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### 1NC---Space Elevators PIC

#### Text – Private Appropriation of Outer Space except for Space Elevators is Unjust.

#### Space Elevators constitute Appropriation – they impede orbits.

Matignon 19 Louis de Gouyon Matignon 3-3-2019 "LEGAL ASPECTS OF THE SPACE ELEVATOR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM" <https://www.spacelegalissues.com/space-law-legal-aspects-of-the-space-elevator-transportation-system/> [PhD in space law (co-supervised by both Philippe Delebecque, from Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne, France, and Christopher D. Johnson, from Georgetown University || regularly write articles on the website Space Legal Issues so as to popularise space law and public international law]//Elmer

An Earth-based space elevator would consist of a cable with one end attached to the surface near the equator and the other end in space beyond geostationary orbit. An orbit is the curved path through which objects in space move around a planet or a star. The 1967 Treaty’s regime and customary law enshrine the principle of non-appropriation and freedom of access to orbital positions. Space Law and International Telecommunication Laws combined to protect this use against any interference. The majority of space-launched objects are satellites that are launched in Earth’s orbit (a very small part of space objects – scientific objects for space exploration – are launched into outer space beyond terrestrial orbits). It is important to precise that an orbit does not exist: satellites describe orbits by obeying the general laws of universal attraction. Depending on the launching techniques and parameters, the orbital trajectory of a satellite may vary. Sun-synchronous satellites fly over a given location constantly at the same time in local civil time: they are used for remote sensing, meteorology or the study of the atmosphere. Geostationary satellites are placed in a very high orbit; they give an impression of immobility because they remain permanently at the same vertical point of a terrestrial point (they are mainly used for telecommunications and television broadcasting). A geocentric orbit or Earth orbit involves any object orbiting Planet Earth, such as the Moon or artificial satellites. Geocentric (having the Earth as its centre) orbits are organised as follow: 1) Low Earth orbit (LEO): geocentric orbits with altitudes (the height of an object above the average surface of the Earth’s oceans) from 100 to 2 000 kilometres. Satellites in LEO have a small momentary field of view, only able to observe and communicate with a fraction of the Earth at a time, meaning a network or constellation of satellites is required in order to provide continuous coverage. Satellites in lower regions of LEO also suffer from fast orbital decay (in orbital mechanics, decay is a gradual decrease of the distance between two orbiting bodies at their closest approach, the periapsis, over many orbital periods), requiring either periodic reboosting to maintain a stable orbit, or launching replacement satellites when old ones re-enter. 2) Medium Earth orbit (MEO), also known as an intermediate circular orbit: geocentric orbits ranging in altitude from 2 000 kilometres to just below geosynchronous orbit at 35 786 kilometres. The most common use for satellites in this region is for navigation, communication, and geodetic/space environment science. The most common altitude is approximately 20 000 kilometres which yields an orbital period of twelve hours. 3) Geosynchronous orbit (GSO) and geostationary orbit (GEO) are orbits around Earth at an altitude of 35 786 kilometres matching Earth’s sidereal rotation period. All geosynchronous and geostationary orbits have a semi-major axis of 42 164 kilometres. A geostationary orbit stays exactly above the equator, whereas a geosynchronous orbit may swing north and south to cover more of the Earth’s surface. Communications satellites and weather satellites are often placed in geostationary orbits, so that the satellite antennae (located on Earth) that communicate with them do not have to rotate to track them, but can be pointed permanently at the position in the sky where the satellites are located. 4) High Earth orbit: geocentric orbits above the altitude of 35 786 kilometres. The competing forces of gravity, which is stronger at the lower end, and the outward/upward centrifugal force, which is stronger at the upper end, would result in the cable being held up, under tension, and stationary over a single position on Earth. With the tether deployed, climbers could repeatedly climb the tether to space by mechanical means, releasing their cargo to orbit. Climbers could also descend the tether to return cargo to the surface from orbit.

#### Private Companies are pursuing Space Elevators.

Alfano 15 Andrea Alfano 8-18-2015 “All Of These Companies Are Working On A Space Elevator” <https://www.techtimes.com/articles/77612/20150818/companies-working-space-elevator.htm> (Writer at the Tech Times)//Elmer

Space elevators are solid proof that any mundane object sounds way cooler if you stick the word "space" in front of it. But there's much more than coolness at stake when building a space elevator – this technology has the potential to revolutionize space transportation, and the Canadian private space company Thoth Technology that was recently awarded a patent for its space elevator design isn't the only company in the game. One of the other major players is a U.S.-based company called LiftPort Group, founded by space entrepreneur Michael Laine in 2003. Its plan for a space elevator is vastly different from the one for which Thoth received a patent, however. Whereas Thoth's plans entail tethering a 12-mile-high inflatable space elevator to the Earth, LiftPort is shooting for the moon. Originally, LiftPort had planned to build an Earth elevator, too, but it abandoned the idea in 2007 in favor of building a lunar elevator. The basic design for a lunar elevator is an anchor in the moon that is attached to a cable that extends to a space station situated at a very special point. Known as a Lagrange Point, this is the gravitational tipping point between the Earth and the moon, where their gravitational pulls essentially cancel one another out. A robot could then travel up and down the tether, ferrying cargo between the moon and the station. Out farther in space, a counterweight would balance out the system. Both types of space elevator are intended to increase space access, but in very different ways. Thoth's Earth elevator aims to make launches easier by starting off 12 miles above the Earth's surface. LiftPort's space elevator aims to increase access to the moon in particular, because it is much easier to launch a rocket to the Lagrange Point and dock it at a space station than it is to get to the moon directly. There's a third major company based in Japan called Obayashi Corp. whose plans look like a hybrid of Thoth's and LiftPort's. Obayashi is not a space company, however – it's actually a construction company. Like Thoth, Obayashi plans to build an Earth elevator. But its Earth elevator would consist of a cable tethered to the blue planet, a robotic cargo-carrier, a space station, and a counterweight. It essentially looks like LiftPort's plans, but stuck to the Earth instead of to the moon.

#### Yes Space Elevators – NASA confirms.

Snowden 18 Scott Snowden 10-2-2018 "A colossal elevator to space could be going up sooner than you ever imagined" <https://www.nbcnews.com/mach/science/colossal-elevator-space-could-be-going-sooner-you-ever-imagined-ncna915421> (Scott has written about science and technology for 20 years for publications around the world. He covers environmental technology for Forbes.)//Elmer

For more than half a century, rockets have been the only way to go to space. But in the not-too-distant future, we may have another option for sending up people and payloads: a colossal elevator extending from Earth’s surface up to an altitude of 22,000 miles, where geosynchronous satellites orbit. NASA says the basic concept of a space elevator is sound, and researchers around the world are optimistic that one can be built. The Obayashi Corp., a global construction firm based in Tokyo, has said it will build one by 2050, and China wants to build one as soon as 2045. Now an experiment to be conducted soon aboard the International Space Station will help determine the real-world feasibility of a space elevator. “The space elevator is the Holy Grail of space exploration,” says Michio Kaku, a professor of physics at City College of New York and a noted futurist. “Imagine pushing the ‘up’ button of an elevator and taking a ride into the heavens. It could open up space to the average person.”

#### Regardless of completion, Elevators spur investment in Nanotechnology

Liam O’Brien 16. University of Wollongong. 07/2016. “Nanotechnology in Space.” Young Scientists Journal; Canterbury, no. 19, p. 22.

Nanotechnology is at the forefront of scientific development, continuing to astound and innovate. Likewise, the space industry is rapidly increasing in sophistication and competition, with companies such as SpaceX, Blue Origin and Virgin Galactic becoming increasingly prevalent in what could become a new commercial space race. The various space programs over the past 60 years have led to a multitude of beneficial impacts for everyday society. Nanotechnology, through research and development in space has the potential to do the same. Potential applications of nanotechnology in space are numerous, many of them have the potential to capture and inspire generations to come. One of these applications is the space elevator. By using carbon nanotubes, a super light yet strong material, this concept would be an actual physical structure from the surface of the Earth to an altitude of approximately 36 000 km. The tallest building in the world would fit into this elevator over 42 000 times. The counterweight, used to keep the elevator taught, is proposed to be an asteroid. This would need to be at a distance of 100 000 km, a quarter of the distance to the moon. The benefits of such a structure would be enormous. 95% of a space shuttle's weight at take-off is fuel, costing US$ 20 000 per kilogram to send something into space. However, with a space elevator the cost per kilogram can be reduced to as little as US$ 200. Exploration to other planets can begin at the tower, and travel to and from the moon could become as simple as a morning commute to work. Solar sails provide the means to travel large distances and incredible speeds. Much like sails on a boat use wind, the solar sail uses light as a source of propulsion. Ideally these sails would be kilometres in length and only a few micrometres in thickness. This provides us with the ability to travel at speeds previously unheard of. Using carbon nanotubes once again, a solar sail has the capability to travel at 39 756 km/s which is 13% of the speed of light! This sail could reach Pluto in an astonishing 1.7 days, and Alpha Centauri in just 32 years. Space travel to other planets, other stars, could be possible with solar sails. The Planetary Society is funding for a space sail of itself, and has successfully launched one into orbit. NASA has also sent a sail into orbit, allowing it to burn up in the atmosphere after 240 days. Investing time and resources into nanotechnology for space exploration has benefits for society today. Materials such as graphene are being used in modern manufacturing at an increasing rate as the applications become utilised. Carbon nanotubes will change the way we think about materials and their strength. These nanotubes have a tensile strength one hundred times that of steel, yet are only a sixth of the weight. Imagine light weight vehicles using less petrol and energy as well as being just as strong as regular vehicles. With potentials to revolutionize the way we think about space travel, nanotechnology has a bright future. As a new field of science, it has the capability to push the human race to the outer reaches of our galaxy and hopefully one day to other stars. It will inspire generations of explorers and dreamers to challenge themselves and advance the human race into the next era. As Richard Feynman said in his 1959 talk 'There's Plenty of Room at the Bottom' "A field in which little has been done, but in which an enormous amount can be done. There is still plenty more to achieve.

#### Nano tech solves warming

Bhavya Khullar. September 4, 2017. Nanomaterials Could Combat Climate Change and Reduce Pollution. https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/nanomaterials-could-combat-climate-change-and-reduce-pollution/

The list of environmental problems that the world faces may be huge, but some strategies for solving them are remarkably small. First explored for applications in microscopy and computing, nanomaterials—materials made up of units that are each thousands of times smaller than the thickness of a human hair—are emerging as useful for tackling threats to our planet’s well-being. Scientists across the globe are developing nanomaterials that can efficiently use carbon dioxide from the air, capture toxic pollutants from water and degrade solid waste into useful products. “Nanomaterials could help us mitigate pollution. They are efficient catalysts and mostly recyclable. Now, they have to become economical for commercialization and better to replace present-day technologies completely,” says [Arun Chattopadhyay](http://www.iitg.ac.in/arun/), a member of the chemistry faculty at the Center for Nanotechnology, Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati. To help slow the climate-changing rise in atmospheric CO2levels, researchers have developed nanoCO2 harvesters that can suck atmospheric carbon dioxide and deploy it for industrial purposes. “Nanomaterials can convert carbon dioxide into useful products like alcohol. The materials could be simple chemical catalysts or photochemical in nature that work in the presence of sunlight,” says Chattopadhyay, who has been working with nanomaterials to tackle environmental pollutants for more than a decade. Many research groups are working to address a problem that, if solved, could be a holy grail in combating climate change: how to pull CO2 out of the atmosphere and convert it into useful products. Chattopadhyay isn’t alone. Many research groups are working to address a problem that, if solved, could be a holy grail in combating climate change: how to pull CO2 out of the atmosphere and convert it into useful products. Nanoparticles offer a promising approach to this because they have a large surface-area-to-volume ratio for interacting with CO2 and properties that allow them to facilitate the conversion of CO2into other things. The challenge is to make them economically viable. Researchers have tried everything from metallic to carbon-based nanoparticles to reduce the cost, but so far they haven’t become efficient enough for industrial-scale application. One of the most recent points of progress in this area is work by scientists at the CSIR-Indian Institute of Petroleum and the Lille University of Science and Technology in France. The researchers developed a nanoCO2 harvester that uses water and sunlight to convert atmospheric CO2 into methanol, which can be employed as an engine fuel, a solvent, an antifreeze agent and a diluent of ethanol. Made by wrapping a layer of modified graphene oxide around spheres of copper zinc oxide and magnetite, the material looks like a miniature golf ball, captures CO2 more efficiently than conventional catalysts and can be readily reused, according to Suman Jain, senior scientist of the Indian Institute of Petroleum, Dehradun in India, who developed the nanoCO2harvester. Jain says that the nanoCO2 harvester has a large molecular surface area and captures more CO2 than a conventional catalyst with similar surface area would, which makes the conversion more efficient. But due to their small size, the nanoparticles have a tendency to clump up, making them inactive with prolonged use. Jain adds that synthesizing useful nanoparticle-based materials is also challenging because it’s hard to make the particles a consistent size. Chattopadhyay says the efficiency of such materials can be improved further, providing hope for useful application in the future. CLEANSING WATER Most toxic dyes used in textile and leather industries can be captured with nanoparticles. “Water pollutants such as dyes from human-created waste like those from tanneries could get to natural sources of water like deep tube wells or groundwater if wastewater from these industries is left untreated,” says Chattopadhyay. “This problem is rather difficult to solve.” An international group of researchers led by professor Elzbieta Megiel of the University of Warsaw in Poland reports that nanomaterials have been widely studied for removing heavy metals and dyes from wastewater. According to the research team, adsorption processes using materials containing magnetic nanoparticles are highly effective and can be easily performed because such nanoparticles have a large number of sites on their surface that can capture pollutants and don’t readily degrade in water. Chattopadhyay adds that appropriately designed magnetic nanomaterials can be used to separate pollutants such as arsenic, lead, chromium and mercury from water. However, the nanotech-based approach has to be more efficient than conventional water purification technology to make it worthwhile. In addition to removing dyes and metals, nanomaterials can also be used to clean up oil spills. Researchers led by Pulickel Ajayan at Rice University in Houston, Texas, have developed a reusable nanosponge that can remove oil from contaminated seawater.

