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## 1

**Interpretation: Appropriation must be permanent and exclusive**

TIMOTHY JUSTIN **Trapp** , JD Candidate @ UIUC Law, **’13**, TAKING UP SPACE BY ANY OTHER MEANS: COMING TO TERMS WITH THE NONAPPROPRIATION ARTICLE OF THE OUTER SPACE TREATY UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LAW REVIEW [Vol. 2013 No. 4]

The issues presented in relation to the nonappropriation article of the Outer Space Treaty should be clear.214 The ITU has, quite blatantly, created something akin to “property interests in outer space.”215 It allows nations to exclude others from their orbital slots, even when the nation is not currently using that slot.216 This is directly in line with at least one definition of outer-space appropriation.217 [\*\*Start Footnote 217\*\*Id. at 236 (“Appropriation of outer space, therefore, is ‘the exercise of exclusive control or exclusive use’ with a sense of permanence, which limits other nations’ access to it.”) (quoting Milton L. Smith, The Role of the ITU in the Development of Space Law, 17 ANNALS AIR & SPACE L. 157, 165 (1992)). \*\*End Footnote 217\*\*]The ITU even allows nations with unused slots to devise them to other entities, creating a market for the property rights set up by this regulation.218 In some aspects, this seems to effect exactly what those signatory nations of the Bogotá Declaration were trying to accomplish, albeit through different means.219

**Violation: satellites’ use of LEO does not exclusively occupy or preclude other orbits**

**Johnson 20** [(Christopher, Professor of Law at the Georgetown University Law Center, Adjunct Faculty at the International Space University in Strasbourg, France, the Legal Advisor for the Moon Village Association, Core Expert and Rule Drafter in the Manual on International Law Applicable to Military Activities in Outer Space project, Juris Doctor from New York Law School and an Advanced Masters in Law in Air and Space Law from Leiden University’s International Institute of Air and Space Law**) “**The Legal Status of MegaLEO Constellations and Concerns About Appropriation of Large Swaths of Earth Orbit,” Handbook of Small Satellites, 2020] JL

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

**Vote neg for limits and ground–literally anything that takes place in space becomes topical under their interp – 2 physical entities can never occupy space at the same time – tourism, mining, constellations, rockets, skydiving, lunar bases, exploration, radio waves, photography – limits explosion precludes nuanced clash and privileges the aff by stretching pre-tournament neg prep too thin–their interp isn’t grounded in any pre round stasis which functionally justifies them jettisoning any word in the res**

## 2

**Interp: The affirmative must not defend a specific form of appropriation, but rather appropriation as a general principle**

**Vote neg for limits–infinite combinations and form of appropriation especially for such a vague term explodes limits and wrecks core neg generics like mining good and innovation since you can find fringe affs to delink them–TVA solves since you can read whole res with your aff as an advantage, but PICs don’t flip limits since 1ar theory checks and they incentivize more pics cuz nothing but cheaty generics link**

## 3

**Interp: The affirmative must only fiat a policy action by states, not private actors**

**Resolved means policy action**

**Louisiana State Legislature** (https://www.legis.la.gov/legis/Glossary.aspx) Ngong

A legislative instrument that generally is used for making declarations, stating policies, and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; a resolution uses the term "resolved". Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor's veto. ( Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11 , 13.1 , 6.8 , and 7.4 and Senate Rules 10.9, 13.5 and 15.1)

**Unjust demands legal action**

**The Law Dictionary, ND**, Def of Unjust, URL: <https://thelawdictionary.org/unjust/>

Contrary to right and justice, or to the enjoyment of his rights by another, or to the standards of conduct furnished by the laws.

**Violation–they fiat private entities not appropriating instead of a multilateral ban by states**

**Vote neg for strat skew and clash–the crux of this topic is space policy and how to enforce it–things like OST and moon treaty prove–they exclude core topic discussions and destroy all neg ground especially for small affs like this such as concon and ICJ–we also lose debates about circumvention since they can just win by fiating utopian things like no company ever causing space debris–no point in discussing unrealistic politics**

**Fairness and education are voters–debate is a game with portable skills**

**DTD–T indicts the whole aff.**

**No rvi–you shouldn’t win for being T and incentivizes baiting T just to beat it back with infinite prep while chilling T since you’ll out frame us and auto-win on 2ar ethos every round.**

**Competing interps–reasonability is arbitrary and causes a race to the bottom–finding the best model of debate is key to preserve the most substantive norms in the long terms but no frivolous race to the top since limited words in the res mean limited interps**

**T before 1ar theory–NC abuse was reactive and only 2 months to discuss T whereas we can discuss 1ar theory whenever**

## 4

**Terrestrial Internet Cables are vulnerable now – risks access.**

**Griffiths 19** James Griffiths 7-26-2019 "The global internet is powered by vast undersea cables. But they’re vulnerable."<https://www.cnn.com/2019/07/25/asia/internet-undersea-cables-intl-hnk/index.html> (CNN Analyst)//ELmer

Hong Kong (CNN) - On July 29, 1858, two steam-powered battleships met in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean. There, they connected two ends of a 4,000 kilometer (2,500 mile) long, 1.5 centimeter (0.6 inch) wide cable, linking for the first time the European and North American continents by telegraph. Just over two weeks later, the UK’s Queen Victoria sent a congratulatory message to then US President James Buchanan, which was followed by a parade through the streets of New York, featuring a replica of a ship which helped lay the cable and fireworks over City Hall. In their inaugural cables, Queen Victoria hailed the “great international work” by the two countries, the culmination of almost two decades of effort, while Buchanan lauded a “triumph more glorious, because far more useful to mankind, than was ever won by conqueror on the field of battle. The message took over 17 hours to deliver, at 2 minutes and 5 seconds per letter by Morse code, and the cable operated for less than a month due to a variety of technical failures, but a global communications revolution had begun. By 1866, new cables were transmitting 6 to 8 words a minute, which would rise to more than 40 words before the end of the century. In 1956, Transatlantic No. 1 (TAT-1), the first underwater telephone cable, was laid, and by 1988, TAT-8 was transmitting 280 megabytes per second – about 15 times the speed of an average US household internet connection – over fiber optics, which use light to transmit data at breakneck speeds. In 2018, the Marea cable began operating between Bilbao, Spain, and the US state of Virginia, with transmission speeds of up to 160 terabits per second – 16 million times faster than the average home internet connection. Today, there are around 380 underwater cables in operation around the world, spanning a length of over 1.2 million kilometers (745,645 miles). Underwater cables are the invisible force driving the modern internet, with many in recent years being funded by internet giants such as Facebook, Google, Microsoft and Amazon. They carry almost all our communications and yet – in a world of wireless networking and smartphones – we are barely aware that they exist. Yet as the internet has become more mobile and wireless, the amount of data traveling across undersea cables has increased exponentially. “Most people are absolutely amazed” by the degree to which the internet is still cable-based, said Byron Clatterbuck, chief executive of Seacom, a multinational telecommunications firm responsible for laying many of the undersea cables connecting Africa to the rest of the world. “People are so mobile and always looking for Wi-Fi,” he said. “They don’t think about it, they don’t understand the workings of this massive mesh of cables working together. “They only notice when it’s cut.” Network down In 2012, Hurricane Sandy slammed into the US East Coast, causing an estimated $71 billion in damage and knocking out several key exchanges where undersea cables linked North America and Europe. “It was a major disruption,” Frank Rey, director of global network strategy for Microsoft’s Cloud Infrastructure and Operations division, said in a statement. “The entire network between North America and Europe was isolated for a number of hours. For us, the storm brought to light a potential challenge in the consolidation of transatlantic cables that all landed in New York and New Jersey.” For its newest cable, Marea, Microsoft chose to base its US operation further down the coast in Virginia, away from the cluster of cables to minimize disruption should another massive storm hit New York. But most often when a cable goes down nature is not to blame. There are about 200 such failures each year and the vast majority are caused by humans. “Two-thirds of cable failures are caused by accidental human activities, fishing nets and trawling and also ships’ anchors,” said Tim Stronge, vice-president of research at TeleGeography, a telecoms market research firm. “The next largest category is natural disaster, mother nature – sometimes earthquakes but also underwater landslides.” A magnitude-7.0 earthquake off the southwest coast off Taiwan in 2006, along with aftershocks, cut eight submarine cables which caused internet outages and disruption in Taiwan, Hong Kong, China, Japan, Korea and the Philippines. Stronge said the reason most people are not aware of these failures is because the whole industry is designed with it in mind. Companies that rely heavily on undersea cables spread their data across multiple routes, so that if one goes down, customers are not cut off. How a cable gets laid Laying a cable is a years-long process which costs millions of dollars, said Seacom’s Clatterbuck. The process begins by looking at naval charts to plot the best route. Cables are safest in deep water where they can rest on a relatively flat seabed, and won’t rub against rocks or be at risk of other disturbances. “The deeper the better,” Clatterbuck said. “When you can lay the cable down in deep water you rarely have any problems. It goes down on the bottom of the seabed and just stays there.” Things become more difficult the closer you get to shore. A cable that is only a few centimeters thick on the bottom of the ocean must be armored from its environment as reaches the landing station that links it with the country’s internet backbone. “Imagine a long garden hose, inside of which are very small tubes that house a very, very thin fiber pair,” Clatterbuck said. That hose is wrapped in copper, which conducts the direct current that powers the cable and its repeaters, sometimes up to 10,000 volts. “The fibers are wrapped in urethane and wrapped in copper and wrapped again in urethane,” he said. “If we’re going to have to put that cable on a shoreline that is very shallow and has a lot of rocks, you’re now going to have to armor coat that cable so no one can hack through it.” Cables in less hospitable areas can be far thicker than garden hoses, wrapped in extra plastic, kevlar armor plating, and stainless steel to ensure they can’t be broken. Depending on the coast, cable companies might also have to build concrete trenches far out to sea, to tuck the cable in to protect it from being bashed against rocks. “Before the cable-laying vessels go out they send out another specialized ship that maps the sea floor in the area when they want to go,” said TeleGeography’s Stronge. “They want to avoid areas where there’s a lot of undersea currents, certainly want to avoid volcanic areas, and avoid a lot of elevation change on the sea floor.” Once the route is plotted and checked, and the shore connections are secure, huge cable laying ships begin passing out the equipment. “Imagine spools of spools of garden hose along with a lot of these repeaters the size of an old travel trunk,” Clatterbuck said. “Sometimes it can take a month to load the cable onto a ship.” The 6,600 kilometer (4,000 mile) Marea cable weighs over 4.6 million kilograms (10.2 million pounds), or the equivalent of 34 blue whales, according to Microsoft, which co-funded the project with Facebook. It took more than two years to lay the entire thing. Malicious cuts The blackout came without warning. In February 2008, a whole swath of North Africa and the Persian Gulf suddenly went offline, or saw internet speeds slow to a painful crawl. This disruption was eventually traced to damage to three undersea cables off the Egyptian coast. At least one – linking Dubai and Oman – was severed by an abandoned, 5,400 kilogram (6-ton) anchor, the cable’s owner said. But the cause of the other damage was never explained, with suggestions it could have been the work of saboteurs. That raises the issue of another threat to undersea cables: deliberate human attacks. In a 2017 paper for the right-wing think tank Policy Exchange, British lawmaker Rishi Sunak wrote that “security remains a challenge” for undersea cables. “Funneled through exposed choke points (often with minimal protection) and their isolated deep-sea locations entirely public, the arteries upon which the Internet and our modern world depends have been left highly vulnerable,” he said. “The threat of these vulnerabilities being exploited is growing. A successful attack would deal a crippling blow to Britain’s security and prosperity.” However, with more than 50 cables connected to the UK alone, Clatterbuck was skeptical about how useful a deliberate outage could be in a time of war, pointing to the level of coordination and resources required to cut multiple cables at once. “If you wanted to sabotage the global internet or cut off a particular place you’d have to do it simultaneously on multiple cables,” he said. “You’d be focusing on the hardest aspect of disrupting a network.”

