## 1NC – CP

#### Counterplan Text:

#### - States, except the United States, should ban the appropriation of outer space for asteroid mining by private entities.

#### - The United States should fund the appropriation of outer space for the mining of rare earth metals from asteroids by private entities.

#### - The United States federal government, the Russian Federation, and People’s Republic of China should establish an international fund collected via a fee upon launch starting at 5% and moving upwards pending international agreement that functions as a partial rebate and victims restitution fund by providing partial compensation to countries who create “debris free” launches and implement post-mission disposal mechanisms as well as providing full compensation to countries in the events of collisions with orbital debris.

#### The PIC is key to beat China and protect against Chinese REM gatekeeping

Stavridis 21 [(James, retired US Navy admiral, chief international diplomacy and national security analyst for NBC News, senior fellow at JHU Applied Physics Library, PhD in Law and Diplomacy from Tufts) “U.S. Needs a Strong Defense Against China’s Rare-Earth Weapon,” Bloomberg Opinion, March 4, 2021, <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2021-03-04/u-s-needs-a-strong-defense-against-china-s-rare-earth-weapon>] TDI

You could be forgiven if you are confused about what’s going on with rare-earth elements. On the one hand, news reports indicate that China may increase production quotas of the minerals this quarter as a [goodwill gesture](https://www.scmp.com/news/china/diplomacy/article/3122501/china-raises-rare-earth-quotas-goodwill-trade-signal-us) to the Joe Biden administration. But other sources say that China may ultimately ban the export of the rare earths altogether on “[security concerns](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-02-19/china-may-ban-rare-earth-technology-exports-on-security-concerns?sref=QYxyklwO).” What’s really going on here?

There are 17 elements considered [rare earths](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-02-16/why-rare-earths-are-achilles-heal-for-europe-u-s-quicktake) — lanthanum, cerium, praseodymium, neodymium, promethium, samarium, europium, gadolinium, terbium, dysprosium, holmium, erbium, thulium, ytterbium, lutetium, scandium and yttrium — and while many aren’t actually rare in terms of global deposits, extracting them is difficult and expensive. They are used across high-tech manufacturing, including smartphones, fighter aircraft and components in virtually all advanced electronics. Of particular note, they are essential to many of the clean-energy technologies expected to come online in this decade.

I began to focus on rare-earth elements when I commanded the North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s presence in Afghanistan, known as the International Security Assistance Force. While Afghans live in an extremely poor country, [studies](https://thediplomat.com/2020/02/afghanistans-mineral-resources-are-a-lost-opportunity-and-a-threat/) have assessed that they sit atop $1 trillion to $3 trillion in a wide variety of minerals, including rare earths. Some [estimates](https://www.fraserinstitute.org/article/afghanistans-rare-earth-element-bonanza) put the rare-earth levels alone at 1.4 million metric tons.

But every time I tried to visit a mining facility, the answer I got from my security team was, “It’s too dangerous right now, admiral.” Unfortunately, despite a great deal of effort by the U.S. and NATO, those security challenges remain, deterring the large foreign-capital investments necessary to harvest the lodes. Which brings us back to Beijing.

China controls roughly 80% of the rare-earths market, between what it mines itself and processes in raw material from elsewhere. If it decided to wield the weapon of restricting the supply — something it has repeatedly [threatened](https://www.wsj.com/articles/china-trade-fight-raises-specter-of-rare-earth-shortage-11559304000) to do — it would create a significant challenge for manufacturers and a geopolitical predicament for the industrialized world.

It could happen. In 2010, Beijing threatened to cut off exports to Japan over the disputed Senkaku Islands. Two years ago, Beijing was reportedly considering restrictions on exports to the U.S. generally, as well as against specific companies (such as defense giant Lockheed Martin Corp.) that it deemed in violation of its policies against selling advanced weapons to Taiwan.

President Donald Trump’s administration issued an executive order to spur the production of rare earths domestically, and created an [Energy Resource Governance Initiative](https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Energy-Resource-Governance-Initiative-ERGI-Fact-Sheet.pdf) to promote international mining. The European Union and Japan, among others, are also aggressively seeking newer sources of rare earths.

Given this tension, it was superficially surprising that China announced it would boost its mining quotas in the first quarter of 2021 by nearly 30%, reflecting a continuation in strong (and rising) demand. But the increase occurs under a shadow of uncertainty, as the Chinese Communist Party is undertaking a “review” of its policies concerning future sales of rare earths. In all probability, the tactics of the increase are temporary, and fit within a larger strategy.

China will go to great lengths to maintain overall control of the global rare-earths supply. This fits neatly within the geo-economic approach of the [One Belt, One Road](https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2019-10-30/china-is-determined-to-reshape-the-globe) initiative, which seeks to use a variety of carrots and sticks — economic, trade, diplomatic and security — to create zones of influence globally. In terms of rare earths, the strategy seems to be allowing carefully calibrated access to the elements at a level that makes it economically less attractive for competitors to undertake costly exploration and mining operations. This is similar to the oil-market strategy used by Russia and the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries for decades.

Some free-market advocates believe that China will not take aggressive action choking off supply because that could [precipitate retaliation](https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2021-02-22/china-weaponizing-rare-earths-technology-will-probably-backfire) or accelerate the search for alternate sources in global markets. What seems more likely is a series of targeted shutdowns directed against specific entities such as U.S. defense companies, Japanese consumer electronics makers, or European industrial concerns that have offended Beijing.

The path to rare-earth independence for the U.S. must include: Ensuring supply chains of rare earths necessary for national security; promoting the exploitation of the elements domestically (and removing barriers to responsibly doing so); mandating that defense contractors and other critical-infrastructure entities wean themselves off Chinese rare earths; sponsoring research and development to find alternative materials, especially for clean energy technology; and creating a substantial stockpile of the elements in case of a Chinese boycott.

This is a bipartisan agenda. The Trump administration’s [strategic assessment](https://www.commerce.gov/news/press-releases/2019/06/department-commerce-releases-report-critical-minerals) of what needs to be done (which goes beyond just 17 rare earths to include a total of 35 critical minerals) is thoughtful, and should serve as a basis for the Biden administration and Congress.

#### “Debris free” incentive solves the case without having to share SSA data.

Prasad and Lochan 7 [(M.Y.S. Prasad, Space Applications Centre, Indian Space Research Organisation, Ahmedabad, India, and Rajeev Lochan Indian Space Research Organisation, Bangalore, India,) “COMMON BUT DIFFERENTIATED RESPONSIBILITY - A PRINCIPLE TO MAINTAIN SPACE ENVIRONMENT WITH RESPECT TO SPACE DEBRIS” ISBN: 9781563479625, Proceedings of the Fiftieth colloquium on the Law of outer space : 24-28 September 2007, Hyderabad, India] TDI

Space debris will be a concern for future for all the countries. Especially the developing countries which have limited Space assets will face serious consequences if any of their satellites is involved with incidents / accidents with Space debris. The manned missions of advanced countries requires absolutely high level of crew safety, and hence Space debris is a serious concern to them also. Even a close approach of the debris to the operational satellites may pose problems if the cloud of debris occupies larger volume. From these considerations, it is definitely essential to evolve strategies to limit the growth of Space debris, and also to evolve debris mitigation measures.

However the analysis of the Space debris presented in section 4 clearly brought out that the debris population is proportional to the number of launches carried out by each country in the past. Hence larger responsibility lies with the countries which carried out a number of launches in the past. So the maintenance of Space environment from the Space debris point of view is a case well suited for “Common but differentiated responsibility” . In this context this principle means that all countries capable of taking actions are responsible to maintain the Space environment relatively clean with respect to Space debris. Also the countries, which are responsible for the present level of the debris population, should take higher responsibility in respect of limiting the future growth of Space debris, and also in providing knowledge and technology in the areas of Space debris monitoring and mitigation to all countries.

In this context various measures can be contemplated for future. One of them had been achieved when UN-COPUOS adopted Space debris mitigation guidelines to be implemented by all countries on voluntary basis through national mechanisms.

Different countries have evolved their own national Space debris mitigation standards and regulations to be implemented by the companies involved in aerospace activities in their countries. Still many countries feel that an appropriate legal regime at a global level is essential to tackle the Space debris issue. This is where the models evolved in the Kyoto Protocol can be considered to be tailored and used with appropriate modifications for Space debris legal regime.

Some of the new mechanisms which can be derived from the principles of Kyoto Protocol are:

• To limit the future Space debris generation, launch quota caps for each Space-faring country can be evolved linked to their past generation of the Space debris.

• The countries can be rewarded with “debris credits” in case they implement Space debris mitigation measures in their missions.

• Some advanced Space-faring nations may have pressing commitments to carry out larger number of launches. They can be enabled to carry out such missions through purchase of “debris credits” from the other countries, who have earned “debris credits” through application of Space debris mitigation measures.

• The countries which do not have any Space activity for the present, but who have plans to develop either Space transportation or deploy satellites in orbit can be given fixed quota of “debris credits”. These credits can lapse after a certain period if they do not realize their Space missions. These countries can also be enabled to market their “debris credits” to the other countries, and benefit by acquiring Space technologies.

• A Trust Fund can be created to compensate the victims involved in the accidents with Space debris, to which the contributions can be linked to the debris generated in the past by different countries. This can be a part of larger aspect of Space debris damage liability regime.

• Special treatment can be considered for the countries willing to share their knowledge and technology in the area of Space debris with other countries, to take up the research and development to a higher level. Such cooperative ventures can be given special treatment as Joint Implementation Mechanisms to earn “Debris credits”.

These are some of the ideas which are derived from the Kyoto Protocol with application to Space debris area. They are not exhaustive but only indicative for friture legal experts to examine while developing Space debris legal regime.

6. CONCLUSIONS

This paper describes various multi-lateral initiatives in the area of analysis, and mitigation of Space debris. The specific features related to type of debris and the level of launches and other activities of Space-faring nations are detailed. The innovative mechanisms evolved in the Kyoto Protocol of UN FCCC are described and their applicability for Space debris case is argued. Possible measures which can be fashioned after the Kyoto Protocol are suggested to deal with the Space debris and maintenance of Outer Space environment. All the analysis is based on the conviction that ‘Common but Differentiated Responsibility’ is very well suited for the present Space debris scenario.

#### REM access key to military primacy and tech advancement – alternatives fail.

Trigaux 12 (David, University Honors Program University of South Florida St. Petersburg) “The US, China and Rare Earth Metals: The Future Of Green Technology, Military Tech, and a Potential Achilles‟ Heel to American Hegemony,” USF St. Petersberg, May 2, 2012, <https://digital.stpetersburg.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1132&context=honorstheses>] TDI

The implications of a rare earth shortage aren’t strictly related to the environment, and energy dependence, but have distinct military implications as well that could threaten the position of the United States world’s strongest military. The United States place in the world was assured by powerful and decisive deployments in World War One and World War Two. Our military expansion was built upon a large, powerful industrial base that created more, better weapons of war for our soldiers. During the World Wars, a well-organized draft that sent millions of men into battle in a short amount of time proved decisive, but as the war ended, and soldiers drafted into service returned to civilian life, the U.S. technological superiority over its opponents provided it with sustained dominance over its enemies, even as the numerical size of the army declined. New technologies, such as the use of the airplane in combat, rocket launched missiles, radar systems, and later, GPS, precision guided missiles, missile defense systems, high tech tanks, lasers, and other technologies now make the difference between victory and defeat.