#### Warming causes Extinction

Kareiva 18, Peter, and Valerie Carranza. "Existential risk due to ecosystem collapse: Nature strikes back." Futures 102 (2018): 39-50. (Ph.D. in ecology and applied mathematics from Cornell University, director of the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability at UCLA, Pritzker Distinguished Professor in Environment & Sustainability at UCLA)//Re-cut by Elmer

In summary, six of the nine proposed planetary boundaries (phosphorous, nitrogen, biodiversity, land use, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution) are unlikely to be associated with existential risks. They all correspond to a degraded environment, but in our assessment do not represent existential risks. However, the three remaining boundaries (**climate change**, global **freshwater** cycle, **and** ocean **acidification**) do **pose existential risks**. This is **because of** intrinsic **positive feedback loops**, substantial lag times between system change and experiencing the consequences of that change, and the fact these different boundaries interact with one another in ways that yield surprises. In addition, climate, freshwater, and ocean acidification are all **directly connected to** the provision of **food and water**, and **shortages** of food and water can **create conflict** and social unrest. Climate change has a long history of disrupting civilizations and sometimes precipitating the collapse of cultures or mass emigrations (McMichael, 2017). For example, the 12th century drought in the North American Southwest is held responsible for the collapse of the Anasazi pueblo culture. More recently, the infamous potato famine of 1846–1849 and the large migration of Irish to the U.S. can be traced to a combination of factors, one of which was climate. Specifically, 1846 was an unusually warm and moist year in Ireland, providing the climatic conditions favorable to the fungus that caused the potato blight. As is so often the case, poor government had a role as well—as the British government forbade the import of grains from outside Britain (imports that could have helped to redress the ravaged potato yields). Climate change intersects with freshwater resources because it is expected to exacerbate drought and water scarcity, as well as flooding. Climate change can even impair water quality because it is associated with heavy rains that overwhelm sewage treatment facilities, or because it results in higher concentrations of pollutants in groundwater as a result of enhanced evaporation and reduced groundwater recharge. **Ample clean water** is not a luxury—it **is essential for human survival**. Consequently, cities, regions and nations that lack clean freshwater are vulnerable to social disruption and disease. Finally, ocean acidification is linked to climate change because it is driven by CO2 emissions just as global warming is. With close to 20% of the world’s protein coming from oceans (FAO, 2016), the potential for severe impacts due to acidification is obvious. Less obvious, but perhaps more insidious, is the interaction between climate change and the loss of oyster and coral reefs due to acidification. Acidification is known to interfere with oyster reef building and coral reefs. Climate change also increases storm frequency and severity. Coral reefs and oyster reefs provide protection from storm surge because they reduce wave energy (Spalding et al., 2014). If these reefs are lost due to acidification at the same time as storms become more severe and sea level rises, coastal communities will be exposed to unprecedented storm surge—and may be ravaged by recurrent storms. A key feature of the risk associated with climate change is that mean annual temperature and mean annual rainfall are not the variables of interest. Rather it is extreme episodic events that place nations and entire regions of the world at risk. These extreme events are by definition “rare” (once every hundred years), and changes in their likelihood are challenging to detect because of their rarity, but are exactly the manifestations of climate change that we must get better at anticipating (Diffenbaugh et al., 2017). Society will have a hard time responding to shorter intervals between rare extreme events because in the lifespan of an individual human, a person might experience as few as two or three extreme events. How likely is it that you would notice a change in the interval between events that are separated by decades, especially given that the interval is not regular but varies stochastically? A concrete example of this dilemma can be found in the past and expected future changes in storm-related flooding of New York City. The highly disruptive flooding of New York City associated with Hurricane Sandy represented a flood height that occurred once every 500 years in the 18th century, and that occurs now once every 25 years, but is expected to occur once every 5 years by 2050 (Garner et al., 2017). This change in frequency of extreme floods has profound implications for the measures New York City should take to protect its infrastructure and its population, yet because of the stochastic nature of such events, this shift in flood frequency is an elevated risk that will go unnoticed by most people. 4. The combination of positive feedback loops and societal inertia is fertile ground for global environmental catastrophes **Humans** are remarkably ingenious, and **have adapted** to crises **throughout** their **history**. Our doom has been repeatedly predicted, only to be averted by innovation (Ridley, 2011). **However**, the many **stories** **of** human ingenuity **successfully** **addressing** **existential risks** such as global famine or extreme air pollution **represent** environmental c**hallenges that are** largely **linear**, have immediate consequences, **and operate without positive feedbacks**. For example, the fact that food is in short supply does not increase the rate at which humans consume food—thereby increasing the shortage. Similarly, massive air pollution episodes such as the London fog of 1952 that killed 12,000 people did not make future air pollution events more likely. In fact it was just the opposite—the London fog sent such a clear message that Britain quickly enacted pollution control measures (Stradling, 2016). Food shortages, air pollution, water pollution, etc. send immediate signals to society of harm, which then trigger a negative feedback of society seeking to reduce the harm. In contrast, today’s great environmental crisis of climate change may cause some harm but there are generally long time delays between rising CO2 concentrations and damage to humans. The consequence of these delays are an absence of urgency; thus although 70% of Americans believe global warming is happening, only 40% think it will harm them (http://climatecommunication.yale.edu/visualizations-data/ycom-us-2016/). Secondly, unlike past environmental challenges, **the Earth’s climate system is rife with positive feedback loops**. In particular, as CO2 increases and the climate warms, that **very warming can cause more CO2 release** which further increases global warming, and then more CO2, and so on. Table 2 summarizes the best documented positive feedback loops for the Earth’s climate system. These feedbacks can be neatly categorized into carbon cycle, biogeochemical, biogeophysical, cloud, ice-albedo, and water vapor feedbacks. As important as it is to understand these feedbacks individually, it is even more essential to study the interactive nature of these feedbacks. Modeling studies show that when interactions among feedback loops are included, uncertainty increases dramatically and there is a heightened potential for perturbations to be magnified (e.g., Cox, Betts, Jones, Spall, & Totterdell, 2000; Hajima, Tachiiri, Ito, & Kawamiya, 2014; Knutti & Rugenstein, 2015; Rosenfeld, Sherwood, Wood, & Donner, 2014). This produces a wide range of future scenarios. Positive feedbacks in the carbon cycle involves the enhancement of future carbon contributions to the atmosphere due to some initial increase in atmospheric CO2. This happens because as CO2 accumulates, it reduces the efficiency in which oceans and terrestrial ecosystems sequester carbon, which in return feeds back to exacerbate climate change (Friedlingstein et al., 2001). Warming can also increase the rate at which organic matter decays and carbon is released into the atmosphere, thereby causing more warming (Melillo et al., 2017). Increases in food shortages and lack of water is also of major concern when biogeophysical feedback mechanisms perpetuate drought conditions. The underlying mechanism here is that losses in vegetation increases the surface albedo, which suppresses rainfall, and thus enhances future vegetation loss and more suppression of rainfall—thereby initiating or prolonging a drought (Chamey, Stone, & Quirk, 1975). To top it off, overgrazing depletes the soil, leading to augmented vegetation loss (Anderies, Janssen, & Walker, 2002). Climate change often also increases the risk of forest fires, as a result of higher temperatures and persistent drought conditions. The expectation is that **forest fires will become more frequent** and severe with climate warming and drought (Scholze, Knorr, Arnell, & Prentice, 2006), a trend for which we have already seen evidence (Allen et al., 2010). Tragically, the increased severity and risk of Southern California wildfires recently predicted by climate scientists (Jin et al., 2015), was realized in December 2017, with the largest fire in the history of California (the “Thomas fire” that burned 282,000 acres, https://www.vox.com/2017/12/27/16822180/thomas-fire-california-largest-wildfire). This **catastrophic fire** embodies the sorts of positive feedbacks and interacting factors that **could catch humanity off-guard and produce a** true **apocalyptic event.** Record-breaking rains produced an extraordinary flush of new vegetation, that then dried out as record heat waves and dry conditions took hold, coupled with stronger than normal winds, and ignition. Of course the record-fire released CO2 into the atmosphere, thereby contributing to future warming. Out of all types of feedbacks, water vapor and the ice-albedo feedbacks are the most clearly understood mechanisms. Losses in reflective snow and ice cover drive up surface temperatures, leading to even more melting of snow and ice cover—this is known as the ice-albedo feedback (Curry, Schramm, & Ebert, 1995). As snow and ice continue to melt at a more rapid pace, millions of people may be displaced by flooding risks as a consequence of sea level rise near coastal communities (Biermann & Boas, 2010; Myers, 2002; Nicholls et al., 2011). The water vapor feedback operates when warmer atmospheric conditions strengthen the saturation vapor pressure, which creates a warming effect given water vapor’s strong greenhouse gas properties (Manabe & Wetherald, 1967). Global warming tends to increase cloud formation because warmer temperatures lead to more evaporation of water into the atmosphere, and warmer temperature also allows the atmosphere to hold more water. The key question is whether this increase in clouds associated with global warming will result in a positive feedback loop (more warming) or a negative feedback loop (less warming). For decades, scientists have sought to answer this question and understand the net role clouds play in future climate projections (Schneider et al., 2017). Clouds are complex because they both have a cooling (reflecting incoming solar radiation) and warming (absorbing incoming solar radiation) effect (Lashof, DeAngelo, Saleska, & Harte, 1997). The type of cloud, altitude, and optical properties combine to determine how these countervailing effects balance out. Although still under debate, it appears that in most circumstances the cloud feedback is likely positive (Boucher et al., 2013). For example, models and observations show that increasing greenhouse gas concentrations reduces the low-level cloud fraction in the Northeast Pacific at decadal time scales. This then has a positive feedback effect and enhances climate warming since less solar radiation is reflected by the atmosphere (Clement, Burgman, & Norris, 2009). The key lesson from the long list of potentially positive feedbacks and their interactions is that **runaway climate change,** and runaway perturbations have to be taken as a serious possibility. Table 2 is just a snapshot of the type of feedbacks that have been identified (see Supplementary material for a more thorough explanation of positive feedback loops). However, this list is not exhaustive and the possibility of undiscovered positive feedbacks **portends** even greater **existential risks**. The many environmental crises humankind has previously averted (famine, ozone depletion, London fog, water pollution, etc.) were averted because of political will based on solid scientific understanding. We cannot count on complete scientific understanding when it comes to positive feedback loops and climate change.