**Mega-constellations provide fast, affordable internet that bridges digital divide – independently, competition lowers prices across the board.**

**Novo 21** Paula Novo 3-31-2021 "Will Starlink Change the Internet?'<https://www.highspeedoptions.com/resources/insights/will-starlink-change-the-internet> (With over four years of broadband experience, Paula Novo is the Site Editor and Senior Writer for HighSpeedOptions. She has helped develop the criterion by which HighSpeedOptions reviews and recommends internet service providers, striving to simplify and guide the user’s decision toward the best communications services. Paula also leads HighSpeedOptions coverage of the digital divide, ISP reviews, and broadband policy.)//Elmer

While it’s not the first – and won’t be the last – company to test low Earth orbit satellites, Starlink, the satellite internet division of SpaceX, is making waves in the telecommunications industry for its residential beta program launched in 2020. As the first U.S.-based firm to successfully bring LEO internet to market, Starlink shows promise where others have heroically failed. Every satellite company in history to launch a low Earth orbit (LEO) constellation has gone bankrupt, except for Starlink, that is. Said best in a tweet by Elon Musk, founder and CEO of this venture, “Starlink is a staggeringly difficult technical and economic endeavor. However, if we don’t fail, the cost to end-users will improve every year.” In the span of a decade, broadband moved from a “nice-to-have” to a “must-have” – the COVID-19 pandemic simply speeding up the clock on its shift towards a utility. Yet, we’re a far cry away from total connectivity. Due to availability and cost issues (to name a few), millions of Americans don’t have access to reliable internet, which further widens the education and wealth gaps. If successful, Starlink – and LEO satellite internet as a whole – may be the first real solution for billions of people missing out on the benefits of broadband. Current State of the Telecom Industry Despite advances in technology, the telecom industry is lagging behind. And, contrary to what internet service providers and the media report, the United States’ internet options are still very limited. The three biggest hurdles standing in the way of real progress include access, affordability, and lack of competition. Access According to the Federal Communications Commission’s (FCC) 2020 Broadband Deployment Report, roughly 6% of all Americans have zero access to fixed broadband at home. And, of those without access, a majority live in rural areas. That’s about 19 million people who, even if they could afford to subscribe to internet service, are out of luck. The FCC defines broadband speeds as just 25 Mbps down and 3 Mbps up, which may be fast enough to check emails but won’t reliably support your Breaking Bad marathon. You can see how living in an underserved area, then, can severely limit a person’s job prospects, schooling, and social connections. Still, we can’t rate internet access without also looking at affordability. While some 19 million Americans do not have access at all, as many as one in three Americans choose to not subscribe to internet service, citing cost as a leading factor. Affordability FCC data shows that nearly 35% of Americans, or about 114 million people, do not subscribe to broadband service at their homes. Affordability – or lack thereof – is often cited as the main driver for this decision. Despite government intervention via efforts like the FCC Lifeline Program and ISP subsidies to incentivize network expansions, America still seems to lag behind other developed countries when it comes to internet cost. In a 2020 study by New America, it turns out that we pay quite a bit more for internet service than most developed countries in Asia and Europe, regardless of speed. Before factoring in data caps and other ancillary ISP fees, we pay “nearly twice as much as European countries for high-speed internet.” Naturally, the ballooning question pops up – How did we fall behind? Lack of Competition The lack of competition today may be the single greatest obstacle preventing the telecom industry (read: ISPs and consumers) from thriving. A long history of privately-owned infrastructures and government regulations has enabled monopolies to quash competition in the marketplace and ignore the demand for innovation. Unsurprisingly, the Institute of Self-Reliance released a new report finding that two of the largest broadband companies in the U.S. – Comcast and Charter Spectrum – maintain a monopoly over 47+ million American households. It also sheds light on an additional 33 million homes only serviceable by one or two DSL providers. While these are just a few examples of the current market, you can easily see how large segments of the population lack the competitive supply needed to drive down costs and push for more development. What if there was a solution to address these pitfalls with the internet? What if Americans (or, really, anyone in the world) could circumvent some of the physical and political barriers stopping us from connecting from seemingly anywhere? These are questions Starlink is attempting to answer. Ways Starlink May Change the Internet First, what is Starlink and how is it different from other internet providers? It’s an Elon Musk satellite internet company bringing life to the telecom industry. In the last year, Starlink launched over 1,000 satellites into low orbit with the goal of offering a new type of broadband. If successful, this LEO service could not only supersede traditional satellite internet like HughesNet or Viasat but also rival the likes of fiber internet in rural and remote communities. Unlike GEO satellite providers who use a few hundred large satellites orbiting over 35,000 kilometers from Earth, Starlink plans to use up to 42,000 small satellites in low orbit no higher than 1,200 kilometers. Because of these key differences, Starlink is anticipated to offer reliable speeds up to 1 Gbps with lower latency of 20ms to 40ms worldwide. Essentially, it’d combine the performance of grounded internet with the geographical freedom of traditional satellite internet so people can live anywhere on Earth while staying connected. In general, LEO satellite service represents a real chance at solving connectivity issues for anyone outside city limits. Starlink may also pave the way for tangible changes to the industry as a whole, including lower prices, faster speeds, and better economic opportunities. Pricing of Internet As Starlink enters new markets, the added competition has the potential to drive down the cost of internet over time. In a study by the Analysis Group, they calculated that when just one new competitor joins a designated market area (DMA), the price of plans with speeds ranging from 50 Mbps to 1 Gbps sees a monthly decline of $1.50. That’s it? McDonald’s saves me more than that. Not so fast, though. Remember how we said Starlink isn’t the only company testing low orbit satellites? With other ventures like Blue Origin, OneWeb, and Telesat itching to launch their own LEO constellations, it won’t be long before new players enter the market. At which point, the Analysis Group guesstimates an 8% reduction in monthly broadband prices, or about $7.50. For low-income households, that may be the difference needed to break even on bills. And, even though Starlink itself is quite expensive, its presence in the market has the potential to still benefit consumers who could choose a (now) cheaper internet provider. Internet Speeds Similarly, the buzz around LEO internet speeds has industry heads raising their eyebrows as well. While Starlink is only testing speeds of 50 Mbps to 150 Mbps right now, in time it’s expected to offer speeds up to 1 Gbps with low latency. Normally these speeds are reserved for grounded connections like fiber or cable internet. So, if Starlink manages to deliver, we may no longer be limited by our geography. Even further, the Analysis Group reports that the availability of higher internet speeds in a DMA “increases the likelihood that other providers will introduce high-speed plans to match […] their competition.” In particular, they found that broadband providers are 4 to 17 percent more likely to increase their speeds on an annual basis because of competition. This goes to show that a little healthy rivalry in the marketplace first and foremost benefits the consumer. Economic Opportunity If Starlink is successful, we expect to see economic opportunity improve for billions with a B as well. With global availability, more people will have the means to compete for jobs in today’s digital age. To put things into perspective, consider the world population. Of the current 7.8 billion people, a little under half of them (40%) lack regular internet access. That’s nearly one out of every two people. If LEO satellite service can make it to where geography, price, and speeds aren’t roadblocks anymore, what happens? In general, more people with internet access equates to more job access. And, as jobs continue to transition online, it’s safe to assume that people won’t be as limited by obstacles such as disabilities, poor education, and wealth disparities when they compete for openings. In these ways, Starlink has the potential to help offset poverty where many governments have failed.

