# AC – War

I affirm the resolution, Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

**The value is justice** because the operative term in the resolution is unjust. The debate centers around whether private entities owning land in outer space is unjust. The affirmative argues that it is unjust. Outer space is defined by oxford dictionary as the physical universe beyond the earth’s atmosphere.

The best way to achieve justice is consequentialism.

**Consequentialism definition**

“Consequentialism Definition & Meaning - **Merriam-Webster ND**.” *Dictionary by Merriam-Webster: America’s Most-Trusted Online Dictionary*, Merriam Webster, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/consequentialism. Accessed 2 Jan. 2022.

**the theory that the value** and especially the moral value **of** **an act should be judged by the value of its** [**consequences**](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/consequences)

**Thus, the criteria is maximizing well-being.** The goal in today’s debate is to determine whether owning land in outer space, privately, will increase the well-being for a majority of the people on earth.

**Under our framework, the best thing to do is to prevent war.**

**Prefer:**

**War has detrimental psychological effects on victims.**

**Rathi ND,** Amrita. “Psychological Impact of Victims of War and Conflict .” *APA*, Columbia University, https://www.apa.org/international/united-nations/un-matters/rathi-war.pdf. Accessed 3 Feb. 2022.

**War adversely affects combatants and non-combatants alike, both physically and emotionally. Death, injury, sexual violence, malnutrition, illness, and disability are some of the most threatening physical consequences of war**, while post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), depression, and anxiety are some of the emotional effects. **The terror and horror spread by the violence of war disrupts lives and severs relationships and families, leaving individuals and communities emotionally distressed**. Wars are likely to continue and cause emotional distress. Additional empirical studies that focus on healing, promoting resilience, and incorporating cultural capacity builders are needed in order to provide appropriate and effective mental health services to future victims of war.

**AND Nuke war causes extinction.**

**Steven Starr 15. “Nuclear War: An Unrecognized Mass Extinction Event Waiting To Happen.” Ratical. March 2015.** [**https://ratical.org/radiation/NuclearExtinction/StevenStarr022815.html**](https://ratical.org/radiation/NuclearExtinction/StevenStarr022815.html) **TG**

**A war fought with 21st century strategic nuclear weapons would be more than just a great catastrophe in human history. If we allow it to happen, such a war would be a mass extinction event that** [**ends human history**](https://ratical.org/radiation/NuclearExtinction/StarrNuclearWinterOct09.pdf)**. There is a profound difference between extinction and “an unprecedented disaster,” or even “the end of civilization,” because even after such an immense catastrophe, human life would go on. But extinction, by definition, is an event of utter finality, and a nuclear war that could cause human extinction should really be considered as the ultimate criminal act. It certainly would be the crime to end all crimes.  The world’s leading climatologists now tell us that nuclear war threatens our continued existence as a species. Their studies predict that a large nuclear war, especially one fought with strategic nuclear weapons, would create a post-war environment in which for many years it would be too cold and dark to even grow food. Their findings make it clear that not only humans, but most large animals and many other forms of complex life would likely vanish forever in a nuclear darkness of our own making. The environmental consequences of nuclear war would attack the ecological support systems of life at every level. Radioactive fallout produced not only by nuclear bombs, but also by the destruction of nuclear power plants and their spent fuel pools, would poison the biosphere. Millions of tons of smoke would act to** [**destroy Earth’s protective ozone layer**](https://www2.ucar.edu/atmosnews/just-published/3995/nuclear-war-and-ultraviolet-radiation) **and block most sunlight from reaching Earth’s surface, creating Ice Age weather conditions that would last for decades. Yet the political and military leaders who control nuclear weapons strictly avoid any direct public discussion of the consequences of nuclear war. They do so by arguing that nuclear weapons are not intended to be used, but only to deter. Remarkably, the leaders of the Nuclear Weapon States have chosen to ignore the authoritative, long-standing scientific research done by the climatologists, research that predicts virtually any nuclear war, fought with even a fraction of the operational and deployed nuclear arsenals, will leave the Earth essentially uninhabitable.**

**We clearly prove that war goes against our framework. The only burden of the aff is to prove that private entities are unjust. If we can prove in one of our contentions that private entities cause war, you automatically vote aff because nuclear war causes extinction and hurt people, which means that we win under the resolution.**

**Contention 1 – OST**

**The non-appropriation principle in Article II of the Outer Space Treaty prevents conflicts between states in space**

**Tronchetti**, Fabio. “THE NON-APPROPRIATION PRINCIPLE UNDER ATTACK: USING ARTICLE II OF THE OUTER SPACE TREATY IN ITS DEFE.” International Institute of Space Law. 200**7**. Web. December 12, 2021. <https://iislweb.org/docs/Diederiks2007.pdf>.

**The non-appropriation principle represents the cardinal rule of the space law system. Since this principle was incorporated in Article II of the Outer Space Treaty (OST)1 in 1967**, first declared in the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) Resolutions 17212 and 19623, **it has provided guidance and basis for space activities and has contributed to 40 years of peaceful exploration and use of outer space**. The importance of the **non-appropriation principle stems from the fact that it has prevented outer space from becoming an area of international conflict among States.** **By prohibiting States from obtaining territorial sovereignty rights over outer space or any of its parts, it has avoided the risk that rivalries and tensions could arise in relation to the management of outer space and its resources.** Moreover, its presence has represented the best guarantee for the realization of one of the fundamental principles of space law, namely the exploration and use of outer space to be carried out for the benefit and in the interest of all States, irrespective of their stage of development. When in the end of the 1950’s and in the beginning of the 1960’s States renounced any potential claims of sovereignty over outer space, indeed, they agreed to consider it as a res belonging to all mankind, whose utilization and development was to be aimed to encounter not only the needs of the few States involved in space activities but also of all countries irrespective of their degree of development. **If we analyse the status of outer space 40 years after the entry into force of the Outer Space Treaty, it is possible to affirm that the non-appropriation principle has been successful in allowing the safe and orderly development of space activities.**

**Cooperation between countries ensures decreased escalation of war and the way to stop “a space war” from happening.**

**Grego 15** LAURA GREGO is a physicist in the Global Security program at UCS. She is an expert in space weapons and security; ballistic missile proliferation; and ballistic missile defense. ”Preventing Space War.” https://allthingsnuclear.org/lgrego/preventing‑space‑war So says a very good New York Times editorial