#### Space Elevators solve Space Debris – reduces Rocket Launches

Forgan 19, Duncan H. Solving Fermi's Paradox. Vol. 10. Cambridge University Press, 2019. (Associate Lecturer at the Centre for Exoplanet Science at the University of St Andrews, Scotland, founding member of the UK Search for Extra-terrestrial Intelligence (SETI) research network and leads UK research efforts into the search)//Elmer

All objects in HEO reside beyond the geostationary orbit (GEO). The orbital period at GEO (w'hich is aligned with the Earth's equator) is equal to the Earth’s rotational period. As a result, from a ground observer’s perspective the satellite resides at a fixed point in the sky, with clear advantages for uses such as global communication. Activities at HEO are considerably less than at LEO and MEO. Earth's orbital environment does contain a natural component - the meteoroids. These pose little to no threat to space operations - the true threat is self-derived. The current limitations of spacefaring technology ensure that every launch is accompanied by substantial amounts of space debris. This debris ranges in size from dust grains to paint flecks to large derelict spacecraft and satellites. According to NASA’s Orbital Debris Program Office, some 21.000 objects greater than 10 cm in size are currently being tracked in LEO. with the population below 10 cm substantially higher. Most debris produced at launch tends to be deposited with no supplemental velocity - hence these objects tend to follow the initial launch trajectory, which often orbits with high eccentricity and inclination. However, these orbits do intersect with the orbits of Earth’s artificial satellite population, resulting in impacts w'hich tend to produce further debris. The vast majority of the low-size debris population is so-called fragmentation debris. This is produced during spacecraft deterioration, and in the most abun- dance during spacecraft break-up and impacts. The first satellite-satellite collision occurred in 1961. resulting in a 400% increase in fragmentation debris (Johnson et al.. 2008). Most notably, a substantial source of fragmentation debris was the deliberate destruction of the Fengyun 1C satellite by the People’s Republic of China, which created approximately 2.000 debris fragments. As with collisions of ‘natural debris’, debris-debris collisions tend to result in an increased count of debris fragments. Since the late 1970s, it has been understood that man-made debris could pose an existential risk to space operations. Kessler and Cour-Palais (1978) worked from the then-population of satellites to extrapolate the debris production rate over the next 30 years. Impact rates on spacecraft at any location. /, can be calculated if one knows the local density of debris p, the mean relative velocity vrei\* and the cross-sectional area ct: [[EQUATION 13.5 OMITTED]] Each impact increases p without substantially altering vrel or o. We should there- fore expect the impact rate (and hence the density of objects) to continue growing at an exponential rate: [[EQUATION 13.6 OMITTED]] Kessler and Cour-Palais (1978) predicted that by the year 2000, p would have increased beyond the critical value for generating a collisional cascade. As new collisions occur, these begin to increase ^jjp, which in turn increases resulting in a rapid positive feedback, with p and I reaching such large values that LEO is rendered completely unnavigable. This has not come to pass - LEO remains navigable, partially due to a slight overprediction of debris produced by individual launches. The spectre of a collisional cascade (often referred to as Kessler syndrome) still looms over human space exploration, as debris counts continue to rise. Without a corresponding dedicated effort to reduce these counts, either through mitigating strategies to reduce the production of debris during launches, or through removal of debris fragments from LEO. we cannot guarantee the protection of the current flotilla of satellites, leaving our highly satellite-dependent society at deep risk. What strategies can be deployed to remove space debris? Almost all debris removal techniques rely on using the Earth’s atmosphere as a waste disposal sys- tem. Most debris is sufficiently small that atmospheric entry would result in its complete destruction, with no appreciable polluting effects. Atmospheric entry requires the debris fragments to be decelerated so that their orbits begin to intersect with lower atmospheric altitudes. Once a critical altitude is reached, atmospheric drag is sufficiently strong that the debris undergoes runaway deceleration and ultimately destruction. There are multiple proposed techniques for decelerating debris. Some mechani- cal methods include capturing the debris using either a net or harpoon, and applying a modest level of reverse thrust. These are most effective for larger fragments, and especially intact satellites (Forshaw et al., 2015). Attaching sails to the debris is also a possibility if the orbit is sufficiently low for weak atmospheric drag. The Japanese space agency JAXA’s Kounotori Integrated Tether Experiment (KITE) will trail a long conductive cable. As a current is passed through the cable, and the cable traverses the Earth’s magnetic field, the cable experiences a magnetic drag force that will de-orbit the spacecraft. Orbiting and ground-based lasers can decelerate the debris through a variety of means. For small debris fragments, the radiation pressure produced by the laser can provide drag. A more powerful laser can act on larger debris fragments through ablation. As the laser ablates the debris, the resulting recoil generated by the escaping material produces drag and encourages de-orbit. A more lateral solution is to ensure that launches and general space-based activity no longer generate debris. These approaches advocate lower-energy launch mechanisms that do not rely on powerful combustion. The most famous is the space elevator (see Aravind. 2007). Originally conceived by Tsiolkovsky, the ele- vator consists of an extremely durable cable extended from a point near the Earth’s equator, up to an anchor point located at GEO (most conceptions of the anchor point envision an asteroid parked in GEO). ‘Climber’ cars can then be attached to the cable and lifted to LEO, MEO and even GEO by a variety of propulsion methods. Most notably, the cars can be driven to GEO without the need for chemical rockets or nuclear explosions - indeed, a great deal of energy can be saved by having coupled cars, one ascending and one descending. Space elevators would solve a great number of problems relating to entering (and leaving) Earth orbit, substantially reducing the cost of delivering payload out of the Earth's atmosphere. The technical challenges involved in deploying a cable tens of thousands of kilometres long are enormous, not to mention the material science required to produce a cable of sufficient tensile strength and flexibility in the first place. The gravitational force (and centrifugal force) felt by the cable will vary significantly along its length. As cars climb the cable, the Coriolis force will move the car (and cable) horizontally also, providing further strain on the cable material. The relatively slow traversal of the biologically hazardous Van Allen Belt on the route to GEO is also a potential concern for crewed space travel. Whatever the means, a spacefaring civilisation (or at least, a civilisation that utilises its local orbital environment as we do) must develop a non-polluting solution to space travel, whether that is via the construction of a space elevator, a maglev launch loop, rail gun, or some other form of non-rocket acceleration. If it cannot perform pollution-free spacecraft launches (or fully clean up its pollution), then it will eventually succumb to Kessler syndrome, with potentially drastic consequences for future space use, with likely civilisation-ending effects (Solution C.13).
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#### Japan’s space industry is driven by private actors.

Jaxa 18 2-8-2018 "Focal Point on commercial space exploration in Japan" https://media.nature.com/full/nature-cms/uploads/ckeditor/attachments/8865/00\_Editorial\_UK.pdf (Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency is the Japanese national aerospace and space agency. Through the merger of three previously independent organizations, JAXA was formed on 1 October 2003.)//Elmer

“The world’s space industry is in the throes of a major transformation,” says Masayasu Ishida. An energetic Tokyoite, Ishida is a principal at the management consulting firm A.T. Kearney and co-founder and president of the Spacetide Foundation, an organization dedicated to promoting space businesses globally. Historically, space has been the exclusive domain of government and multinational projects, but increasingly private enterprises are venturing above in a movement dubbed ‘new space’. Entrepreneurs such as Jeff Bezos, Elon Musk and Richard Branson have captured the headlines, but this movement is not restricted to famous entrepreneurs or huge corporations. Increasingly, small to medium-sized businesses are becoming involved. Ishida, who has written a book on promoting the space industry to the private sector, is excited about Japan’s involvement in new space. “I think Japan has the potential to be one of the world’s new-space industry hubs,” he says. “Future space exploration needs innovative technologies like robotics, artificial intelligence, advanced communication, and new materials, which will be brought by non-space industries,” he explains. “Japan is home to many of the world’s leading industries, and has a variety of technological assets. Their involvement could be of help in the global space exploration effort.” Yasuhiro Yukimatsu, deputy director-general of the National Space Policy Secretariat, Cabinet Office, notes that Japanese companies and universities have developed micro-, nano- and even pico-satellite technology, which allows countries that have yet to join the space community affordable access to space. Ishida concurs: “Japanese space-related business players have unique technologies and are working on projects such as small launchers, space debris removal, and space resource mining.” JAPAN IN SPACE Japan has a proud history of ‘old space’ government-funded exploration. It was the fourth country to venture into space, and the third one to send spacecraft to both Mars and the Moon. It has the distinction of being the only country to have brought a sample back from an extraterrestrial body besides the Moon, when Hayabusa landed in the Australian outback in 2010 with a sample collected from the surface a deep-space asteroid. But times are changing. “For the industry to realize sustainable growth, a shift from the government to the private sector is urgently needed,” says Masanori Tsuruda from the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI). This shift is driven in part by shrinking government budgets for big projects as well as the many emerging possibilities for enterprises to profit from space.

#### Japan space commitment re-vitalizes and modernizes the US-Japan Alliance.

Wright 20 John Wright 2-4-2020 "Where No Alliance Has Gone Before: US-Japan Military Cooperation in Space" <https://thediplomat.com/2020/02/where-no-alliance-has-gone-before-us-japan-military-cooperation-in-space/> (Major John Wright is a U.S. Air Force officer, pilot, and a Mike and Maureen Mansfield Fellow. He is a Foreign Area Officer who specializes in Japan, and recent author of the book “Deep Space Warfare: Military Strategy Beyond Orbit.” The views expressed in this article are solely those of the author, and not necessarily those of the U.S. Air Force, U.S. Government, Mansfield Foundation, or any other government or government entity.)//Elmer

With the United States’ December 21, 2019 creation of a separate and sovereign branch of its military completely devoted to space, the U.S. Space Force, the global race to emancipate a portion of national military power from terrestrial shackles and place it firmly into orbit is on. The announcement also unleashed a somewhat unexpected cascading effect: the increased attention paid to military space activities by U.S. allies and partners, who have no choice but to follow where the U.S. military moves its gravitational pull. In particular, Japan has made announcements in recent days that indicate its intention to remain in lockstep with the United States, at least in terms of defense. On January 5, 2020, scarcely two weeks following the U.S. Space Force announcement, the Japanese government indicated it plans to rename the Japan Air Self Defense Force to the Japan Aerospace Defense Force. Not coincidentally, on January 21, during a speech given on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the U.S.-Japan Alliance, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe vowed to make the alliance “a pillar for safeguarding peace and security in both outer space and cyberspace.” While words are good, actions are better. In a less-noticed but more consequential move, the Ministry of Defense is finalizing a bill to be placed before the Diet that asks to craft a space operations-exclusive military unit staffed with 20 personnel. While this paltry number of people can barely be expected to efficiently run their task of monitoring space debris and “suspicious satellites,” the move is a significant step for a nation that often struggles with global defense developments due to Japan’s unique domestic restrictions and legal concerns. In many ways, it is surprising to see Japan, a nation that still sorties 1960s-era F-4 aircraft (though there are plans to replace them with F-35s), and is fielding their very first military Remote Piloted Aircraft (a model the United States has been flying for nearly 20 years) in 2021, take its defense posture in space seriously. These initiatives have several implications. First, the Japanese government’s attitude toward space and its place in the U.S.-Japan alliance reflects what’s at stake during the next major conflict, which will surely involve space. As an increasing number of government and commercial systems depend on space assets and space support, space can no longer be ignored as a future theater; the time is now to incorporate space into alliance strategy. This strategy, however, needs to catch up. Currently, Japan refers to space as a “new domain” in the 2018 National Defense Program Guidelines and briefly discusses space defense in the annual 2019 Defense of Japan white paper. Space is completely left out of the now-outdated 2015 Guidelines for U.S.- Japan Defense Cooperation. Enjoying this article? Click here to subscribe for full access. Just $5 a month. Second, Japan’s emphasis is a good move for the alliance as a whole, and enhances its survivability. If Japan takes measurable steps to join its ally and if Japan meaningfully contributes to space security, space is less likely to become another seam where the alliance could come undone. Further, there is a strategic advantage to taking a stance on both position and form when it comes to space. While other nations will struggle to “get serious” about space, and will need to decide between size, scope, and capability of their forces, Japan has confirmed its political and defensive outlook toward space, which means it has also acknowledged space’s effect on combined alliance defense. This is good, since the political dangers posed in space are very real. Despite the existence of the well-intentioned but toothless Outer Space Treaty of 1967, which prohibits use of force activities in space, the obvious future is that space will act as yet another stage upon which the political games of earthbound nation-states will play out. Nation-state competition will not disappear as states found and fund forces to travel, explore, and exploit the inky blackness of space; rather, competition will intensify, as discoveries with both economic and defense applications are made, and as states better understand how vulnerable they are without proper space defense and deterrence. This is the political reality of space, and the fact that both members of the U.S.-Japan alliance understand this means the alliance has much less danger of breaking apart upon first contact with space-centric competition. If anything, mutual interest in the same environment will lead to cooperative efforts and a strengthened alliance here on Earth. Notably, the odds of military confrontation in space have also increased. By funneling U.S. military space power into the highest echelon of military independence and funding (an independent service), escalation and competition is not far behind. It will not be surprising if we see several other competitors forming their own service-level forces by year’s end, though their actual forms will likely vary greatly. The fact that the United States has “jumped” to a service-sized solution to military space competition, and not a smaller organization like a corps or geographic command, means other nations have no real strategic options but to match the U.S. precedent as close as they can in size and capability. The U.S.-Japan alliance must prepare for this eventuality. Japanese government decisions to strengthen its space defense capabilities thus come from a mix of terrestrial strategy, political realities, and prudent alliance management. However, significant challenges remain. For one thing, today’s nation-states (including the United States) are understandably gun-shy about sharing space defense capabilities and space-centric technology, which means alliance military space activity will naturally move at the speed of the slowest member. For another, we do not yet know just what space-on-space conflict will look like between combatants who possess similar space-based strength, which makes warfare difficult to plan for and will present an immediate challenge to alliance coordination should such a conflict occur. Despite these doubts, recent Japanese government announces are positive and will help usher both the alliance and U.S.-Japan relations through its current comparatively rocky period of trade spats and quibbles over military basing. Without a doubt, the political impact of allied space defense could easily result in the U.S.-Japan alliance extending its prerogatives beyond Earth’s territorial confines.