**Internet solves extinction**

**Eagleman 10** [David Eagleman is a neuroscientist at Baylor College of Medicine, where he directs the Laboratory for Perception and Action and the Initiative on Neuroscience and Law and author of Sum (Canongate). Nov. 9, 2010, “ Six ways the internet will save civilization,”

http://www.wired.co.uk/magazine/archive/2010/12/start/apocalypse-no]

Many great civilisations have fallen, leaving nothing but cracked ruins and scattered genetics. Usually this results from: natural disasters, resource depletion, economic meltdown, disease, poor information flow and corruption. But we’re luckier than our predecessors because we command a technology that no one else possessed: a rapid communication network that finds its highest expression in the internet. I propose that there are six ways in which the net has vastly reduced the threat of societal collapse. Epidemics can be deflected by telepresence One of our more dire prospects for collapse is an infectious-disease epidemic. Viral and bacterial epidemics precipitated the fall of the Golden Age of Athens, the Roman Empire and most of the empires of the Native Americans. The internet can be our key to survival because the ability to work telepresently can inhibit microbial transmission by reducing human-to-human contact. In the face of an otherwise devastating epidemic, businesses can keep supply chains running with the maximum number of employees working from home. This can reduce host density below the tipping point required for an epidemic. If we are well prepared when an epidemic arrives, we can fluidly shift into a self-quarantined society in which microbes fail due to host scarcity. Whatever the social ills of isolation, they are worse for the microbes than for us. The internet will predict natural disasters We are witnessing the downfall of slow central control in the media: news stories are increasingly becoming user-generated nets of up-to-the-minute information. During the recent California wildfires, locals went to the TV stations to learn whether their neighbourhoods were in danger. But the news stations appeared most concerned with the fate of celebrity mansions, so Californians changed their tack: they uploaded geotagged mobile-phone pictures, updated Facebook statuses and tweeted. The balance tipped: the internet carried news about the fire more quickly and accurately than any news station could. In this grass-roots, decentralised scheme, there were embedded reporters on every block, and the news shockwave kept ahead of the fire. This head start could provide the extra hours that save us. If the Pompeiians had had the internet in 79AD, they could have easily marched 10km to safety, well ahead of the pyroclastic flow from Mount Vesuvius. If the Indian Ocean had the Pacific’s networked tsunami-warning system, South-East Asia would look quite different today. Discoveries are retained and shared Historically, critical information has required constant rediscovery. Collections of learning -- from the library at Alexandria to the entire Minoan civilisation -- have fallen to the bonfires of invaders or the wrecking ball of natural disaster. Knowledge is hard won but easily lost. And information that survives often does not spread. Consider smallpox inoculation: this was under way in India, China and Africa centuries before it made its way to Europe. By the time the idea reached North America, native civilisations who needed it had already collapsed. The net solved the problem. New discoveries catch on immediately; information spreads widely. In this way, societies can optimally ratchet up, using the latest bricks of knowledge in their fortification against risk. Tyranny is mitigated Censorship of ideas was a familiar spectre in the last century, with state-approved news outlets ruling the press, airwaves and copying machines in the USSR, Romania, Cuba, China, Iraq and elsewhere. In many cases, such as Lysenko’s agricultural despotism in the USSR, it directly contributed to the collapse of the nation. Historically, a more successful strategy has been to confront free speech with free speech -- and the internet allows this in a natural way. It democratises the flow of information by offering access to the newspapers of the world, the photographers of every nation, the bloggers of every political stripe. Some posts are full of doctoring and dishonesty whereas others strive for independence and impartiality -- but all are available to us to sift through. Given the attempts by some governments to build firewalls, it’s clear that this benefit of the net requires constant vigilance. Human capital is vastly increased Crowdsourcing brings people together to solve problems. Yet far fewer than one per cent of the world’s population is involved. We need expand human capital. Most of the world not have access to the education afforded a small minority. For every Albert Einstein, Yo-Yo Ma or Barack Obama who has educational opportunities, uncountable others do not. This squandering of talent translates into reduced economic output and a smaller pool of problem solvers. The net opens the gates education to anyone with a computer. A motivated teen anywhere on the planet can walk through the world’s knowledge -- from the webs of Wikipedia to the curriculum of MIT’s OpenCourseWare. The new human capital will serve us well when we confront existential threats we’ve never imagined before. Energy expenditure is reduced Societal collapse can often be understood in terms of an energy budget: when energy spend outweighs energy return, collapse ensues. This has taken the form of deforestation or soil erosion; currently, the worry involves fossil-fuel depletion. The internet addresses the energy problem with a natural ease. Consider the massive energy savings inherent in the shift from paper to electrons -- as seen in the transition from the post to email. Ecommerce reduces the need to drive long distances to purchase products. Delivery trucks are more eco-friendly than individuals driving around, not least because of tight packaging and optimisation algorithms for driving routes. Of course, there are energy costs to the banks of computers that underpin the internet -- but these costs are less than the wood, coal and oil that would be expended for the same quantity of information flow. The tangle of events that triggers societal collapse can be complex, and there are several threats the net does not address. But vast, networked communication can be an antidote to several of the most deadly diseases threatening civilisation. The next time your coworker laments internet addiction, the banality of tweeting or the decline of face-to-face conversation, you may want to suggest that the net may just be the technology that saves us.

## 5

**Xi is tightening control over the PLA but completing goals are critical.**

**Krishnan 21** – Ananth, 11/18/21, [‘Xi tightened control over the PLA’, TheHindu,<https://www.thehindu.com/news/international/xi-tightened-control-over-the-pla/article37549460.ece>] Justin

The new resolution on history passed last week by China’s ruling Communist Party has said that President Xi Jinping had tightened control over the military to address the party’s “obviously lacking” leadership of the armed forces under his predecessors. The full text of the resolution, released on Tuesday evening, listed some of the actions taken by the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) under Mr. Xi, who is also the chairman of the Central Military Commission. These included what the document described as “major operations related to border defence”. No specifics It did not specify what those major operations were. China has unresolved land borders with India and Bhutan. In April 2020, the PLA mobilised two divisions and carried out multiple transgressions across the Line of Actual Control (LAC) in Eastern Ladakh, sparking the worst crisis along the border in many years. Talks to resolve the tensions are still on-going. “The armed forces have remained committed to carrying out military struggles in a flexible manner to counter military provocations by external forces, and they have created a strong deterrent against separatist activities seeking ‘Taiwan independence,’” the resolution said. “They have conducted major operations related to border defence, protecting China’s maritime rights, countering terrorism and maintaining stability, disaster rescue and relief, fighting COVID-19, peacekeeping and escort services, humanitarian assistance, and international military cooperation.” Last week’s resolution on history was only third such document putting forth the official view on party history, following resolutions passed by Mao Zedong in 1945 and Deng Xiaoping in 1981. The new resolution dealt more with the future than the past. It essentially reaffirmed the official view on history, saying that the “basic points and conclusions” of past resolutions “remain valid to this day.” It repeated the conclusion reached in 1981 on Mao’s errors noting that “mistakes were made” and that “Mao Zedong’s theoretical and practical errors concerning class struggle in a socialist society became increasingly serious” leading to the disasters of the Cultural Revolution. Criticism of predecessors Much of the new resolution focuses on emphasising Mr. Xi’s leadership and calling for the party to support his “core” status. It only briefly mentioned Mr. Xi’s predecessors Jiang Zemin and Hu Jintao, and implicitly critcised some aspects of their leadership including on military matters. “For a period of time, the party’s leadership over the military was obviously lacking,” it noted. “If this problem had not been completely solved, it would not only have diminished the military’s combat capacity, but also undermined the key political principle that the party commands the gun.” The document said Mr. Xi’s leadership had tightened supervision on the military including boosting “troop training and battle preparedness”, and it repeated China’s stated goals of completing the modernisation of its armed forces by 2035 and building a “world class” military by 2050, which observers see as meaning on par with the U.S. ‘Working vigorously’ “To build strong people’s armed forces, it is of paramount importance to uphold the fundamental principle and system of absolute party leadership over the military, to ensure that supreme leadership and command authority rest with the party Central Committee and the Central Military Commission (CMC), and to fully enforce the system of the CMC chairman assuming overall responsibility,” the resolution said, adding that “setting their sights on this problem, the Central Committee and the CMC have worked vigorously to govern the military with strict discipline in every respect.”

