# 1AC

## Truth Testing

**The role of the ballot is to determine the truth or falsity of the resolution.**

**[1] Linguistics – five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true. That outweighs – a) Controls the internal link to predictability and prep which is key for clash and substantive education b) Key to jurisdiction since the judge can only endorse what is within their burden.**

#### [2] Every statement is a question of truth – for example, saying “the res is false” is the same as saying, “it is true that the res is false.” That means other ROTBs collapse to truth testing.

## Advocacy

#### I affirm, resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

#### Appropriation:

Merriam Webster No Date Merriam Webster, dictionary, "Definition of APPROPRIATION,” no date, Merriam Webster, accessed 26 December 2021, pg. 1, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/appropriation

an act or instance of appropriating something

#### **And to appropriate:**

Merriam Webster No Date Merriam Webster, dictionary, "Definition of APPROPRIATE,” no date, Merriam Webster, accessed 26 December 2021, pg. 1, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/appropriate

to take exclusive possession of

#### Outer space:

Oxford Languages No Date Oxford Languages, dictionary, “outer space,” no date, Google, accessed 27 December 2021, pg. 1, <https://www.google.com/search?q=define+outer+space&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS909US909&oq=define+outer+space&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j0i22i30l6j0i390l3.1588j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8>

the physical universe beyond the earth's atmosphere.

## Framework

#### The value is justice as per the resolution, defined as giving each their due.

#### Ethics are derived from practical reason instead of a posteriori knowledge.

#### [1] Is-ought gap – we can only perceive what is, not what ought to be. For example, if I witness someone being punched, I can’t conclude it’s bad just from the knowledge that they are punched; I need prior justification.

#### [2] Reason is the highest moral authority because a) ability to reason is what defines a moral agent b) trying to find a way to escape reason requires the use of reason, conceding that it is valid.

**[3] Epistemology – all arguments appeal to reason; otherwise, they are baseless, so reason is a constraint on evaluating their arguments.**

**[4] Infinite regress – we can always ask “why should I follow this framework,” leading to infinite regress, but asking for a reason for reason concedes its authority.**

**[5] Action theory – action is infinitely divisible. For example, the action of brewing tea could be broken into many small actions. The actions can’t be moral or immoral since it would be infinitely divisible, but intention to brew tea unifies action.**

#### All actions must pass the test of universalizability, which means that an action cannot logically contradict itself.

#### [1] Law of non-contradiction – 2 + 2 = 4 for any reasoner. Acting recognizes the validity of others to take the action, which makes universal maxims a logical side constraint to other frameworks.

**[2] Arbitrariness – absent universal ethics, morality is subjective because it relies on individual interpretation of morality instead of concrete rules, making it useless.**

**Thus, the standard is consistency with universal maxims.**

#### Prefer additionally:

**[1] Performativity – freedom is key to argumentation. Abiding by their ethical theory presupposes we own ourselves, making it incoherent to justify a standard without willing ours.**

**[2] Only my framework applies to justice.**

Miller 17 David Miller, Professor of Political Theory and Senior Research Fellow at the University of Oxford, "Justice," 26 June 2017, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed 26 December 2021, pg. 1, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/justice/#UtilJust> ~ST~

The third aspect of justice to which Justinian’s definition draws our attention is the connection between justice and the impartial and consistent application of rules – that is what the ‘constant and perpetual will’ part of the definition conveys. Justice is the opposite of arbitrariness. It requires that where two cases are relevantly alike, they should be treated in the same way (We discuss below the special case of justice and lotteries). Following a rule that specifies what is due to a person who has features X, Y, Z whenever such a person is encountered ensures this. And although the rule need not be unchangeable – perpetual in the literal sense – it must be relatively stable. This explains why justice is exemplified in the rule of law, where laws are understood as general rules impartially applied over time. Outside of the law itself, individuals and institutions that want to behave justly must mimic the law in certain ways (for instance, gathering reliable information about individual claimants, allowing for appeals against decisions).