**“Preventing a Space War” this week**. Sounds right, if X‑Wing fighters come to mind when you think space conflict. But in reality **conflict in space is both more likely than one would think** and less likely to be so photogenic. **Space as a locus of conflict The Pentagon has known that space could be a flash point at least since the late 1990s when it began including satellites and space weapons in earnest as part of its wargames**. The early games revealed some surprises. For example, attacking an adversary’s ground‑based anti‑satellite weapons before they were used could be the “trip wire” that starts a war: in the one of the first war games, an attack on an enemy’s ground‑based lasers was meant to defuse a potential conflict and protect space assets, but instead was interpreted as an act of war and initiated hostilities. The games also revealed that disrupting space‑based communication and information flow or “blinding” could rapidly escalate a war, eventually leading to nuclear weapon exchange. **The war games have continued over the years with increased sophistication, but continue to find that conflicts can rapidly escalate and become global when space weapons are involved, and that even minor opponents can create big problems.** The report back from the 2012 game, which included NATO partners, said these insights have become “virtually axiomatic.” **Participants in the most recent** Schriever **war games found that when space weapons were introduced in a regional crisis, it escalated quickly and was difficult to stop from spreading. The compressed timelines, the global as well as dual‑use nature of space assets, the difficulty of attribution and seeing what is happening, and the inherent vulnerability of satellites all contribute to this problem.** Satellite vulnerability & solutions Satellites are valuable but, at least on an individual basis, physically vulnerable. Vulnerable in that they are relatively fragile, as launch mass is at a premium and so protective armor is too expensive, and a large number of low‑earth‑orbiting satellites are no farther from the earth’s surface than the distance from Boston to Washington.

**A war in space causes many harms such as lack of communication and space debris.**

**Skibba**, Ramin, **and Undark.** “Countries Are Gearing Up for Space Warfare - The Atlantic.” *The Atlantic*, https://www.facebook.com/TheAtlantic/, 12 July 20**20**, https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2020/07/space-warfare-unregulated/614059/.

For example, the **thousands of everyday satellites that already circle low-Earth orbit, below an altitude of 1,200 miles, could potentially suffer collateral damage.** More than half of those satellites are from the U.S.; many of the rest are from China and Russia. **They provide key services like internet access, GPS signals, long-distance communications, and weather information. Any missile that smashes into a satellite—either as an attack or during a test—would disperse thousands of bits of debris.** Any one of those pieces, still hurtling at orbital speeds, could take out another spacecraft and create yet more debris. “It’s very easy to pollute space,” Burbach said. “The debris doesn’t discriminate. If you create debris, it might just as well come back and hit one of your own satellites. So I think we’re pretty unlikely to see countries actually use those capabilities.” Still, he said, “it would be worrying to see countries showing off that [they] can do it and start testing.”

**Communication is crucial for space exploration.**

**NASA**. “NASA Space Communications and Navigation: Supporting Exploration  | NASA.” *NASA*, 6 Dec. 20**18**,<https://www.nasa.gov/directorates/heo/scan/explore>.

**Communications is perhaps most critical in human spaceflight, when human lives depend on being able to exchange information with mission controllers on Earth.** NASA’s networks support the [International Space Station](https://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/station/main/index.html), several [commercial cargo vehicles](https://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/station/structure/launch/index.html), and will support [commercial crew](https://www.nasa.gov/exploration/commercial/crew/index.html) and NASA’s [Orion](https://www.nasa.gov/exploration/systems/orion/index.html) crew vehicle in the future. **NASA’s** [**Space Network (SN)**](https://www.nasa.gov/directorates/heo/scan/services/networks/sn) **currently transmits most human spaceflight data, including astronaut communications with Mission Control and even data about the spacecraft’s health and telemetry.** Data from science and technology experiments also come down to Earth through the SN. The SN is so named because it is currently NASA’s only space communications network that employs satellites to transmit data. [Tracking and Data Relay Satellites (TDRS)](https://www.nasa.gov/directorates/heo/scan/services/networks/tdrs_main) circle Earth in geosynchronous orbit, an orbit about 22,000 miles from Earth’s surface that allows them to remain stationary over one spot on the planet. Because of this orbit, these satellites are always within line of sight of an antenna on the ground. They are placed in key positions around Earth, meaning that one TDRS is always within line of sight of a low-Earth-orbiting spacecraft. This allows the SN to provide 24/7/365 continuous communications coverage, which is crucial to human spaceflight.

**Contention 2 – Space Debris**

**Increased private space activity increases debris.**

**Parker**, Andrew. “Space Pollution.”. September 27, 20**11**. Web. December 13, 2021. <http://www.greeniacs.com/GreeniacsArticles/Waste/Space-Pollution.html>.

. The big sky theory was challenged in 1978 by a NASA scientist named Donald Kessler. Kessler published a paper titled “Collision Frequency of Artificial Satellites: The Creation of a Debris Belt,” which argued that **the increasing number of man-made objects in space pose[s] a huge threat.** It wasn’t just the slow growth of these objects, Kessler wrote, but the way in which inevitable **collisions would create a domino-like effect. One big collision could generate thousands of pieces of debris, each of which might go on to strike other objects, leading to a chain reaction that would exponentially increase the number of items in space**. This phenomenon, later dubbed the “Kessler Syndrome,” would produce a “growing belt of debris.” The **development of** this “belt of **debris” would have significant consequences, beginning with damage to existing satellites, as more and more are pelted with sharp objects traveling at high speeds**. **This could eventually disrupt satellites tasked with communication and weather observation functions, causing a noticeable impact for people on Earth**. Even worse, any future space exploration missions – or even service missions to repair existing objects in orbit – would become far more dangerous.

**Private companies lack jurisdiction to clean space debris.**

**Oliver**, Stéphane. “Active Debris Removal: A Business Opportunity?.” Toulouse Business School. 20**15**. Web. December 13, 2021. <https://chaire-sirius.eu/f/Oliver-Pugliese-2015-Active- Debris-Removal-A-Business-Opportunity-Unknown.pdf>.