The United States military now serves many important functions, deterring threats across the world. The United States projects its power internationally, through a network of bases and allied nations. Thus, the United States is a powerful player in all regions of the world, and often serves as a buffer against conflict in these regions. US military presence serves as a buffer against Chinese military modernization in Eastern Asia, against an increasingly nationalist Russia in Europe, and smaller regional actors, such as Venezuela in South America and Iran in the Middle East. The U.S. Navy is deployed all over the world, as the guarantor of international maritime trade routes. The US Navy leads action against challenges to its maritime sovereignty on the other side of the globe, such as current action against Somali piracy. Presence in regions across the world prevents escalation of potential crisis. These could result in either a larger power fighting a smaller nation or nations (Russia and Georgia, Taiwan and China), religious opponents (Israel and Iran), or traditional foes (Ethiopia and Eretria, Venezuela and Colombia, India and Pakistan). US projection is also key deterring emerging threats such as terrorism and nuclear proliferation. While not direct challenges to US primacy, both terrorism and nuclear proliferation can kill thousands.

The US Air Force has a commanding lead over the rest of the world, in terms of both numbers and capabilities. American ground forces have few peers, and are unmatched in their ability to deploy to anywhere in the world at an equally unmatched pace.

The only perceived challenge to the United States militarily comes from the People’s Republic of China.76 While the United States outspends all other nations in the world put together in terms of military spending, China follows as a close second, and has begun an extensive modernization program to boot.77 The Chinese military however, is several decades behind the United States in air power and nuclear capabilities.78 To compensate, China has begun the construction of access-denial technology, preventing the US from exercising its dominance in China’s sphere of influence.79 Chinese modernization efforts have a serious long-term advantage over the United States; access to rare earth metals, and a large concentration of rare earth chemists doing research.80 This advantage, coupled with the U.S. losing access to rare earth metals, will even the odds much quicker than policymakers had previously anticipated. 81

The largest example is US airpower. With every successive generation of military aircraft, the U.S. Air Force becomes more and more dependent on Rare Earth Metals.82 As planes get faster and faster, they have to get lighter and lighter, while adding weight from extra computers and other features on board.83 To lighten the weight of the plane, scandium is used to produce lightweight aluminum alloys for the body of the plane. Rare Earth metals are also useful in fighter jet engines, and fuel cells.84 For example, rare earths are required to producing miniaturized fins, and samarium is required to build the motors for the F-35 fighter jet.85 F-35 jets are the next generation fighter jet that works together to form the dual plane combination that cements U.S. dominance in air power over the Russian PAK FA.86

Rare earth shortages don’t just affect air power, also compromising the navigation system of Abrams Tanks, which need samarium cobalt magnets. The Abrams Tank is the primary offensive mechanized vehicle in the U.S. arsenal. The Aegis Spy 1 Radar also uses samarium.87 Many naval ships require neodymium. Hell Fire missiles, satellites, night vision goggles, avionics, and precision guided munitions all require rare earth metals. 88

American military superiority is based on technological advancement that outstrips the rest of the world. Command and control technology allows the U.S. to fight multiple wars at once and maintain readiness for other issues, as well as have overwhelming force against rising challengers. This technology helps the U.S. know who, where, and what is going to attack them, and respond effectively, regardless of the source of the threat.

Rare Earth Elements make this technological superiority possible.

To make matters worse, the defense industrial base is often a single market industry, dependent on government contracts for its business. If China tightens the export quotas further, major US defense contractors will be in trouble.89 Every sector of the defense industrial base is dependent on rare earth metals. Without rare earths, these contractors can’t build anything, which collapses the industry.90

Rare Earth shortages are actually already affecting our military, with shortages of lanthanum, cerium, europium and gadolinium happening in the status quo. This prevents us not only from building the next generation of high tech weaponry, but also from constructing more of the weapons and munitions that are needed in the status quo. As current weapon systems age and they can’t be replaced, the US primacy will be undermined. Of special concern is that U.S. domestic mining doesn’t produce “heavy” rare earth metals that are needed for many advanced components of military technologies. Given the nature of many military applications, substitutions aren’t possible. 91

#### Climate solutions rely on REMs.

Arrobas et al 17 [(Daniele La Porta Arrobas is a senior mining specialist with the World Bank based in Washington DC and has degrees in Geoscience and Environmental Management, Kirsten Hund is a senior mining specialist with the Energy and Extractives Global Practice of the World Bank and holds a Master’s in IR from the University of Groningen in the Netherlands, Michael Stephen McCormick, Jagabanta Ningthoujam has an MA in international economics and international development from JHU and a BS in MechE from Natl University of Singapore, John Drexhage also works at the Intl Institute for Sustainable Development) “The Growing Role of Minerals and Metals for a Low Carbon Future,” World Bank, June 30, 2017, <https://documents.worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/207371500386458722/the-growing-role-of-minerals-and-metals-for-a-low-carbon-future>] TDI

* Full report - https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/207371500386458722/pdf/117581-WP-P159838-PUBLIC-ClimateSmartMiningJuly.pdf

Climate and greenhouse gas (GHG) scenarios have typically paid scant attention to the metal implications necessary to realize a low/zero carbon future. The 2015 Paris Agreement on Climate Change indicates a global resolve to embark on development patterns that would significantly be less GHG intensive. One might assume that nonrenewable resource development and use will also need to decline in a carbon-constrained future. This report tests that assumption, identifies those commodities implicated in such a scenario and explores ramifications for relevant resource-rich developing countries. Using wind, solar, and energy storage batteries as proxies, the study examines which metals will likely rise in demand to be able to deliver on a carbon-constrained future. Metals which could see a growing market include aluminum (including its key constituent, bauxite), cobalt, copper, iron ore, lead, lithium, nickel, manganese, the platinum group of metals, rare earth metals including cadmium, molybdenum, neodymium, and indium—silver, steel, titanium and zinc. The report then maps production and reserve levels of relevant metals globally, focusing on implications for resource-rich developing countries. It concludes by identifying critical research gaps and suggestions for future work.

#### Heg solves arms races, land grabs, rogue states, and great power war.

Brands 18 [Hal, Henry Kissinger Distinguished Professor at Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies and a senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments." American Grand Strategy in the Age of Trump." Page 129-133]

Since World War II, the United States has had a military second to none. Since the Cold War, America has committed to having overwhelming military primacy. The idea, as George W. Bush declared in 2002, that America must possess “strengths beyond challenge” has featured in every major U.S. strategy document for a quarter century; it has also been reflected in concrete terms.6

From the early 1990s, for example, the United States consistently accounted for around 35 to 45 percent of world defense spending and maintained peerless global power-projection capabilities.7 Perhaps more important, U.S. primacy was also unrivaled in key overseas strategic regions—Europe, East Asia, the Middle East. From thrashing Saddam Hussein’s million-man Iraqi military during Operation Desert Storm, to deploying—with impunity—two carrier strike groups off Taiwan during the China-Taiwan crisis of 1995– 96, Washington has been able to project military power superior to anything a regional rival could employ even on its own geopolitical doorstep.

This military dominance has constituted the hard-power backbone of an ambitious global strategy. After the Cold War, U.S. policymakers committed to averting a return to the unstable multipolarity of earlier eras, and to perpetuating the more favorable unipolar order. They committed to building on the successes of the postwar era by further advancing liberal political values and an open international economy, and to suppressing international scourges such as rogue states, nuclear proliferation, and catastrophic terrorism. And because they recognized that military force remained the ultima ratio regum, they understood the centrality of military preponderance.

Washington would need the military power necessary to underwrite worldwide alliance commitments. It would have to preserve substantial overmatch versus any potential great-power rival. It must be able to answer the sharpest challenges to the international system, such as Saddam’s invasion of Kuwait in 1990 or jihadist extremism after 9/11. Finally, because prevailing global norms generally reflect hard-power realities, America would need the superiority to assure that its own values remained ascendant. It was impolitic to say that U.S. strategy and the international order required “strengths beyond challenge,” but it was not at all inaccurate.

American primacy, moreover, was eminently affordable. At the height of the Cold War, the United States spent over 12 percent of GDP on defense. Since the mid-1990s, the number has usually been between 3 and 4 percent.8 In a historically favorable international environment, Washington could enjoy primacy—and its geopolitical fruits—on the cheap.

Yet U.S. strategy also heeded, at least until recently, the fact that there was a limit to how cheaply that primacy could be had. The American military did shrink significantly during the 1990s, but U.S. officials understood that if Washington cut back too far, its primacy would erode to a point where it ceased to deliver its geopolitical benefits. Alliances would lose credibility; the stability of key regions would be eroded; rivals would be emboldened; international crises would go unaddressed. American primacy was thus like a reasonably priced insurance policy. It required nontrivial expenditures, but protected against far costlier outcomes.9 Washington paid its insurance premiums for two decades after the Cold War. But more recently American primacy and strategic solvency have been imperiled.

THE DARKENING HORIZON For most of the post–Cold War era, the international system was— by historical standards—remarkably benign. Dangers existed, and as the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, demonstrated, they could manifest with horrific effect. But for two decades after the Soviet collapse, the world was characterized by remarkably low levels of great-power competition, high levels of security in key theaters such as Europe and East Asia, and the comparative weakness of those “rogue” actors—Iran, Iraq, North Korea, al-Qaeda—who most aggressively challenged American power. During the 1990s, some observers even spoke of a “strategic pause,” the idea being that the end of the Cold War had afforded the United States a respite from normal levels of geopolitical danger and competition. Now, however, the strategic horizon is darkening, due to four factors.

First, great-power military competition is back. The world’s two leading authoritarian powers—China and Russia—are seeking regional hegemony, contesting global norms such as nonaggression and freedom of navigation, and developing the military punch to underwrite these ambitions. Notwithstanding severe economic and demographic problems, Russia has conducted a major military modernization emphasizing nuclear weapons, high-end conventional capabilities, and rapid-deployment and special operations forces— and utilized many of these capabilities in conflicts in Ukraine and Syria.10 China, meanwhile, has carried out a buildup of historic proportions, with constant-dollar defense outlays rising from US$26 billion in 1995 to US$226 billion in 2016.11 Ominously, these expenditures have funded development of power-projection and antiaccess/area denial (A2/AD) tools necessary to threaten China’s neighbors and complicate U.S. intervention on their behalf. Washington has grown accustomed to having a generational military lead; Russian and Chinese modernization efforts are now creating a far more competitive environment.