#### [3] Predictions fail – policymakers are worse than monkeys.

Menand 05 Louis Menand, professor of English at Harvard University, “Everybody’s An Expert,” 27 November 2005, The New Yorker, accessed 7 September 2021, <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2005/12/05/everybodys-an-expert//> FSU SS recut

Tetlock is a psychologist—he teaches at Berkeley—and his conclusions are based on a long-term study that he began twenty years ago. He picked two hundred and eighty-four people who made their living “commenting or offering advice on political and economic trends,” and he started asking them to assess the probability that various things would or would not come to pass, both in the areas of the world in which they specialized and in areas about which they were not expert. Would there be a nonviolent end to apartheid in South Africa? Would Gorbachev be ousted in a coup? Would the United States go to war in the Persian Gulf? Would Canada disintegrate? (Many experts believed that it would, on the ground that Quebec would succeed in seceding.) And so on. By the end of the study, in 2003, the experts had made 82,361 forecasts. Tetlock also asked questions designed to determine how they reached their judgments, how they reacted when their predictions proved to be wrong, how they evaluated new information that did not support their views, and how they assessed the probability that rival theories and predictions were accurate. Tetlock got a statistical handle on his task by putting most of the forecasting questions into a “three possible futures” form. The respondents were asked to rate the probability of three alternative outcomes: the persistence of the status quo, more of something (political freedom, [e.g.] economic growth), or less of something (repression, [e.g.] recession). And he measured his experts on two dimensions: how good they were at guessing probabilities (did all the things they said had an x per cent chance of happening happen x per cent of the time?), and how accurate they were at predicting specific outcomes. The results were unimpressive. On the first scale, the experts performed worse than they would have if they had simply assigned an equal probability to all three outcomes—if they had given each possible future a thirty-three-per-cent chance of occurring. Human beings who spend their lives studying the state of the world, in other words, are poorer forecasters than dart-throwing monkeys, who would have distributed their picks evenly over the three choices.

#### Pre-emptively takes out frameworks based on consequences.

## Offense

#### [1] Private entities are bound by the Outer Space Treaty, which bans appropriation.

Van Eijk 20 Cristian Van Eijk, BA cum laude in International Justice and an LLM in Public International Law from Leiden University, “Sorry, Elon: Mars is not a legal vacuum – and it’s not yours, either,” 11 May 2020, Völkerrechtsblog, accessed 27 December 2021, Pg. 1, [https://voelkerrechtsblog.org/sorry-elon-mars-is-not-a-legal-vacuum-and-its-not-yours-either](https://voelkerrechtsblog.org/sorry-elon-mars-is-not-a-legal-vacuum-and-its-not-yours-either%20) TDI recut

OST article II: “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.”

OST article III: “States… shall carry on activities in the exploration and use of outer space, including (…) celestial bodies, in accordance with international law”.

SpaceX is a private entity, and is not bound by the Outer Space Treaty – but that does not mean it can opt out. Its actions in space could have consequences for the United States in three ways. First, the US, as SpaceX’s launch state, bears fault-based liability for injury or damage SpaceX’s space objects cause to other states’ persons or property (OST article VII, Liability Convention articles I, III). Second, the US, as SpaceX’s state of registry, is the sole state that retains jurisdiction and control over SpaceX objects (OST article VIII, Registration Convention article II). Both refer to objects in space and are irrelevant.

According to article VI OST, States “bear international responsibility for national activities in outer space”, including Mars, including those by “non-governmental entities”. The US, as SpaceX’s state of incorporation, must authorise and continuously supervise SpaceX’s actions in space to ensure compliance with the OST (OST article VI) and international law (OST article III). In practice, this task is done by the US Federal Communications Commission, which licenses and regulates SpaceX.

Article VI OST sets a specific rule of attribution, supplementing the customary rules of state responsibility (Stubbe 2017, pp. 85-104). SpaceX acts with US authorisation, and its conduct in space within and beyond that authorisation is attributable to the US (ARSIWA articles 5, 7). In the absence of circumstances precluding wrongfulness, the result is straightforward. If SpaceX breaches a US obligation under international law, the US bears responsibility for an internationally wrongful act.

The principle of non-appropriation

SpaceX risks breaching OST article II, the “cardinal rule” of space law (Tronchetti, 2007). This principle is a jus cogens norm (Hobe et al. 2009, pp. 255-6) establishing Mars as res communis, rather than terra nullius. I must acknowledge, with tongue firmly in cheek, that SpaceX is partly correct – states have no sovereignty on Mars. But that does not leave Mars a “free planet” up for grabs – SpaceX has no sovereignty either.

