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#### PIC text: States except for the Republic of India ought to ban the appropriation of outer space by private entities. The Republic of India ought to increase funding for the appropriation of outer space by private entities.

#### China is ramping up aggression in outer space – sets the grounds for Chinese cyberattacks

Broad 21 [(William J, is a science journalist and senior writer.) "How Space Became the Next ‘Great Power’ Contest Between the U.S. and China," 1-24-2021 updated 5-6-2018, https://www.nytimes.com/2021/01/24/us/politics/trump-biden-pentagon-space-missiles-satellite.html] TDI

For years, the Chinese studied — with growing anxiety — the American military, especially its invasions of Afghanistan in 2001 and Iraq in 2003. The battlefield successes were seen as rooted in space dominance. Planners noted that thousands of satellite-guided bombs and cruise missiles had rained down with devastating precision on Taliban forces and Iraqi defenses.

While the Pentagon’s edge in orbital assets was clearly a threat to China, planners argued that it might also represent a liability.

“They saw how the U.S. projected power,” said Todd Harrison, a space analyst at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a Washington think tank. “And they saw that it was largely undefended.”

China began its antisatellite tests in 2005. It fired two missiles in two years and then made headlines in 2007 by shattering a derelict weather satellite. There was no explosion. The inert warhead simply smashed into the satellite at blinding speed. The successful test reverberated globally because it was the first such act of destruction since the Cold War.

The whirling shards, more than 150,000 in all, threatened satellites as well as the International Space Station. Ground controllers raced to move dozens of spacecraft and astronauts out of harm’s way.

The Bush administration initially did little. Then, in a show of force meant to send Beijing a message, in 2008, it fired a sophisticated missile to shoot down one of its own satellites.

Beijing conducted about a dozen more tests, including ones in which warheads shot much higher, in theory putting most classes of American spacecraft at risk.

China also sought to diversify its antisatellite force. A warhead could take hours to reach a high orbit, potentially giving American forces time for evasive or retaliatory action. Moreover, the speeding debris from a successful attack might endanger Beijing’s own spacecraft.

In tests, China began firing weak laser beams at satellites and studying other ways to strike at the speed of light. However, all the techniques were judged as requiring years and perhaps decades of development.

Then came the new idea. Every aspect of American space power was controlled from the ground by powerful computers. If penetrated, the brains of Washington’s space fleets might be degraded or destroyed. Such attacks, compared with every other antisatellite move, were also remarkably inexpensive.

In 2005, China began to incorporate cyberattacks into its military exercises, primarily in first strikes against enemy networks. Increasingly, its military doctrine called for ~~paralyzing~~ early attacks.

In 2008, hackers seized control of a civilian imaging satellite named Terra that orbited low, like the military’s reconnaissance craft. They did so twice — first in June and again in October — roaming control circuits with seeming impunity. Remarkably, in both cases, the hackers achieved all the necessary steps to command the spacecraft but refrained from doing so, apparently to reduce their fingerprints.

#### Chinese aggression makes escalation inevitable – draws in other powers

Fabian 19 [Christopher David Fabian, Bachelor of Science, United States Air Force Academy. (“A Neoclassical Realist’s Analysis Of Sino-U.S. Space Policy”, *University of North Dakota Scholarly Commons*, January, Available Online at: <https://commons.und.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3456&context=theses>]

Second, Chinese strikes on U.S. space assets must not result in uncontrolled escalation. The advantage of possessing soft-kill technology is the suitability for low-intensity conflicts, while the use of destructive/non-reversible attacks will not be constrained during high-intensity conflicts.234 The use of exclusively non-lethal versus a combination of lethal and non-lethal capabilities can serve as strategic signaling about the phase of combat. However, due to a capability and vulnerability gap, combined with a lack of credible retaliatory threat, a tit-for-tat strategy along a clearly defined escalation ladder may not be a legitimate strategy for the Sino-U.S. relationship. 235 Counterspace action intended to have a tactical/operational effect may cross American strategic red lines, resulting in unintended escalation. For example, an attack on American overhead persistent infrared (OPIR) sensors would degrade their capability to detect conventional medium range ballistic missiles, with targets in the first island chain also interfering with the early detection of nuclear capable ICBMs launched against the U.S.236 Concerningly enough, there is evidence that the implication of interfering with or destroying strategically important U.S. capabilities has only been appreciated on the tactical and operational levels within the Chinese military.