#### Re-vitalized and updated US-Japan Alliance preserves US LIO against a revisionist China.

Fujisue 21 Kenzo Fujisue (Kenzo Fujisue is a member of the House of Councillors in Japan. He is also the director of the Multi-partisan Economic Security Policy Study Team. Previously, he was the chair of the Committee of Information and Telecommunication and the senior vice minister of Internal Affairs and Communications. He received an MS from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Sloan School of Management, an MPA from Harvard Kennedy School, and two Ph.D.s in Industrial Management and in International Relations from Tokyo Institute of Technology and Waseda University, respectively.), 9/8/21, "Rebooting the Japan-US Alliance," <https://thediplomat.com/2021/09/rebooting-the-japan-us-alliance/> mvp

In fact, such a lingering legacy is a major impediment to the evolution of the Japan-U.S. alliance as it faces off an increasingly bellicose China. The sober reality is that Beijing is at war with the world. The U.S.-led liberal international order, of which post-war Japan is a direct beneficiary, is under ceaseless assault by China’s unrestricted warfare, seeking to replace it with a new world order under Beijing’s mandate. The retired Chinese Major General Qiao Liang, one of the co-authors of the 1999 treatise, “Unrestricted Warfare,” ominously advocated that “the first rule of unrestricted warfare is that there are no rules, with nothing forbidden.” Indeed, from artificial islands in the South China Sea to global cyber espionage, China has transformed all of society into a battlefield by “using all means, including armed force or non-armed force, military and non-military, and lethal and non-lethal means to compel the enemy to accept one’s interests.” While the former commander of the U.S. Indo-Pacific Command, Admiral Philip Davidson, correctly denounced China as the “greatest long-term strategic threat of the 21st century” earlier this year, Tokyo has yet to reciprocate Washington’s renewed perspective, merely expressing “grave concerns.” Given Tokyo’s enduring disinclination to recognize the Chinese threat, the current bilateral alliance suffers a perilous perception gap and is fundamentally lagging in effectively countering China’s post-Clausewitzian challenges. The upshot is the growing prospect of a Chinese geoeconomic suzerainty engulfing Japan before shots are even fired. China’s unrestricted offensives against Japan are most palpable in the emerging field of economic security. Ironically, Japan’s long-standing economic-centric approach to national security has scarcely inspired thinking about the country’s own economic security, let alone its economic statecraft. Instead, Japan has long allowed itself to wallow in the poisoned chalice of virtually unfettered access to an ascendant communist economy. As a result, blithe ignorance and unmitigated avarice have blinded Japan to the Marxist-Leninist nature of the Chinese Communist regime and its authoritarian agenda, culminating in Tokyo’s willful embrace of the Beijing-led Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement (RCEP) earlier this year. In other words, Japan has sold China the rope with which it is to be hanged, to the ultimate detriment of the Japan-U.S. alliance. This has profound operational implications for the U.S. military assets forward deployed in Japan. For example, special operators in the U.S. forces in Japan could come under the constant risk of leaving digital footprints in a telecommunications environment increasingly compromised by Chinese providers, such as Huawei. Such information could lead to major vulnerabilities in operational security, endangering mission assurance in future operations. Unlike the United States, Japan has yet to exclude Huawei and other Chinese 5G technologies from its domestic market. Business viability is no excuse for being a liability if the alliance itself is at risk. Equally important, Japan’s decades-long economic engagement with China has ironically led to the erosion of the country’s industrial base, the very piece that supported Japan’s post-war prosperity as well as the rules-based order. Indeed, the advent of the coronavirus pandemic in 2020 exposed Japan’s severe supply chain risks as the country scrambled to procure masks and other medical equipment, only to discover its entrenched national reliance on Chinese producers. Such dependency is a crippling vulnerability of geopolitical significance, exploitation of which could subdue an entire society without firing a single bullet. Moreover, the revelation of the popular LINE messenger app’s suspicious ties to Beijing earlier this year also underscores fundamental flaws in Japan’s digital transformation (DX) process. Indeed, despite its tremendous innovation potential, Japan has yet to witness a homegrown alternative to LINE, largely due to the country’s lingering systemic constraints on entrepreneurship. According to the 2019 Inc. magazine survey, Japan was ranked the fourth least entrepreneurial country in the world. As a result, Japan has largely failed to leverage the technological prowess it once boasted during the Cold War and yielded its coveted place as the world’s leading technology powerhouse to China in the age of DX. As China looks to become the “Saudi Arabia of data,” Japan’s DX dependence on China is tantamount to aiding and abetting Beijing’s globalizing digital authoritarianism and is incompatible with the democratic world order. As the China-U.S. geopolitical competition increasingly turns into another Cold War, Japan finds itself at a historic crossroads that will determine the country’s future. As a member of the House of Councillors, Japan’s upper house, leading the country’s economic security policy, I argue that Japan must fully realign itself with the United States in fighting China’s unrestricted war against the rules-based order in the Indo-Pacific. To do so requires first and foremost a system upgrade in the Yoshida Doctrine, explicitly recognizing that economic security is national security. To this end, Japan must accelerate the process of targeted decoupling from China in the fields of essential goods and advanced technologies. The present degree of Japan’s economic dependence on China is so profound that total disengagement would be mutually destructive. Therefore, Tokyo must design its own economic statecraft based on a calculated balance between economic incentives and economic security. In implementing targeted decoupling from China, Japan’s economic statecraft must pursue strategic autonomy and strategic indispensability in key basic industries so as to ensure the country’s control over chokepoints in economic security.

#### Collapse of the LIO causes Extinction – Nuclear War, Warming, Emerging Tech.

Harari 18 Yuval Noah Harari, Professor of History at Hebrew University of Jerusalem, “We need a post-liberal order now,” The Economist, <https://www.economist.com/open-future/2018/09/26/we-need-a-post-liberal-order-now>

For several generations, the world has been governed by what today we call “the global liberal order”. Behind these lofty words is the idea that all humans share some core experiences, values and interests, and that no human group is inherently superior to all others. Cooperation is therefore more sensible than conflict. All humans should work together to protect their common values and advance their common interests. And the best way to foster such cooperation is to ease the movement of ideas, goods, money and people across the globe. Though the global liberal order has many faults and problems, it has proved superior to all alternatives. The liberal world of the early 21st century is more prosperous, healthy and peaceful than ever before. For the first time in human history, starvation kills fewer people than obesity; plagues kill fewer people than old age; and violence kills fewer people than accidents. When I was six months old I didn’t die in an epidemic, thanks to medicines discovered by foreign scientists in distant lands. When I was three I didn’t starve to death, thanks to wheat grown by foreign farmers thousands of kilometers away. And when I was eleven I wasn’t obliterated in a nuclear war, thanks to agreements signed by foreign leaders on the other side of the planet. If you think we should go back to some pre-liberal golden age, please name the year in which humankind was in better shape than in the early 21st century. Was it 1918? 1718? 1218? Nevertheless, people all over the world are now losing faith in the liberal order. Nationalist and religious views that privilege one human group over all others are back in vogue. Governments are increasingly restricting the flow of ideas, goods, money and people. Walls are popping up everywhere, both on the ground and in cyberspace. Immigration is out, tariffs are in. If the liberal order is collapsing, what new kind of global order might replace it? So far, those who challenge the liberal order do so mainly on a national level. They have many ideas about how to advance the interests of their particular country, but they don’t have a viable vision for how the world as a whole should function. For example, Russian nationalism can be a reasonable guide for running the affairs of Russia, but Russian nationalism has no plan for the rest of humanity. Unless, of course, nationalism morphs into imperialism, and calls for one nation to conquer and rule the entire world. A century ago, several nationalist movements indeed harboured such imperialist fantasies. Today’s nationalists, whether in Russia, Turkey, Italy or China, so far refrain from advocating global conquest. In place of violently establishing a global empire, some nationalists such as Steve Bannon, Viktor Orban, the Northern League in Italy and the British Brexiteers dream about a peaceful “Nationalist International”. They argue that all nations today face the same enemies. The bogeymen of globalism, multiculturalism and immigration are threatening to destroy the traditions and identities of all nations. Therefore nationalists across the world should make common cause in opposing these global forces. Hungarians, Italians, Turks and Israelis should build walls, erect fences and slow down the movement of people, goods, money and ideas. The world will then be divided into distinct nation-states, each with its own sacred identity and traditions. Based on mutual respect for these differing identities, all nation-states could cooperate and trade peacefully with one another. Hungary will be Hungarian, Turkey will be Turkish, Israel will be Israeli, and everyone will know who they are and what is their proper place in the world. It will be a world without immigration, without universal values, without multiculturalism, and without a global elite—but with peaceful international relations and some trade. In a word, the “Nationalist International” envisions the world as a network of walled-but-friendly fortresses. Many people would think this is quite a reasonable vision. Why isn’t it a viable alternative to the liberal order? Two things should be noted about it. First, it is still a comparatively liberal vision. It assumes that no human group is superior to all others, that no nation should dominate its peers, and that international cooperation is better than conflict. In fact, liberalism and nationalism were originally closely aligned with one another. The 19th century liberal nationalists, such as Giuseppe Garibaldi and Giuseppe Mazzini in Italy, and Adam Mickiewicz in Poland, dreamt about precisely such an international liberal order of peacefully-coexisting nations. The second thing to note about this vision of friendly fortresses is that it has been tried—and it failed spectacularly. All attempts to divide the world into clear-cut nations have so far resulted in war and genocide. When the heirs of Garibaldi, Mazzini and Mickiewicz managed to overthrow the multi-ethnic Habsburg Empire, it proved impossible to find a clear line dividing Italians from Slovenes or Poles from Ukrainians. This had set the stage for the second world war. The key problem with the network of fortresses is that each national fortress wants a bit more land, security and prosperity for itself at the expense of the neighbors, and without the help of universal values and global organisations, rival fortresses cannot agree on any common rules. Walled fortresses are seldom friendly. But if you happen to live inside a particularly strong fortress, such as America or Russia, why should you care? Some nationalists indeed adopt a more extreme isolationist position. They don’t believe in either a global empire or in a global network of fortresses. Instead, they deny the necessity of any global order whatsoever. “Our fortress should just raise the drawbridges,” they say, “and the rest of the world can go to hell. We should refuse entry to foreign people, foreign ideas and foreign goods, and as long as our walls are stout and the guards are loyal, who cares what happens to the foreigners?” Such extreme isolationism, however, is completely divorced from economic realities. Without a global trade network, all existing national economies will collapse—including that of North Korea. Many countries will not be able even to feed themselves without imports, and prices of almost all products will skyrocket. The made-in-China shirt I am wearing cost me about $5. If it had been produced by Israeli workers from Israeli-grown cotton using Israeli-made machines powered by non-existing Israeli oil, it may well have cost ten times as much. Nationalist leaders from Donald Trump to Vladimir Putin may therefore heap abuse on the global trade network, but none thinks seriously of taking their country completely out of that network. And we cannot have a global trade network without some global order that sets the rules of the game. Even more importantly, whether people like it or not, humankind today faces three common problems that make a mockery of all national borders, and that can only be solved through global cooperation. These are nuclear war, climate change and technological disruption. You cannot build a wall against nuclear winter or against global warming, and no nation can regulate artificial intelligence (AI) or bioengineering single-handedly. It won’t be enough if only the European Union forbids producing killer robots or only America bans genetically-engineering human babies. Due to the immense potential of such disruptive technologies, if even one country decides to pursue these high-risk high-gain paths, other countries will be forced to follow its dangerous lead for fear of being left behind. An AI arms race or a biotechnological arms race almost guarantees the worst outcome. Whoever wins the arms race, the loser will likely be humanity itself. For in an arms race, all regulations will collapse. Consider, for example, conducting genetic-engineering experiments on human babies. Every country will say: “We don’t want to conduct such experiments—we are the good guys. But how do we know our rivals are not doing it? We cannot afford to remain behind. So we must do it before them.” Similarly, consider developing autonomous-weapon systems, that can decide for themselves whether to shoot and kill people. Again, every country will say: “This is a very dangerous technology, and it should be regulated carefully. But we don’t trust our rivals to regulate it, so we must develop it first”. The only thing that can prevent such destructive arms races is greater trust between countries. This is not an impossible mission. If today the Germans promise the French: “Trust us, we aren’t developing killer robots in a secret laboratory under the Bavarian Alps,” the French are likely to believe the Germans, despite the terrible history of these two countries. We need to build such trust globally. We need to reach a point when Americans and Chinese can trust one another like the French and Germans. Similarly, we need to create a global safety-net to protect humans against the economic shocks that AI is likely to cause. Automation will create immense new wealth in high-tech hubs such as Silicon Valley, while the worst effects will be felt in developing countries whose economies depend on cheap manual labor. There will be more jobs to software engineers in California, but fewer jobs to Mexican factory workers and truck drivers. We now have a global economy, but politics is still very national. Unless we find solutions on a global level to the disruptions caused by AI, entire countries might collapse, and the resulting chaos, violence and waves of immigration will destabilise the entire world. This is the proper perspective to look at recent developments such as Brexit. In itself, Brexit isn’t necessarily a bad idea. But is this what Britain and the EU should be dealing with right now? How does Brexit help prevent nuclear war? How does Brexit help prevent climate change? How does Brexit help regulate artificial intelligence and bioengineering? Instead of helping, Brexit makes it harder to solve all of these problems. Every minute that Britain and the EU spend on Brexit is one less minute they spend on preventing climate change and on regulating AI. In order to survive and flourish in the 21st century, humankind needs effective global cooperation, and so far the only viable blueprint for such cooperation is offered by liberalism. Nevertheless, governments all over the world are undermining the foundations of the liberal order, and the world is turning into a network of fortresses. The first to feel the impact are the weakest members of humanity, who find themselves without any fortress willing to protect them: refugees, illegal migrants, persecuted minorities. But if the walls keep rising, eventually the whole of humankind will feel the squeeze.
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#### Long term econ collapse is coming.