On plain reading, article II OST lacks clarity on two key points: i) whose claims are prohibited, and ii) what exactly constitutes a ‘claim of sovereignty’. The first has been answered; per the then-customary interpretative rules and travaux préparatoires, there is quite broad academic consensus (Hobe, et al. 2017; Tronchetti, 2007; Pershing, 2019; Cheney, 2009) that sovereign claims include those by private entities. This is consistent with OST article VI; private entities act in space with state authorisation, and thus state authority. It also accords with the law of state responsibility, wherein conduct of entities exercising state authority is attributable to the state, even if ultra vires (ARSIWA articles 5, 7).

The second issue is more complex. Much has been written on whether claims to space resources or space property (Nemitz v United States) are sovereign. In this case, the territorial claim is less clear; is establishing a jurisdiction a sovereign claim “by other means”? SpaceX purports not to create law horizontally via contract, but to establish the only law on Mars – a vertical structure endemic to sovereign legal orders. International caselaw on territorial acquisition agrees; sovereign acts include “legislative, administrative and quasi-judicial acts” (Case concerning sovereignty over Pulau Ligitan and Pulau Sipadan (Indonesia v. Malaysia), para 148; Decision regarding delimitation of the border between Eritrea and Ethiopia, para. 3.29) with the exercise of jurisdiction and local administration having “particular, probative value” (Minquiers and Ecrehos (France v. UK), p. 22). Also relevant are attempts to exclude other states’ jurisdiction (Island of Palmas (USA v. Netherlands), pp. 838-9). An attempt by SpaceX to prescribe its own jurisdiction on Mars would constitute a sovereign claim in breach of OST article II, and entail US responsibility for an internationally wrongful act.

#### Violating international contracts is non-universalizable.

Davis 91 Kevin R. Davis, researcher at East Central University, “Kantian ‘Publicity’ And Political Justice,” October 1991, History of Philosophy Quarterly, accessed 27 December 2021, Pg. 417, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27743995> TDI recut

Kant also gives examples from international politics to illustrate the application of the publicity principle. In these cases states themselves are conceived as rational agents who would object to unequal restrictions on their freedom. The first case involves the issue of promise-keeping between states. What if a state promises something to another state, but finds that the preservation of its own existence depends on not keeping the promise? Is it permitted to break the promise?

Again Kant answers -No. If a state (or its chief) publicizes this maxim, others would naturally avoid entering an alliance with it, or ally themselves with others so as to resist such pretensions. This proves that politics with all its cunning would defeat its purpose by candor; therefore, that maxim must be illegitimate.

The announcement is not publicly proclaimable because by so doing the state would make it impossible for its intention to be carried out. The agreement would never have been made had the other state known in advance that the first had no intention of keeping it. At least this is how the ideal rational agents must be thought to respond in Kant’s examples.

#### If everyone were to break a promise, the meaning of a promise would be nullified, and promises would therefore be nonexistent.

#### [2] Intelligible possession cannot be justified – the ability to prevent others’ usage of property is intrinsic to appropriation and violates their freedom since empirical possession is sufficient. For clarification, intelligible possession is exclusion of others’ usage even absent the current use of the owner, and empirical, or narrow, possession is exclusion only when the owner is using it.

Westphal 97 Kenneth R. Westphal, Professor of Philosophy at Boðaziçi Üniversitesi, PhD in Philosophy from Wisco, “Do Kant’s Principles Justify Property or Usufruct?,” 1997, Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik 5, accessed 28 December 2021, Pg. 144-160, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43593592> RE recut

The compatibility of possession with the freedom of everyone according to universal laws is not a trivial assumption even for the case of detention or “empirical” possession. Under conditions of extreme scarcity, anyone’s use of some vital thing precludes someone else’s equally vital use of that thing or of anything of its kind (given the condition of extreme relative scarcity). This is not quite to agree with Hume, that conditions of justice exclude both extreme scarcity and superabundance.32 But it is to recognize that he came close to an important insight: legitimate action requires sufficient abundance so that one person’s use (benefit) is not (at least not directly) someone else’s vital injury (deprivation). This is not merely to say that property is psychologically impossible in extreme scarcity because no one could respect it (per Hume); the point is that possession and perhaps even use are not, at least not obviously, legitimate under such conditions. (How Kant would propose to resolve the conflicting grounds of obligation in such circumstances, the duty to self-preservation versus the duty not to harm others’ life or liberty, I do not understand.)