## India DA

#### Space is an intrinsic part of India’s soft power expansion and they’re set to rapidly scale now

Sarthak Kathayat, Sarthak Kathayat is a student at Jamia Millia Islamia, India., NIICE NEPAL, 11-1-2020, "Soft Power and India’s Space Diplomacy," https://niice.org.np/archives/6420 TDI

In international relations, soft power is the ability of any country to persuade other countries to do what it wants without the use of force. According to Joseph Nye Jr., soft power is – getting others to want the outcomes that you want – co-opts people rather than coerces them. As compared to hard power, soft power takes relatively longer to built as its intangible resources develop over a long time. Soft power tends to change other party’s attitude to the end where she acts voluntarily in a way which is different to her usual behaviour. Several characteristics of the current world order like globalisation driven economic interdependence, rise of transnational actors, resurgence of nationalism in weak states, the spread of military technology and the changed nature of international political problems have significantly reduced the effectiveness of hard power strategies. The most noteworthy example of a foreign policy misadventure based solely on hard power strategies is the 2003 US invasion of Iraq. Soft power also has its own weakness. However, the ineffectiveness of soft power strategies is an exception. In longer-term, soft power strategies appear to be more effective in the contemporary world order than the hard power. One such tool of soft power is the space technology and space diplomacy. Space technology are increasingly viewed as a crucial instrument of soft power as states have now understood the direct relation between the technological feats and global prestige that follows. Expertise in rocket science puts a state on a higher pedestal than the countries who are still struggling in the domain. Moreover, expertise in rocket science ensues significant strategic implications. The output delivered has noteworthy social and economic relevance with a massive growth potential. In a broadening concept of security that encompasses other dimensions such as economic, environmental and political, Indian space programme has been distinctive and lucid in the way it simultaneously addresses the requirements of the Indian citizenry and the state collectively in all the dimensions. Despite being challenged by numerous embargoes and technology denial regimes during Cold War, Indian space programme has emerged as the most cost-effective and successful space programme in the world. India’s space programme has been a tremendous achievement for a developing country which despite being faced with many challenges used space as a crucial mechanism to lift its people out of poverty through education, social and economic programmes. With the course of time, India’s space policy has become an intrinsic part of India’s foreign policy to strengthen India’s position as a dominant power in South Asia. Indian Space Programme India’s space programme has been seen making efforts in projecting soft power which is especially evident through its new commitment to planetary exploration and human spaceflight. The Chandrayaan-1 and Mangalyaan-1 mission cleared the fact that India now looks at space as a standard of global standing. India’s soft power has witnessed a progression with an increasingly successful participation in global space economy through ISRO’s commercial arm, Antrix Corporation. India’s growing influence on the global space economy has been an indication of its changing stature in international arena. India has also been involved in capacity building initiatives. It has successfully established itself as a leader in terms of healthcare provisions through satellite-based telemedicine. India hosts the largest telemedicine network in South Asia which has also expanded to the African continent. A non-profit Indian organisation named Apollo Telemedicine Networking Foundation has been involved in telemedicine services with dedicated centres in Iraq, Yemen, Kazakhstan and Myanmar. India’s Space Diplomacy Further using space for diplomacy in order to project its soft power across the globe, India has assisted countries like Colombia in launching its satellite which boosted India-Colombia relations. Many Latin American countries are often dependent on the US for space and military matters. However, after the launch, many countries like Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Mexico, Nicaragua and Venezuela have reached out to ISRO for launching or developing satellites. Similarly, India’s PSLV also launched Israel’s TecSar satellite in 2008 for remote sensing purposes. The launch boosted the political and strategic relations with Israel. Once a recipient of space technology from developed countries, India has demonstrated the robustness of its own space programmes by setting up joint projects and even providing assistance at the time of disaster to a number of countries. ISRO’s Oceansat-2 satellite played a pertinent role in monitoring Hurricane Sandy and helping the authorities to implement timely disaster mitigation and rescue strategies. Adding more feathers to its hat, ISRO has also launched dozens of satellites for US, Europe and Britain based companies. The recent launches of British reconnaissance satellites, NovaSAR and S1-4 are a sign of what could come next. Britain is one of the EU’s biggest spender in space sector. After Brexit, the dispute over Britain’s continued access to the European Union’s Galileo satellite navigation project will inevitably lead Britain look for alternatives and India’s space ambitions could offer a tempting proposition within the ambit of wider bilateral cooperation. As a part of India’s efforts in space diplomacy, ISRO undertook another capacity building initiative ‘Unispace Nanosatellite Assembly and Training (UNNATI)’. Under UNNATI, ISRO planned to train 45 countries in making Nano-satellites. Closer to home, India proposed a SAARC satellite in 2014 for the overall development of the region. The proposal was welcomed by SAARC nations but unfortunately the proposal couldn’t materialise as envisioned initially due to Pakistan’s backing out from the project. However, three years later, in 2017, ISRO launched the South Asia satellite or GSAT-9 to help India’s neighbouring countries in space communication. The idea of South Asia satellite ensured no political impediment as with the case of SAARC satellite. The positive spill over effect of the satellite’s launch on India’s “neighbourhood first” diplomacy was well demonstrated by the warm responses given by the leaders of South Asian countries. India’s space diplomacy with neighbours also extends on a bilateral basis. For instance, in Afghanistan, India included remote sensing satellite transmitters for acquiring space-based data in a USD 1.2 billion aid package. It is evident that soft power strategies are more relevant than the hard power strategies, especially in the contemporary world order. The rise of China as an emerging superpower is backed with its economic and military might leave less avenues for other developing nations such as India to contest China. However, soft power strategies open up another dimension for the interaction of the nations. India has utilised space as a tool of its soft power effectively in order to expand its clout. That space being an intrinsic part of India’s foreign policy has brought numerous achievements to the country, and is expected to remain an essential element for future course of India’s foreign policy.

#### Private sector key to Indian space efforts

Raghu Krishnan, Raghu Krishnan is the technology editor for the Economic Times. In the over two decades of reporting and managing teams, he has seen the Indian IT industry grow from $ 1 billion to nearly $ 191 billion. He has a deep understanding of the shifts the Indian IT industry has undergone over the years. He has also covered science and India's aerospace R&D industry., 12-7-2020, "New space policy may take local companies global: Sivan," Economic Times, https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/science/new-space-policy-may-take-local-companies-global-sivan/articleshow/79599874.cms?from=mdr TDI

Bengaluru: India will draft a new space policy aimed at increasing private investments in the country’s space sector to build companies that are global in scale, Indian Space Research Organisation (Isro) chairman K Sivan told ET. The proposed regulations will be in addition to specific policies planned for launch vehicles, satellite navigation, human space mission and deep space exploration. “We want to create competition and get multiple companies in the space sector that can grow as global leaders,” Sivan said. Over 23 Indian and overseas companies have approached Isro since August seeking to harness assets built over six decades including rockets, satellites, ground stations and satellite imagery. The nodal agency is looking to transfer critical technologies through its commercial arm — New Space India Ltd (NSIL NSE -0.45 %) — to these companies at lower costs. “Space technology is costly. We want to make it viable for Indian industries and help them commercialise these technologies,” said Sivan. “We want to make the technology transfer a very simple and low-cost affair.” Last week, NSIL signed a pact to share technology as well as to allow testing facilities with Chennai-based startup Agnikul Cosmos to build a small rocket that can hurl 100 kg satellites to low-earth orbit. Bengaluru-based Pixxel, which is building India’s first private fleet of earth observation satellites, will launch its first satellite atop the homegrown polar satellite launch vehicle (PSLV) in 2021. So far, the department of space has released drafts of technology transfer policy, remote sensing and satellite communication policy for public comments. These draft policies state that Indian companies can now own and operate satellites, build rockets and launch them from Indian soil and offer satellite-based applications to consumers. The policies also define how sensitive dual-use technologies are to be utilised and stresses on the need for adherence to national and international laws. “The industry players are able to see the sea change (in our policies). They are asking for clarifications on some of them,” said Sivan. He added the policies will be notified after consultations. India is adopting the model of the US space agency National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), which allowed private firms such as SpaceX to get access to its technology and facilities to build reusable rockets that have carried humans to space this year. NASA also allows startups to compete and build vehicles and solutions for its programmes, including deep space missions. The policies are also designed to make India a global hub for satellite manufacturing and launches and providing satellite-based services for global customers. Hyderabad-based Aerospace firm Ananth Technologies is setting up a joint venture with US satellite operator Saturn Satellites, through which it will first build two communication satellites and launch them locally on an Indian rocket. Ananth is the first Indian private company to tap the global market after India opened up its space sector, which allows private firms to build satellites and rockets and offer space services from the country. “Earlier, when IITs produced aero-space engineers, there was not a strong domestic industrial ecosystem to employ them. Today, with our historic reforms in the space sector, the last frontier before humanity has opened up to Indian talent,” Prime Minister Narendra Modi told a Pan IIT conference on Friday. India has nearly 50 space startups in the sector and over 1,000 companies — both small and medium enterprises (SMEs) and large enterprises such as Larsen & Toubro, Godrej Aerospace, Tata Advanced Systems and Hindustan Aeronautics, which have been vendors to Isro, building systems and subsystems for the space programme. After opening the space sector to private firms in August, the department of space formed Indian National Space Promotion and Authorisation Centre (IN-SPACe), a new body that will act as a regulator whose rulings would apply to the space agency as well as private firms in the country. Sivan said an independent board is being set up and an approval is expected from the government by the end of December.

#### India has led multiple non-proliferation movements and their benign perception is k2 maintaining US-China Relations

Pethiyagoda 14 [Kadira Pethiyagoda, a former diplomat whose PhD and upcoming book investigated Indian foreign policy. He was a visiting scholar at the University of Oxford, “India’s Soft Power Advantage,” The Diplomat, 9/17/14, <https://thediplomat.com/2014/09/indias-soft-power-advantage/>] TDI