A clear lack of jurisdiction. Since the first steps of mankind in space, spacefaring nations have established agreements in order to create a juridical framework for the space conquest and the space industry. The Outer Space Treaty, ratified in 1967, forms the basis of space law and gives the first principles for governing the activities of States in the exploration and the use of outer space. In 1972 the Space Liability Convention, dealing with the eventual damages caused by space objects, started including space debris in its scope, thus expanding the former treaty. One of the main principles of this convention is that ?States are internationally responsible for all space objects that are launched within their territory [...], and then States are fully liable for damages that result from their space object?. In other words, **nations are responsible for their actions and potential damages that they can cause in the space environment**. It means also that the **consent from the country owning a spacecraft is mandatory to remove the aforementioned object,** may it be from a private or a public ownership. Indeed, **the Outer Space Treaty specifies that ?countries are responsible for the outer space activities of both sides**, their governmental and non-governmental entities?. However, **despite all these measures written to create a jurisdiction regarding space activities, the clear lack of a comprehensive definition of space debris remains a major issue for the development of an active debris removal solution.** Indeed, even if the United Nations Committee On the Peaceful Use Of Space (UNCOPUOS) implements a new definition for space debris, we observe that the definition is too evasive. For instance, according to the IAA Cosmic Study on Space Traffic Management ?no legal distinction is made between valuable active space-craft and valueless space debris.? In fact, international organizations did not even take into account the fact that some space debris may not have an assigned launching state. According to Paul Kallender -Umezu in A Market for Cleaning Up Space Junk ?, ?Neither the Liability Convention nor the OST cover who is at fault if a third party disturbs a piece of debris, which explodes and later collides with another satellite, or who is liable for a removed debris object that lands on a house, private property, etc.? Eventually, **it seems that the lack of definition and details of international laws regarding space debris makes it impossible to identify removable objects and to actually create a legal framework that would manage ODR operations and deal with space disputes.** But as we will explain it in this second part, the fragility of space laws is not the only issue in this matter.

**Private entities like SpaceX launch large amounts of satellites into space that create space debris.**

**Mohanta**, Nibedita. “How Many Satellites Are Orbiting the Earth in 2021? – Geospatial World.” *Geospatial World*,https://www.facebook.com/GeospatialMedia/, 28 May 20**21**,https://www.geospatialworld.net/blogs/how-many-satellites-are-orbiting-the-earth-in-2021/.

The growth in the number of satellites over the last decade was mainly driven by the development of the smaller CubeSat, which allows a large number of small sized satellites to launch at the same time, however earlier rockets were used only to launch one or two satellites at a time. Other causes can be that the satellites have made geoinformation and Space technologies play a number of roles in various development sectors, such as agriculture, education, food security, climate change, rural development, health, public management, energy and environment as well as in governance, transport water, urban development and disaster management. Other development factors which caused the rise in numbers of satellite launches is the race for satellite broadband services, especially SpaceX Starlink satellite constellation. In May 2021, **SpaceX has launched 172 Starlink satellites in just three launches making their constellation over 1,600, whereas the UK Government part-owned OneWeb has launched 72 satellites in 2021.** The numbers might look fascinating on the surface but on the contrary, **it raises severe concern around Space traffic management and Space debris.** According to NASA, there are millions of pieces of junk flying in LEO, which comprises of Space craft, tiny flecks of paint from Space craft, parts of rockets and satellites that are either dead or lost, including objects that are results of explosions in the Space. **Most of this “Space junk” is flying at very high speed and there are high chances of unwarranted accidents to happen, which will produce a dangerous amount of Space debris as well as disturb the channels of the neighboring active satellites, transmitting critical information to astronauts and International Space Centers, it holds potential to create a chain reaction leading to mass disaster.** This also poses a threat to safety of people and property on Earth and in Space as well as future operations and Space explorations.

**Collisions are devastating – they ultimately create a vicious cycle where space debris and collisions increase.**

**Luke**, Charlotte. “What Is Space Junk and How Does It Affect the Environment?” *Earth.Org - Past | Present | Future*, https://www.facebook.com/hivelifemagazine, 6 Sept. 20**21**, https://earth.org/space-junk-what-is-it-what-can-we-do-about-it/.

Artificial, or orbital, space junk consists of objects ranging from paint flecks from functioning space stations, to those as large as decades-old, inoperative spacecraft.  As of August 2021, the **European Space Agency (ESA) reports that approximately 29,210 pieces of debris are tracked on a regular basis by Space Surveillance Networks.** Statistically, however, **the numbers are likely to be much higher.** The count of artificial objects in orbit around the Earth that are greater than 10cm in length is likely to be approximately 34,000, with approximately 900,000 objects between 1cm and 10cm. For those objects between 1mm and 1cm, the count is some 128 million. Consequently, **the sheer number of these objects currently in orbit, and their potential to slam into other objects at speeds of up to 5 miles per second, means that the risk of causing serious damage to functioning spacecraft is significant.** In 2006, the International Space Station’s (ISS) fused-silica and borosilicate-glass fortified window suffered a 7mm chip due to an impact from a piece of space debris no larger than thousandths of a millimetre across. It is easy to see the threat posed by much larger objects. **A single collision can generate thousands of particles of space trash. In 2009, the inactive Russian satellite Cosmos 2251 collided with the active American communication satellite Iridium 33 approximately 804 kms above Siberia, resulting in approximately 2,000 pieces of debris at least 10cm in diameter, and thousands more smaller pieces, entering the Earth’s atmosphere.** It is estimated that over 50% of the debris from Iridium 33 will remain in orbit for at least a century, and that of Cosmos 2251 for at least 20 to 30 years.

**It cascades with catastrophic results including nuclear war, mass starvation, and economic destruction.**

Les **Johnson 13**, Deputy Manager for NASA's Advanced Concepts Office at theMarshall Space Flight Center, Co-Investigator for the JAXA T-Rex Space TetherExperiment and PI of NASA's ProSEDS Experiment, Master's Degree in Physics fromVanderbilt University, Popular Science Writer, and NASA Technologist, FrequentContributor to the Journal of the British Interplanetary Sodety and Member of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, National Space Society, the World Future Society, and MENSA, Sky Alert!: When Satellites Fail, p. 9-12

[language modified]