**Megaconstellations are part of China’s core space agenda, is seen as their greatest opportunity to compete with the West, and is a national priority – the private sector is key and the plan is a 180**

**Jones, 21** (Ash Jones, 4-27-2021, accessed on 1-23-2022, Industry Europe, "China's plans for a 13,000 satellite megaconstellation", https://industryeurope.com/sectors/aerospace-defence/china-s-plans-for-a-13-000-satellite-megaconstellation/)azhang

by Ash Jones 27 April 2021 14:00 China has announced plans to oversee and construct a megaconstellation - used for sending satellite internet services - made up of a little under 13,000 satellites through a coordinated effort involving many of the country's key space players. Satellites are used to project networks across the globe; pictured is an artists' rendition of a global satellite internet network. Credit: ESA Plans for this have been publicly known since at least October 2020, when analysts predicted the Chinese state would move to create a Low Earth Orbit (LEO) constellation to compete with major western rivals such as Amazon, OneWeb and SpaceX. Read more: NASA & California partner on methane-mapping satellite project Recent comments by Chinese state officials suggest it may already make use of existing satellite infrastructure, potentially forming part of the larger "Guoweng" network, part of its idea for a national internet network. These have come as a boost to previous plans for similar networks made last year. SpaceNews reported on April 21 that spectrum filings were submitted to the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) by China in September last year. The filings show as many as 12,992 satellites will make up the constellation, although there are fears this would only serve China's interest by operating state-run media and intranet outlets. These would lie - as the name LEO suggests - in low orbit, anywhere between 500 and 1500 km and would operate under a number of frequency bands. In a March 7 interview with Shanghai Securities News, Bao Weimin, a senior official with the state-owned China Aerospace Science and Technology Bao Weimin. Credit: SASAC Corp. (CASC) revealed it had already launched some test satellites. “We are planning and developing space Internet satellites and have launched test satellites," he said. "A 'State Grid' company will also be established to be responsible for the overall planning and operation of space Internet construction." Washington DC-based analyst Bhavya Lal surmised that out of the 20 or so Chinese companies engaged in satellite technologies, fewer than a dozen had proposed the use of constellation at the time the filings were submitted. “Many focus on narrowband communications, targeting markets such as the Internet of Things (IoT)," he said in a statement released in October 2020, adding that many of the state-owned outlets "[had] the deeper pockets needed to rapidly launch satellite constellations." She concluded that many of the private companies lacked the required hardware to launch. Read more: The satellite drone that can beam 5G from the stratosphere She said: “However, as in other areas, the Chinese are making fast progress. The best we can tell the current focus of most companies is domestic. But as the Chinese have done in other areas such as high-speed rail, it would be not a stretch of the imagination that once the bugs in the system are worked out domestically, the Chinese will begin to market services internationally.” It is currently unknown if any of this has changed in the six months since it broke. In mid-April Ge Yujung, the president of China Spacesat, another key player, revealed the previously planned satellite clusters would be altered to fit a new plan, saying the Hongyan and Hongyun systems would "undergo major changes" by "relevant government authorities." He also revealed plans for the constellations have been in development since at least 2018 and that CASC was planning to launch at least 60 satellites by 2022. It is currently unclear how the project will proceed, but news reports indicate it has become a national priority. SpaceX's global satellite network was completed in early April, and the network is now active. It is likely China has issued this as a national priority in order to compete with western rivals.

**That triggers backlash – they don’t support restrictions on the space sector and will do everything to convince leaders not to do the plan – independently, is a reason the plan gets circumvented**

**Cheng 14** [Dean Cheng, Senior Research Fellow in the Asia Studies Center at the Heritage Foundation, Former Senior Analyst at the China Studies Division of the Center for Naval Analyses, Former Senior Analyst with Science Applications International Corporation, “Prospects for U.S.-China Space Cooperation”, Testimony before the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, United States Senate, 4/9/2014, https://www.heritage.org/testimony/prospects-us-china-space-cooperation]

At the same time, space is now a sector that enjoys significant political support within the Chinese political system. Based on their writings, the PLA is clearly intent upon developing the ability to establish “space dominance,” in order to fight and win “local wars under informationized conditions.”[8] The two SOEs are seen as key parts of the larger military-industrial complex, providing the opportunities to expose a large workforce to such areas as systems engineering and systems integration. It is no accident that China’s commercial airliner development effort tapped the top leadership of China’s aerospace corporations for managerial and design talent.[9] From a bureaucratic perspective, this is a powerful lobby, intent on preserving its interests. China’s space efforts should therefore be seen as political, as much as military or economic, statements, directed at both domestic and foreign audiences. Insofar as the PRC has scored major achievements in space, these reflect positively on both China’s growing power and respect (internationally) and the CCP’s legitimacy (internally). Efforts at inducing Chinese cooperation in space, then, are likely to be viewed in terms of whether they promote one or both objectives. As China has progressed to the point of being the world’s second-largest economy (in gross domestic product terms), it becomes less clear as to why China would necessarily want to cooperate with other countries on anything other than its own terms. Prospects for Cooperation Within this context, then, in. China’s past experience of major high-technology cooperative ventures (Sino–Soviet cooperation in the 1950s, U.S.–China cooperation in the 1980s until Tiananmen, and Sino–European space cooperation on the Galileo satellite program) is an unhappy one, at best. The failure of the joint Russian–Chinese Phobos–Grunt mission is likely seen in Beijing as further evidence that a “go-it-alone” approach is preferable. Nor is it clear that, bureaucratically, there is significant interest from key players such as the PLA or the military industrial complex in expanding cooperation.[10] Moreover, as long as China’s economy continues to expand, and the top political leadership values space efforts, there is little prospect of a reduction in space expenditures—making international cooperation far less urgent for the PRC than most other spacefaring states. [FOOTNOTE] [10]It is worth noting here that the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs is not a part of the CCP Politburo, a key power center in China. Thus, the voice of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is muted, at best, in any internal debate on policy. [END FOOTNOTE] If there is likely to be limited enthusiasm for cooperation in Chinese circles, there should also be skepticism in American ones. China’s space program is arguably one of the most opaque in the world. Even such basic data as China’s annual space expenditures is lacking—with little prospect of Beijing being forthcoming. As important, China’s decision-making processes are little understood, especially in the context of space. Seven years after the Chinese anti-satellite (ASAT) test, exactly which organizations were party to that decision, and why it was undertaken, remains unclear. Consequently, any effort at cooperation would raise questions about the identity of the partners and ultimate beneficiaries—with a real likelihood that the PLA would be one of them.

**An unhinged PLA triggers Himalayan war – goes global**

**Chellaney 17** [Dr. Brahma Chellaney, Professor of Strategic Studies at the Center for Policy Research and Fellow at the Robert Bosch Academy, PhD in International Studies from Jawaharlal Nehru University, “Why the Chinese Military’s Rising Clout Troubles Xi Jinping”, The National, 9/9/2017, https://www.thenational.ae/opinion/why-the-chinese-military-s-rising-clout-troubles-xi-jinping-1.626815?videoId=5754807360001]