Conerly 11-2 (, B., 2021. No Recession In 2022—But Watch Out In 2023. [online] Forbes. Available at: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/billconerly/2021/11/02/no-recession-in-2022-but-watch-out-in-2023/?sh=5e3b27d33555> [Accessed 24 December 2021] Dr. Bill Conerly connects the dots between the economy and business decisions. He has the unique combination of a Ph.D. in economics from Duke University and over 30 years’ experience helping companies adapt to changing economic conditions. He was formerly Senior Vice President at a major bank and held positions in economics and corporate planning at two Fortune 500 corporations. Dr. Conerly has earned the Chartered Financial Analyst designation.)-rahulpenu

No Recession In 2022—But Watch Out In 2023

A **recession** **will** **come** to the United States economy, but not in 2022. Federal Reserve policy will lead to more business cycles, which many businesses are not well prepared for. The downturn won’t come in 2022, but could arrive as early as 2023. If the Fed avoids recession in 2023, then look for a more severe slump in 2024 or 2025.

Recessions usually come from demand weakness, but **supply** **problems** can also trigger a downturn. In 2022 demand for goods and services will be strong. Consumers have plenty of money, thanks to past earnings, stimulus payments and extra unemployment insurance. They have paid down their credit card balances. Even though they also increased their car loans outstanding as they upgraded their rides, their general condition is good. Employment will increase thanks to the spending, reinforcing the income gains that enable expenditures.

Businesses, too, have plenty of cash on hand. Not only have profits been good, but the Paycheck Protection Program gave nearly $800 billion to businesses. Companies want to buy computers, equipment and machinery to substitute for the workers they cannot find, and this spending will help manufacturers of the equipment.

Homebuilders will construct as many homes as they can, though that will be limited by buildable lots, skilled labor and building materials. Non-residential construction will slowly gain ground, especially in warehouse space and suburban offices.

The government will spend, not only at the federal level but also among state and local entities. The federal government has no worries about deficits, while state and local governments are flush with federal money.

Exports should grow slowly, thanks to improving world economies.

The **spending** side of the economy has **little** **risk** of recession in 2022, but could supply problems trigger a recession?

Supply chain problems can have negative impacts when factories have to shut down for lack of parts, as happened in the **automobile** industry. Recently Ford Europe’s Gunnar Herrmann told CNBC, “It’s not only semiconductors. You find shortages or constraints all over the place,” mentioning **lithium**, **plastics** and **steel** in particular. The automobile industry has laid off workers at multiple plants, mostly for a few weeks, but some long term. When workers are laid off for lack of materials to assemble, then the economy suffers. Most of the shortages under discussion, however, are **limiting** **growth** rather than cutting back on current production.

So the supply challenge we have is not an actual reduction in materials available, just **insufficient** **materials** to meet the stronger demand. Despite the snarls at the ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, more inbound containers are hitting the docks than in 2019. Mostly we are seeing supply as a limit on growth rather than a cause of recession.

Much of the supply limitation prevents growth, but does not push spending downward. Businesses are cutting back on variety. A shirt in a particular size may only be available in a few colors, not 16. That is unfortunate, and may discourage a few shoppers, but for the most part we’ll still be buying goods.

**Job** **losses** from vaccine mandate layoffs could push the economy toward recession, given that 31% of people over age 18 are not fully vaccinated. The various mandates cover about 100 million workers. Some of those 31 million unvaccinated workers subject to mandates will get their shots, but others certainly won’t. In the worst of the pandemic recession, the country lost 22 million jobs. Losing 31 million jobs because of vaccine mandates—or even half that number—would be disastrous. And because it would be disastrous, it will not happen. The Biden administration almost certainly will pull back the mandate before accepting such a harsh result rise in unemployment.

Though 2022 is unlikely to host a recession, 2023 and 2024 are extremely risky. The Federal Reserve will start tapering its quantitative stimulus soon, and sometime in mid-2022 it will begin raising short-term interest rates. The economy reacts with a **time** **lag** of about one year, plus or minus. The **greatest** **risk** in the near term is that the Fed realizes that much of the recent inflation is long-lasting rather than transitory. They will then hit the brakes. Because of the time lag, the Fed may decide to stomp down harder on the brakes, triggering a recession.

If the Fed avoids an over-reaction recession, it risks not bringing inflation down at all. The longer the Fed waits, the more work they will need to do later. We’ll still have massive fiscal stimulus plus the lagged effects of past monetary stimulus. Public anger over inflation will provoke a stronger Fed response by 2025 at the latest, but probably earlier.

Can a recession be completely avoided in the next few years? Theoretically it’s possible. The Fed would have to tighten at just the right time, in just the right magnitude, then return to neutral at just the right time. It could happen, but the odds are very, very slim. The people at the Fed are smart and knowledgeable, but the task is too difficult for mere mortals. So businesses should enjoy their gains in 2022 while developing contingency plans to be ready for the nearly-inevitable recession.

#### Private appropriation saves econ growth and innovation in the long run---the plan flips it and saps resources that spills over.

Clark 20 (, S., 2020. Opinion: Space is our new economic frontier. The US can't afford to lose out. [online] CNN. Available at: <https://www.cnn.com/2020/03/02/perspectives/space-economic-frontier/index.html> [Accessed 24 December 2021] Suzanne Clark is president and chief executive officer of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, a director on two corporate boards, a former business owner, and an entrepreneur at heart. With a global perspective and a fierce commitment to free enterprise, Clark’s experience in the private sector deeply informs her leadership of the U.S. Chamber—the world’s largest business organization representing employers of every size and sector in Washington, D.C., across the country, and around the globe. Clark has led a multiyear effort to strengthen the Chamber’s well-known influence, advocacy, and impact, while modernizing its work and attracting new members from the fastest-growing and most innovative sectors of the U.S. economy. These efforts to invest in the Chamber’s future proved prescient when the COVID-19 pandemic hit in 2020, enabling the organization to quickly pivot to new ways of working and successfully advocate for businesses in the midst of the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression. Clark has also helped drive the national conversation on issues central to managing and recovering from the pandemic through the U.S. Chamber Foundation’s Path Forward program. In interviews with dozens of thought leaders and experts such as Dr. Anthony Fauci, former CDC Director Dr. Robert Redfield, Bill and Melinda Gates, Carlyle Group Founder David Rubenstein, and former U.S. Surgeon General Jerome Adams, Path Forward has reached an audience of millions of viewers with practical information, insightful guidance, and forward-looking strategies.)-rahulpenu

**Space** is our **new** economic **frontier**. The US can't afford to lose out

President Trump's budget, which was released last month, outlines several moonshots that are unlikely to pass a divided Congress. But there's one in particular that both Republicans and Democrats should support wholeheartedly: the $25.2 billion request to fund NASA, a 12% boost over the prior year.

The **future** **of** our **economy** **depends** **on** the **vigorous** **pursuit** **of** **space** exploration. And with NASA leading the way, the potential for **growth** — like space itself — **has** **no** **limits**.

Since NASA's launch, American space exploration has always been a bipartisan venture. It was President Kennedy who announced our goal of going to the moon, but it was President Nixon who brought that goal to fruition. Reaching the next milestone in interplanetary travel requires a commitment from our leaders that spans political parties and administrations. And with a new space race getting underway — one that could prove even more consequential than the last — NASA needs bipartisan support from Congress today more than ever.

**Space** is the **most** **promising** **industry** to arise since the birth of the tech sector, with **growth** projected to **skyrocket** in the coming years **led** **by** companies such as **Boeing** and **Northrop** **Grumman**, and new entrants, such as Virgin **Galactic**, **SpaceX** and **Blue** **Origin**. According to US Chamber of Commerce economists, the industry will be worth at least $1.5 trillion by 2040. While no one can fully grasp what our economy will look like 20 years from now, one thing is certain: the **private** **sector** space **industry** will **transform** how societies across the **globe** **live**, **communicate** and do **business**. In fact, it already has.

Nearly **every** **company** **depends** **on** **space**-enabled **tech**nologies **for** **day**-**to**-**day** **op**eration**s** — whether they use satellite **communications**, **remote** **sensing** or **location**-based **services**. **Businesses** across multiple sectors are **leveraging** these and other **tech**nologies to **stake** their **claim** **in** this new economic **frontier**.

Pharmaceutical companies such as Merck and Sanofi, for example, are conducting experiments in low-Earth orbit aboard the International Space Station to evaluate the potential advantages of microgravity in developing new drug treatments that will help people live longer, healthier lives. Companies, such as Bigelow, are committed to making off-Earth habitation a reality. Even retailers are getting in on the action, with companies like Target funding research on the International Space Station to produce more sustainable forms of cotton.