During [Prime Minister Tony Abbott’s recent visit to India](https://thediplomat.com/2014/09/australian-pm-visits-india-signs-nuclear-deal/), he was asked to justify Australia’s signing of a deal to sell uranium to the country. In response, the [prime minister said](http://www.smh.com.au/federal-politics/political-news/australia-to-power-indias-energy-market-as-tony-abbott-settles-terms-for-uranium-trade-20140905-10cq6y.html), “India threatens no one” and “is the friend to many.” This was no mere diplomatic nicety, but a carefully chosen answer based on India’s international image. It is an image that is rare amongst great powers of India’s size and strength, and will give Delhi a unique soft power advantage in the future multipolar world. Much of the globe sees India as a relatively non-violent, tolerant and pluralistic democracy with a benign international influence. Its values are seen as largely positive. The U.S., with its Indo-U.S. nuclear deal, accorded India special treatment in nuclear cooperation. The deal provided benefits usually reserved for Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) signatories. Washington justified cooperation with India by highlighting Delhi’s impeccable non-proliferation record. This stance was replicated by other states, including the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) member states who allowed India’s participation in international nuclear commerce and supported the Indo-U.S. deal. The NSG decided to re-engage with India following an India-specific safeguards agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The IAEA’s Board of Governors endorsed a nuclear safeguards agreement with India by consensus that would permit Delhi to add more nuclear facilities to be placed under the IAEA safeguards framework. India did not have to have an Additional Protocol like the non-nuclear weapons states who are NPT signatories. India also received favorable treatment from Canada (which agreed to supply “dual-use items” that can be used for civilian and military applications), Japan and South Korea. This cooperation was not merely driven by these states’ strategic relationships with the U.S. Russia has long cooperated with India on nuclear technology. Even China, as a member of the NSG, did not oppose the group’s decision on India. Today, India is the only known nuclear weapons state that is not part of the NPT but is still permitted to engage in nuclear commerce globally. India’s reputation extends beyond its nuclear posture. Since independence, the country has been viewed as a neutral and harmless power by most foreign audiences, particularly in Africa, the Middle East, South America and Southeast Asia. This is in part due to its prominent role in the Non-Aligned movement. Whilst Delhi’s reputation in its own neighborhood is quite different, South Asian states do not see India as a threat in the way that many of Russia or China’s neighbors view those powers. Even long-time nemesis Pakistan is unlikely to have been as adventurous in its dealings with its much larger and more powerful neighbor had it not had firsthand experience of Delhi’s restraint – even before Islamabad had nuclear capability. So what is behind India’s benign image? In part, it is self-created. For 60-plus years Delhi has favored cultivating the impression of a non-violent India. This is particularly clear in the realm of nuclear posture. Despite having tested weapons in 1974 and 1998 and being a non-signatory to the NPT and Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, India has been one of the most vocal advocates for global disarmament. It has arguably been the most passionate anti-nuclear campaigner amongst the world’s nine known or suspected nuclear weapons states, with one of the world’s most notable pleas for global disarmament made by Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi at the U.N. in 1988. The pursuit of this image continued a decade later, even after the Pokhran II nuclear tests. BJP Prime Minister Vajpayee stated that the tests were not a repudiation of the disarmament goal. In the Draft Report on Indian Nuclear Doctrine, the very first sentence of the first paragraph [describes](https://www.armscontrol.org/print/514) the use of nuclear weapons as the “gravest threat to humanity and to peace and stability.” The paragraph goes on to criticize the virtual abandonment by states of the goal of disarmament. Delhi sought to avoid labels of hypocrisy by positioning itself as the “[reluctant nuclear power](http://www.rediff.com/news/2004/mar/22ram.htm).” India argued that the bomb was a last resort in a world of threatening nuclear states who make no pledges to refrain from first strikes and the use of nukes against non-nuclear states. Somewhat legitimately, Indian leaders asserted that the country’s nuclear weapons could act as bargaining chips to support its global disarmament agenda. India was said to have more credibility as a nuclear weapons state with itself having something to sacrifice in order to usher in global disarmament. India declared that its security would be enhanced and not diminished in a nuclear free world. Delhi also sought to project an image of non-violence in other areas of foreign policy. In relation to the norm of “Responsibility to Protect,” India voiced support for those aspects of R2P that encouraged and supported states to protect their own populations, and expressed extreme caution at R2P’s coercive side. When some of the world’s greatest debates over intervention occurred at the U.N., Indian ambassadors drenched their speeches with the language of non-violence. This preciously guarded national image is not merely a strategic ploy to [increase India’s soft power](https://thediplomat.com/2011/09/indias-central-asia-soft-power/). Policymakers wish the country to be seen as non-violent, pluralistic and tolerant, because India genuinely holds these values. Within the nuclear realm the influence of non-violence is seen through the foot-dragging in relation to integrating nuclear weapons into military strategy and in relation to serial production of weapons. A further sign of this influence is the long public debate before going nuclear – a rarity amongst nuclear powers. We have seen repeatedly that India’s leaders find it morally inconceivable that nukes could ever be useable tools of war. Delhi’s disarmament pleas were not merely PR: they consumed valuable diplomatic resources including precious stage-time in international forums. More broadly, non-violence affected for India’s relatively restrained conduct in several conflicts with Pakistan. When it came to humanitarian intervention, over the last 25 years India’s opposition or support was directly related to the level of intrastate violence entailed in intervening. This was true regardless of who was intervening in whom, for what reason, and whether there were strategic gains in it for Delhi. This included interventions in Iraq, Libya and [Syria](https://thediplomat.com/2013/11/indias-syria-juggling-act/). India’s opposition to intervention was compounded by its pluralistic worldview, with acceptance of all regime types. It would seem that India’s values of non-violence, pluralism and tolerance stem from the independence era, when the country’s foreign policy and modern identity was crafted. Mahatma Gandhi made India’s independence movement synonymous with non-violence. First Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru imbued morals into his external relations. But if the values influencing India’s foreign policy took shape only then, they would have fizzled when Congress lost power. Instead the values have remained, as has the resultant global persona. This is because the values that help guide Indian foreign policy and underpin its image are rooted deep in the country’s cultural history. These values attained dominance during the formative stage of Indian civilization – the period between the Vedic era and medieval times when the greatest empires arose. India and China are the only modern great powers that have held a largely continuous culture for several millennia. Ancient India’s cultural connection to its present-day manifestation is far stronger than ancient Greek, Roman or Anglo-Celtic culture is to present-day Western states, or the ancient Middle Eastern civilizations are to today’s Arab world. It remains to be seen how India’s international reputation will fare as its strategic interests [expand throughout the Indo-Pacific](https://thediplomat.com/2013/09/india-and-the-rise-of-the-indo-pacific/) and beyond. With some diplomatic craftsmanship, Delhi can convert its somewhat ethereal values-based soft power advantage into hard strategic and economic gains. Modi’s government seems to have recognized this and is building on Congress’ initiatives to enhance India’s public diplomacy toolkit. India’s soft power has rare characteristics when compared with the other great powers of the emerging multipolar world: U.S., China, Russia, Japan and Europe (as a unified entity). Its relatively neutral, non-threatening image will make India a uniquely attractive great-power partner for countries looking to hedge against future fallout between the U.S. and China, and not wanting to antagonize either superpower. Australia has chosen a wise time to solidify ties with one of the world’s most dynamic rising powers.

#### Risk of US-China military confrontation in flashpoints inevitably go nuclear due to intermingled forces

Talmadge 18 [Caitlin Talmadge, Associate Professor of Security Studies at the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University, “Beijing’s Nuclear Option, Why a U.S.-Chinese War Could Spiral Out of Control,” Foreign Affairs, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2018-10-15/beijings-nuclear-option>, 10/15/18] TDI