China’s president Xi Jinping has stepped up his domestic political moves in the run-up to the critical 19th national congress of the Chinese Communist Party next month, but he is still struggling to keep the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) in line. China’s political system makes it hard to get a clear picture, yet Mr Xi’s actions underscore the troublesome civil-military relations in the country. Take the recent standoff with India that raised the spectre of a Himalayan war, with China threatening reprisals if New Delhi did not unconditionally withdraw its forces from a small Bhutanese plateau, which Beijing claims is Chinese territory. After 10 weeks, the face-off on the Doklam Plateau ended with both sides pulling back troops and equipment from the site on the same day, signalling that Beijing, not New Delhi, had blinked. The mutual-withdrawal deal was struck just after Mr Xi replaced the chief of the PLA’s joint staff department. This key position, equivalent to the chairman of the US joint chiefs of staff, was created only last year as part of Mr Xi’s military reforms to turn the PLA into a force “able to fight and win wars”. The Doklam pullback suggests that the removed chief, Gen Fang Fenghui, who has since been detained for alleged corruption, was an obstacle to clinching a deal with India. To be sure, this was not the first time that the PLA’s belligerent actions in the Himalayas imposed diplomatic costs on China. A classic case happened when Mr Xi reached India on a state visit in September 2014. He arrived on Indian prime minister Narendra Modi’s birthday with a strange gift for his host, a predawn Chinese military encroachment deep into India’s northern region of Ladakh. The encroachment, the worst in many years in terms of the number of intruding troops, overshadowed Mr Xi’s visit. It appeared bizarre that the military of an important power would seek to mar the visit of its own head of state to a key neighbouring country. Yet Chinese premier Li Keqiang’s earlier visit to New Delhi in 2013 was similarly preceded by a PLA incursion into another part of Ladakh that lasted three weeks. Such provocations might suggest that they are intentional, with the Chinese government in the know, thus reflecting a preference for blending soft and hard tactics. But it is also possible that these actions underscore the continuing “disconnect between the military and the civilian leadership” in China that then US defence secretary Robert Gates warned about in 2011. During his 2014 India trip, Mr Xi appeared embarrassed by the accompanying PLA encroachment and assured Mr Modi that he would sort it out upon his return. Soon after he returned, the Chinese defence ministry quoted Mr Xi as telling a closed-door meeting with PLA commanders that “all PLA forces should follow the president’s instructions” and that the military must display “absolute loyalty and firm faith in the party”. Recently Xi conveyed that same message yet again when he addressed a parade marking the 90th anniversary of the PLA’s creation on August 1, 1927. Donning military fatigues, Mr Xi exhorted members of his 2.3-million-strong armed forces to “unswervingly follow the absolute leadership of the party.” Had civilian control of the PLA been working well, would Mr Xi repeatedly be demanding “absolute loyalty” from the military or asking it to “follow his instructions”? China does not have a national army; rather the party has an army. So the PLA has traditionally sworn fealty to the party, not the nation. Under Mr Xi’s two immediate predecessors, Hu Jintao and Jiang Zemin, the PLA gradually became stronger at the expense of the party. The military’s rising clout has troubled Mr Xi because it hampers his larger ambition. As part of his effort to reassert party control over the military, Mr Xi has used his anti-corruption campaign to ensnare a number of top PLA officers. He has also cut the size of the ground force and established a new command-and-control structure. But just as a dog’s tail cannot be straightened, asserting full civil control over a politically ascendant PLA is proving unachievable. After all, the party depends on the PLA to ensure domestic order and sustain its own political monopoly. The regime’s legitimacy increasingly relies on an appeal to nationalism. But the PLA, with its soaring budgets and expanding role to safeguard China’s overseas interests, sees itself as the ultimate arbiter of nationalism. To make matters worse, Mr Xi has made many enemies at home in his effort to concentrate power in himself, including through corruption purges. It is not known whether the PLA’s upper echelon respects him to the extent to be fully guided by his instructions. In the past decade, the PLA’s increasing clout has led China to stake out a more muscular role. This includes resurrecting territorial and maritime disputes, asserting new sovereignty claims, and using construction activity to change the status quo. China’s cut-throat internal politics and troubled civil-military relations clearly have a bearing on its external policy. The risks of China’s rise as a praetorian state are real and carry major implications for international security.

**Extinction.**

**Caldicott 17** – Helen, 2017, Founder of Physicians for Social Responsibility [“The new nuclear danger: George W. Bush's military-industrial complex,” The New Press]//Elmer

The use of Pakistani nuclear weapons could trigger a chain reac­tion. Nuclear-armed India, an ancient enemy, could respond in kind. China, India's hated foe, could react if India used her nuclear weapons, triggering a nuclear [war] ~~holocaust~~ on the subcontinent. If any of either Russia or America's 2,250 strategic weapons on hair-trigger alert were launched either accidentally or purposefully in response, nuclear winter would ensue, meaning the end of most life on earth.

## 6

**Text – States should**

* **Implement cooperative active debris removal measures aimed at mitigating debris from mega-constellations.**
* **Cooperate on the development of a cloud-based infrastructure system between private and public entities with the purpose of advancing overall cyber security and create a protected mandatory reporting system for government contractors and critical infrastructure employees**
* **Dismantle their antisatellite weapon systems and stop all development of space weapons**
* **Adopt a system of market share liability in regard to the creation of debris in outer space by private entities in accordance with Munoz-Patchen 18**

**1st solves for Mega-constellation Impacts.**

**Hardy 20**, Brian Patrick. Long-term effects of satellite megaconstellations on the debris environment in low earth orbit. Diss. 2020. (Master of Science in Aerospace Engineering in the Graduate College of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)//Elmer

The results of this thesis demonstrate that satellite megaconstellations have the potential to leave a significant mark on the LEO debris environment, even centuries after they cease operations. Various test cases for the Starlink megaconstellation were analyzed in a new, medium-fidelity simulation for orbital debris evolution, and a variety of PMD and ADR rates for Starlink were considered. It was shown that if Starlink adheres only to the minimum regulatory requirement of 90% PMD for large constellations, then LEO debris levels will grow almost twice as fast as the baseline scenario with no megaconstellations. Improving Starlink’s PMD rate to 95% would lead to only 19% more debris, while 99% PMD is the preferred option that prevents any significant debris contributions at all. Importantly, Starlink’s choice of PMD strategy will affect its own collision risk very little over the short term, but the impact will be noticeable on multi-century timescales by the overall LEO environment. Finally, in scenarios with 90% and 95% PMD, active debris removal of non-operating Starlink satellites yields significant, if limited, benefits. The 90% PMD scenario combined with an ADR rate of 5 Starlink satellites per year, for example, is able to reduce debris levels to those seen for the 95% PMD scenario. This result suggests that active debris removal could be a viable mitigation strategy for megaconstellations with sub-optimal PMD rates.

**2nd plank solves Cyber-Attacks.**

**Robertl and Vocl 21** [Christopher Robertl and Vince Vocl. Christopher is the Senior Vice President of Cyber Intelligence and Supply Chain Security Policy at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Vince VocI is the Executive Director Cyber Policy and Operations at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. 5-14-2021, accessed on 8-8-2021, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, "4 Ways U.S. Government Leaders Can Protect IP and Personal Data",<https://www.uschamber.com/on-demand/cybersecurity/how-can-the-government-help-protect-intellectual-property-and-personal-data>] Adam

During the past several months, U.S. adversaries have carried out significant cyber-enabled espionage campaigns, impacting a wide range of public and private sector targets. With our nation’s cybersecurity at risk, government leaders have quickly turned to legislative solutions to protect our intellectual property and personal data. Protected Mandatory Reporting Can Help Thwart Increasingly Sophisticated Cyberattacks Since the [Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015](https://www.cisa.gov/publication/cybersecurity-information-sharing-act-2015-procedures-and-guidance#:~:text=of%20Mass%20Destruction-,Cybersecurity%20Information%20Sharing%20Act%20of%202015%20Procedures%20and%20Guidance,indicators%20with%20the%20Federal%20Government.) was passed, companies facing data breaches have been encouraged to share this information with the U.S. government. Yet cyberattacks have only become more sophisticated since then, according to [Sen. Mark Warner](https://www.warner.senate.gov/public/), chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. “There is an evolving belief that the 2015 structure, on a voluntary basis, is not giving us the level of comprehensive security that we need,” said Warner. “The bad guys, when they’re focused, they’re going to have a fairly high probability of getting in.” In response, the Committee on Intelligence is working on a bipartisan level to create a structure that would mandate reporting for government contractors and critical infrastructure employees. “Some of the privacy and other kinds of counter-incentives don’t take place,” Sen. Warner noted, adding that affected companies would have limited immunity and anonymized information. “We can pulse the overall system in a way that will allow [the] public sector and private sector to respond in a more comprehensive way.” The U.S. Seeks to Work With Its Allies to Establish Cyber Incident Notification Systems After creating a limited mandatory reporting system in the country, Warner hopes that the U.S. can work with its allies to establish similar notification systems as well as multilateral cyber norms. “If our adversaries violate these norms and we can find appropriate attribution, there will be consequences to their actions,” Warner explained. “Our failure to have norms [and] a more robust notification system in existence … has allowed, in many ways, Russia and China to launch cyberattacks with virtual impunity.” “This is a problem of protecting intellectual property … [and] personal information,” he continued. “As long as we can provide that level of limited immunity with anonymity so that those reports are then not made public, I think we can earn industry support.” The U.S. Cyberspace Solarium Commission Outlines Priorities for 2021 In 2019, the U.S. Cyberspace Solarium Commission was chartered to manage cyber risk and significant cyber events at home and abroad. With several of the Commission’s recommendations being codified into law in 2020, this year has seen a renewed focus in engaging the private sector. “We’re looking at ways that [we] can get to a common cloud-based environment between federal government agencies, state, local, tribal, territorial and the private sector, basically to get common visibility,” said Solarium commissioner [Frank J. Cilluffo](https://www.solarium.gov/commissioners/frank-cilluffo). “We’re also going to be zeroing in on what we’re calling SICI (systemically important critical infrastructure) ... which will basically hone in on the most critical of our critical infrastructures, our lifeline sectors, and establish a set of … benefits and burdens to truly get to that partnership between the public and private sector,” Cilluffo added. Public and Private Sector Collaboration Is Crucial to Cybersecurity Advancement “We want to make sure that at the end of the day, our companies, our national security agencies and our citizens as a whole are enhancing their overall cybersecurity efforts,” stated Cilluffo. “The bottom line is, we need to follow up our ideas with the resources.” “This is not going to be accomplished through Washington alone,” he stressed. “The private sector needs a front-row seat at his table and ultimately will be most critical to any success going forward.” [Mark Montgomery](https://www.solarium.gov/about/staff/mark-montgomery), executive director of the Cyberspace Solarium Commission, agreed that partnership between the public and private sectors would be crucial for success in 2021. “We actually have to build, pay for and establish infrastructure for collaboration,” Montgomery noted. “Once you do that, the companies will see that their equities are protected … and their opinions matter, and then we’ll get things done.”

