanctions if he orders the troops amassed on Ukraine’s border to invade. At the same time, Biden has invited Putin to a NATO summit to air his grievances about the alliance he seeks to break apart. The Biden administration has also sent mixed messages on whether Ukraine should give separatists in the Donbas region special political status before Russia withdraws its forces and dismantles the illegal armed groups it created during its first invasion of Ukraine in 2014.

Another aspect of Biden’s policy is that coercive measures against Russia are proposed as a consequence only if it invades. This makes Putin’s destabilizing troop buildup on Ukraine’s border essentially cost-free. Biden still hasn’t used his congressionally mandated authority to send up to $200 million in military aid to Ukraine, an authority that exists for just this type of an emergency. Last week a group of Democratic House lawmakers urged the White House to tap this fund.

The Biden administration has also declined to enforce significant sanctions against the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, which would bypass Ukraine and provide natural gas directly to Germany, depriving the struggling Ukrainian country of a critical source of revenue and a hedge against Russian belligerence. The U.S. has hinted that such sanctions would be enforced if there were an invasion, but for now Russia has a path to securing one of Putin’s strategic priorities.

The lack of action has caught the attention of Ukraine President Volodymyr Zelenskiy. “It is important to have sanctions applied before, rather than after, the conflict would happen,” he told reporters this week. “If they were applied after the conflict would happen, this would basically make them meaningless.”

Biden’s approach to Russia is part of a pattern. Consider the lack of response to Russia’s hack earlier this year of the Colonial oil

pipeline, which led to gasoline shortages across the U.S. Biden warned Putin that the U.S. would respond if Russian hackers targeted critical infrastructure again, but did not respond to the pipeline hack itself.

Biden also appeased Russia during the U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan. Initially, the U.S. wanted counterterrorism agreements with Afghanistan’s neighbors, such as Uzbekistan and Tajikistan. But Russia instructed those governments to decline to meet with the U.S., leading the Biden administration to pursue a counterterrorism partnership with Russia instead. This is a tacit acknowledgement of Putin’s claim to hold dominion over the republics that were once part of the Soviet Union.

Alina Polyokova, the president and CEO of the Center for European Policy Analysis, told me that while she has been pleased with some of the recent rhetoric from the administration, many of her interlocutors in Eastern Europe are shocked that Biden has not pursued a more hawkish policy against Russia. “A lot of this is revealing that much of the criticism of Russia from the Democratic side was because of Trump and doesn’t reflect policy,” she said.

This presents a political crisis for Democrats, in addition to the strategic crisis in Ukraine. For four years, Democrats portrayed themselves as a party of Russia hawks, in contrast to a president they saw as Putin’s lackey. But since Biden came into office, his administration has stopped enforcing major sanctions on Russia’s pipeline to Germany, held off on punishing Russian hacks of critical infrastructure and now seeks to deter a Russian invasion of Ukraine with threats alone.

Some might call that appeasement. Others might say Biden’s presidency so far has been a gift to Vladimir Putin.

#### 2] No Russian action in Ukraine now – they view geopolitical costs and perceived reactions as too high – the Plan reverses that by signaling a lessened stance.

Chausovsky 21 Eugene Chausovsky 12-27-2021 "How Russia Decides When to Invade" <https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/12/27/how-russia-decides-when-to-invade/> (Eugene Chausovsky is a nonresident fellow at the Newlines Institute. Chausovsky previously served as senior Eurasia analyst at the geopolitical analysis firm Stratfor for more than 10 years. His work focuses on political, economic, and security issues pertaining to Russia, Eurasia, and the Middle East.)//Elmer

The world is looking fearfully at the Russian-Ukrainian border and for good reason. Russia has amassed some 120,000 troops on the border, and fighting along the line of contact between Moscow-backed separatists and Ukraine’s security forces has intensified in recent days. Signs at the top are no better. The Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs released a draft proposal on Dec. 17 detailing security guarantees between Russia and the United States that explicitly draws a red line on NATO’s expansion eastward to Ukraine and other former Soviet states, and Russian President Vladimir Putin issued an ominous warning on Dec. 21 of a “military-technical” response to what he deemed as “aggressive” measures by the West. U.S. and other Western officials have already deemed many of Russia’s proposals “unacceptable,” though the urgency of the situation has spurred plans for security talks between the United States and Russia in January. While many have tried to read the tea leaves and psychoanalyze Russian President Vladimir Putin as to whether or not he will actually make the decision to invade Ukraine, there is a broader structural framework for understanding and anticipating Russian military interventions in the post-Soviet space that can perhaps be a more useful guide. Despite all the hard words from Moscow, Russia’s record shows that an invasion is unlikely. What specific objectives would Putin have in launching an invasion? The answer to this question must be rooted in Russia’s geopolitical imperatives, which frame all manners of Moscow’s decision-making. Russia’s primary imperatives are domestic political consolidation on the homefront, protecting itself from external threats (whether that be from neighbors or global powers), and expanding its influence both regionally—especially in the countries of the former Soviet Union—and beyond to the extent possible. The expansion of NATO to the former Soviet bloc thus violates a key imperative for Russia, which leaves Moscow feeling fundamentally insecure both from neighboring countries that join the bloc and the external powers—primarily the United States—that support them. While Russia was too weak to stop NATO expansion into Central Europe and the Baltic states in the 1990s and early 2000s, Moscow was willing to go to war in Georgia in 2008 and subsequently in Ukraine in 2014 to stop this from happening. But even this decision was not taken lightly or indiscriminately by the Kremlin, which brings us back to the framework on Russian military interventions. In its decision-making process on whether to intervene militarily in the former Soviet sphere, Russia’s calculus uses a strategic framework that rests primarily on five variables: 1) a trigger; 2) local support; 3) anticipated military reaction; 4) technical feasibility; and 5) relatively low anticipated political and economic costs, especially when it comes to nonmilitary responses to invasion such as sanctions or diplomatic restrictions. If any one of these conditions is insufficient or nonexistent, then Russia is unlikely to intervene militarily, even within the former Soviet space. If all these factors are present, there is a much higher likelihood for a Russian military intervention. And if Russia gambles wrong, it pays a very high cost.