Lunar colonies, asteroid mining and interplanetary travel — once the stuff of science fiction — could become a reality. But for any of that to happen, we need sustained and meaningful action from members of Congress.

They can start by meeting the president's request for NASA funding. Included in the White House budget is $12.4 billion specifically for lunar exploration that would include landing systems, continued development of the Space Launch System (SLS) and the Orion crew module. These spacecraft will allow us to shuttle people and equipment to the moon and back. They will take us not only beyond Earth's orbit but also into the **next** **phase** **of** **commercial** **space** **development**. Most importantly, they will **ensure** that the **U**nited **S**tates continues to **outpace** **competitors** like China and Russia in the space race. Our country must be the vanguard in exploring these new economic frontiers. **Planting** the **American** **flag** **in** the **private** **sector** space **industry** will help **create** the **jobs** of the future and **allow** the **U**nited **S**tates **to** **lead** the **formation** of best practices **that** **will** **govern** the **industry** for decades to come.

Some might ask if returning to the moon is worth the expense. The answer is undeniably yes. Providing NASA with the resources it needs to succeed is a small investment that will yield tremendous dividends over time.

To start, it would help **secure** American **commercial** **dominance** in a fast-growing industry. It also would be a **catalyst** **for** **innovation** and scientific discovery, with **salutary** **effects** that would **benefit** the **entire** **economy**.

#### Decline causes nuclear war via hotspot escalation---accelerates tech shift and warming.

Oppenheimer 21 (, M., 2021. 2. The Turbulent Future of International Relations. The Future of Global Affairs - Springer International Publishing, 1(1), p.Chapter 2. Michael Oppenheimer leads the IR Futures concentration at CGA, teaching courses on International Relations (core course), The Future of International Relations, and U.S. Foreign Policy. He also oversees an ongoing research and consulting project for the UN Security Council’s Counter Terrorism Executive Directorate, which involves students directly in advising the UN system on counter terrorism policies and practices. He writes and speaks publicly on U.S foreign policy and on the future of international relations. He has had a varied career, beginning with several years with the U.S. government, then in strategic consulting for government policy makers and private firms, and-since 2005-teaching and research at CGA. His particular specialty is the cognition and methods of thinking about the future, and how perceptions of future change can be incorporated into the foreign policy process, in order to improve foresight and agility. He has applied his skills in research and consulting for the US intelligence community, the Department of State, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the UN, and many others. He is a life member of the Council on Foreign Relations, and is actively involved (and involves his students) in the foreign policy/IR community.)-re-cut rahulpenu

Some of these structural forces could be managed to promote prosperity and avoid war. Multipolarity (inherently more prone to conflict than other configurations of power, given coordination problems)5 plus globalization can work in a world of prosperity, convergent values, and effective conflict management. The Congress of Vienna system achieved relative peace in Europe over a hundred-year period through informal cooperation among multiple states sharing a fear of populist revolution. It ended decisively in 1914. Contemporary neoliberal institutionalists, such as John Ikenberry, accept multipolarity as our likely future, but are confident that globalization with liberal characteristics can be sustained without American hegemony, arguing that liberal values and practices have been fully accepted by states, global institutions, and private actors as imperative for growth and political legitimacy.6 Divergent values plus multipolarity can work, though at significantly lower levels of economic growth-in an autarchic world of isolated units, a world envisioned by the advocates of decoupling, including the current American president. 7 Divergent values plus globalization can be managed by hegemonic power, exemplified by the decade of the 1990s, when the Washington Consensus, imposed by American leverage exerted through the IMF and other U.S. dominated institutions, overrode national differences, but with real costs to those states undergoing “structural adjustment programs,”8 and ultimately at the cost of global growth, as states—especially in Asia—increased their savings to self insure against future financial crises.9

But all four forces operating simultaneously will produce a future of increasing internal polarization and cross border conflict, diminished economic growth and poverty alleviation, weakened global institutions and norms of behavior, and reduced collective capacity to confront emerging challenges of global warming, accelerating technology change, nuclear weapons innovation and proliferation. As in any effective scenario, this future is clearly visible to any keen observer. We have only to abolish wishful thinking and believe our own eyes.10

Secular Stagnation

This unbrave new world has been emerging for some time, as US power has declined relative to other states, especially China, global liberalism has failed to deliver on its promises, and totalitarian capitalism has proven effective in leveraging globalization for economic growth and political legitimacy while exploiting technology and the state’s coercive powers to maintain internal political control. But this new era was jumpstarted by the world financial crisis of 2007, which revealed the bankruptcy of unregulated market capitalism, weakened faith in US leadership, exacerbated economic deprivation and inequality around the world, ignited growing populism, and undermined international liberal institutions. The skewed distribution of wealth experienced in most developed countries, politically tolerated in periods of growth, became intolerable as growth rates declined. A combination of aging populations, accelerating technology, and global populism/nationalism promises to make this growth decline very difficult to reverse. What Larry Summers and other international political economists have come to call “secular stagnation” increases the likelihood that illiberal globalization, multipolarity, and rising nationalism will define our future. Summers11 has argued that the world is entering a long period of diminishing economic growth. He suggests that secular stagnation “may be the defining macroeconomic challenge of our times.” Julius Probst, in his recent assessment of Summers’ ideas, explains:

…rich countries are ageing as birth rates decline and people live longer. This has pushed down real interest rates because investors think these trends will mean they will make lower returns from investing in future, making them more willing to accept a lower return on government debt as a result.

Other factors that make investors similarly pessimistic include rising global inequality and the slowdown in productivity growth…

This decline in real interest rates matters because economists believe that to overcome an economic downturn, a central bank must drive down the real interest rate to a certain level to encourage more spending and investment… Because real interest rates are so low, Summers and his supporters believe that the rate required to reach full employment is so far into negative territory that it is effectively impossible.

…in the long run, more immigration might be a vital part of curing secular stagnation. Summers also heavily prescribes increased government spending, arguing that it might actually be more prudent than cutting back – especially if the money is spent on infrastructure, education and research and development.

Of course, governments in Europe and the US are instead trying to shut their doors to migrants. And austerity policies have taken their toll on infrastructure and public research. This looks set to ensure that the next recession will be particularly nasty when it comes… Unless governments change course radically, we could be in for a sobering period ahead.12

The rise of nationalism/populism is both cause and effect of this economic outlook. Lower growth will make every aspect of the liberal order more difficult to resuscitate post-Trump. Domestic politics will become more polarized and dysfunctional, as competition for diminishing resources intensifies. International collaboration, ad hoc or through institutions, will become politically toxic. Protectionism, in its multiple forms, will make economic recovery from “secular stagnation” a heavy lift, and the liberal hegemonic leadership and strong institutions that limited the damage of previous downturns, will be unavailable. A clear demonstration of this negative feedback loop is the economic damage being inflicted on the world by Trump’s trade war with China, which— despite the so-called phase one agreement—has predictably escalated from negotiating tactic to imbedded reality, with no end in sight. In a world already suffering from inadequate investment, the uncertainties generated by this confrontation will further curb the investments essential for future growth. Another demonstration of the intersection of structural forces is how populist-motivated controls on immigration (always a weakness in the hyper-globalization narrative) deprives developed countries of Summers’ recommended policy response to secular stagnation, which in a more open world would be a win-win for rich and poor countries alike, increasing wage rates and remittance revenues for the developing countries, replenishing the labor supply for rich countries experiencing low birth rates.

Illiberal Globalization

Economic weakness and rising nationalism (along with multipolarity) will not end globalization, but will profoundly alter its character and greatly reduce its economic and political benefits. Liberal global institutions, under American hegemony, have served multiple purposes, enabling states to improve the quality of international relations and more fully satisfy the needs of their citizens, and provide companies with the legal and institutional stability necessary to manage the inherent risks of global investment. But under present and future conditions these institutions will become the battlegrounds—and the victims—of geopolitical competition. The Trump Administration’s frontal attack on multilateralism is but the final nail in the coffin of the Bretton Woods system in trade and finance, which has been in slow but accelerating decline since the end of the Cold War. Future American leadership may embrace renewed collaboration in global trade and finance, macroeconomic management, environmental sustainability and the like, but repairing the damage requires the heroic assumption that America’s own identity has not been fundamentally altered by the Trump era (four years or eight matters here), and by the internal and global forces that enabled his rise. The fact will remain that a sizeable portion of the American electorate, and a monolithically pro- Trump Republican Party, is committed to an illiberal future. And even if the effects are transitory, the causes of weakening global collaboration are structural, not subject to the efforts of some hypothetical future US liberal leadership. It is clear that the US has lost respect among its rivals, and trust among its allies. While its economic and military capacity is still greatly superior to all others, its political dysfunction has diminished its ability to convert this wealth into effective power.13 It will furthermore operate in a future system of diffusing material power, diverging economic and political governance approaches, and rising nationalism. Trump has promoted these forces, but did not invent them, and future US Administrations will struggle to cope with them.

What will illiberal globalization look like? Consider recent events. The instruments of globalization have been weaponized by strong states in pursuit of their geopolitical objectives. This has turned the liberal argument on behalf of globalization on its head. Instead of interdependence as an unstoppable force pushing states toward collaboration and convergence around market-friendly domestic policies, states are exploiting interdependence to inflict harm on their adversaries, and even on their allies. The increasing interaction across national boundaries that globalization entails, now produces not harmonization and cooperation, but friction and escalating trade and investment disputes.14 The Trump Administration is in the lead here, but it is not alone. Trade and investment friction with China is the most obvious and damaging example, precipitated by China’s long failure to conform to the World Trade Organization (WTO) principles, now escalated by President Trump into a trade and currency war disturbingly reminiscent of the 1930s that Bretton Woods was designed to prevent. Financial sanctions against Iran, in violation of US obligations in the Joint Comprehensive Plan Of Action (JCPOA), is another example of the rule of law succumbing to geopolitical competition. Though more mercantilist in intent than geopolitical, US tariffs on steel and aluminum, and their threatened use in automotives, aimed at the EU, Canada, and Japan,15 are equally destructive of the liberal system and of future economic growth, imposed as they are by the author of that system, and will spread to others. And indeed, Japan has used export controls in its escalating conflict with South Korea16 (as did China in imposing controls on rare earth,17 and as the US has done as part of its trade war with China). Inward foreign direct investment restrictions are spreading. The vitality of the WTO is being sapped by its inability to complete the Doha Round, by the proliferation of bilateral and regional agreements, and now by the Trump Administration’s hold on appointments to WTO judicial panels. It should not surprise anyone if, during a second term, Trump formally withdrew the US from the WTO. At a minimum it will become a “dead letter regime.”18

As such measures gain traction, it will become clear to states—and to companies—that a global trading system more responsive to raw power than to law entails escalating risk and diminishing benefits. This will be the end of economic globalization, and its many benefits, as we know it. It represents nothing less than the subordination of economic globalization, a system which many thought obeyed its own logic, to an international politics of zero-sum power competition among multiple actors with divergent interests and values. The costs will be significant: Bloomberg Economics estimates that the cost in lost US GDP in 2019- dollar terms from the trade war with China has reached $134 billion to date and will rise to a total of $316 billion by the end of 2020.19 Economically, the just-in-time, maximally efficient world of global supply chains, driving down costs, incentivizing innovation, spreading investment, integrating new countries and populations into the global system, is being Balkanized. Bilateral and regional deals are proliferating, while global, nondiscriminatory trade agreements are at an end.