The assumption that possession is compatible with the freedom of everyone according to universal laws [5] is even less trivial for the case of “intelligible” or “noumenal” possession, that is, possession without physical detention. The compatibility of intelligible possession with the freedom of everyone according to universal laws requires both sufficient resources so that the free use of something by one person is not as such the infringement of like freedom of another, and it requires that mere empirical or physical possession does not suffice to secure the innate right to freedom of overt (äußere) action. If physical possession did suffice to secure the innate right to overt action, Kant’s main ground of proof would entail no conclusion stronger than that rights of physical possession (detention) are legitimate. Furthermore, by assuming that noumenal possession is compatible with the freedom of everyone according to universal laws [5], Kant assumes rather than proves that possession without detention is permissible. However, this is precisely the point that needs to be proven! This issue remains central throughout the remainder of §2 and is addressed again in §3 below.

2.2.6 The previous section raises a very serious question about Kant’s justification of intelligible rights to possess and use (possessio). The questions about Kant’s supposed justification of property rights, the possibility of having things as one’s own (Eigentum, dominium), are even more acute. To derive such strong rights from Kant’s argument requires at least one of three assumptions. The first assumption would be that the sole relevant condition of use is proprietary ownership of things (cf. RL §1 ¶1); this assumption requires interpreting “Besitz” broadly. The second assumption would involve conflating the ownership of a right – viz., a right to use – with a right to property ownership. However, the legitimacy of neither of these assumptions is demonstrated by Kant’s argument in RL §2. Or it may be assumed, third, that Kant’s argument in §2 aims to prove, not merely rights to possession, but rights to property, insofar as it aims to prove a right to “arbitrary” (beliebigen) use, that is, the right to do whatever one pleases with something ([10]; cf. RL §7, 253.25–27), where this can include any of the rights involved in the further incidents of proprietary ownership. Reading Kant’s text in this way assimilates possessio to dominium by stressing Kant’s term “beliebigen”. So far as Kant’s literal statement is concerned, it is equally plausible to stress Kant’s term “Gebrauch” (use), which would restrict Kant’s argument to justifying possessio. Kant’s reductio ad absurdum argument assumes the contrapositive thesis that [it is not] altogether ... rightly in my power, i.e. it [is] not ... compatible with the freedom of everyone according to a universal law ([it is] wrong), to make use of [something which is physically within my power to use]. ([2], [1])

His argument then purports to derive a contradiction from this assumption. From this contradiction follows the negation of this assumption by disjunctive syllogism. Strictly speaking, what Kant’s argument (at best) proves is that it is indeed rightful to make use of things which in principle are within one’s power, provided (“obgleich ...”) that one ’s use is compatible with the freedom of everyone in accord with a universal law [5]. As mentioned, Kant’s argument assumes rather than proves that this assumption is correct. Kant must prove that this assumption is correct in order to prove his conclusion. This requires showing that possession and use of things (in their narrow, strict senses) is consistent with the freedom of everyone in accord with universal laws. That would justify rights to possessio. To justify the stronger rights to dominium requires showing that holding things in accord with the rights involved in the further incidents of property ownership is also consistent with the freedom of everyone in accord with universal laws. Because the rights involved in property ownership are not analytically, indeed are not necessarily, related, justifying dominium requires separate justification of each component right. But it also requires more than this. Insofar as these rights are supposed to be proven as a matter of natural right, these further rights cannot be instituted solely by convention. However, there are alternative packages of rights, both for kinds of property as well as for various weaker sets of rights to use, any of which can be formulated in ways that are consistent with the like freedom of everyone according to universal laws. Consequently, merely demonstrating the consistency of one or another of these sets of rights with the freedom of everyone according to universal laws suffices only to justify the permissibility of that set of rights.

It does not suffice to justify the obligation to respect that set of rights instead of any other such set of rights. This is to say, once alternative sets of rights are possible or permissible because they meet the sine qua non of consistency with the like freedom of everyone according to universal laws [5], Kant’s natural law grounds of proof do not suffice to justify an obligation to respect one particular set of rights among the range of possible, permissible alternatives. Consequently, interpreting Kant’s statement [10] by stressing “beliebigen”, using it to specify the scope of “Gebrauch”, can only lead to fallacious, question-begging interpretations of Kant’s argument. Consequently, it is strongly preferable to interpret Kant’s statement by stressing “Gebrauch”, and using it in its strict, narrow sense to specify the scope of “beliebigen”. (This parallels the case for interpreting “Besitz” narrowly instead of broadly.)