Whatever the initial cause, the result may be the same. A satellite destroyed in orbit will break apart into thousands of pieces, each traveling at over 8 km/sec. This virtual shotgun blast, with pellets traveling 20 times faster than a bullet, will quickly spread out, with each pellet now follo`wing its own orbit around the Earth. With over 300,000 other pieces of junk already there, the tipping point is crossed and a runaway series of collisions begins. A few orbits later, two of the new debris pieces strike other satellites, causing them to explode into thousands more pieces of debris. The rate of collisions increases, now with more spacecraft being destroyed. Called the "Kessler Effect", after the NASA scientist who first warned of its dangers, these debris objects, now numbering in the millions, cascade around the Earth, destroying every satellite in low Earth orbit. Without an atmosphere to slow them down, thus allowing debris pieces to bum up, most debris (perhaps numbering in the millions) will remain in space for hundreds or thousands of years. Any new satellite will be threatened by destruction as soon as it enters space, effectively rendering many Earth orbits unusable. But what about us on the ground? How will this affect us? Imagine a world that suddenly loses all of its space technology. If you are like most people, then you would probably have a few fleeting thoughts about the Apollo-era missions to the Moon, perhaps a vision of the Space Shuttle launching astronauts into space for a visit to the International Space Station (ISS), or you might fondly recall the"wow" images taken by the orbiting Hubble Space Telescope. In short, you would know that things important to science would be lost, but you would likely not assume that their loss would have any impact on your daily life. Now imagine a world that suddenly loses network and cable television, accurate weather forecasts, Global Positioning System (GPS) navigation, some cellular phone networks, on-time delivery of food and medical supplies via truck and train to stores and hospitals in virtually every community in America, as well as science useful in monitoring such things as climate change and agricultural sustainability. Add to this the [disabling] ~~crippling~~ of the US military who now depend upon spy satellites, space-based communications systems, and GPS to know where their troops and supplies are located at all times and anywhere in the world. The result is a nightmarish world, one step away from nuclear war, economic disaster, and potential mass starvation. This is the world in which we are now perilously close to living. Space satellites now touch our lives in many ways. And, unfortunately, these satellites are extremely vulnerable to risks arising from a half-century of carelessness regarding protecting the space environment around the Earth as well as from potential adversaries such as China, North Korea, and Iran. No government policy has put us at risk. It has not been the result of a conspiracy. No, we are dependent upon them simply because they offer capabilities that are simply unavailable any other way. Individuals, corporations, and governments found ways to use the unique environment of space to provide services, make money, and better defend the country. In fact, only a few space visionaries and futurists could have foreseen where the advent of rocketry and space technology would take us a mere 50 years since those first satellites orbited the Earth. It was the slow progression of capability followed by dependence that puts us at risk. The exploration and use of space began in 1957 with the launch of Sputnik 1 by the Soviet Union. The United States soon followed with Explorer 1. Since then, the nations of the world have launched over 8,000 spacecraft. Of these, several hundred are still providing information and services to the global economy and the world's governments. Over time, nations, corporations, and individuals have grown accustomed to the services these spacecraft provide and many are dependent upon them. Commercial aviation, shipping, emergency services, vehicle fleet tracking, financial transactions, and agriculture are areas of the economy that are increasingly reliant on space. Telestar 1, launched into space in the year of my birth, 1962, relayed the world's first live transatlantic news feed and showed that space satellites can be used to relay television signals, telephone calls, and data. The modern telecommunications age was born. We've come a long way since Telstar; most television networks now distribute most, if not ali, of their programming via satellite. Cable television signals are received by local providers from satellite relays before being sent to our homes and businesses using cables. With 65% of US households relying on cable television and a growing percentage using satellite dishes to receive signals from direct-to-home satellite television providers, a large number of people would be cut off from vital information in an emergency should these satellites be destroyed. And communications satellites relay more than television signals. They serve as hosts to corporate video conferences and convey business, banking, and other commercial information to and from all areas of the planet. The first successful weather satellite was TIROS. Launched in 1960, TIROS operated for only 78 days but it served as the precursor for today's much more long-lived weather satellites, which provide continuous monitoring of weather conditions around the world. Without them, providing accurate weather forecasts for virtually any place on the globe more than a day in advance would be nearly impossible. Figure !.1 shows a satellite image of Hurricane Ivan approaching the Alabama Gulf coast in 2004. Without this type of information, evacuation warnings would have to be given more generally, resulting in needless evacuations and lost economic activity (from areas that avoid landfall) and potentially increasing loss of life in areas that may be unexpectedly hit. The formerly top-secret Corona spy satellites began operation in 1959 and provided critical information about the Soviet Union's military and industrial capabilities to a nervous West in a time of unprecedented paranoia and nuclear risk. With these satellites, US military planners were able to understand and assess the real military threat posed by the Soviet Union. They used information provided by spy satellites to help avert potential military confrontations on numerous occasions. Conversely, the Soviet Union's spy satellites were able to observe the United States and its allies, with similar results. It is nearly impossible to move an army and hide it from multiple eyes in the sky. Satellite information is critical to all aspects of US intelligence and military planning. Spy satellites are used to monitor compliance with international arms treaties and to assess the military activities of countries such as China, Russia, Iran, and North Korea. Figure 1.2 shows the capability of modem unclassified space-based imaging. Thecapability of the classified systems is presumed to be significantly better, providing much more detail. Losing these satellites would place global militaries on high alert and have them operating, literally, in the blind. Our military would suddenly become vulnerable in other areas as well. GPS, a network of 24-32 satellites in medium-Earth orbit, was developed to provide precise position information to the military, and it is now in common use by individuals and industry. The network, which became fully operational in 1993, allows our armed forces to know their exact locations anywhere in the world. It is used to guide bombs to their targets with unprecedented accuracy, requiring that only one bomb be used to destroy a target that would have previously required perhaps hundreds of bombs to destroy in the pre-GPS world (which, incidentally, has resulted in us reducing our stockpile of non-GPS-guided munitions dramatically). It allows soldiers to navigate in the dark or in adverse weather or sandstorms. Without GPS, our military advantage over potentialadversaries would be dramatically reduced or eliminated.

**Contention 3 - Cooperation**

**Cooperation allows extreme advancement in space technology.**

**Patrick**, Stewart. “A New Space Age Demands International Cooperation, Not Competition or Dominance | Council on Foreign Relations.” *Council on Foreign Relations*, 20 May 20**19**, https://www.cfr.org/blog/new-space-age-demands-international-cooperation-not-competition-or-dominance.

Fifty years after Apollo 11 astronauts first walked on the moon, **the world is entering a new Space Age**. Outer space, a domain once reserved for the great powers, is democratizing. New “**space-faring” nations and private corporations are entering the final frontier, taking advantage of breakthrough technologies and lower financial barriers. The possibilities for humanity are immense. They include new opportunities for communication, for observing and understanding the Earth’s natural systems, for exploring the solar system and the heavens beyond, for exploiting space-based resources, and for constructing planetary defense systems to protect the planet from catastrophic collisions with near-Earth objects**—asteroids, comets—and other celestial hazards.

**Innovation is important for an economy – which prevents economic recession**

**ECB 21**Bank, European Central. “How Does Innovation Lead to Growth?” *European Central Bank*, 18 Nov. 2021, https://www.ecb.europa.eu/ecb/educational/explainers/tell-me-more/html/growth.en.html.

**Innovation is an essential driver of economic progress that benefits consumers, businesses and the economy as a whole.** How does it play that role, how does it contribute to economic growth and what can be done to promote it? **In economic terms, innovation describes the development and application of ideas and technologies that improve goods and services or make their production more efficient**. A classic example of innovation is the development of steam engine technology in the 18th century. Steam engines could be put to use in factories, enabling mass production, and they revolutionized transport with the railways. More recently, information technology transformed the way companies produce and sell their goods and services, while opening up new markets and new business models.