237 Similarly, a Chinese attack on U.S. space systems at the outset of a low-grade conflict could raise the likelihood of a “space Pearl Harbor,” which could, in turn, provoke the United States to contemplate pre-emptive attacks or horizontal escalation on the Chinese mainland.238 In addition, commercial-military integration and combined efforts may result in escalation with third parties. A significant portion of U.S. military communication and imaging capabilities are purchased from commercial companies or provided by allied nations, meaning that to adequately degrade U.S. military capabilities, an attack on non-military and/or non-U.S. assets is required.

#### India space participation is crucial to India’s soft power – independently Indian norm setting curbs Chinese militarization

Castro ’17. [Bhavani Castro Fellow of Indian Studies at the Getulio Vargas Foundation in São Paulo, 03-03-2017, "Why India Should Help Shape Norms for Outer Space Activities," The Diplomat, <https://thediplomat.com/2017/03/why-india-should-help-shape-norms-for-outer-space-activities/>] TDI

The past years have been groundbreaking for the Indian Space Program. In 2014, its first interplanetary mission, Mangalyaan, entered into Mars orbit, putting the Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO) into the select group of space agencies to reach Mars, and the first one to succeed entering its orbit in the first attempt. In 2015, the agency launched its first space observatory, Astrosat, aimed to observe distant planets and astronomical objects, a first-class technology mastered by few countries. Last year, India also set a record by launching 20 satellites at once, many from other countries. However, India could go one step further in the space business and engage in a much more rewarding activity for its ambitions: taking the lead in shaping norms for outer space activities.

As the ISRO achieved a new world record in February – the launching of 104 satellites on a single rocket – Prime Minister Narendra Modi should consider giving new focus to the diplomacy surrounding the use of space. India has not been very active in the ongoing international efforts to update the outer space regime. It has not supported the European Union’s proposal for a Code of Conduct for Outer Space Activities, and it also watched silently while China and Russia joined efforts to issue a draft for a treaty on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space. However, if India aims for greater recognition in the international scenario, it is about time to take a more proactive stance on the creation of new norms and rules in global governance.

The existing international space regime includes several outdated treaties – mainly the Outer Space Treaty from 1967 and the Moon Treaty from 1979. These documents do not deal with urgent issues for today’s space exploration, including the prohibition of non-nuclear weapons tests in space and the creation of risky debris from the destruction of old satellites. The entrance of new actors, specifically in the space communications industry, makes it increasingly difficult to coordinate the positioning of new satellites in an already overcrowded orbit. Moreover, it is still unknown how those new actors – including China and India – will behave in space: whether they will choose to follow the peaceful use of space, or whether militarization will be their path.

It is crucial for India to work actively for new norms in the current scenario because of a variety of reasons. First, India needs to consider its national security interests. The vacuum created by the slow growth of the US and Russia on space capabilities is being filled by China, whose intentions are not entirely clear. In 2007, Beijing launched an anti-satellite weapon (ASAT) to destroy an old satellite. This move, not previously notified to the international community, not only produced thousands of harmful debris in orbit, but also evidenced China’s growing military capacity. If India wants to curb potentially harmful Chinese activities in outer space, it needs to endorse rules that fit its national interests.

India also needs to promote the regulation of space activities to enhance its cooperation with other space-faring nations – possibly including China, if the two countries decide for cooperation instead of competition. Vital sectors of the economy, as finance and communications, are dependent on space technologies, which makes cooperation essential for countries in a globalized world. India is proud of the indigeneity of its space technology, but it is about time to engage in technology sharing and commercial agreements with other countries. Space technologies are economic stimulants and useful tools in communication, resource management, and disaster prevention activities, all of which are essential assets for emerging economies like India.

More importantly, engaging in and committing to the creation of a new space governance framework would project India as an agenda-setter in a field of increasing importance for international relations. As in other realms of global governance, the future of space research is in the hands of Asia.

India can promote the creation of a more comprehensive regime for the use of outer space in a variety of ways. It is possible, for example, to start discussions within organizations like the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa), IBSA (India, Brazil, South Africa), and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization. India can also actively engage with existing forums, such as the UN Committee on the Peaceful Use of Outer Space and ongoing discussions held by the European Union on the creation of a code of conduct.