In sum, to use something legitimately it suffices to have a right to use it. That, in brief, is “possession” strictly speaking; in the narrow sense of the term, “possession” involves only the right of a qualified chose in possession. Since this condition suffices to fulfill the condition specified by Kant’s reductio argument, no stronger condition follows from Kant’s argument. One can have or “own” a right to use something without, of course, having property in that thing. Recall Honoré’s point that possession involves two claims: being in exclusive control and remaining in control by being free of unpermitted interference of others. Insofar as possession persists despite subsequent and continuing disuse, Kant’s proof does not demonstrate even a narrow right to possession. (This is why I speak of qualified choses in possession; one key qualification justified by Kant’s argument is that one’s right to use persists only so long as one’s legitimate need to use and regular use continue.) Moreover, aside from the prohibition on harmful use, Kant’s argument does not even address the other incidents of property ownership. If Kant’s primary assumption [5] can be justified, then Kant’s proof demonstrates at most three important conclusions: one has the right to use things one currently detains, one has the right to use any usable thing not previously (and hence currently) detained by others (provided one’s use does not infringe the like freedom of others), and one has the right to continue to use things so long as one’s need to use them and actions of using them continue. These are not trivial theses! However, because it does not prove the indefinite duration of possession, in the narrow sense, Kant’s proof of the (first version of the) Postulate of Practical Reason regarding Right is unsound. Kant’s further considerations in RL §6 suffer analogous weaknesses (see §§2.4f.).

#### [3] The rightful condition does not exist in space because the omnilateral will is unable to hinder a hinderance.

Rauscher 07 Frederick Rauscher, Professor of Philosophy at Michigan State University, "Kant’s Social and Political,” 24 July 2007, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, accessed 28 December 2021, Pg. 1, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-social-political/> ~ST~

The very existence of a state might seem to some as a limitation of freedom, since a state possesses power to control the external freedom of individual citizens through force. This is the basic claim of anarchism. Kant holds in contrast that the state is not an impediment to freedom but is the means for freedom. State action that is a hindrance to freedom can, when properly directed, support and maintain freedom if the state action is aimed at hindering actions that themselves would hinder the freedom of others. Given a subject’s action that would limit the freedom of another subject, the state may hinder the first subject to defend the second by “hindering a hindrance to freedom”. Such state coercion is compatible with the maximal freedom demanded in the principle of right because it does not reduce freedom but instead provides the necessary background conditions needed to secure freedom. The amount of freedom lost by the first subject through direct state coercion is equal to the amount gained by the second subject through lifting the hindrance to actions. State action sustains the maximal amount of freedom consistent with identical freedom for all without reducing it.

Freedom is not the only basis for principles underlying the state. In “Theory and Practice” Kant makes freedom the first of three principles (8:290):

The freedom of every member of the state as a human being.

The equality of each with every other as a subject.

The independence of every member of a commonwealth as a citizen.

Freedom as discussed in “Theory and Practice” stresses the autonomous right of all individuals to conceive of happiness in their own way. Interference with another’s freedom is understood as coercing the other to be happy as the former sees fit. The direct link to action comes when pursuing that autonomously chosen conception of happiness. Each may pursue happiness as they see fit provided that their pursuit does not infringe upon others’ similar pursuits.

Equality is not substantive but formal. Each member of the state is equal to every other member of the state before the law. Each has equal coercive right, that is, the right to invoke the power of the state to enforce the laws on one’s behalf. (Kant exempts the head of state from this equality, since the head of state cannot be coerced by anyone else). This formal equality is perfectly compatible with the inequality of members of the state in income, physical power, mental ability, possessions, etc. Further, this equality supports an equality of opportunity: every office or rank in the political structure must be open to all subjects without regard for any hereditary or similar restrictions.