**Econ decline causes world war.**

**Sundaram and Popov 19 [Jomo Kwame Sundaram, a former economics professor, was United Nations Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development, and received the Wassily Leontief Prize for Advancing the Frontiers of Economic Thought in 2007. Vladimir Popov, a former senior economics researcher in the Soviet Union, Russia and the United Nations Secretariat, is now Research Director at the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute in Berlin. Economic Crisis Can Trigger World War. February 12, 2019. www.ipsnews.net/2019/02/economic-crisis-can-trigger-world-war/]**

**KUALA LUMPUR and BERLIN, Feb 12 2019 (IPS) - Economic recovery efforts since the 2008-2009 global financial crisis have mainly depended on unconventional monetary policies. As fears rise of yet another international financial crisis, there are growing concerns about the increased possibility of large-scale military conflict. More worryingly, in the current political landscape, prolonged economic crisis, combined with rising economic inequality, chauvinistic ethno-populism as well as aggressive jingoist rhetoric, including threats, could easily spin out of control and ‘morph’ into military conflict, and worse, world war. Crisis responses limited The 2008-2009 global financial crisis almost ‘bankrupted’ governments and caused systemic collapse. Policymakers managed to pull the world economy from the brink, but soon switched from counter-cyclical fiscal efforts to unconventional monetary measures, primarily ‘quantitative easing’ and very low, if not negative real interest rates. But while these monetary interventions averted realization of the worst fears at the time by turning the US economy around, they did little to address underlying economic weaknesses, largely due to the ascendance of finance in recent decades at the expense of the real economy. Since then, despite promising to do so, policymakers have not seriously pursued, let alone achieved, such needed reforms. Instead, ostensible structural reformers have taken advantage of the crisis to pursue largely irrelevant efforts to further ‘casualize’ labour markets. This lack of structural reform has meant that the unprecedented liquidity central banks injected into economies has not been well allocated to stimulate resurgence of the real economy. From bust to bubble Instead, easy credit raised asset prices to levels even higher than those prevailing before 2008. US house prices are now 8% more than at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, while its price-to-earnings ratio in late 2018 was even higher than in 2008 and in 1929, when the Wall Street Crash precipitated the Great Depression. As monetary tightening checks asset price bubbles, another economic crisis — possibly more severe than the last, as the economy has become less responsive to such blunt monetary interventions — is considered likely. A decade of such unconventional monetary policies, with very low interest rates, has greatly depleted their ability to revive the economy. The implications beyond the economy of such developments and policy responses are already being seen. Prolonged economic distress has worsened public antipathy towards the culturally alien — not only abroad, but also within. Thus, another round of economic stress is deemed likely to foment unrest, conflict, even war as it is blamed on the foreign. International trade shrank by two-thirds within half a decade after the US passed the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act in 1930, at the start of the Great Depression, ostensibly to protect American workers and farmers from foreign competition! Liberalization’s discontents Rising economic insecurity, inequalities and deprivation are expected to strengthen ethno-populist and jingoistic nationalist sentiments, and increase social tensions and turmoil, especially among the growing precariat and others who feel vulnerable or threatened. Thus, ethno-populist inspired chauvinistic nationalism may exacerbate tensions, leading to conflicts and tensions among countries, as in the 1930s. Opportunistic leaders have been blaming such misfortunes on outsiders and may seek to reverse policies associated with the perceived causes, such as ‘globalist’ economic liberalization. Policies which successfully check such problems may reduce social tensions, as well as the likelihood of social turmoil and conflict, including among countries. However, these may also inadvertently exacerbate problems. The recent spread of anti-globalization sentiment appears correlated to slow, if not negative per capita income growth and increased economic inequality. To be sure, globalization and liberalization are statistically associated with growing economic inequality and rising ethno-populism. Declining real incomes and growing economic insecurity have apparently strengthened ethno-populism and nationalistic chauvinism, threatening economic liberalization itself, both within and among countries. Insecurity, populism, conflict Thomas Piketty has argued that a sudden increase in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Although causality is difficult to prove, with wealth and income inequality now at historical highs, this should give cause for concern. Of course, other factors also contribute to or exacerbate civil and international tensions, with some due to policies intended for other purposes. Nevertheless, even if unintended, such developments could inadvertently catalyse future crises and conflicts. Publics often have good reason to be restless, if not angry, but the emotional appeals of ethno-populism and jingoistic nationalism are leading to chauvinistic policy measures which only make things worse. At the international level, despite the world’s unprecedented and still growing interconnectedness, multilateralism is increasingly being eschewed as the US increasingly resorts to unilateral, sovereigntist policies without bothering to even build coalitions with its usual allies. Avoiding Thucydides’ iceberg Thus, protracted economic distress, economic conflicts or another financial crisis could lead to military confrontation by the protagonists, even if unintended. Less than a decade after the Great Depression started, the Second World War had begun as the Axis powers challenged the earlier entrenched colonial powers.**

**Contention 4 – China Domination**

**Surging commercial space industry in China ready to overcome US lead – manufacturing and international collaboration locks in national power.**

**Patel 21, Neel. (I’m the space reporter for MIT Technology Review, and I also write The Airlock newsletter, your number one source for everything happening off this planet. Before joining, I worked as a freelance science and technology journalist, contributing stories to Popular Science, The Daily Beast, Slate, Wired, the Verge, and elsewhere. Prior to that, I was an associate editor for Inverse, where I grew and led the website’s space coverage.) “China's Surging Private Space Industry Is out to Challenge the US.” MIT Technology Review, MIT Technology Review, 28 Jan. 2021, https://www.technologyreview.com/2021/01/21/1016513/china-private-commercial-space-industry-dominance/. //JQ**