Economies of scale will shrink, incentivizing less investment, increasing costs and prices, compromising growth, marginalizing countries whose growth and poverty reduction depended on participation in global supply chains. A world already suffering from excess savings (in the corporate sector, among mostly Asian countries) will respond to heightened risk and uncertainty with further retrenchment. The problem is perfectly captured by Tim Boyle, CEO of Columbia Sportswear, whose supply chain runs through China, reacting to yet another ratcheting up of US tariffs on Chinese imports, most recently on consumer goods:

We move stuff around to take advantage of inexpensive labor. That’s why we’re in Bangladesh. That’s why we’re looking at Africa. We’re putting investment capital to work, to get a return for our shareholders. So, when we make a wager on investment, this is not Vegas. We have to have a reasonable expectation we can get a return. That’s predicated on the rule of law: where can we expect the laws to be enforced, and for the foreseeable future, the rules will be in place? That’s what America used to be.20

The international political effects will be equally damaging. The four structural forces act on each other to produce the more dangerous, less prosperous world projected here. Illiberal globalization represents geopolitical conflict by (at first) physically non-kinetic means. It arises from intensifying competition among powerful states with divergent interests and identities, but in its effects drives down growth and fuels increased nationalism/populism, which further contributes to conflict. Twenty-first-century protectionism represents bottom-up forces arising from economic disruption. But it is also a top-down phenomenon, representing a strategic effort by political leadership to reduce the constraints of interdependence on freedom of geopolitical action, in effect a precursor and enabler of war. This is the disturbing hypothesis of Daniel Drezner, argued in an important May 2019 piece in Reason, titled “Will Today’s Global Trade Wars Lead to World War Three,”21 which examines the pre- World War I period of heightened trade conflict, its contribution to the disaster that followed, and its parallels to the present:

Before the First World War started, powers great and small took a variety of steps to thwart the globalization of the 19th century. Each of these steps made it easier for the key combatants to conceive of a general war. We are beginning to see a similar approach to the globalization of the 21st century. One by one, the economic constraints on military aggression are eroding. And too many have forgotten—or never knew—how this played out a century ago.

…In many ways, 19th century globalization was a victim of its own success. Reduced tariffs and transport costs flooded Europe with inexpensive grains from Russia and the United States. The incomes of landowners in these countries suffered a serious hit, and the Long Depression that ran from 1873 until 1896 generated pressure on European governments to protect against cheap imports.

…The primary lesson to draw from the years before 1914 is not that economic interdependence was a weak constraint on military conflict. It is that, even in a globalized economy, governments can take protectionist actions to reduce their interdependence in anticipation of future wars. In retrospect, the 30 years of tariff hikes, trade wars, and currency conflicts that preceded 1914 were harbingers of the devastation to come. European governments did not necessarily want to ignite a war among the great powers. By reducing their interdependence, however, they made that option conceivable.

…the backlash to globalization that preceded the Great War seems to be reprised in the current moment. Indeed, there are ways in which the current moment is scarier than the pre-1914 era. Back then, the world’s hegemon, the United Kingdom, acted as a brake on economic closure. In 2019, the United States is the protectionist with its foot on the accelerator. The constraints of Sino-American interdependence—what economist Larry Summers once called “the financial balance of terror”—no longer look so binding. And there are far too many hot spots—the Korean peninsula, the South China Sea, Taiwan—where the kindling seems awfully dry.

## OFF

### 1NC---Extra T

#### 1] Interp – Unjust refers to a negative action – it means contrary.

Black Laws No Date "What is Unjust?" <https://thelawdictionary.org/unjust/> //Elmer

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

#### 2] Violation – The Aff is a positive action – it creates a new concept for Space i.e. the treating of Space as a “Global Commons”.

#### 3] Standards –

#### a] Limits – making the topic bi-directional explodes predictability – it means that Aff’s can both increase non-exist property regimes in space AND decrease appropriation by private actors – makes the topic untenable.

#### b] Ground – wrecks Neg Generics – we can’t say appropriation good since the 1AC can create new views on Outer Space Property Rights that circumvent our Links since they can say “Global Commons” approach solves.

#### Independently - the Plan is both Extra-T - since it establishes a new property rights regime AND Effects-T - since the Global Commons ISNT INTRINSICALLY a reduction on Private Property in Space, it involves actions like creating a governance system AND redistribution/cooperation which is the I/L to their Colonialism Advantage - both of which are voters for Limits and Predictability

#### 4] TVA – just defend that space appropriation is bad.

#### a] Topicality is Drop the Debater – it’s a fundamental baseline for debate-ability.

#### b] Use Competing Interps – 1] Topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical and 2] Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

#### c] No RVI’s - 1] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, 2] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and 3] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive.

## OFF

### 1NC---Global Con Con CP

#### Statesought to call a global constitutional convention and establish a constitution reflecting intergenerational concern with exclusive authority to ban appropriation of outer space by private entities and bind participating bodies to its result.

#### That solves the aff – it addresses shared anxieties while building political consensus---avoids countries feeling betrayed and takes away the “shock”

Gardiner 14 1 [Stephen M. Gardiner, Professor of Philosophy and Ben Rabinowitz Endowed Professor of Human Dimensions of the Environment at the University of Washington, Seattle, “A Call for a Global Constitutional Convention Focused on Future Generations,” 2014, *Ethics & International Affairs*, Vol. 28, Issue 3, pp. 299-315, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0892679414000379, EA]

A Constitutional Convention

In my view, the above line of reasoning leads naturally to a more specific proposal: that we—concerned individuals, interested community groups, national governments, and transnational organizations—should initiate a call for a global constitutional convention focused on future generations. This proposal has two components. The first component is procedural. The proposal takes the form of a “call to action.” It is explicitly an attempt to engage a range of actors, based on a claim that they have or should take on a set of responsibilities, and a view about how to go about discharging those responsibilities. The second component is substantive. The main focus for action is a push for the creation of a constitutional convention at the global level, whose role is to pave the way for an overall constitutional system that appropriately embodies intergenerational concern.

The substantive idea rests on several key ideas. Still, for the purposes of a basic proposal, I suggest that these be understood in a relatively open way that, as far as is practicable, does not prejudge the outcome of the convention, and especially its main recommendations. First, the convention itself should be understood as “a representative body called together for some occasional or temporary purpose” and “constituted by statute to represent the people in their primary relations.”14 Second, a constitutional system should be thought of in a minimalist sense as “a set of norms (rules, principles or values) creating, structuring, and possibly defining the limits of government power or authority.”15 Third, the “instigating” role of the convention should be to discuss, develop, make recommendations toward, and set in motion a process for the establishment of a constitution. Fourth, its primary subject matter should be the need to adequately reflect and embody intergenerational concern, where this would include at least the protection of future generations, the promotion of their interests (where “interests” is to be broadly conceived so as to include rights, claims, welfare, and so on), and the discharging of duties with respect to them. It may also (and in my view should) include some way of reflecting concern for past generations, including responsiveness to at least certain of their interests and views. However, I will leave that issue aside in what follows.

The proposal to initiate a call for a global constitutional convention has at least two attractive features. First, it is based in a deep political reality, and does not underplay the challenge. It acknowledges the problem as it is, both specific and general, and calls attention to the heart of that problem, including to the failures of the current system, the need for an alternative, and the background issue of responsibility. Moreover, though the proposal is dramatic and rhetorically eye-catching, it is so in a way that is appropriately responsive to the seriousness of the issue at hand, the persistent political inertia surrounding more modest initiatives, and the fact that (grave though concerns about it are) climate change is only one instance of the tyranny of the contemporary (and the wider perfect moral storm), and we should expect others to arise over the coming decades and centuries.

The second attractive feature of the proposal is that, though ambitious, it is not alienating. While it does not succumb to despair in the face of the challenge, neither does it needlessly polarize and divide from the outset (for example, by leaping to specific recommendations about how to fill the institutional gap). Instead, it acknowledges that there are fundamental difficulties and anxieties, but uses them to start the right kind of debate, rather than to foreclose it. As a result, the proposal is a promising candidate to serve as the subject of a wide and overlapping political consensus, at least among those who share intergenerational concern.

Selective Mirroring

To quell some initial anxieties, it is perhaps worth clarifying the open-ended and non-alienating character of the proposal. One temptation would be to view the call for a global constitutional convention as a fairly naked plea for world government, a prospect that would be deeply alienating—indeed anathema—to many. However, that is not my intention. Though it is possible that a global constitutional convention would lead in this direction, it is by no means certain.

At a minimum, no such body could plausibly recommend any form of “world government” without simultaneously advancing detailed suggestions about how to avoid the standard threats such an institution might pose. Moreover, it seems perfectly conceivable, even likely under current ways of thinking, that a global constitutional convention would pursue what we might call a selective mirroring strategy. Specifically, a convention would seek to develop a broader system of institutions and practices that reflected the desirable features of a powerful and highly centralized global authority but neutralized the standing threats posed by it (for example, it might employ familiar strategies such as the separation of powers). In all likelihood, one feature of a selective mirroring approach would be the significant preservation of existing institutions to serve as a bulwark against the excesses of any newly created ones. Whether and how such a strategy might be made effective against the perfect moral storm, and whether something closer to a “world government” would do better, would be a central issue for discussion by the convention.

#### Conventions are key to set up an effective commons---their ev.

AC Silverstein & Panda ‘3/9 - Benjamin Silverstein [research analyst for the Space Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. MA, International Relations, Syracuse University Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs BA, International Affairs, George Washington University] and Ankit Panda [Stanton Senior Fellow in the Nuclear Policy Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. AB, Princeton University], “Space Is a Great Commons. It’s Time to Treat It as Such.” *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace* (Web). March 9, 2021. Accessed Dec. 13, 2021. <<https://carnegieendowment.org/2021/03/09/space-is-great-commons.-it-s-time-to-treat-it-as-such-pub-84018>> AT---rehighlighted rahulpenu

plano reads blue

The failure to manage Earth orbits as a commons undermines safety and predictability, exposing space operators to growing risks such as collisions with other satellites and debris. The long-standing debris problem has been building for decades and demands an international solution.¶ Competing states need to coalesce behind a commons-based understanding of Earth orbits to set the table for a governance system to organize space traffic and address rampant debris. New leadership in the United States can spur progress on space governance by affirming that Earth orbits are a great commons. So far, President Joe Biden and his administration have focused on major space projects, but a relatively simple policy declaration that frames Earth orbits as a great commons can support efforts to negotiate space governance models for issues like debris mitigation and remediation. The Biden administration can set the stage to pursue broad space policy goals by establishing a consensus among states, particularly those with the most invested in Earth orbits, that space is a great commons.¶ THE PRESSING NEED FOR SPACE GOVERNANCE¶ The Earth orbits that provide the majority of benefits to states and commercial ventures represent only a tiny fraction of outer space as a whole. Competition for the limited volume of these Earth orbits is especially fierce since two satellites cannot be in the same place at the same time and not all orbits are equally useful for all missions. The number of objects residing in Earth orbits is now at an all-time high, with most new objects introduced into orbits at altitudes of between 400 and 700 kilometers above sea level. Millions of pieces of debris in Earth orbits pose a threat to continuing space operations. For instance, the final U.S. space shuttle missions faced 1-in-300 odds of losing a space vehicle or crew member to orbital debris or micrometeoroid impacts.¶ Collisions with fragments of orbital litter as small as a few millimeters across can ruin satellites and end missions. Current technologies cannot track all of these tiny pieces of debris, leaving space assets at the mercy of undetectable, untraceable, and unpredictable pieces of space junk. Some researchers have determined that the debris population in low Earth orbit is already self-sustaining, meaning that collisions between space objects will produce debris more rapidly than natural forces, like atmospheric drag, can remove it from orbit.¶ States—namely the United States, Russia, China, and India—have exacerbated this debris accumulation trend by testing kinetic anti-satellite capabilities or otherwise purposefully fragmenting their satellites in orbit. These states, along with the rest of the multilateral disarmament community, are currently at an impasse on establishing future space governance mechanisms that can address the debris issue. A portion of this impasse may be attributable to disparate views of the nature of outer space in the international context. Establishing a clear view among negotiating parties that Earth orbits should be treated as a great commons would establish a basis for future agreements that reduce debris-related risks.¶ Beyond debris-generating, kinetic anti-satellite weapons tests, revolutionary operating concepts challenge existing space traffic management practices. For instance, commercial ventures are planning networks of thousands of satellites to provide low-latency connectivity on Earth and deploying them by the dozens. States are following this trend. Some are considering transitioning away from using single (or few) exquisite assets in higher orbits and toward using many satellites in low Earth orbits. These new operational concepts could lead to an increase in collision risks.¶ Without new governance agreements, problems related to debris, heavy orbital traffic, and harmful interference will only intensify. Debris in higher orbits can persist for a century or more. The costs of adapting to increasingly polluted orbits would be immense, and the opportunity costs would be even higher. For instance, all else being equal, hardening satellites against collisions increases their mass and volume, in turn raising launch costs per satellite. These costs, rooted in a failure to govern space as a commons, will be borne by all space actors, including emerging states and commercial entities.¶ EXISTING FORMS OF SPACE GOVERNANCE¶ A well-designed governance system, founded on a widespread understanding of Earth orbits as a great commons, could temper these risks. Currently, space is not wholly unregulated, but existing regulations are limited both in scope and implementation. Many operators pledge to follow national regulations and international guidelines, but decentralized accountability mechanisms limit enforcement. These guidelines also do not cover the full range of potentially risky behaviors in space. For example, while some space operators can maneuver satellites to avoid collisions, there are no compulsory rules or standards on who has the right of way.¶ At the interstate level, seminal multilateral agreements provide some more narrow guidance on what is and is not acceptable in space. Most famously, the Outer Space Treaty affirms that outer space “shall be free for exploration and use by all states without discrimination of any kind” and that “there shall be free access to all areas of celestial bodies.” Similar concepts of Earth orbits being a great commons arise in subsequent international texts. Agreements like the Liability Convention impose fault-based liability for debris-related collisions in space, but it is difficult to prove fault in this regime in part because satellite owners and operators have yet to codify a standard of care in space, and thus the regime does not clearly disincentivize debris creation in orbit. Other rules of behavior in Earth orbits have been more successful in reducing harmful interference between satellite operations, but even these efforts are limited in scope.¶ States have acceded to supranational regulations of the most limited (and thus most valuable) Earth orbits. The International Telecommunication Union (ITU) coordinates, but does not authorize, satellite deployments and operations in geosynchronous orbits and manages radiofrequency spectrum assignments in other regions of space to reduce interference between satellites. These coordination activities are underpinned by the ITU’s constitution, which reminds states “that radio frequencies and any associate orbits . . . are limited natural resources,” indicating a commons-based approach to governing the radiofrequency spectrum. However, the union’s processes are still adapting to new operational realities in low Earth orbit, and these rules were never designed to address issues like debris.