#### Appropriation is unjust without the rightful condition – property is fundamentally social recognition.

Williams 77 Howard Williams, Professor of Law and Politics at Cardiff University, “Kant’s Concept of Property,” 1977, Oxford University Press, accessed 29 December 2021, Pg. 33-34, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2218926> ~ST~ brackets for clarity

Kant is making a sound point here. In saying that property is noumenal what he means is that it is not a fact accessible to empirical discovery. This is sound because the proposition that this is mine cannot be established in the same way as the proposition that this is green. Empirical observation, however systematic, would do little to clear up the problem. Kant perhaps senses here that property is not an object, but an institution which depends for its functioning on the observance of a certain system of rules. An individual cannot of himself establish a right to a thing, because a right consists of the public recognition of an existing or desired future state of affairs. Rights, and in particular property rights, must hold for others as well as oneself, or else they are not rights. Kant is remarkably clear on this point. Unfortunately, however, it is a point which he does not pursue at any length as he is more concerned to show how noumenal possession is possible than he is to discover in what it consists.

Now if such a proposition permitting noumenal possession were possible, Kant argues, taking possession of a certain part of the earth’s surface would be an act of arbitrary will (Willkur) without being an usurpation. The possessor would base[d] his act, Kant argues, on our innate common possession of the earth’s surface and on the a priori General Will corresponding to that common possession (359/57) permitting private property. But although this meant that the use of the earth would be open to all (without distinction) it did not mean that it had been so from nature or originally. It is Kant’s view, therefore, that private ownership cannot be free of, or prior to, all legal acts.

## Advantage

#### If they read a consequentialist framework, here’s why you should still affirm under their framework:

#### Space exploration is a shared goal – privatization threatens US-Russia relations.

CSIS 18 Center for Strategic and International Studies, Policy Think Tank., "Space for Cooperation?," 21 August 2018, CSIS, accessed 4 January 2022, Pg. 1, <https://www.csis.org/blogs/post-soviet-post/space-cooperation> TDI

U.S.-Russian space cooperation continues to be a stated mutual goal. In April 2018, President Putin said of space, “Thank God, this field of activity is not being influenced by problems in politics. Therefore, I hope that everything will develop, since it is in the interests of everyone…This is a sphere that unites people. I hope it will continue to be this way.” During his statement at a recent event at CSIS, NASA Administrator Jim Bridenstine said, “[space] is our best opportunity to dialogue when everything else falls apart. We’ve got American astronauts and Russian cosmonauts dependent on each other on the International Space Station, which enables us to ultimately maintain that dialogue.” The U.S. and Russia both benefit from the ISS partnership. Russia provides transportation to the ISS for U.S. astronauts, from which Russia receives an average of $81 million per seat on the Soyuz (and recognition of its status as a space power). The U.S. also benefits from Russia’s technical contributions to the ISS while Russia benefits The U.S. and Russia signed a joint statement in 2017 in support of the idea of collaborating on deep space exploration, including the construction of the Lunar Orbital Platform-Gateway, a research-focused space station orbiting the moon. Through agreements on civilian space exploration, such as the Lunar Orbital Platform-Gateway or future Mars projects, that have clear benefits to both sides, some degree of cooperation will remain in both countries’ interest. The high price tag for pursuing space exploration alone and opportunities for sharing and receiving technical expertise encourages international partnerships like the ISS.

However, at least three factors, apart from the overall deterioration of U.S.-Russia relations, threaten this cooperation. First, growth of the private sector space industry may alter the economic arrangement between the U.S. and Russia, and ultimately lower the benefits of cooperation to both countries. The development of advanced technologies by private companies will give NASA new options to choose from and reduce the need to depend on (and negotiate with) Russia. If NASA and its Russian counterpart, Roskosmos, have no need to talk with one another, they probably won’t in the face of tense political relations. The U.S. intends to use Boeing and SpaceX capsules for human spaceflight beginning in 2020, and a Congressional plan in 2016 set a phase out date of Russian RD-180 rocket engines by 2022.

#### Ukraine puts us on the brink of war – private appropriation is the scapegoat.

Detsch and Gramer 2/11/22 Jack Detsch, Pentagon and national security reporter at Foreign Policy, and Robbie Gramer, diplomacy and national security reporter at Foreign Policy, "White House Warns Russian Invasion of Ukraine Could be Imminent," 11 February 2022, Foreign Policy, accessed 11 February 2022, Pg. 1, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2022/02/11/russia-invasion-ukraine-imminent-white-house/> ~ST~

While National Security Advisor Jake Sullivan said that current U.S. intelligence did not indicate that Russian President Vladimir Putin had made the decision to invade—as some outlets reported earlier—he echoed public warnings from top administration officials that a further Russian invasion of Ukraine could begin any day now.