**The rivalry between the US and China, whose space program has surged over the last two decades, is what most people mean when they refer to the 21st-century's space race. China is set to build a new space station later this year and will likely attempt to send its taikonauts to the moon before the decade ends. But these big-picture projects represent just one aspect of the country’s space ambitions. Increasingly, the focus is now on the commercial space industry as well. The nation's growing private space business is less focused on bringing prestige and glory to the nation and more concerned with reducing the cost of spaceflight, increasing its international influence—and making money. “The state is really great at large, ambitious projects like going to the moon or developing a large reconnaissance satellite,” says Lincoln Hines, a Cornell University researcher who focuses on Chinese foreign policy. “But it’s not responsive to meeting market needs”—one big way to encourage rapid technological growth and innovation. “I think the government thinks its commercial space sector can be complementary to the state,” he says. What are the market needs that Hines is referring to? Satellites, and rockets that can launch them into orbit. The space industry is undergoing a renaissance thanks to two big trends spurred by the commercial industry: we can make satellites for less money by making them smaller and using off-the-shelf hardware; and we can also make rockets for less money, by using less costly materials or reusing boosters after they’ve already flown (which SpaceX pioneered with its Falcon 9). These trends mean it is now cheaper to send stuff into space, and the services and data that satellites can offer have come down in price accordingly.  China has seen an opportunity. A** [**2017 report by Bank of America Merrill Lynch**](https://www.cnbc.com/2017/10/31/the-space-industry-will-be-worth-nearly-3-trillion-in-30-years-bank-of-america-predicts.html) **estimates that the space industry could be worth up to $2.7 trillion by 2030. Setting foot on the moon and establishing a lunar colony might be a statement of national power, but securing a share of such a highly lucrative business is perhaps even more important to the country’s future.  “In the future, there will be tens of thousands of satellites waiting to launch, which is a major opportunity for Galactic Energy” says Wu Yue, a company spokesperson. The problem is, China has to make up decades’ worth of ground lost to the West. How did China get here—and why?Until recently, China’s space activity has been overwhelmingly dominated by two state-owned enterprises: the China Aerospace Science & Industry Corporation Limited (CASIC) and the China Aerospace Science and Technology Corporation (CASC). A few private space firms have been allowed to operate in the country for a while: for example, there’s the China Great Wall Industry Corporation Limited (in reality a subsidiary of CASC), which has provided commercial launches since it was established in 1980. But for the most part, China’s commercial space industry has been nonexistent. Satellites were expensive to build and launch, and they were too heavy and large for anything but the biggest rockets to actually deliver to orbit. The costs involved were too much for anything but national budgets to handle.That all changed this past decade as the costs of making satellites and launching rockets plunged. In 2014, a year after Xi Jinping took over as the new leader of China, the Chinese government decided to treat civil space development as a key area of innovation, as it had already begun doing with AI and solar power. It issued a policy directive called** [**Document 60**](http://www.cpppc.org/en/zy/994006.jhtml) **that year to enable large private investment in companies interested in participating in the space industry. “Xi’s goal was that if China has to become a critical player in technology, including in civil space and aerospace, it was critical to develop a space ecosystem that includes the private sector,” says Namrata Goswami, a geopolitics expert based in Montgomery, Alabama, who’s been studying China’s space program for many years. “He was taking a cue from the American private sector to encourage innovation from a talent pool that extended beyond state-funded organizations.”As a result, there are now 78 commercial space companies operating in China, according to a** [**2019 report by the Institute for Defense Analyses**](https://www.ida.org/-/media/feature/publications/e/ev/evaluation-of-chinas-commercial-space-sector/d-10873.ashx)**. More than half have been founded since 2014, and the vast majority focus on satellite manufacturing and launch services.For example, Galactic Energy, founded in February 2018, is building its Ceres rocket to offer rapid launch service for single payloads, while its Pallas rocket is being built to deploy entire constellations. Rival company i-Space, formed in 2016, became the first commercial Chinese company to make it to space with its Hyperbola-1 in July 2019. It wants to pursue reusable first-stage boosters that can land vertically, like those from SpaceX. So does LinkSpace (founded in 2014), although it also hopes to use rockets to deliver packages from one terrestrial location to another. Spacety, founded in 2016, wants to turn around customer orders to build and launch its small satellites in just six months. In December it launched a miniaturized version of a satellite that uses 2D radar images to build 3D reconstructions of terrestrial landscapes. Weeks later, it** [**released the first images taken by the satellite**](https://spacenews.com/spacety-releases-first-sar-images/)**, Hisea-1, featuring three-meter resolution. Spacety wants to launch a constellation of these satellites to offer high-quality imaging at low cost.  To a large extent, China is following the same blueprint drawn up by the US: using government contracts and subsidies to give these companies a foot up. US firms like SpaceX benefited greatly from NASA contracts that paid out millions to build and test rockets and space vehicles for delivering cargo to the International Space Station. With that experience under its belt, SpaceX was able to attract more customers with greater confidence.  Venture capital is another tried-and-true route. The IDA report estimates that VC funding for Chinese space companies was up to $516 million in 2018—far shy of the $2.2 billion American companies raised, but nothing to scoff at for an industry that really only began seven years ago. At least 42 companies had no known government funding. And much of the government support these companies do receive doesn’t have a federal origin, but a provincial one. “[These companies] are drawing high-tech development to these local communities,” says Hines. “And in return, they’re given more autonomy by the local government.” While most have headquarters in Beijing, many keep facilities in Shenzhen, Chongqing, and other areas that might draw talent from local universities. There’s also one advantage specific to China: manufacturing. “What is the best country to trust for manufacturing needs?” asks James Zheng, the CEO of Spacety’s Luxembourg headquarters. “It’s China. It’s the manufacturing center of the world.” Zheng believes the country is in a better position than any other to take advantage of the space industry’s new need for mass production of satellites and rockets alike. The most critical strategic reason to encourage a private space sector is to create opportunities for international collaboration—particularly to attract customers wary of being seen to mix with the Chinese government. (US agencies and government contractors, for example, are barred from working with any groups the regime funds.) Document 60 and others issued by China’s National Development and Reform Commission were aimed not just at promoting technological innovation, but also at drawing in foreign investment and maximizing a customer base beyond Chinese borders. “China realizes there are certain things they cannot get on their own,” says Frans von der Dunk, a space policy expert at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln. Chinese companies like LandSpace and MinoSpace have worked to accrue funding through foreign investment, escaping dependence on state subsidies. And by avoiding state funding, a company can also avoid an array of restrictions on what it can and can’t do (such as constraints on talking with the media). Foreign investment also makes it easier to compete on a global scale: you’re taking on clients around the world, launching from other countries, and bringing talent from outside China.**

**China’s private space industry is key to tighten the grip on mining of space resources – reinforces lead on REE extraction and space domination over the US.**

**Cohen 21,** Ariel. (I am a Senior Fellow at the Atlantic Council and the Founding Principal of International Market Analysis, a Washington, D.C.-based global risk advisory boutique. I advise law firms and corporations, and once helped to get a famous Russian oligarch out of Putin’s jail. I am also a Senior Fellow with the International Tax and Investment Center (ITIC) where I direct their Energy, Growth, and Security Program (EGS). For 22 years, I was the Heritage Foundation’s leading Russia/Eurasia and international energy expert. My consultancy focuses on political risk, national security, and energy policy, especially in Russia/Europe/Eurasia, and the Middle East. The firm’s interventions span international security, economics, law, politics, terrorism, and crime and corruption. In addition to consulting for both the public and private sectors, I testify regularly before the U.S. Congress, and appear on Bloomberg, CNN, FOX, BBC, Al Jazeera, and other TV channels.) “China's Space Mining Industry Is Prepping for Launch – but What about the US?” Forbes, Forbes Magazine, 26 Oct. 2021, https://www.forbes.com/sites/arielcohen/2021/10/26/chinas-space-mining-industry-is-prepping-for-launch--but-what-about-the-us/?sh=7587281c2ae0. //JQ