**3rd plank solves second advantage – states won’t possess asat capability to escalate**

**4th plank incentivizes sustainable use of space**

**Munoz-Patchen 18** [Chelsea Munoz-Patchen, Chelsea Muñoz-Patchen is an associate in the Houston office of Latham & Watkins. While attending University of Chicago Law School, Ms. Muñoz-Patchen was an articles editor for The Chicago Journal of International Law. Her research on regulating space debris was published in 2018. Ms. Muñoz-Patchen served as a research assistant for Professors Daniel Abebe and Jonathan Masur, focusing on intellectual property and constitutional law in the US and Ethiopia. Prior to law school, Ms. Muñoz-Patchen earned her BA and BS in Geography from Arizona State University. As a graduate student, she studied political ecology and people’s relationship to urban nature, and taught Introduction to Physical Geography labs. 7-1-2018, Semanticscholar, "Regulating the Space Commons: Treating Space Debris as Abandoned Property in Violation of the Outer Space Treaty | Semantic Scholar",<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Regulating-the-Space-Commons%3A-Treating-Space-Debris-Munoz-Patchen/607eff0141f48332a69ae8c5a3301d871057a4fa> accessed 12/21/21] Adam

Market-share liability has been suggested as a way to deal with the difficulty of identifying the individual ownership of objects and it could be put to use in the obligation to clean up debris.154 Market-share liability would allow for the apportionment of responsibility based on the respective contribution to the risk, and would not require the identification of individual pieces of space debris.155 Market-share liability has already been successfully applied where multiple parties contribute to a dangerous situation, but where it is virtually impossible to tie a particular party to the harm caused.156 Market-share liability was created in 1980 in the case Sindell v. Abbott Labororatories. 157 In Sindell, the Supreme Court of California devised the concept in response to a case in which pharmaceuticals that were marketed to pregnant women caused cancer in their children at least a decade later.158 Since the latent period was so long, the women naturally could not remember the specific pill manufacturer out of two hundred such manufacturers.159 The court found that each defendant’s market share could be determined fairly accurately, and therefore used market share as a basis for the apportionment of liability.160 While market-share liability has not been broadly adopted, this is likely because cases with fungible products and a serious causation problem are rare.161 Academics have taken this idea and sought to apply it to space debris, which has similar fungibility and causation issues, but their applications have been limited to a tort-like context.162 One author suggested that whenever a collision occurs due to an unidentifiable piece of debris and a functional space object, liability and compensation should be apportioned “among spacefaring nations equal to the percentages of the total debris population for which the particular nation is responsible.” 163 This mechanism frees the victim from having to prove causation by a specific nation, when that would be virtually impossible.164 There will be difficulties calculating the percentage with precision in such a system, but there is fairly accurate information from the U.N. including registry, sampling, mathematical models, and other records of known collisions and the resultant debris.165 Without strong buy-in, it may be challenging to get this rarely used domestic tort theory to apply in international space law, especially with the potential for disputes over the proper apportionment of market share.166 The states primarily responsible for existing debris are the U.S., Russia, and China – powerful countries unlikely to be pleased with this newfound expense. That said, though these nations would be paying the highest cost, this would be proportional to their respective contributions to the problem. Indeed, these nations may welcome this remedy, because their space activity is threatened by the proliferation of space debris and they likely value continuing their extensive and advanced use of space. This solution solves the free rider problem and would compensate any nation or company that cleans up space such that any nation (like the U.S., Russia, or China) fearing the collapse of its space program and unwilling to bear all the cleanup costs itself would see this as an attractive solution. It is even possible that liable states like the U.S. and Russia will be eager to aid in debris identification, so as to add to other states’ liability.167 This regulatory remedy would resolve the current tragedy of the commons. By assigning responsibility for the cost of cleanup, nations or companies would be incentivized to begin cleanup operations, because they would know that others will not freeride on their costly efforts. Instead, they will have guaranteed compensation from those responsible. Obtaining the funds is crucial, particularly since the high cost of deploying existing technology to destroy space debris has been a hindrance thus far.168 Using market-share liability is also a useful way to compensate victims of debris collisions and to incentivize spacefaring nations to avoid creating new debris in the future.169 However, this does not do enough to remedy the persistent existence of space debris, which is threatening the very continuation of space activity. The Outer Space Treaty creates an obligation on states to carry out space activities “for the ‘benefit and interests of all countries,’ and that outer space shall never be subject to national appropriation.” 170 To uphold their obligations under this treaty, nations should not be creating debris, because it interferes with the ability of others to conduct their space activities, or perhaps keeps them from space altogether. Due to this legal violation, and the negative externality created by property abandonment, states should be required to pay for the disposal of debris in proportion to the amount they create. While the creation of debris may be unavoidable, there are existing practices that can greatly minimize the proliferation of debris, and any debris that is nonetheless created can be dealt with through market-share liability payments. This collection of market-share disposal payments would not simply be a tax on operations or tort compensation for harmful acts. Instead, once liability is apportioned, (and this could be done on an ongoing or periodic basis to reflect new developments), nations or companies undertaking actions to clean up space would be compensated for their costs by the nations responsible according to their percentage of responsibility. The U.N. Office for Outer Space Affairs (UNOOSA) could allocate the percentage of liability, drawing on its role in promoting international cooperation and the peaceful use of outer space, as well as preparing reports and studies.171 If any disputes were to arise from nonpayment, familiar procedures could be employed—perhaps by drawing from other notable space treaties that provide “established procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.” 172 In many of the space treaties and conventions, including the Liability Convention, disputes and claims can be brought to the SecretaryGeneral of the U.N.173 These bodies could be utilized here to assure fairness in allocating liability and handling routine compensation disputes. This new regulatory regime can thus be grounded in the existing space treaty regime and administered by existing authorities. It would resolve the incentive problems that exist in the international commons of space through regulation that allocates the cost of debris cleanup to those who have created and continue to create it. The regime can also adapt as the outer space marketplace and the actors who comprise it shift over time, and as the registry of space objects, incidents, and tracking capabilities improves. This regulatory regime also ultimately would allocate cleanup funds to parties who would like to continue to operate in space, removing the disincentive to carry the cost in the face of potential freeriding.

## 7

**CP: Private entities ought not engage in the exclusive use of Low Earth Orbit via Large Satellite Constellations except in the instance of space based solar power**

**Coming in the LEO**

Aleksey **Shtivelman n/d** SOLAR POWER SATELLITES: THE RIGHT TO A SPOT IN THE WORLD’S HIGHEST PARKING LOT <https://www.bu.edu/jostl/files/2015/02/Shtivelman_web.pdf> //SR

​​There are now several companies dedicated to successfully creating a solar power satellite system. Space Energy is a company that plans to develop the first solar power satellite and transmit electricity to the Earth’s surface by creating and launching a test satellite into low earth orbit.32 If the prototype works, Space Energy seeks to enter into power supply contracts with customers and launch larger scale satellites into orbit around the Earth.33 LaserMotive is a Seattle-based company that develops laser power beams to transmit electricity without wires.34 The company boasts various applications of wireless power transmission technology including powering unmanned aerial vehicles, launching rockets via laser power and beaming energy from satellites to the Earth.35

**LEO is key**

Aleksey **Shtivelman n/d** SOLAR POWER SATELLITES: THE RIGHT TO A SPOT IN THE WORLD’S HIGHEST PARKING LOT <https://www.bu.edu/jostl/files/2015/02/Shtivelman_web.pdf> //SR

One solution to the legal hurdle of orbital slot allocation described above may be to establish a new international agency to manage these satellite systems.13 Another answer may be to require launching countries to sign a separate international agreement related to orbital slot allocation for SBSP satellites.14 Finally, another technologically feasible alternative is to place SBSP satellites into a lower earth orbit, where slots are so abundant that they are not normally sought or allocated.15 This alternative would avoid an international debate regarding property rights in space and thereby bypass the slot allocation issue.