The Outer Space Treaty will be celebrating its 50th anniversary this year; 2017 might be a good year for India to start an active campaign for an upgrade in the space regime. It might be difficult for India to build a new international institution or create legally binding treaties, but it can work on the promotion and creation of new conventions, cooperation agreements, and consensual norms.

#### Private sector is key

Rajagopalan ’20 [Dr Rajeswari (Raji) Pillai Rajagopalan is the Director of the Centre for Security, Strategy and Technology (CSST) at the Observer Research Foundation, New Delhi., 5-24-2020, "India’s Space Programme: A role for the private sector, finally?," ORF, <https://www.orfonline.org/research/indias-space-programme-a-role-for-the-private-sector-finally-66661/>] NChu

India’s finance minister Nirmala Sitharaman announced last week that India’s private sector will play a key role in augmenting India’s space programme, and that the government intends to share the facilities of the Indian Space Research Organisation (ISRO) with the private sector. This announcement was part of the Narendra Modi government’s call for new and bold reforms in an effort to promote its ‘self-reliant India’ mission. It is the fourth segment of the Rs 20 lakh crore Aatma Nirbhar Bharat Abhiyan special economic stimulus.

Sitharaman’s announcement entails a role for the private sector, possibly with the goal of greater investments in technology development and acquisition, capacity-building and space exploration, including planetary exploration. The minister, while announcing these reforms, appeared to understand that the private sector can help augment India’s space capability. While praising the work done by ISRO, she also pointed out that the private sector is also doing a lot of work in developing space technology. She also acknowledged that the existing regulations prevent private entities from using or even testing their products.

Therefore, to level the playing field, the government “will make a provision for the private sector to benefit from the assets which are available to ISRO and for India (in general) to benefit from.” The minister also said the new reforms would allow the private sector to play an active role in “satellites, launches and space-based services”.

But as always, implementation is key. Properly executing these reforms will require enabling policies and appropriate regulatory frameworks.

That the new reforms will allow private sector players to use ISRO facilities is a big deal. This indeed must be music to the ears of commercial players who have been seeking to get a fair share of the pie in terms of manufacturing of satellites and propellant technologies, among other areas. It should not be too difficult for India’s private space sector because there is a sizeable talent pool available outside ISRO. More importantly, the entry of the private sector, as in the telecom sector, can bring several advantages in terms of cost and access.

Following the announcement, ISRO tweeted that it will follow the government’s guidelines to allow the private sector to undertake space activities in the country. Though this did not seem particularly welcoming of the government’s initiative, ISRO’s support is critical to making it a success.

ISRO has in the last few years been opening up to the Indian private space sector in a gradual manner – mostly as a matter of compulsion because ISRO simply does not have the in-house capacity to address India’s growing requirements. Today, the Indian space programme is not just about civilian applications for remote-sensing, meteorology and communication, as in the early decades. India’s space sector and its requirements have grown enormously in the last decade to include television and broadband services, space science and exploration, space-based navigation and, of course, defence and security applications.

Among others, Ambassador Rakesh Sood has articulated the need for legislation to facilitate ISRO’s partnership with industries and entrepreneurs. Narayan Prasad and Prateep Basu, two prominent faces in the Indian space start-up segment, have argued that despite ISRO’s successes, “India’s space competitiveness has suffered from the absence of a globally reputed, private space industry.”

The private sector, especially the NewSpace industry and start-ups, have an advantage in terms of low-cost operations, which itself should be a big incentive for the government to make it an active stakeholder. A certain amount of democratisation of space technology with the participation of the private sector can ensure costs are kept low. And expanding the number of stakeholders will also ensure more transparency and better accountability and regulatory practices. This has been missing in India’s space sector. The same agency has undertaken promotion, commercialisation and regulatory functions – which is not healthy.

Following the minister’s announcement, I spoke to a few key players in the private sector to capture their sense of the reforms in the pipeline. Sadly, the general mood is not one of excitement but rather to wait and watch. To them, as stated earlier, the key is implementation. One of them, who did not wish to be named, argued that unless there is a conducive structure for the private sector to engage with, the announcement is more lip service. Narayan Prasad said that there need to be basic changes for the reforms to be effective. The private sector is particularly concerned about issues such as sharing intellectual property for products developed by the private sector. Prasad argued that IP-centric policymaking has to be taken for real reform.