As China’s power has grown in recent years, so, too, has the risk of war with the United States. Under President Xi Jinping, China has increased its political and economic [pressure](https://archive.is/o/fHOWC/https:/www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/taiwan/2017-04-13/how-beijing-could-squeeze-taiwan) on Taiwan and built [military installations](https://archive.is/o/fHOWC/https:/www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/asia/2017-05-18/adrift-south-china-sea) on coral reefs in the South China Sea, fueling Washington’s fears that Chinese expansionism will threaten U.S. allies and influence in the region. U.S. destroyers have transited the Taiwan Strait, to loud protests from Beijing. American policymakers have wondered aloud whether they should send an aircraft carrier through the strait as well. Chinese fighter jets have intercepted U.S. aircraft in the skies above the South China Sea. Meanwhile, U.S. President Donald Trump has brought long-simmering economic disputes to a rolling boil. A war between the two countries remains unlikely, but the prospect of a military confrontation—resulting, for example, from a Chinese campaign against Taiwan—no longer seems as implausible as it once did. And the odds of such a confrontation going nuclear are higher than most policymakers and analysts think. Members of China’s strategic com­munity tend to dismiss such concerns. Likewise, U.S. studies of a potential war with China often exclude nuclear weapons from the analysis entirely, treating them as basically irrelevant to the course of a conflict. Asked about the issue in 2015, Dennis Blair, the former commander of U.S. forces in the Indo-Pacific, estimated the likelihood of a U.S.-Chinese nuclear crisis as “[somewhere between nil and zero](https://archive.is/o/fHOWC/carnegieendowment.org/files/240315carnegieManaging.pdf).” This assurance is misguided. If deployed against China, the Pentagon’s preferred style of conventional warfare would be a potential recipe for nuclear escalation. Since the end of the Cold War, the United States’ signature approach to war has been simple: punch deep into enemy territory in order to rapidly knock out the opponent’s key military assets at minimal cost. But the Pentagon developed this formula in wars against Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, and Serbia, none of which was a nuclear power. If deployed against China, the Pentagon’s preferred style of conventional warfare would be a potential recipe for nuclear escalation. China, by contrast, not only has nuclear weapons; it has also intermingled them with its conventional military forces, making it difficult to attack one without attacking the other. This means that a major U.S. military campaign targeting China’s conventional forces would likely also threaten its nuclear arsenal. Faced with such a threat, Chinese leaders could decide to use their nuclear weapons while they were still able to. As U.S. and Chinese leaders navigate a relationship fraught with mutual suspicion, they must come to grips with the fact that a conventional war could skid into a nuclear confrontation. Although this risk is not high in absolute terms, its consequences for the region and the world would be devastating. As long as the United States and China continue to pursue their current grand strategies, the risk is likely to endure. This means that leaders on both sides should dispense with the illusion that they can easily fight a limited war. They should focus instead on managing or resolving the political, economic, and military tensions that might lead to a conflict in the first place. There are some reasons for optimism. For one, China has long stood out for its nonaggressive nuclear doctrine. After its first nuclear test, in 1964, China largely avoided the Cold War arms race, building a much smaller and simpler nuclear arsenal than its resources would have allowed. Chinese leaders have consistently characterized nuclear weapons as useful only for deterring nuclear aggression and coercion. Historically, this narrow purpose required only a handful of nuclear weapons that could ensure Chinese retaliation in the event of an attack. To this day, China maintains a “[no first use](https://archive.is/o/fHOWC/https:/www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/1972-07-01/no-first-use-nuclear-weapons)” pledge, promising that it will never be the first to use nuclear weapons. The prospect of a nuclear conflict can also seem like a relic of the Cold War. Back then, the United States and its allies lived in fear of a Warsaw Pact offensive rapidly overrunning Europe. NATO stood ready to use nuclear weapons first to stalemate such an attack. Both Washington and Moscow also consistently worried that their nuclear forces could be taken out in a bolt-from-the-blue nuclear strike by the other side. This mutual fear increased the risk that one superpower might rush to launch in the erroneous belief that it was already under attack. Initially, the danger of unauthorized strikes also loomed large. In the 1950s, lax safety procedures for U.S. nuclear weapons stationed on NATO soil, as well as minimal civilian oversight of U.S. military commanders, raised a serious risk that nuclear escalation could have occurred without explicit orders from the U.S. president. The good news is that these Cold War worries have little bearing on U.S.-Chinese relations today. Neither country could rapidly overrun the other’s territory in a conventional war. Neither seems worried about a nuclear bolt from the blue. And civilian political control of nuclear weapons is relatively strong in both countries. What remains, in theory, is the comforting logic of mutual deterrence: in a war between two nuclear powers, neither side will launch a nuclear strike for fear that its enemy will respond in kind. The bad news is that one other trigger remains: a conventional war that threatens China’s nuclear arsenal. Conventional forces can threaten nuclear forces in ways that generate pressures to escalate—especially when ever more capable U.S. conventional forces face adversaries with relatively small and fragile nuclear arsenals, such as China. If U.S. operations endangered or damaged China’s nuclear forces, Chinese leaders might come to think that Washington had aims beyond winning the conventional war—that it might be seeking to disable or destroy China’s nuclear arsenal outright, perhaps as a prelude to regime change. In the fog of war, Beijing might reluctantly conclude that limited nuclear escalation—an initial strike small enough that it could avoid full-scale U.S. retaliation—was a viable option to defend itself. The most worrisome flash point for a U.S.-Chinese war is Taiwan. Beijing’s long-term objective of reunifying the island with mainland China is clearly in conflict with Washington’s longstanding desire to maintain the status quo in the strait. It is not difficult to imagine how this might lead to war. For example, China could decide that the political or military window for regaining control over the island was closing and launch an attack, using air and naval forces to blockade Taiwanese harbors or bombard the island. Although U.S. law does not require Washington to intervene in such a scenario, the Taiwan Relations Act [states](https://archive.is/o/fHOWC/uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title22-section3301&num=0&edition=prelim) that the United States will “consider any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means, including by boycotts or embargoes, a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific area and of grave concern to the United States.” Were Washington to intervene on Taipei’s behalf, the world’s sole superpower and its rising competitor would find themselves in the first great-power war of the twenty-first century. In the course of such a war, U.S. conventional military operations would likely threaten, disable, or outright eliminate some Chinese nuclear capabilities—whether doing so was Washington’s stated objective or not. In fact, if the United States engaged in the style of warfare it has practiced over the last 30 years, this outcome would be all but guaranteed.  The most worrisome flash point for a U.S.-Chinese war is Taiwan. Consider submarine warfare. China could use its conventionally armed attack submarines to blockade Taiwanese harbors or bomb the island, or to attack U.S. and allied forces in the region. If that happened, the U.S. Navy would almost certainly undertake an antisubmarine campaign, which would likely threaten China’s “boomers,” the four nuclear-armed ballistic missile submarines that form its naval nuclear deterrent. China’s conventionally armed and nuclear-armed submarines share the same shore-based communications system; a U.S. attack on these transmitters would thus not only disrupt the activities of China’s attack submarine force but also cut off its boomers from contact with Beijing, leaving Chinese leaders unsure of the fate of their naval nuclear force. In addition, nuclear ballistic missile submarines depend on attack submarines for protection, just as lumbering bomber aircraft rely on nimble fighter jets. If the United States started sinking Chinese attack submarines, it would be sinking the very force that protects China’s ballistic missile submarines, leaving the latter dramatically more vulnerable. Even more dangerous, U.S. forces hunting Chinese attack submarines could inadvertently sink a Chinese boomer instead. After all, at least some Chinese attack submarines might be escorting ballistic missile submarines, especially in wartime, when China might flush its boomers from their ports and try to send them within range of the continental United States. Since correctly identifying targets remains one of the trickiest challenges of undersea warfare, a U.S. submarine crew might come within shooting range of a Chinese submarine without being sure of its type, especially in a crowded, noisy environment like the Taiwan Strait. Platitudes about caution are easy in peacetime. In wartime, when Chinese attack submarines might already have launched deadly strikes, the U.S. crew might decide to shoot first and ask questions later. Adding to China’s sense of vulnerability, the small size of its nuclear-armed submarine force means that just two such incidents would eliminate half of its sea-based deterrent. Meanwhile, any Chinese boomers that escaped this fate would likely be cut off from communication with onshore commanders, left without an escort force, and unable to return to destroyed ports. If that happened, China would essentially have no naval nuclear deterrent. Platitudes about caution are easy in peacetime. In wartime, U.S. forces might decide to shoot first and ask questions later. The situation is similar onshore, where any U.S. military campaign would have to contend with China’s growing land-based conventional ballistic missile force. Much of this force is within range of Taiwan, ready to launch ballistic missiles against the island or at any allies coming to its aid. Once again, U.S. victory would hinge on the ability to degrade this conventional ballistic missile force. And once again, it would be virtually impossible to do so while leaving China’s nuclear ballistic missile force unscathed. Chinese conventional and nuclear ballistic missiles are often attached to the same base headquarters, meaning that they likely share transportation and supply networks, patrol routes, and other supporting infrastructure. It is also possible that they share some command-and-control networks, or that the United States would be unable to distinguish between the conventional and nuclear networks even if they were physically separate. To add to the challenge, some of China’s ballistic missiles can carry either a conventional or a nuclear warhead, and the two versions are virtually indistinguishable to U.S. aerial surveillance. In a war, targeting the conventional variants would likely mean destroying some nuclear ones in the process. Furthermore, sending manned aircraft to attack Chinese missile launch sites and bases would require at least partial control of the airspace over China, which in turn would require weakening Chinese air defenses. But degrading China’s coastal air defense network in order to fight a conventional war would also leave much of its nuclear force without protection. Once China was under attack, its leaders might come to fear that even intercontinental ballistic missiles located deep in the country’s interior were vulnerable. For years, observers have pointed to the U.S. military’s failed attempts to locate and destroy Iraqi Scud missiles during the 1990–91 Gulf War as evidence that mobile missiles are virtually impervious to attack. Therefore, the thinking goes, China could retain a nuclear deterrent no matter what harm U.S. forces inflicted on its coastal areas. Yet recent research suggests otherwise. Chinese intercontinental ballistic missiles are larger and less mobile than the Iraqi Scuds were, and they are harder to move without detection. The United States is also likely to have been tracking them much more closely in peacetime. As a result, China is unlikely to view a failed Scud hunt in Iraq nearly 30 years ago as reassurance that its residual nuclear force is safe today, especially during an ongoing, high-intensity conventional war. China’s [vehement criticism](https://archive.is/o/fHOWC/https:/www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2017-02-15/good-thaad-and-ugly) of a U.S. regional missile defense system designed to guard against a potential North Korean attack already reflects these latent fears. Beijing’s worry is that this system could help Washington block the handful of missiles China might launch in the aftermath of a U.S. attack on its arsenal. That sort of campaign might seem much more plausible in Beijing’s eyes if a conventional war had already begun to seriously undermine other parts of China’s nuclear deterrent. It does not help that China’s real-time awareness of the state of its forces would probably be limited, since blinding the adversary is a standard part of the U.S. military playbook. Put simply, the favored U.S. strategy to ensure a conventional victory would likely endanger much of China’s nuclear arsenal in the process, at sea and on land. Whether the United States actually intended to target all of China’s nuclear weapons would be incidental. All that would matter is that Chinese leaders would consider them threatened. At that point, the question becomes, How will China react? Will it practice restraint and uphold the “no first use” pledge once its nuclear forces appear to be under attack? Or will it use those weapons while it still can, gambling that limited escalation will either halt the U.S. campaign or intimidate Washington into backing down? Chinese writings and statements remain deliberately ambiguous on this point. It is unclear which exact set of capabilities China considers part of its core nuclear deterrent and which it considers less crucial. For example, if China already recognizes that its sea-based nuclear deterrent is relatively small and weak, then losing some of its ballistic missile submarines in a war might not prompt any radical discontinuity in its calculus. The danger lies in wartime developments that could shift China’s assumptions about U.S. intentions. If Beijing interprets the erosion of its sea- and land-based nuclear forces as a deliberate effort to destroy its nuclear deterrent, or perhaps even as a prelude to a nuclear attack, it might see limited nuclear escalation as a way to force an end to the conflict. For example, China could use nuclear weapons to instantaneously destroy the U.S. air bases that posed the biggest threat to its arsenal. It could also launch a nuclear strike with no direct military purpose—on an unpopulated area or at sea—as a way to signal that the United States had crossed a redline. If such escalation appears far-fetched, China’s history suggests otherwise. In 1969, similar dynamics brought China to the brink of nuclear war with the Soviet Union. In early March of that year, Chinese troops ambushed Soviet guards amid rising tensions over a disputed [border area](https://archive.is/o/fHOWC/https:/www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/1967-07-01/tension-sino-soviet-border). Less than two weeks later, the two countries were fighting an undeclared border war with heavy artillery and aircraft. The conflict quickly escalated beyond what Chinese leaders had expected, and before the end of March, Moscow was making thinly veiled nuclear threats to pressure China to back down. If nuclear escalation appears far-fetched, China’s history suggests otherwise. Chinese leaders initially dismissed these warnings, only to radically upgrade their threat assessment once they learned that the Soviets had privately discussed nuclear attack plans with other countries. Moscow never intended to follow through on its nuclear threat, archives would later reveal, but Chinese leaders believed otherwise. On three separate occasions, they were convinced that a Soviet nuclear attack was imminent. Once, when Moscow sent representatives to talks in Beijing, China suspected that the plane transporting the delegation was in fact carrying nuclear weapons. Increasingly fearful, China test-fired a thermonuclear weapon in the Lop Nur desert and put its rudimentary nuclear forces on alert—a dangerous step in itself, as it increased the risk of an unauthorized or accidental launch. Only after numerous preparations for Soviet nuclear attacks that never came did Beijing finally agree to negotiations. China is a different country today than it was in the time of Mao Zedong, but the 1969 conflict offers important lessons. China started a war in which it believed nuclear weapons would be irrelevant, even though the Soviet arsenal was several orders of magnitude larger than China’s, just as the U.S. arsenal dwarfs China’s today. Once the conventional war did not go as planned, the Chinese reversed their assessment of the possibility of a nuclear attack to a degree bordering on paranoia. Most worrying, China signaled that it was actually considering using its nuclear weapons, even though it had to expect devastating retaliation. Ambiguous wartime information and worst-case thinking led it to take nuclear risks it would have considered unthinkable only months earlier. This pattern could unfold again today. A U.S. B-2 Spirit bomber, capable of carrying nuclear weapons, in Hawaii, September 2018 Danielle Quilla/U.S. Air Force. Both the United States and China can take some basic measures to reduce these dangers. More extensive dialogue and exchange—formal and informal, high level and working level, military and political—could help build relationships that might allow for backchannel de-escalation during a conflict. The two countries already have a formal military hot line in place, although it does not connect political leaders. A dedicated and tested infrastructure for senior military and political leaders to reliably and easily communicate during wartime would provide at least one off-ramp in the event of a crisis. But better communication can only do so much for a problem that ultimately stems from military doctrine and grand strategy. Given that the United States’ standard wartime playbook is likely to back China into a nuclear corner, it would be logical for Washington to consider alternative strategies that would leave China’s nuclear capabilities untouched. For example, some analysts have proposed coercing China through a distant naval blockade, and others have suggested confining any U.S. campaign to air and naval operations off China’s coast. The goal in both cases would be to avoid attacks on the Chinese mainland, where the bulk of Chinese nuclear forces reside. The problem with these alternatives is that the mainland is also where the bulk of Chinese conventional capabilities are located. The United States is unlikely to voluntarily leave these capabilities intact, given its predilection for reducing its own casualties and rapidly destroying enemy forces. If China is using its mainland bases to lob ballistic missiles at U.S. troops and allies, it is hard to imagine a U.S. president ordering the military to hold back in the interest of de-escalation. U.S. allies are particularly unlikely to accept a cautious approach, as they will be more exposed to Chinese military power the longer it is left intact. No one wants a U.S.-Chinese war to go nuclear, but a U.S. campaign that avoids escalation while letting China’s conventional forces turn Taiwan—not to mention Japan or South Korea—into a smoking ruin would not seem like much of a victory either. Of course, Beijing could also take steps to ameliorate the problem, but this is just as unlikely. China has chosen to mount both conventional and nuclear warheads on the same missiles and to attach both conventional and nuclear launch brigades to the same bases. It likely sees some strategic advantage in these linkages. Precisely because these entanglements raise the prospect of nuclear escalation, Beijing may believe that they contribute to deterrence—that they will make the United States less likely to go to war in the first place. But just as China benefits if the United States believes there is no safe way to fight a war, the United States benefits if China believes that war would result not only in China’s conventional defeat but also in its nuclear disarmament. In fact, the United States might believe that this fear could give it greater leverage during a conflict and perhaps deter China from starting one at all. In short, neither side may see much value in peacetime reassurance. Quite the opposite: they may be courting instability. If this is the case, however, then U.S. and Chinese leaders should recognize the tradeoffs inherent in their chosen policies. The threat of escalation may make war less likely, but it also makes war radically more dangerous if it does break out. This sobering reality should encourage leaders on both sides to find ways of resolving political, economic, and military disputes without resorting to a war that could rapidly turn catastrophic for the region and the world.