**It’s a megaconstellation coming now**

**David 11-03**, [David, Leonard. 11/03/21 Space Solar Power’s Time May Finally Be Coming.”https://www.space.com/space-solar-power-research-advances/] Recut DurSac

The sun never sets in space. The idea of harvesting solar energy via power-beaming satellites has therefore long intrigued researchers looking for ways to feed an energy-ravenous [Earth](https://www.space.com/54-earth-history-composition-and-atmosphere.html). That reflection has fomented for decades but is now garnering new looks all over the world: Technologists in the U.S. and China, experts in Japan and researchers within the European Space Agency and the United Kingdom Space Agency are all working to make space-based solar power a reality. Related: [Solar power stations in space could be the answer to our energy needs](https://www.space.com/solar-power-stations-in-space-could-be-the-answer-to-our-energy-needs.html) History machine Peter Glaser, the father of the solar power satellite concept. (Image credit: Arthur D. Little Inc.) The idea of wireless power transmission dates back to [Nikola Tesla](https://www.livescience.com/45950-nikola-tesla-biography.html) near the end of the 19th century. Fast-forwarding to 1968, the notion of a solar power satellite was detailed and patented by U.S. space pioneer Peter Glaser. He blueprinted a novel way to collect energy from sunlight using solar cells and beam down an energetic muscle of microwaves to receiving antennas ("rectennas") on Earth. Those microwaves could then be converted to electrical energy and supplied to the power grid. Then, in the mid-1970s, microwave power transmission experiments in the tens of kilowatts were successfully conducted at the Goldstone Deep Space Communications Complex in California, a facility of NASA's [Jet Propulsion Laboratory](https://www.space.com/16952-nasa-jet-propulsion-laboratory.html). And this "power trip" doesn't stop there.The Space Solar Power Incremental and Demonstrations Research (SSPIDR) project is designed to beam power from space to Earth. SSPIDR consists of several small-scale flight experiments that will mature technology needed to build a prototype solar power distribution system. (Image credit: Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL)) Impressive advances Over the past decade, researchers have made impressive advances that increase the likelihood that space solar power (SSP) will be realized during the next decade, said John Mankins, president of Artemis Innovation Management Solutions of Santa Maria, California. His view: the longstanding vision for SSP as a sustainable energy alternative should be revisited in light of such recent advances.Bolstering that outlook is a set of key perspectives, Mankins told Space.com. "Climate change is really going to be a disaster. Nations are committed to go [carbon net-zero](https://www.livescience.com/climate-report-net-zero.html) … and they have no idea how to do it."The rapidly unfolding value of "New Space" is also reshaping the landscape of 21st century space activities, he added. "Two of the biggest hurdles to the realization of SSP have always been the cost of launch and the cost of hardware," said Mankins. "Add flight rate, and all of a sudden you're looking at numbers always talked about for solar power satellites."Related: [What is climate change?](https://www.livescience.com/climate-change.html) Megaconstellations Another recent change is the dawn of the megaconstellations, Mankins added. That's exemplified by SpaceX's [Starlink](https://www.space.com/spacex-starlink-satellites.html) broadband network, a mass-production effort that now cranks out 30 tons of satellites a month. SpaceX is on course to potentially manufacture 40,000 satellites within five years, and launch all of them. "The path to low-cost hardware has been shown," Mankins said. "It's modular and mass-produced. The hurdles of less-expensive launch and lowering hardware costs have been overcome."Mankins said that the economics of SSP concepts in the near term, within the next decade, have never been more viable. He flagged advances in space launch capabilities; progress in robotics for space assembly, maintenance and servicing systems; and the growth in various component technologies, such as high-efficiency solid state power amplifiers. As a result, SSP is ready to see the light of day, Mankins said.Astroelectricity An early entrant in focusing on understanding the energy policy needed and establishment of SSP is James Michael Snead, president of the Spacefaring Institute. He's adopted the use of the term "astroelectricity" to describe the transmitted electrical power produced by SSP systems.In looking at what he terms the "[coming age of astroelectricity](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5E-0NYnAaUA)," he sees a world needing a replacement for oil and natural gas, the two primary sources of energy currently maintaining an industrial standard of living. Snead envisions a world in the year 2100 where about 20% of electrical power comes from terrestrial nuclear and renewables, with 80% supplied by astroelectricity."Just as the military, economic and diplomatic control of Middle East oil has substantially influenced world events for the past 80 years, the control of space solar power platforms will come to dominate outer space activities this century," Snead told Space.com. Wanted: high-priority leadershipIf SSP becomes a reality later this century, Snead said, the U.S. military will be required to protect and defend these new sources of national energy security just as it guards oil infrastructure in the Persian Gulf today."While some people are developing SSP concepts that would be launched from the Earth and autonomously assembled in geostationary Earth orbit, I do not see this as a successful proposition," said Snead. He believes that building the thousands of SSP platforms needed requires a substantial [space industrialization effort](https://www.space.com/nasa-low-earth-orbit-iss-commercialization.html) involving more than a million people in space by the end of the century. The starting point, Snead said, will be establishing the enabling "astrologistics" infrastructure operating throughout the Earth-moon system. He stressed that those astrologistics require high-priority U.S. Air Force — not [Space Force](https://www.space.com/42089-space-force.html) — leadership to draw upon nearly a century of human flight/operational logistics experience and expertise.That is necessary to manage industry's efforts to design and build the required new human spaceflight systems, with a clearly needed emphasis on safety and effectiveness, Snead said. As these new military astrologistics capabilities begin, Snead contends, commercialization of these capabilities will extend these safety and operational benefits to support the coming space industrial revolution needed to undertake SSP. "This is exactly what happened to enable U.S. airline manufacturers to dominate the airline and air cargo industry for decades. It is a successful model to now replicate in space — a model that neither NASA nor the U.S. Space Force can effectively execute," Snead said. The U.S. Naval Research Laboratory’s Paul Jaffe holds a module designed for space solar power investigations in front of a customized vacuum chamber used to test the device. (Image credit: NRL/Jamie Hartman) 'Performing like a champ' While new artwork, economic plots and conceptual SPS thinking and visions flow, there's an in-space technology experiment already underway. On its latest mission, which launched in May 2020, the Space Force's robotic [X-37B space plane](https://www.space.com/25275-x37b-space-plane.html) is toting the Photovoltaic Radio-frequency Antenna Module Flight Experiment (PRAM-FX), a Naval Research Laboratory (NRL) investigation into transforming solar power into radio-frequency microwave energy. The focus of that X-37B investigation is not establishing an actual power-beaming link, but more on appraising the performance of sunlight-to-microwave conversion. "It is performing like a champ," said Paul Jaffe, an NRL electronics engineer working on power beaming and solar power satellites. "We are getting data regularly, and that data is exceeding our expectations," he told Space.com. [PRAM-FX](https://www.space.com/x-37b-space-plane-solar-power-beaming) is principally made out of commercial parts, not "space-grade" hardware. "The fact that it is continuing to operate and give us positive results is quite encouraging," Jaffe said. Commercial parts are mass-produced, while many space-grade parts are one-offs. Solar power satellites, like those envisioned in high Earth orbit, would have thousands of elements made out of similar components being tested onboard the X-37B, Jaffe said. [The US Space Force's secretive X-37B space plane: 10 surprising facts](https://www.space.com/x-37b-military-space-plane-surprising-facts) Space-based solar power could help the UK achieve net-zero emissions by 2050, according to a leading British systems, engineering and technology company. (Image credit: Frazer-Nash Consultancy) Making the economics work There's much more work ahead, of course. "The big strike against space solar power has always been making the economics work. People who have looked at the idea seriously do understand that, from a physics standpoint, there is no reason you couldn't do it," Jaffe said. "With mass production of space hardware, and with the cost reduction of space access, it is more plausible that it could work," he added. "I would caution against excessive optimism … but also point out that things are changing. There are a lot of encouraging developments." SPS will assuredly be compared to a "levelized cost of energy" metric, Jaffe concluded. "There's just not enough data to come up with a levelized cost of energy basis for space solar power. It's premature. What you are seeing now is laying the foundation for that sort of evaluation." Clear, affordable path To that end, Mankins of Artemis Innovation Management Solutions has rolled out SPS-ALPHA ("Solar Power Satellite by means of Arbitrarily Large Phased Array"), a design he showcased at the 72nd International Astronautical Congress, which was held from Oct. 25 to Oct. 29 in Dubai, United Arab Emirates. Detailing a business model and step-by-step SSP roadmap, he feels the concept promises a clear, affordable path to deploying a critically needed new energy option. "I believe you could have operational solar power satellites to scale within a decade," Mankins said. That possibility, combined with the fact that multiple nations are eying SSP as a promising power generation system of the future, begs a question: Is there a solar power satellite race afoot? It is close to that, Mankins said. "I think it has to be cooperation among friends and allies. But I think it's very likely to end up being competition with China. The longer we wait with regard to the urgency of policies on [climate change](https://www.space.com/climate-change-dimming-earth), the more likely it is we're going to miss the boat." Mankins is a 26-year veteran of assessing SSP and the technologies required. "The moment has come," he said. "I think the right answer is really clear: We need to just go do it."