Right now, ISRO thinks they will use the suppliers only as manufacturing or services partners. So all IP is controlled by ISRO and suppliers just replace ISRO technicians and production facilities. This means most suppliers have no real IP of their own, and just depend on cost plus contracts from ISRO for business. The only way to change that is to create reforms where local industry can invest in building their own IP and/or products that can match global standards.

This in turn means that policymakers will need to view industry as more than sweatshops and look at what steps can be taken for IP/product development by private industry. This is the only way to integrate India’s private sector into the global supply chain. Prasad adds that if ISRO is serious about partnering with the private sector, it must spell out the requirements and select the best available. Several private-sector actors have articulated the need for an independent regulator.

This is an area that has been a common thread in many of my conversations with Indian entrepreneurs. Rohan M. Ganapathy, CEO and CTO of Bellatrix Aerospace in Bengaluru, also made a strong case for an autonomous regulator, and acknowledged a need for the government to clarify R&D risk funding, which is crucial to realise new technologies.

It is not that ISRO has not engaged the private sector. ISRO has long been associated with private firms like Larsen & Toubro, Godrej and Walchand Nagar Industries. It is just that the mode of participation envisaged through the new reforms is very different. The current mode of work, more of an outsourcing model, is becoming inadequate. In the last few years, because of significant capacity deficit, ISRO began to work with a few in the private sector such as the Bengaluru-based Alpha Design Technologies, contracted to build satellites. Similarly, Bellatrix Aerospace began to work with ISRO on advanced in-space propulsion systems. But these remain exceptions.

But ISRO does recognise the new compulsions and has been trying to change. The newly formed commercial enterprise called the NewSpace India Limited (NSIL), under the Department of Space, is an initiative to engage the private sector. NSIL is meant to help the private sector with transfer of some technologies to the private sector, especially the small satellite launch vehicle that is being developed and even the older PSLV. But the pace of ISRO’s engagement with the private sector needs to quicken.

Followed up effectively, the new government initiatives could help. Indeed, ISRO needs to expand its operations significantly if it has to remain competitive, both from a domestic and international outlook. The Indian space programme has several advantages, the most important being cost: the ability to provide reliable launches in a cost-effective manner is a big advantage. The Polar Satellite Launch Vehicle remains a tried and tested launch vehicle and has managed to remain the cheapest for launching small satellites into space. But competition in this sector is picking up.

Jeff Bezos’ Blue Origin, Elon Musk’s SpaceX and start-ups from China want a share of the global commercial market, estimated to be worth around $350 billion (Rs 26.46 lakh crore). If ISRO does not improve its launch infrastructure and increase the number of launches, it will be at a disadvantage. And despite India’s cost advantages, it has a mere 2% share of this, worth $7 billion. India can gain significantly if ISRO and the country’s private space sector can cooperate effectively and synergistically. This requires the government to actually act on the initiatives it announced.

#### Cyberattacks spiral to all-out fatal nuclear conflict

***Klare 19*** [Michael; November 2019; Professor emeritus of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College; “*Cyber Battles, Nuclear Outcomes? Dangerous New Pathways to Escalation*,” Arms Control Association, <https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation>] Justin

Yet another pathway to escalation could arise from a cascading series of cyberstrikes and counterstrikes against vital national infrastructure rather than on military targets. All major powers, along with Iran and North Korea, have developed and deployed cyberweapons designed to disrupt and destroy major elements of an adversary’s key economic systems, such as power grids, financial systems, and transportation networks. As noted, Russia has infiltrated the U.S. electrical grid, and it is widely believed that the United States has done the same in Russia.12 The Pentagon has also devised a plan known as “Nitro Zeus,” intended to immobilize the entire Iranian economy and so force it to capitulate to U.S. demands or, if that approach failed, to pave the way for a crippling air and missile attack.13 The danger here is that economic attacks of this sort, if undertaken during a period of tension and crisis, could lead to an escalating series of tit-for-tat attacks against ever more vital elements of an adversary’s critical infrastructure, producing widespread chaos and harm and eventually leading one side to initiate kinetic attacks on critical military targets, risking the slippery slope to nuclear conflict. For example, a Russian cyberattack on the U.S. power grid could trigger U.S. attacks on Russian energy and financial systems, causing widespread disorder in both countries and generating an impulse for even more devastating attacks. At some point, such attacks “could lead to major conflict and possibly nuclear war.”14