## Case

#### Capitalism is good and solves every ecological impact

Marco Rosaire Rossi 15, writer and activist in Olympia, Washington. He is the author of the book, A Politics for the 99%. His previous works have been published in Z Magazine, the Peace and Conflict Monitor, Counterpunch.org, New Compass, and the Humanist magazine., 9-29-2015, "Ecological Modernity versus Capitalist Modernity," New Compass, http://new-compass.net/articles/ecological-modernity-versus-capitalist-modernity

In this provocative essay, Marco Rosaire Rossi challenges Murray Bookchin's fundamental claim that capitalism's lifeblood is unfettered growth. Contrary to radical wisdom, Rossi writes, if we are to build an ecological society we will need more growth, not less. De-growth in a time of austerity is morally reprehensible and material prosperity must be increased; the Industrial Revolution must be rapidly advanced. Without this progress, humanity will only remain at the threshold of an ecological society and no more. It has become almost cliché to remark that human civilization is facing an existential crisis unparalleled in history. It is almost cliché, but not quite, because to refer to it as cliché does a disservice to the extensiveness of the problem; and yet, calling it a cliché somehow speaks to the banality of the apocalyptic cries. From across the political spectrum, there is a sense that “The End Is Nigh,” and after “Nigh” has lasted many years—for some, even decades—a sense of apathetic dread sinks in. The world is going to die, it has been dying for years, and apparently there is nothing anyone can do about it. This acedia of apathetic dread is based both in reality and in ideology. The reality is that the planet is experiencing a major threat in the form of global warming. Our global economic system has put itself in violent opposition to any ecological parameters. The major disruptions of global warming still loom over the horizon; yet, their immanence means that we need to consider the consequences of increasing humanity’s material prosperity. Billions of people need to be pulled out of poverty, but if doing so ends up sending the planet off a cliff then it makes little sense to do just that. At the same time, billions of people are living in abject poverty. Chilling ourselves to their plight out of ecological concern requires a dimming of our sense of humanity. In halting material prosperity we may save the planet but in the process we kill our humanity. Development or Sustainability? The ideological source of this apathetic dread is the Morton’s Fork between material security and ecological sustainability to begin with. Ideologically, there appears to be an inability to imagine a society that is materially secure, even prosperous, and ecologically sustainable. Finding a loving marriage between technology and ecology is at the center of many of our ecological and social problems. New technologies must allow ecosystems to become more diverse and stable, and that environmental diversity and stability must be used in such a way that it allows humans the time and leisure to engage in even more sophisticated technological pursuits. What environmentalists have failed to cultivate when it comes to nature is the same sense of progress that seems instinctual to a modernist understanding of technology, thus their opposition. Since the birth of the environmental movement the entire approach to the natural world has been one of conservation. A pristine, romantic, and often spiritual approach to the natural world has meant that environmentalists have adopted a savior psychology to their activism. Nature, in its innocence, cannot be polluted with civilization. It must be saved from the inherent capriciousness of humanity through prohibitions and austerity. This one-sided approach to environmentalism not only ignores the vitality and resilience of the natural world, but also establishes an “otherness” between humanity and nature that reinforces humanity’s alienation to the natural world. In the hopes of bringing the “arrogance of man” down to the level of nature, environmentalists have duplicated the very dichotomy that they oppose but with one important twist: Nature is supposed to reign over society, and it should reign even if the supremacy of nature means that certain people in society must be made desolate. Ecology should not, and cannot, be a synonym for misanthropy. Civilization does have the potential to destroy nature, but it also has the potential to restore and complement it. The modern world has endowed us with both unprecedented destructive capacities and liberating potentialities. Moreover, modern technology has shown us the means to not only liberate humans from the harsh conditions of the natural world, but also to liberate the natural world from a harsh and myopic civilization. Before the use of coal fed the Industrial Revolution, the main source of energy in the world was wood. Wood is an extraordinarily inefficient source of energy that releases a lot of carbon into the atmosphere. If the European need for wood had not transferred to coal—and there was no reason to suspect that it would have slowed down—then all of Europe would have been deforested, and we would still be dealing with the problem of climate change. The fossil fuel economy saved humanity from this travesty. Fossil fuels, though problematic in our own time, are far denser forms of energy. They do not require a massive project of deforestation to extract. The movement beyond fossil fuels continues along the same lines as the movement beyond wood, that is, the search for denser and more efficient forms of energy. This project can only come about through the advancement of technological and scientific progress, a furthering of the Industrial Revolution, not its retraction. Similarly, our economy is potentially going through a subtle process of dematerialization that is forcing a reassessment of the relationship between industrial and postindustrial societies. We are able to generate more wealth, with less stuff, more efficiently. In the developing world, many countries are still experiencing materializing economies, but—as the developed nations dematerializes—there appears to be a point when economic development reaches past material security and into intellectual and cultural achievements. Consumerism is to be feared when it becomes a substitute for social creativity. Consumption, in contrast, is not just metabolically necessary, but socially desirable. The sociability of a farmers’ market or craft fair indicates that there is an innate participatory aspect to consumption that goes beyond avaricious conceptions of humanity as automaton pigs with bottomless stomachs. People consume the most when they are in groups, and yet our consumption is the least material when it is the most communal. The greatest ecological transformation that the modern world has brought is the migration of people from villages to cities and the bifurcation of rural and urban life. From an ecological perspective, cities, with their geographical density and tightly interwoven economies, create an ideal situation for harmonizing the social and the natural world. Cities enable rich cultural lives and they do so at a minimum of ecological consequences. Stacking homes in apartment buildings and concentrating human activity within a walkable distance requires an intense alteration of an ecological landscape, but that landscape is extremely small, and uses a fraction of the resources used by sprawling suburbs. In turn, the movement to the cities has been matched and encouraged by startling technological innovations in agriculture. The sustainable intensification that has happened through the creation of the modern city is also happening on the modern farm. Food production has reached heights undreamed of a hundred years ago, and it has done so with a fraction of the labor power and a slowing down of the need for more land. The ability to produce more with less has meant that a feral nature has been able to bounce back. The social and the natural world are cobbling together a lasting peace within a strategic division between urban, rural, and feral landscapes. These important trends give hope to reconciling technology and ecology but they are not inevitable. Apathetic dread should not be replaced by euphoric naiveté. These trends have only developed through an effort to modernize civilization. This includes pursuing a secular and scientific worldview that values innovation and technological achievements, but it also includes expanding democratic governance, ensuring social and economic equality, and encouraging cosmopolitan perspectives. Dealing with our current ecological crisis means that we must recognize that our inability to move from fossil fuels to other sources of energy is rooted in stubborn institutional arrangements that do not respond more to the imperatives hierarchical management and market competition than human and ecological needs do. Capitalism: No friend of growth Global warming is a market failure of potentially catastrophic proportions. The carbon released into the earth’s atmosphere is externalized from the transactions within our economy, and this externalization means that the cost of this pollution is placed on future generations and the environment. The pursuit of developing nations to have a living standard on par with that of developed nations is thought to be at the heart of this market failure, but that is a misplaced analysis. Free market libertarians and Luddite eco-socialists alike have thought that economic development was a byproduct of capitalism. This assumption ignores the reality that the areas of the world that have been forced to deal with the fiercest free-market conditions are the areas of the world that have been the most chronically underdeveloped. Developing nations have only been able to shake off the yoke of imperialism through establishing planned economies, industrial policies, and social safety nets that prevent the self-destructive tendencies of markets. For decades, pioneering social ecologists such as Murray Bookchin warned environmentalists and political radicals of a coming ecological collapse initiated by capitalist modes of production. For Bookchin it was capitalism’s “grow-or-die” ethos that inexorably linked the market economy to the simplification and eventual destruction of complex life, including humanity. Bookchin got the problem right, but the causal mechanism wrong. Indeed, capitalist modes of production are at the heart of much of our current ecological problems, but it is not because capitalism inherently promotes economic growth. If there is one major lesson that should be drawn from post-World War II economic history, especially from our own globalized neoliberal era, it is that the economic growth unleashed by unfettered free markets is quite limited. Free market capitalism does not seem to operate along the lines of “grow-or-die,” but instead along the lines of “grow-then-die,” meaning that macroeconomic growth under capitalism is hindered by the same anarchic market forces that lead to its initial paroxysm. And it is the periods of economic destruction—where there are continual recessions and extreme social volatility—that pose the greatest threats to our ecology. It is in those periods when it is the most difficult for people to understand that the fate of humanity is intimately tied to the fate of the natural world, and when people are least inclined to use additional resources to explore newer, more environmentally sustainable technologies. Capitalism is at the heart of our ecological crisis not because it develops economies, but for the very fact that it does the opposite. Joseph Schumpeter’s plucking of the term “creative destruction” from Marxists has both enlightened and obfuscated our conceptual understanding of economic development and its relation to technology. For Schumpeter, largely drawing on Marxist writings on capitalism, creative destruction referred to periods of economic development where an old world was destroyed to make way for the prosperity of a new one. His meaning is more akin to the Hegelian notion Aufhebung, a concept that is always underneath Marx’s work, than to the mechanistic repetition of collapse and regeneration of the business cycle that free-market apologists have emphasized. The exogenous factor for these economic upheavals was the introduction of new technologies, ones that were able to internalize externalities, create efficiencies, and thus undermine all previous forms of competition, even monopolistic forms. Schumpeter was correct in recognizing the inherent developmental nature within economies and the important role of technological progress as in usurping a given economic order, but his willingness to attribute this progress to capitalists, specifically large corporations and monopolistic entities, clouds the actual nature of this economic development. The increasing complexity of economic transactions and technological innovation demand that those periods of creative destruction become less driven by lone inventors and more the result of collective institutions and mass social cooperation. The belief that capitalism, as an ethical framework, can save itself by its own innovation ignores the stark reality that to produce such innovation in complex modern societies capitalist ethics must be violated, sometimes violently so. Marx and Engels were correct: there is a disjunction between modes of production that require increasingly cooperative institutions and an economic system that promotes an extreme individualistic ethos above all else. But, their focus on the birth of factory labor out of feudal artisanship was myopic. Capitalism’s inconsistencies arise not only within the factory, where the cooperation of workers to produce goods is at odds with the individual ownership of the factory by capitalists, but also in society at large, where the demands for modern technological innovation require huge economies of scale and cooperation between workers in entire industries. In this way, economies have developed despite private ownership and hierarchical forms of management, not because of them. As the Solow-Swan growth model has shown, the main engine for economic growth in developed nations, at least since World War II, has been the introduction of technological innovation. In this same period, the primer for this engine has been public sector spending. It is the public sector that has played the most critical role in economic development through planning economies and allocating resources toward research and development. Unfortunately, the public, disengaged from their political institutions by a sprawling hierarchical class of bureaucrats and professional politicians, have allowed a parasitic private sector to profit from this innovation and to direct this allocation in a manner that best serves them. Regardless though, modern capitalist prosperity has only been able to occur through shadow socialism. The irony of all modern entrepreneurs is that none of them would have been able to innovate without the aid of the state. Socialism, democracy and equality The question then beckons: why should socialism remain in the shadows? What is needed to deal with the crisis of global warming is not policies of planned economic de-growth that mimic rightwing austerity under a socialists facade, but rapid and sustainable economic growth through embracing technological innovations that reconcile the tension between society and nature. A great confusion has overcome both the acolytes and adversaries of capitalism. “Capitalism” as a particular mode of production has become so synonymous with economics in general that any economic growth is seen as capitalist economic growth, regardless of its context or results. In actuality, capitalism is an example of an alienated economy where the vast majority of its participants—that is to say, workers and consumers—are unaware of their true economic potential. The ultimate form of “creative destruction” regarding capitalism is the technological and economic development out of capitalism itself. The humanist desire for continuous and sustainable economic development, the constant pursuit for ecologically sound and cooperative forms of production and consumption is a threat to capitalism, not the apex of its expression. Polemical calls for economic de-growth in a world where the majority of people still live in abject poverty are worse than strategically inept; they are morally reprehensible and politically asphyxiating. Democracy, especially sophisticated forms of direct democracy, cannot advance without increasing material prosperity. Since the time o