**A slew of activities amongst China’s private and state-owned aerospace companies this year are a testament to China’s growing ambitions for economic and** [**military domination**](https://www.defensenews.com/congress/2021/04/14/china-aims-to-weaponize-space-says-intel-community-report/) **of space. On October 19, the Academy of Aerospace Solid Propulsion Technology (AASPT) – which belongs to the China Aerospace Science and Technology Corporation (CASC) – test fired “the** [**most powerful solid rocket motor**](https://www.space.com/china-tests-giant-solid-fueled-rocket) **with the largest thrust in the world so far.” The 500 tons of thrust is designed to propel the next iteration of China’s heavy-lift rockets, which would meet various demands for space missions like crewed Moon landings, deep space exploration, and off-world resource extraction. Exploration of space-based natural resources are on the Chinese policy makers’ mind. The question is, what Joe Biden thinks? In April of this year, China’s Shenzen** [**Origin Space**](https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2020/oct/1/china-determined-to-dominate-future-mining-with-or/) **Technology Co. Ltd.** [**launched the NEO-1**](https://origin.space/#/detail?id=27)**, the first commercial spacecraft dedicated to the mining of space resources – from asteroids to the lunar surface.Falling costs of space launches and spacecraft technology alongside existing infrastructure provides a unique opportunity to explore extraterrestrial resource extraction. Current technologies are equipped to analyze and categorize asteroids within our solar system with a limited degree of certainty. One of the accompanying payloads to the NEO-1 was the Yuanwang-1, or “little hubble” satellite, which searches the stars for possible asteroid mining targets. The NEO-1 launch marks another milestone in private satellite development, adding a new player to space based companies which include Japan’s** [**Astroscale**](https://astroscale.com/space-debris_/)**. Private asteroid identification via the Sentinel Space Telescope was** [**supported by NASA until 2015**](https://b612foundation.org/b612-official-statement-nasa-following-canceled-space-agreement-act/)**. As private investment in space grows, the end goal is to be capable of harvesting resources to bring to Earth.**

**According to Shenzen** [**Origin Space**](https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2020/oct/1/china-determined-to-dominate-future-mining-with-or/) **Technology company website: “Through the development and launch of the spacecraft, Origin Space is able to carry out low-Earth orbit space junk cleanup and prototype technology verification for space resource acquisition, and at the same time demonstrate future asteroid defense related technologies.” In the end, it will come down to progressively lowering the cost of launched unit of weight and booster rocket reliability – before fundamentally new engines may drive the launch costs even further down.The April launch demonstrates that China is already succeeding while the West is spinning its wheels. The much touted Planetary Resources and Deep Space Industries (DSI)** [**DSI**](https://www.forbes.com/investment-funds/dsi/)[**+0.1%**](https://www.forbes.com/investment-funds/dsi/)**were** [**supposed to be**](https://www.technologyreview.com/2019/06/26/134510/asteroid-mining-bubble-burst-history/) **the vanguard of extra-terrestrial resource acquisition with major backers including Google’s** [**GOOG**](https://www.forbes.com/companies/google)[**+0.3%**](https://www.forbes.com/companies/google)**Larry Page. But both have since been acquired, the former by block chain company** [**ConsenSys**](https://consensys.net/) **and the latter by** [**Bradford Space**](https://www.bradford-space.com/)**, neither of which are prioritizing asteroid mining.This is too bad, given that that supply chain crunches here on Earth – coupled with the global green energy transition – are spiking demand for strategic minerals that are increasingly hard to come by on our environmentally stressed planet. And here China currently** [**holds a monopoly**](https://www.fpri.org/article/2021/06/americas-critical-strategic-vulnerability-rare-earth-elements/) **on rare earth element (REE) extraction and processing to the tune of 90%. REE’s 17 minerals essential for modern computing and manufacturing technologies for everything from solar panels to semi-conductors. Resource-hungry China also has major involvement in global critical mineral supply chains, which include cobalt, tungsten, and lithium. As** [**I’ve written before**](https://www.forbes.com/sites/arielcohen/2021/06/02/chinas-journey-to-the-center-of-the-earth/?sh=673812a9131f)**, the Chinese hold of upstream and downstream markets is staggering. Possessing 30% of the global mined ore, 80% of the global processing facilities, and an ever increasing list of high dollar investments around the world, China boasts over $36 billion invested in mining projects in Africa alone. Beijing’s space program clearly indicates that the Chinese would also like to tighten their grip on space-based resources as well. According to research, it is estimated that a small asteroid roughly 200 meters in length that is rich in platinum could be worth up to $300 million. Merrill Lynch predicts the space industry — including extraterrestrial mining industry – to value** [**$2.7 trillion**](https://www.cnbc.com/2017/10/31/the-space-industry-will-be-worth-nearly-3-trillion-in-30-years-bank-of-america-predicts.html) **in the next three decades. REEs are fairly common in the solar system, but to what degree remains unknown. The most sought after are M-type asteroids which are mostly metal and hundreds of cubic meters. While these are not the most common, the 27,115 Near Earth asteroids are bound to contain a few. This – and military applications – are no doubt a driving factor of China’s ever increasing space ambitions.A new goldrush in space based resource extraction has sparked a new age of miners looking to find their fortunes. In reality, the industry cannot get off the ground without further innovation in deep space observation, on-board power, extraction processes, and logistical support in low earth and high earth orbit. As Uberization of space looms closer, the prices of space launches are falling rapidly. Privately funded satellites like the NEO-1 or Sentinel are the first of many novel economic ventures deploying technologies essential to the viability of solar system mining projects. Private launches by** [**SpaceX**](https://www.spacex.com/) **and** [**Blue Origin**](https://www.blueorigin.com/)**will provide low cost satellite deployment for further testing craft and classification telescopes.Right now, the cost to capture and process asteroids is far greater than traditional mining techniques. This is changing, but like in traditional mining and rare earths refining, China is far ahead of the U.S. in terms of industrial policy and new investments. China is cognizant of the riches in space, while the U.S. fails to support both their public and private space missions. The United States cannot afford to cede this industry – like it has so many others – to its peer competitors. If we do, the joke is on U.S., and it will not be funny.**

**Precedent of success in key sectors like space reinforces China rise - causes nuclear war and destabilizing expansion.**