“Russia has all the forces it needs to conduct a major military action,” Sullivan told reporters from the White House podium on Friday. “Russia could choose in very short order to commence a major military action against Ukraine.”

Meanwhile, the United States has continued to take precautionary measures and has urged U.S. citizens who are still in Ukraine to leave immediately. Sullivan said that the Biden administration had instructed diplomats to continue to reduce the footprint of the U.S. Embassy in Kyiv. Some—but not all—U.S. allies have followed suit, based on intelligence assessments that Sullivan would not elaborate on in his briefing. The British Foreign Office issued a new alert on Friday advising all British nationals left in the country to leave “immediately.” Israel also is evacuating its embassy staff and diplomats’ families, and the European Union has encouraged nonessential diplomats to leave.

“We want to be crystal clear on this point: Any American in Ukraine should leave as soon as possible, and in any event, in the next 24 to 48 hours,” Sullivan told reporters. “No one would be able to count on air, road, or rail departures once military action got underway.” Nor would U.S. troops be going into a war zone to extract Americans who chose not to leave, Sullivan added. On Friday, the Biden administration approved the deployment of an additional 3,000 paratroopers from the 82nd Airborne Division to Poland, a senior defense official said, bringing the grand total of Pentagon deployments in the country to nearly 5,000 troops.

Sullivan said he expected that U.S. President Joe Biden would talk with Putin by telephone in the coming days. German Chancellor Olaf Scholz is set to meet Putin at the Kremlin on Tuesday. The Beijing Olympics are set to end on Feb. 20. In an ominous sign, top Russian officials have already indicated that they do not plan to attend the Munich Security Conference in Germany that starts on Feb. 18, a possible sign that Moscow sees a dead end in the diplomatic road after openly fuming at Western officials this week.

But as Foreign Policy previously reported, officials have indicated that Russia has continued to look for a pretext to launch a further invasion of Ukraine, such as a false flag operation to pin the blame on Ukrainians. Sullivan cautioned on Friday that the United States could not pinpoint the day or hour of a possible invasion.

#### That causes extinction.

Cotton-Barratt 17 Owen Cotton-Barratt, Ph.D. in Pure Mathematics from Oxford, Lecturer in Mathematics at Oxford, Research Associate at the Future of Humanity Institute, “Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance,” 3 February 2017, Future of Humanity Institute, accessed 4 January 2022, Pg. 7, <https://um.fi/documents/35732/48132/existential_risk_diplomacy_and_governance/6dcc5557-0a2d-709d-57a2-7e7784512115?t=1525645980997> TDI

The bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki demonstrated the unprecedented destructive power of nuclear weapons. However, even in an all-out nuclear war between the United States and Russia, despite horrific casualties, neither country’s population is likely to be completely destroyed by the direct effects of the blast, fire, and radiation.8 The aftermath could be much worse: the burning of flammable materials could send massive amounts of smoke into the atmosphere, which would absorb sunlight and cause sustained global cooling, severe ozone loss, and agricultural disruption – a nuclear winter.

According to one model 9, an all-out exchange of 4,000 weapons10 could lead to a drop in global temperatures of around 8°C, making it impossible to grow food for 4 to 5 years. This could leave some survivors in parts of Australia and New Zealand, but they would be in a very precarious situation and the threat of extinction from other sources would be great. An exchange on this scale is only possible between the US and Russia who have more than 90% of the world’s nuclear weapons, with stockpiles of around 4,500 warheads each, although many are not operationally deployed.11 Some models suggest that even a small regional nuclear war involving 100 nuclear weapons would produce a nuclear winter serious enough to put two billion people at risk of starvation,12 though this estimate might be pessimistic.13 Wars on this scale are unlikely to lead to outright human extinction, but this does suggest that conflicts which are around an order of magnitude larger may be likely to threaten civilisation. It should be emphasised that there is very large uncertainty about the effects of a large nuclear war on global climate. This remains an area where increased academic research work, including more detailed climate modelling and a better understanding of how survivors might be able to cope and adapt, would have high returns.
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