f Aristotle, it has been recognized that for democracy to function there must be a degree of leisure time spent among the population. No robust public life can be established in a society where material scarcity causes people to devote the majority of their time to securing the fundamental means of subsistence. Further, a society where technologies have reduced, and in some cases eliminated, odious tasks liberates people to engage in higher cultural functions, including their own self-management and governance. This is especially the case for those who have been traditionally denied access to the public sphere. Despite its necessity for its time, the eighteenth-century cry that “we are all born equal” has become an ossified platitude. The reality is that we are not all born equal. Nature produces grave inequalities between us in ability. Morality demands that we rectify these inequalities by creating new opportunities, both socially and materially, for all. There is a dialectical relation between social equality and technological innovation. Modern feminism would have an entirely different meaning if breakthroughs in contraceptive technologies were not established by the mid-twentieth century. The case is similar for the elderly, for transgender individuals, for people with disabilities, children, and nations established in areas of the world with a dearth of natural resources. In each situation, the interaction between social struggles and technological innovations has led to greater social inclusion. People are not born equal, rather, they are perpetually made and remade equal by continuous efforts at social uplift and prosperity. Conclusion There is no reason to doubt that such “equalizing” efforts could not only continue but be advanced into the ecological realm. Modern technologies and the growth of material prosperity have within them the potential to “uplift” the environment. Far from being a matter of mere conservation, environmental sustainability in the modern world is a twin-cousin to development economics. Influenced by the work of soft deep ecologists such as Bill McKibben, many environmentalists have lamented the “end of nature” and arrival of the Anthropocene, fearing that it signifies the beginning of the end for biodiversity. No doubt, the Anthropocene has this potential, but it also has another potential. Through modeling its environment to ensure human prosperity while at the same time organizing its social institutions to guarantee environmental stewardship, humanity has a historical opportunity that is unprecedented among any species on that planet. Humanity can escape its Malthusian traps through continually enriching, rather than simplifying, it surrounding environment. Its flourishing as a species could be a boon for biodiversity rather than its dwindling. There needs to be a conscious social reconfiguration that utilizes denser forms of energy, dematerializes economies, and geographically decouples humanity from nature within a triad of urban, rural, and feral development. If such a reconfiguration where to occur it would mean a massive expansion of economic growth through the unleashing of humanity’s technological and scientific potential. The complexity of such a project can only happen through the type of large participatory planned economy that socialists have always advocated for. All capitalists have a vested interest in protecting their business model, even if such a model is based on an obsolete technology that is destroying the planet. The only way societal development can avoid getting bogged down in the obstinateinterests of capitalists is if economic interests become the general interest of all. That is only possible in a democratic economic system that values the participation and perspective of each individual, in community, instead of the will of one class over another

#### Alt cause – broad space privatization and existing debris.

Muelhapt et al 19 [(Theodore J., Center for Orbital and Reentry Debris Studies, Center for Space Policy and Strategy, The Aerospace Corporation, 30 year Space Systems Analyst and Operator, Marlon E. Sorge, Jamie Morin, Robert S. Wilson), “Space traffic management in the new space era,” Journal of Space Safety Engineering, 6/18/19, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsse.2019.05.007>] TDI

The last decade has seen rapid growth and change in the space industry, and an explosion of commercial and private activity. Terms like NewSpace or democratized space are often used to describe this global trend to develop faster and cheaper access to space, distinct from more traditional government-driven activities focused on security, political, or scientific activities. The easier access to space has opened participation to many more participants than was historically possible. This new activity could profoundly worsen the space debris environment, particularly in low Earth orbit (LEO), but there are also signs of progress and the outlook is encouraging. Many NewSpace operators are actively working to mitigate their impact. Nevertheless, NewSpace represents a significant break with past experience and business as usual will not work in this changed environment. New standards, space policy, and licensing approaches are powerful levers that can shape the future of operations and the debris environment.

2. Characterizing NewSpace: a step change in the space environment

In just the last few years, commercial companies have proposed, funded, and in a few cases begun deployment of very large constellations of small to medium-sized satellites. These constellations will add much more complexity to space operations. Table 1 shows some of the constellations that have been announced for launch in the next decade. Two dozen companies, when taken together, have proposed placing well over ~~20,000~~ [twenty thousand] satellites in orbit in the next ~~10~~ [10]years. For perspective, fewer than ~~8100~~[eight thousand one hundred] payloads have been placed in Earth orbit in the entire history of the space age, only 4800 [1] remain in orbit and approximately 1950 [2] of those are still active. And it isn't simply numbers – the mass in orbit will increase substantially, and long-term debris generation is strongly correlated with mass.

[Table 1 Omitted]

This table is in constant flux. It is based largely on U.S. filings with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and various press releases, but many of the companies here have already altered or abandoned their original plans, and new systems are no doubt in work. Although many of these large constellations may never be launched as listed, the traffic created if just half are successful would be more than double the number of payloads launched in the last 60 years and more than 6 times the number of currently active satellites.

Current space safety, space surveillance, collision avoidance (COLA) and debris mitigation processes have been designed for and have evolved with the current population profile, launch rates and density of LEO space.

By almost any metric used to measure activity in space, whether it is payloads in orbit, the size of constellations, the rate of launches, the economic stakes, the potential for debris creation, the number of conjunctions, NewSpace represents a fundamental change.

3. Compounding effects of better SSA, more satellites, and new operational concepts

The changes in the space environment can be seen on this figurative map of low Earth orbit. Fig. 1 shows the LEO environment as a function of altitude. The number of objects found in each 10 km “bin” is plotted on the horizontal axis, while the altitude is plotted vertically. Objects in elliptical orbits are distributed between bins as partial objects proportional to the time spent in each bin. Some notable resident systems are indicated in blue text on the right to provide an altitude reference. The (dotted) red line shows the number of objects in the current catalog tracked by the U.S. Space Surveillance Network (SSN). All the COLA alerts and actions that must be taken by the residents are due to their neighbors in the nearby bins, so the currently visible risk is proportional to the red line.



The red line of the current catalog does not represent the complete risk; it indicates the risk we can track and perhaps avoid. A rule of thumb is that the current SSN LEO catalog contains objects about 10 cm or larger. It is generally accepted that an impact in LEO with an object 1 cm or larger will cause damage likely to be fatal to a satellite's mission. Therefore, there is a large latent risk from unobserved debris. While we cannot currently track and catalog much smaller than 10 cm, experiments have been performed to detect and sample much smaller objects and statistically model the population at this size [3]. The (solid) blue line represents the model of the 1 cm and larger debris that is likely mission-ending, usually called lethal but not trackable. If LEO operators avoid collisions with all the objects in the red line, they are nonetheless inherently accepting the risk from the blue line. This risk is already present.

The (dashed) orange line is an estimate of the population at 5 cm and larger and is thus an estimate of what the catalog might conservatively be a few years after the Space Fence, a new radar system being built by the Air Force, comes on line (currently planned for 2019) [4]. Commercial companies offering space surveillance services, such as LeoLabs, ExoAnalytics, Analytic Graphics Inc., Lockheed, and Boeing, might also add to the number of objects currently tracked. Space Policy Directive 3 (SPD-3) [13] specifically seeks to expand the use of commercial SSA services.

Existing operators can expect a sharp increase in the number of warnings and alerts they will receive because of the increase in the cataloged population. Almost all the increase will come from newly detected debris [5].

The pace of safety operations for each satellite on orbit will significantly change because of the increase in the catalog from the Space Fence. This effect is compounded because the NewSpace constellations described in Table 1 will drastically change the profile of satellites in LEO. The green bars in Fig. 1 represent the number of objects that will be added to the catalog (red or orange lines) from only the NewSpace large LEO constellations at their operational altitudes. This does not include the rocket stages that launch them, or satellites in the process of being phased into or removed from the operational orbits. Neighbors of one of these new constellations may face a radically different operations environment than their current practices were designed to address.

Satellites in these large LEO constellations typically have planned operational lifetimes of 5–10 years. Some companies have proposed to dispose of their satellites using low thrust electric propulsion systems, which would spiral satellites down over a period of months or years from operating altitudes as high as 1500 km through lower orbits where the Hubble Space Telescope, the International Space Station, and other critical LEO satellites operate [6]. Similar propulsive techniques would raise replacement satellites from lower launch injection orbits to higher operational orbits. These disposal and replenishment activities will add thousands of satellites each year transiting through lower altitudes and posing a risk to all resident satellites in those lower orbits. More importantly, failures will occur both among transiting satellites and operational constellations, potentially leaving hundreds more stranded along the transit path.

#### Rigorous climate simulations prove hydrophilic black carbon would cause atmospheric precipitation – results in a rainout effect that reverses nuclear cooling

Reisner et al. 18 ([Jon Reisner – Climate and atmospheric scientist at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Gennaro D’Angelo – Climate scientist at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, Research scientist at the SETI institute, Associate specialist at the University of California, Santa Cruz, NASA Postdoctoral Fellow at the NASA Ames Research Center, UKAFF Fellow at the University of Exeter. Eunmo Koo - Scientist at Applied Terrestrial, Energy, and Atmospheric Modeling (ATEAM) Team, in Computational Earth Science Group (EES-16) in Earth and Environmental Sciences Division and Co-Lead of Parallel Computing Summer Research Internship (PCSRI) program at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, former Staff research associate at UC Berkeley. Wesley Even - Computational scientist in the Computational Physics and Methods Group at Los Alamos National Laboratory. Matthew Hecht – Atmospheric scientist at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Elizabeth Hunke - Lead developer for the Los Alamos Sea Ice Model (CICE) at the Los Alamos National Laboratory responsible for development and incorporation of new parameterizations, model testing and validation, computational performance, documentation, and consultation with external model users on all aspects of sea ice modeling, including interfacing with global climate and earth system models. Darin Comeau – Climate scientist at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Randy Bos - Project leader at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, former Weapons Effects program manager at Tech-Source. James Cooley – Computational scientist at the Los Alamos National Laboratory specializing in weapons physics, emergency response, and computational physics.) “Climate impact of a regional nuclear weapons exchange:An improved assessment based on detailed source calculations,” March 16, 2018, <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/2017JD027331>] TDI