**Bradley A. Thayer & Lianchao Han 19. \* Professor of Political Science at the University of Texas San Antonio. \*\*vice president of Citizen Power Initiatives for China and a visiting fellow at the Hudson Institute. Founder of the Independent Federation of Chinese Students and Scholars. "The ‘Xi Doctrine’: Proclaiming and Rationalizing China’s Aggression". National Interest. 6-12-2019.** [**https://nationalinterest.org/feature/%E2%80%98xi-doctrine%E2%80%99-proclaiming-and-rationalizing-china%E2%80%99s-aggression-62402**](https://nationalinterest.org/feature/%E2%80%98xi-doctrine%E2%80%99-proclaiming-and-rationalizing-china%E2%80%99s-aggression-62402)

**Using the occasion of the Shangri-La Dialogue in Singapore this month, Chinese Minister of National Defense and State Councilor Gen. Wei Fenghe, delivered a sharp message to the United States, which may be termed the “Xi Doctrine” on China’s use of force, after Chinese premier Xi Jinping. Wei declaring both China’s resolve to aggress to advance its interests and a rationalization for the use of force. Wei’s de facto threat of war should not be lost in his nuances, deliberate ambiguity, or in translation. His remarks were so bellicose that the world has noticed, as was certainly intended by the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP). Empirical evidence of China’s aggression is increasingly common, from its attempt to dominate the South China Sea, the neo-imperialist effort to gain control of states through the Belt and Road Initiative, to its technological imperialism to control 5G and artificial intelligence technologies. What is rather less frequent are statements from high-level Chinese officials proclaiming the country’s intent to be aggressive and offering an attempted legitimizing principle justifying that aggression. While much of the content of Wei’s remarks were in keeping with the gossamer pronouncements on China’s peaceful intentions, as well as a paean to Xi Jinping’s leadership, they still conveyed that China is ready and willing to resort to war if the United States stands in its way of global expansion; and they made clear that China must go to war, or even a nuclear war, to occupy Taiwan. Specifically, there are four elements that comprise the Xi Doctrine and are indications of China’s signaling its willingness to use force. The first component is a new and alarming proclamation of the undisguised threats to use force or wage an unlimited war. China is becoming bolder as its military power grows. This is evidenced in Wei’s muscular remarks on the People’s Republic of China’s approach against Taiwan, his explicit statement that China does not renounce the use of force against Taiwan, and his effort to deter the United States and its allies from intervention should an attack occur. Wei forcefully stated: “If anyone dares to separate Taiwan from China, the Chinese military has no choice but must go to war, and must fight for the reunification of the motherland at all costs.” “At all cost” means that China will not hesitate to use nuclear weapons or launching another Pearl Harbor to take over Taiwan. This is a clear warning of an invasion. Second, the Xi Doctrine legitimizes territorial expansion. Through his remarks, Wei sought to convince the rest of the world that China’s seizure of most of the South China Sea is an accomplished fact that cannot be overturned. He made bogus accusations, which included blaming the United States for “raking in profits by stirring up troubles” in the region. He insisted that only ASEAN and China must resolve the issue. He claimed that China’s militarization on South China Sea islands and reefs were an act of self-defense. Should this be allowed to stand, then the Xi Doctrine will set a perilous precedent of successful territorial expansion, which will further entice China and jeopardize the peace of the region. Third, the doctrine targets the United States as a cause of the world’s major problems and envisions a powerful China evicting the United States from the region. Wei obliquely identified the United States as the cause wars, conflicts, and unrest, and sought to convey that the United States will abandon the states of the South China Sea (SCS) when it is confronted by Chinese power, a typical divide and conquer strategy used by the CCP regime. The Xi Doctrine’s fourth element is the mendacity regarding China’s historical use of force and current actions. While the distortions of history were numerous, there were three major lies that should be alarming for the states of the region and the global community. First, Wei said that China had never invaded another country, which is a claim so transparently false it can only be a measure of the contempt he held for the audience. China has a long history of aggression, including against the Tibetans and Vietnamese, and perhaps soon against the Taiwanese. Second, Wei argued that hegemony does not conform to China’s values when, in fact, China proudly was Asia’s hegemon for most of the last two thousand years. Lastly, he claimed that the situation in the SCS is moving toward stability—from China’s perspective this stability is caused by its successful seizure of territory. In fact, the SCS is far less stable as a result of China’s actions. Efforts to counter this grab are denounced by Wei as destabilizing, which is a bit like a thief accusing you of a crime for wanting your property returned. Wei’s belligerent rhetoric is an indication that the CCP regime faces deep external and internal crises. Externally, the Trump administration has shocked the CCP with the three major steps it has taken. First, it has shifted the focus of the U.S. national-security strategy and now identifies China explicitly as its primary rival—abandoning the far more muted policies of previous administrations. Second, Trump has acted on this peer competitive threat by advancing tangible measures, such as arms sales to allies and the ban of Huawei. Third, the administration has made credible commitments to assure partners and allies to counter China’s aggression and bullying. These have unbalanced the CCP regime, and its natural reaction is to bully its way out. Additionally, the CCP regime has perceived that the world today has begun to consider the negative implications of China’s rise, and the United States is determined to prevent what heretofore had been considered China’s unstoppable rise. From the perspective of CCP, conflict is increasingly seen as inevitable and perhaps even imminent. Wei’s bellicosity should be seen in this light, and the PLA is tasked with fighting and winning the war. Internally, Xi’s anti-corruption campaign that selectively targets his political rivalries, and his abandoning the established rules such as term limited of presidency, have introduced deep cleavages into the unity of the regime unity. China’s economic slowdown, made worse by the U.S. trade war, is a fundamental challenge to the regime’s legitimacy. Xi’s repression and suppression of the Chinese people, particularly human-rights defenders, Christians, Kazakhs, Uighurs, and other minorities, have miscarried. Drawing from the pages of unfortunate history, in a classic social-imperialist move, the regime wants to direct these internal tensions outward. At the same time, the nationalistic fervor advanced by the CCP’s propaganda and by the rapid military modernization have made many young militant officers in the PLA overconfident. This is infrequently noticed in the West. They can hardly wait to fight an ultimate war to defeat the arch-enemy. This plainly dangerous mentality echoes the Japanese military’s beliefs before Pearl Harbor. The bellicosity evinced in Wei’s speech is serious and is not bluster intended to deter. The United States cannot meet China’s threat with half-measures, which are likely to further encourage China’s aggressive behavior. The United States must respond to China’s belligerence with greater strength, adamantine determination, and more vigorous diplomatic and military measures. With the Xi Doctrine, China has proclaimed and rationalized its aggression. A Trump Doctrine forged in response has to reveal to all global audiences, most importantly the CCP leadership, the recklessness of the Xi Doctrine and the supreme folly of aggression.**