**SBSP solves warming**

**Katete 12-17**, [Katete, Esthere. (December 17 2021) “Space-Based Solar Power: The Future Source of Energy?”https://www.greenmatch.co.uk/blog/2020/02/space-based-solar-power] Sachin

Space-based solar power (SBSP) involves collecting the sun’s energy in space, and then wirelessly transmitting it to Earth. There are several [advantages to solar energy](https://www.greenmatch.co.uk/blog/2014/08/5-advantages-and-5-disadvantages-of-solar-energy). Although expensive, it is a great source of [clean energy](https://www.greenmatch.co.uk/blog/clean-energy) that has the capacity to provide more energy than the world consumes or is predicted to consume in the future. A space-based solar power technological process includes using [solar panels](https://www.greenmatch.co.uk/solar-energy/solar-panels) to collect solar energy in space with reflectors or inflatable mirrors that direct solar radiation onto solar panels, and then beaming it on Earth through a microwave or laser. The energy is then received on Earth via a microwave antenna (a rectenna). According to the [National Space Society](https://space.nss.org/space-solar-power/), space-based solar power has the potential to dwarf all the other sources of energy combined. They argue that space-based solar power can provide large quantities of energy with very little negative environmental impact. It can also solve our current energy and greenhouse gas emissions problems. The infographic below highlights information about space-based solar power, current related trends, and what different countries are doing in terms of research and funding. Current Global Energy Consumption and Trends The world’s energy consumption is only growing. According to a report by the University of Oxford’s Our World in Data, on the global primary energy consumption, the current world consumption is over 160,000 TWh annually. Solar energy contributes only 585 TWh. Although there is an increase in renewable energy solutions, investments, and usage, oil, coal, and gas still generate more than 80% of the global energy that is consumed - with solar energy generating less than 1%. Between 2004 and 2015, investments in renewable energy increased by 600% from £36.2 billion (US$46.7 billion) to £220.6 billion (US$284.8 billion). Current predictions indicate that the world population will reach [9.7 billion by 2050](https://www.un.org/development/desa/en/news/population/world-population-prospects-2019.html). With the increase in population, the world energy consumption is also predicted to grow by 50% by 2050. In addition, climate change impacts are accelerating. Although we generate a big percentage of the world energy from fossil fuels, fossil fuels contribute significantly to the increase of climate change. Comparatively, solar energy is the [safest source of energy](https://ourworldindata.org/uploads/2020/02/Safest-source-of-energy.png) today - though it still only contributes a small percentage of the global energy production. The death rates from solar production are 1,230 times lower than coal, and it has one of the lowest CO2 emissions, at 5g CO2 eq per kWh. Why Space-Based Solar Power? Space-based solar power has several benefits; unlike solar panels on our roofs that can only generate electricity during the day, space-based solar power can generate continuous electricity, 24 hours a day, 99% of the year. This is because, unlike Earth, the space environment does not have night and day, and the satellites are in the Earth's shadow for only a maximum of 72 minutes per night. Space-based solar panels can generate 2,000 gigawatts of power constantly. This is 40 times more energy than a solar panel would generate on Earth annually. This is also several folds higher than the [efficiency of solar panels](https://www.greenmatch.co.uk/blog/2014/11/how-efficient-are-solar-panels) today. What’s more, is that space-based solar power would generate [0% greenhouse gas emissions](https://space.nss.org/space-solar-power/) unlike other alternatives energy like nuclear, coal, oil, gas, and ethanol. The current source of energy that generates the lowest CO2 is nuclear power, which generates CO2 of 5g CO2 eq per kWh. Space-based solar power generates almost 0% hazardous waste to our environment compared to nuclear power. Why Are We Not There Yet? While space-based solar power is an innovative concept, we are not able to fully launch a system into space yet. Launching a space-based solar system is very expensive. In fact, the cost is estimated to be about 100 times too high to compete with current utility costs. One of the causes of the high costs is the high cost of launching the panels to space, which is mostly due to the high mass per watt generated by the current solar panels. In other words, the solar panels are currently too heavy per watt generated to make it feasible. Currently, the cost of launching in space is estimated to be £7,716 per kilogram - approximately £154 per watt. In comparison to the cost that homeowners pay today, which is approximately £2 per watt peak, the cost in space is extremely high to be competitive. In UK homes, the [installation cost of solar panels](https://www.greenmatch.co.uk/blog/2014/08/what-is-the-installation-cost-for-solar-panels) can be as low as £1.5 per watt. Other reasons for high costs include the overall high transport costs to space. This is because transporting all other materials that are needed to space would require many space shuttle launches, and these space shuttles are currently not reusable. So, not only is the launch of solar panels themselves expensive, but the additional materials needing to be transported is also expensive. A lot of research and engineering is still ongoing to find the most feasible way to launch space-based solar panels and launch systems, at a lower cost. The environment out in space also has several hazards that could cause damage to the solar panels. These include space debris and extreme solar radiation, which could degrade the solar panels up to 8 times faster than panels installed on Earth. Finally, there is a potential of wasting large amounts of energy when transporting or during transmission from space to Earth. Therefore, scientists and engineers must continue their R&D efforts to ensure little to no energy is lost during the process. Current SBSP Projects and Progress The key players in SBSP include China, the US, and Japan, who have shown progress in terms of technology advancements, partnerships, and launch plans. China is already progressing to launch into space. The China Aerospace Science and Technology Corporation plans to launch small to medium solar satellites in the stratosphere that can harness energy in space between 2021 and 2025. China also plans to generate one megawatt of energy from space-based solar panels by 2030, and to be operating a commercially viable solar space station by 2050. In the US, there are ongoing partnerships and investments. For example, a $100 million partnership between Northrop Grumman and U.S. Air Force Research Laboratory has been established to provide advanced technology for SBSP. Also in the US, a $17.5 million collaboration between Northrop Grumman Corporation and Caltech was set up to develop the space solar power project called ‘The Space Solar Power Initiative’. The initiative’s goal was to develop scientific and technological innovations that would enable a space-based solar power system generate electricity at a cost comparable to current sources of electricity. There has been ongoing research and technological advancements. In the US, the development of the SPS-ALPHA Mark-II concept is underway. This, if successful, would enable construction of huge platforms in space that can remotely deliver tens of thousands of megawatts of electricity to Earth, using wireless power transmissions. This will also enable delivery of affordable power to Earth and on space missions. In addition, progress is being made to build reusable launch systems. Success in this will lower the cost of transport to space and overall cost of space-based solar power. An example is SpaceX, that is currently working on reusable launch vehicles that can be used for transport to space. In Japan, researchers successfully transmitted electric power wirelessly using microwaves. Researchers transformed 1.8 kW of electric power into microwaves and accurately transmitted it into a receiver that was 55 metres away. This was a technological advancement towards bringing SBSP closer to reality. Japan also made space-based solar systems part of its future space exploration vision. Future Outlook for SBSP Fossil fuels are finite and can eventually run out. According to predictions, oil and natural gas could run out in 50 years and coal production in 115 years. With ongoing research and investments, there is a high possibility that space-based solar power is the viable [future of solar power](https://www.greenmatch.co.uk/blog/2015/01/the-future-for-solar-power-in-the-uk). If the cost of space-based solar power can be lowered, it is likely to be a major source of sustainable energy that cannot diminish. Major players like China, who already have timelines of implementing the technology in space, may be able to provide some key learnings for future improvements in the technology.

**Extinction**

**Schultz 16** (Robert Schultz [Retired Professor and Chair of Computer Information Systems at Woodbury University] “Modern Technology and Human Extinction,” <http://proceedings.informingscience.org/InSITE2016/InSITE16p131-145Schultz2307.pdf>) RW

There is consensus that there is a relatively short window to reduce carbon emissions before drastic effects occur. Recent credible projections of the result of lack of rapid drastic action is an average temperature increase of about 10o F by 2050. This change alone will be incredibly disruptive to all life, but will also cause great weather and climate change. For comparison purposes, a 10 degree (Fahrenheit) decrease was enough to cause an ice layer 4000 feet thick over Wisconsin (Co2gether, 2012). Recently relevant information has surfaced about a massive previous extinction. This is the Permian extinction, which happened 252 million years ago, during which 95% of all species on earth, both terrestrial and aquatic, vanished. The ocean temperature after almost all life had disappeared was 15 degrees (Fahrenheit) above current ocean temperatures. Recent information about the Permian extinction indicates it was caused by a rapid increase in land and ocean temperatures, caused by the sudden appearance of stupendous amounts of carbon in the form of greenhouse gases (Kolbert, 2014, pp. 102-144). The origin of the carbon in these enormous quantities is not yet known, but one possibility is the sudden release of methane gases stored in permafrost. This is also a possibility in our current situation. If so, extinction would be a natural side effect of human processes. There is also a real but smaller possibility of what is called “runaway greenhouse,” in which the earth’s temperature becomes like Venus’ surface temperature of 800o The threat of extinction here is not entirely sudden. The threat is, if anything, worse. Changes in the atmosphere--mainly increases in the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere-- can start processes that can’t be reversed but which take long periods of time to manifest. “Runaway greenhouse” may be the worst. Once again, suggestions of technological solutions to this situation should be treated with some skepticism. These proposals are often made by technophiles ignoring all the evidence that technology is very much subject to unanticipated side effects and unanticipated failures. What has happened concerning the depletion of the ozone layer should be a clear warning against the facile uses of technology through geoengineering to alter the makeup of the entire planet and its atmosphere. The complicating factor in assessing extinction likelihood from climate change is corporations, especially American fossil fuel corporations such as Exxon-Mobil and Shell. Through their contributions, they have been able to delay legislation ameliorating global warming and climate change. As mentioned before, recently released papers from Exxon-Mobil show that the corporation did accept the scientific findings about global warming and climate change. But they concluded that maintaining their profits was more important than acting to ameliorate climate change. Since it is not a matter of getting corporations to appreciate scientific facts, the chances of extinction from climate change are good. To ameliorate climate change, it is important to leave a high percentage of fossil fuel reserves in the ground. But this is exactly what a profit-seeking fossil fuel corporation cannot do. One can still hope that because fossil fuel corporations are made up of individuals, increasingly bad consequences of global warming and climate change will change their minds about profits. But because of the lag in effects, this mind change will probably be too late. So I conclude we will probably see something like the effects of the Permian extinction perhaps some time around 2050. (The Permian extinction was 95% extinction of all species.) This assumes the release of methane from the arctic will take place around then.