\*BC = Black Carbon

The no-rubble simulation produces a significantly more intense fire, with more fire spread, and consequently a significantly stronger plume with larger amounts of BC reaching into the upper atmosphere than the simulation with rubble, illustrated in Figure 5. While the no-rubble simulation **represents the worst-case scenario** involving vigorous fire activity, **only a relatively small amount of carbon makes its way into the stratosphere** during the course of the simulation. But while small compared to the surface BC mass, stratospheric BC amounts from the current simulations are significantly higher than what would be expected from burning vegetation such as trees (Heilman et al., 2014), e.g., the higher energy density of the building fuels and the initial fluence from the weapon produce an intense response within HIGRAD with initial updrafts of order 100 m/s in the lower troposphere. Or, in comparison to a mass fire, wildfires will burn only a small amount of fuel in the corresponding time period (roughly 10 minutes) that a nuclear weapon fluence can effectively ignite a large area of fuel producing an impressive atmospheric response. Figure 6 shows vertical profiles of BC multiplied by 100 (number of cities involved in the exchange) from the two simulations. The total amount of BC produced is in line with previous estimates (about 3.69 Tg from no-rubble simulation); however, the majority of BC resides **below the stratosphere** (3.46 Tg below 12 km) and can be **readily impacted by scavenging from precipitation** either via pyro-cumulonimbus produced by the fire itself (not modeled) or other synoptic weather systems. While the impact on climate of these more realistic profiles will be explored in the next section, it should be mentioned that **these estimates are** still **at the high end**, considering the inherent simplifications in the combustion model that lead to **overestimating BC production**. 3.3 Climate Results Long-term climatic effects critically depend on the initial injection height of the soot, with larger quantities reaching the upper troposphere/lower stratosphere inducing a greater cooling impact because of longer residence times (Robock et al., 2007a). Absorption of solar radiation by the BC aerosol and its subsequent radiative cooling tends to heat the surrounding air, driving an initial upward diffusion of the soot plumes, an effect that depends on the initial aerosol concentrations. **Mixing and sedimentation** tend to **reduce this process**, and low altitude emissions are also significantly impacted by precipitation if aging of the BC aerosol occurs on sufficiently rapid timescales. But once at stratospheric altitudes, aerosol dilution via coagulation is hindered by low particulate concentrations (e.g., Robock et al., 2007a) and lofting to much higher altitudes is inhibited by gravitational settling in the low-density air (Stenke et al., 2013), resulting in more stable BC concentrations over long times. Of the initial BC

mass released in the atmosphere, most of which is emitted below 9 km, **70% rains out within the first month** and 78%, or about 2.9 Tg, is removed within the first two months (Figure 7, solid line), with the remainder (about 0.8 Tg, dashed line) being transported above about 12 km (200 hPa) within the first week. This outcome differs from the findings of, e.g., Stenke et al. (2013, their high BC-load cases) and Mills et al. (2014), who found that most of the BC mass (between 60 and 70%) is lifted in the stratosphere within the first couple of weeks. This can also be seen in Figure 8 (red lines) and in Figure 9, which include results from our calculation with the initial BC distribution from Mills et al. (2014). In that case, only 30% of the initial BC mass rains out in the troposphere during the first two weeks after the exchange, with the remainder rising to the stratosphere. In the study of Mills et al. (2008) this percentage is somewhat smaller, about 20%, and smaller still in the experiments of Robock et al. (2007a) in which the soot is initially emitted in the upper troposphere or higher. In Figure 7, the e-folding timescale for the removal of tropospheric soot, here interpreted as the time required for an initial drop of a factor e, is about one week. This result compares favorably with the “LT” experiment of Robock et al. (2007a), considering 5 Tg of BC released in the lower troposphere, in which 50% of the aerosols are removed within two weeks. By contrast, the initial e-folding timescale for the removal of stratospheric soot in Figure 8 is about 4.2 years (blue solid line), compared to about 8.4 years for the calculation using Mills et al. (2014) initial BC emission (red solid line). The removal timescale from our forced ensemble simulations is close to those obtained by Mills et al. (2008) in their 1 Tg experiment, by Robock et al. (2007a) in their experiment “UT 1 Tg”, and © 2018 American Geophysical Union. All rights reserved. by Stenke et al. (2013) in their experiment “Exp1”, in all of which 1 Tg of soot was emitted in the atmosphere in the aftermath of the exchange. Notably, the e-folding timescale for the decline of the BC mass in Figure 8 (blue solid line) is also close to the value of about 4 years quoted by Pausata et al. (2016) for their long-term “intermediate” scenario. In that scenario, which is also based on 5 Tg of soot initially distributed as in Mills et al. (2014), the factor-of2 shorter residence time of the aerosols is caused by particle growth via coagulation of BC with organic carbon. Figure 9 shows the BC mass-mixing ratio, horizontally averaged over the globe, as a function of atmospheric pressure (height) and time. The BC distributions used in our simulations imply that the upward transport of particles is substantially less efficient compared to the case in which 5 Tg of BC is directly injected into the upper troposphere. The semiannual cycle of lofting and sinking of the aerosols is associated with atmospheric heating and cooling during the solstice in each hemisphere (Robock et al., 2007a). During the first year, the oscillation amplitude in our forced ensemble simulations is particularly large during the summer solstice, compared to that during the winter solstice (see bottom panel of Figure 9), because of the higher soot concentrations in the Northern Hemisphere, as can be seen in Figure 11 (see also left panel of Figure 12). Comparing the top and bottom panels of Figure 9, the BC reaches the highest altitudes during the first year in both cases, but the concentrations at 0.1 hPa in the top panel can be 200 times as large. Qualitatively, the difference can be understood in terms of the air temperature increase caused by BC radiation emission, which is several tens of kelvin degrees in the simulations of Robock et al. (2007a, see their Figure 4), Mills et al. (2008, see their Figure 5), Stenke et al. (2013, see high-load cases in their Figure 4), Mills et al. (2014, see their Figure 7), and Pausata et al. (2016, see one-day emission cases in their Figure 1), due to high BC concentrations, but it amounts to only about 10 K in our forced ensemble simulations, as illustrated in Figure 10. Results similar to those presented in Figure 10 were obtained from the experiment “Exp1” performed by Stenke et al. (2013, see their Figure 4). **In that scenario as well, somewhat less that 1 Tg of BC remained in the atmosphere after the initial rainout**. As mentioned before, the BC aerosol that remains in the atmosphere, lifted to stratospheric heights by the rising soot plumes, undergoes sedimentation over a timescale of several years (Figures 8 and 9). This mass represents the effective amount of BC that can force climatic changes over multi-year timescales. In the forced ensemble simulations, it is about 0.8 Tg after the initial rainout, whereas it is about 3.4 Tg in the simulation with an initial soot distribution as in Mills et al. (2014). Our more realistic source simulation involves the worstcase assumption of no-rubble (along with other assumptions) and hence serves as an upper bound for the impact on climate. As mentioned above and further discussed below, our scenario induces perturbations on the climate system similar to those found in previous studies in which the climatic response was driven by roughly 1 Tg of soot rising to stratospheric heights following the exchange. Figure 11 illustrates the vertically integrated mass-mixing ratio of BC over the globe, at various times after the exchange for the simulation using the initial BC distribution of Mills et al. (2014, upper panels) and as an average from the forced ensemble members (lower panels). All simulations predict enhanced concentrations at high latitudes during the first year after the exchange. In the cases shown in the top panels, however, these high concentrations persist for several years (see also Figure 1 of Mills et al., 2014), whereas the forced ensemble simulations indicate that the BC concentration starts to decline after the first year. In fact, in the simulation represented in the top panels, mass-mixing ratios larger than about 1 kg of BC © 2018 American Geophysical Union. All rights reserved. per Tg of air persist for well over 10 years after the exchange, whereas they only last for 3 years in our forced simulations (compare top and middle panels of Figure 9). After the first year, values drop below 3 kg BC/Tg air, whereas it takes about 8 years to reach these values in the simulation in the top panels (see also Robock et al., 2007a). Over crop-producing, midlatitude regions in the Northern Hemisphere, the BC loading is reduced from more than 0.8 kg BC/Tg air in the simulation in the top panels to 0.2-0.4 kg BC/Tg air in our forced simulations (see middle and right panels). The more rapid clearing of the atmosphere in the forced ensemble is also signaled by the soot optical depth in the visible radiation spectrum, which drops below values of 0.03 toward the second half of the first year at mid latitudes in the Northern Hemisphere, and everywhere on the globe after about 2.5 years (without never attaining this value in the Southern Hemisphere). In contrast, the soot optical depth in the calculation shown in the top panels of Figure 11 becomes smaller than 0.03 everywhere only after about 10 years. The two cases show a similar tendency, in that the BC optical depth is typically lower between latitudes 30º S-30º N than it is at other latitudes. This behavior is associated to the persistence of stratospheric soot toward high-latitudes and the Arctic/Antarctic regions, as illustrated by the zonally-averaged, column-integrated mass-mixing ratio of the BC in Figure 12 for both the forced ensemble simulations (left panel) and the simulation with an initial 5 Tg BC emission in the upper troposphere (right panel). The spread in the globally averaged (near) surface temperature of the atmosphere, from the control (left panel) and forced (right panel) ensembles, is displayed in Figure 13. For each month, the plots show the largest variations (i.e., maximum and minimum values), within each ensemble of values obtained for that month, relative to the mean value of that month. The plot also shows yearly-averaged data (thinner lines). The spread is comparable in the control and forced ensembles, with average values calculated over the 33-years run length of 0.4-0.5 K. This spread is also similar to the internal variability of the globally averaged surface temperature quoted for the NCAR Large Ensemble Community Project (Kay et al., 2015). These results imply that surface air temperature differences, between forced and control simulations, which lie within the spread may not be distinguished from effects due to internal variability of the two simulation ensembles. Figure 14 shows the difference in the globally averaged surface temperature of the atmosphere (top panel), net solar radiation flux at surface (middle panel), and precipitation rate (bottom panel), computed as the (forced minus control) difference in ensemble mean values. The sum of standard deviations from each ensemble is shaded. Differences are qualitatively significant over the first few years, when the anomalies lie near or outside the total standard deviation. Inside the shaded region, differences may not be distinguished from those arising from the internal variability of one or both ensembles. The surface solar flux (middle panel) is the quantity that appears most affected by the BC emission, with qualitatively significant differences persisting for about 5 years. The precipitation rate (bottom panel) is instead affected only at the very beginning of the simulations. The red lines in all panels show the results from the simulation applying the initial BC distribution of Mills et al. (2014), where the period of significant impact is much longer owing to the higher altitude of the initial soot distribution that results in longer residence times of the BC aerosol in the atmosphere. When yearly averages of the same quantities are performed over the IndiaPakistan region, the differences in ensemble mean values lie within the total standard deviations of the two ensembles. The results in Figure 14 can also be compared to the outcomes of other previous studies. In their experiment “UT 1 Tg”, Robock et al. (2007a) found that, when only 1 Tg of soot © 2018 American Geophysical Union. All rights reserved. remains in the atmosphere after the initial rainout, temperature and precipitation anomalies are about 20% of those obtained from their standard 5 Tg BC emission case. Therefore, the largest differences they observed, during the first few years after the exchange, were about - 0.3 K and -0.06 mm/day, respectively, comparable to the anomalies in the top and bottom panels of Figure 14. Their standard 5 Tg emission case resulted in a solar radiation flux anomaly at surface of -12 W/m2 after the second year (see their Figure 3), between 5 and 6 time as large as the corresponding anomalies from our ensembles shown in the middle panel. In their experiment “Exp1”, Stenke et al. (2013) reported global mean surface temperature anomalies not exceeding about 0.3 K in magnitude and precipitation anomalies hovering around -0.07 mm/day during the first few years, again consistent with the results of Figure 14. In a recent study, Pausata et al. (2016) considered the effects of an admixture of BC and organic carbon aerosols, both of which would be emitted in the atmosphere in the aftermath of a nuclear exchange. In particular, they concentrated on the effects of coagulation of these aerosol species and examined their climatic impacts. The initial BC distribution was as in Mills et al. (2014), although the soot burden was released in the atmosphere over time periods of various lengths. Most relevant to our and other previous work are their one-day emission scenarios. They found that, during the first year, the largest values of the atmospheric surface temperature anomalies ranged between about -0.5 and -1.3 K, those of the sea surface temperature anomalies ranged between -0.2 and -0.55 K, and those of the precipitation anomalies varied between -0.15 and -0.2 mm/day. All these ranges are compatible with our results shown in Figure 14 as red lines and with those of Mills et al. (2014, see their Figures 3 and 6). As already mentioned in Section 2.3, the net solar flux anomalies at surface are also consistent. This overall agreement suggests that the **inclusion of organic carbon aerosols, and** ensuing **coagulation** with BC, **should not dramatically alter the climatic effects** resulting from our forced ensemble simulations. Moreover, aerosol growth would likely **shorten the residence time of the BC particulate in the atmosphere** (Pausata et al., 2016), possibly **reducing the duration of these effects.**