\*marlborough’s card ends here\*

BUILDING ON PRIOR MODELS FOR MANAGING COMMONS

The histories of other great commons provide lessons on how to manage shared space resources meaningfully and effectively. Efforts to minimize damage to other great commons—like the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution and subsequent protocols—offer guidance on how to resolve compliance issues. Notably, the negotiations on the original convention on air pollution involved, among others, the United States and the Soviet Union. This suggests that states can pursue mutual benefits in areas considered great commons even under competitive conditions. More recent negotiations on the convention’s accompanying protocols show that these competing states can even agree on financing a monitoring regime to support progress.

Existing conventions and implementing agreements indicate that states can reach valuable commitments to manage the Earth’s great commons. These governance models protect state interests and preserve the commons themselves. These principles apply to space, but progress on establishing more encompassing space governance principles, enforcement mechanisms, and dispute resolution procedures hinges on states sharing the fundamental view that space is a great commons. Reaching such a consensus is an important first step.

New leadership in prominent spacefaring states can revitalize efforts to recognize space as a commons and can build on established legal standards to pursue commons-related principles for governing Earth orbits. Space actors do not have to resolve all their competing interests based on the debris problem. But negligence, mismanagement, or poorly designed rules may spell disaster for Earth orbits. As a more diverse range of actors with space-based interests emerges, no single actor will be able to unilaterally impose universal rules. States can, however, negotiate agreements to manage commons areas to better pursue national objectives. The only way to effectively govern state and commercial space activities is to settle on and abide by common norms or rules.

New conventions or regulatory mechanisms for governing Earth orbits will not appear overnight, but states can build toward these goals by clarifying their commitments to treat space as a commons and pursuing governance arrangements that reflect this commitment. New policies in the United States should reflect that Earth orbits are a great commons.

However, this is only the beginning of the path toward international governance in space. Developing internal commons-based policies for Earth orbits is only an initial action to create conditions for cooperative regulation of space activities. This domestic policy development effort alone would have limited effect without the necessary next steps: engaging partners and allies to align perspectives and eventually leading negotiations among competitors to mitigate issues like space debris and orbital traffic congestion. Future governance and regulations can leverage commons-based principles to establish accountability mechanisms that preserve the usefulness of Earth orbits for all.

## Debris ADV

### 1NC---Re-highlighting

#### 5-10 pieces is sufficient.

Chelsea AC **MuñOz-Patchen, 19** - ("Regulating the Space Commons: Treating Space Debris as Abandoned Property in Violation of the Outer Space Treaty," University of Chicago, 2019, 12-6-2021, <https://cjil.uchicago.edu/publication/regulating-space-commons-treating-space-debris-abandoned-property-violation-outer-space)//AW---rehighlighted> rahulpenu

plano reads blue

Debris poses a threat to functioning space objects and astronauts in space, and may cause damage to the earth’s surface upon re-entry.29 Much of the small debris cannot be tracked due to its size and the velocity at which it travels, making it impossible to anticipate and maneuver to avoid collisions.30 To remain in orbit, debris must travel at speeds of up to 17,500 miles per hour.31 At this speed even very small pieces of debris can cause serious damage, threatening a spacecraft and causing expensive damage.32 There are millions of these very small pieces, and thousands of larger ones.33 The small-to-medium pieces of debris “continuously shed fragments like lens caps, booster upper stages, nuts, bolts, paint chips, motor sprays of aluminum particles, glass splinters, waste water, and bits of foil,” and may stay in orbit for decades or even centuries, posing an ongoing risk.34 Debris ten centimeters or larger in diameter creates the likelihood of complete destruction for any functioning satellite with which it collides.35 Large nonfunctional objects remaining in orbit are a collision threat, capable of creating huge amounts of space debris and taking up otherwise useful orbit space.36 This issue is of growing importance as more nations and companies gain the ability to launch satellites and other objects into space.37 From February 2009 through the end of 2010, more than thirty-two collision-avoidance maneuvers were reportedly used to avoid debris by various space agencies and satellite companies, and as of March 2012, the crew of the International Space Station (ISS) had to take shelter three times due to close calls with passing debris.38 These maneuvers require costly fuel usage and place a strain on astronauts.39 Furthermore, the launches of some spacecraft have “been delayed because of the presence of space debris in the planned flight paths.”40 In 2011, Euroconsult, a satellite consultant, projected that there would be “a 51% increase in satellites launched in the next decade over the number launched in the past decade.”41 In addition to satellites, the rise of commercial space tourism will also increase the number of objects launched into space and thus the amount of debris.42 The more objects are sent into space, and the more collisions create cascades of debris, the greater the risk of damage to vital satellites and other devices relied on for “weather forecasting, telecommunications, commerce, and national security.”43 The Space Debris Mitigation Guidelines44 were created by UNCOPUOS with input from the IADC and adopted in 2007.45 The guidelines were developed to address the problem of space debris and were intended to “increase mutual understanding on acceptable activities in space.”46 These guidelines are nonbinding but suggest best practices to implement at the national level when planning for a launch. Many nations have adopted the guidelines to some degree, and some have gone beyond what the guidelines suggest.47 While the guidelines do not address existing debris, they do much to prevent the creation of new debris. The Kessler Syndrome is the biggest concern with space debris. The Kessler Syndrome is a cascade created when debris hits a space object, creating new debris and setting off a chain reaction of collisions that eventually closes off entire orbits.48 The concern is that this cascade will occur when a tipping point is reached at which the natural removal rate cannot keep up with the amount of new debris added.49 At this point a collision could set off a cascade destroying all space objects within the orbit.50 In 2011, The National Research Council predicted that the Kessler Syndrome could happen within ten to twenty years.51 Donald J. Kessler, the astrophysicist and NASA scientist who theorized the Kessler Syndrome in 1978, believes this cascade may be a century away, meaning that there is still time to develop a solution.52

\*marlborough’s card ends here\*

Fortunately, a common estimate suggests that the Kessler Syndrome could be avoided if five to ten large pieces of debris were removed per year.53 Dealing with the problem of space debris, including avoiding the Kessler Syndrome, therefore involves not only avoiding the creation of new debris, but also the removal of the debris already in existence.54

### 1NC---Defense

#### Collision risk is infinitesimally small

Fange 17 Daniel Von Fange 17, Web Application Engineer, Founder and Owner of LeanCoder, Full Stack, Polyglot Web Developer, “Kessler Syndrome is Over Hyped”, 5/21/2017, http://braino.org/essays/kessler\_syndrome\_is\_over\_hyped/

The orbital area around earth can be broken down into four regions. Low LEO - Up to about 400km. Things that orbit here burn up in the earth’s atmosphere quickly - between a few months to two years. The space station operates at the high end of this range. It loses about a kilometer of altitude a month and if not pushed higher every few months, would soon burn up. For all practical purposes, Low LEO doesn’t matter for Kessler Syndrome. If Low LEO was ever full of space junk, we’d just wait a year and a half, and the problem would be over. High LEO - 400km to 2000km. This where most heavy satellites and most space junk orbits. The air is thin enough here that satellites only go down slowly, and they have a much farther distance to fall. It can take 50 years for stuff here to get down. This is where Kessler Syndrome could be an issue. Mid Orbit - GPS satellites and other navigation satellites travel here in lonely, long lives. The volume of space is so huge, and the number of satellites so few, that we don’t need to worry about Kessler here. GEO - If you put a satellite far enough out from earth, the speed that the satellite travels around the earth will match the speed of the surface of the earth rotating under it. From the ground, the satellite will appear to hang motionless. Usually the geostationary orbit is used by big weather satellites and big TV broadcasting satellites. (This apparent motionlessness is why satellite TV dishes can be mounted pointing in a fixed direction. You can find approximate south just by looking around at the dishes in your northern hemisphere neighborhood.) For Kessler purposes, GEO orbit is roughly a ring 384,400 km around. However, all the satellites here are moving the same direction at the same speed - debris doesn’t get free velocity from the speed of the satellites. Also, it’s quite expensive to get a satellite here, and so there aren’t many, only about one satellite per 1000km of the ring. Kessler is not a problem here. How bad could Kessler Syndrome in High LEO be? Let’s imagine a worst case scenario. An evil alien intelligence chops up everything in High LEO, turning it into 1cm cubes of death orbiting at 1000km, spread as evenly across the surface of this sphere as orbital mechanics would allow. Is humanity cut off from space? I’m guessing the world has launched about 10,000 tons of satellites total. For guessing purposes, I’ll assume 2,500 tons of satellites and junk currently in High LEO. If satellites are made of aluminum, with a density of 2.70 g/cm3, then that’s 839,985,870 1cm cubes. A sphere for an orbit of 1,000km has a surface area of 682,752,000 square KM. So there would be one cube of junk per .81 square KM. If a rocket traveled through that, its odds of hitting that cube are tiny - less than 1 in 10,000.

#### No Kessler

Drmola and Hubik 18 [Jakub Drmola, Division of Security and Strategic Studies, Department of Political Science at the Faculty of Social Sciences of Masaryk University. Tomas Hubik, Department of Theoretical Computer Science and Mathematical Logic, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Charles University. Kessler Syndrome: System Dynamics Model. Space Policy Volumes 44–45, August 2018, Pages 29-39. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0265964617300966?via%3Dihub]

The baseline scenario represents a continuation of the current trends, which are simply extended into the future. An average 1% growth rate of yearly launches of new satellites (starting at 89) is assumed, together with constant success rate in satellites’ ability to actively avoid collisions with debris and other satellites, constant lifetime, and failure rate. This basic model lacks any sudden events or major policy changes that would markedly influence the debris propagation. However, it serves both as a foundation for all the following scenarios and as a basis of comparison to see what the impact would be.

Given high uncertainty regarding future state of the satellite industry (how many satellites will be launched per year, of what type and size, etc.), we elected to limit our simulations to 50 years. The model can certainly continue beyond this point, but the associated unknowns make the simulations progressively less useful.

Running this model for its full 50 years (2016–2066) yields the expected result of perpetually growing amount of debris in the LEO. One can observe nearly 2-fold increase in the large debris (over 10 cm) and 3-fold increase in small debris (less than 1 cm) quantities (Fig. 5). The oscillations visible in the graph are caused by the aforementioned solar cycles which influence the rate of reentry for all simulated populations except the still active (i.e. powered) satellites. Also please note that throughout the article, the graphs use quite different scales for debris populations because of the considerable variations between scenarios. Using any single scale for all graphs would render some of them unintelligible.

We can see that this increase in numbers still does not result in realization of the Kessler syndrome as most of the satellites being launched remain intact for their full expected service life. However, it comes with a considerable increase in risk to satellites, which is manifested by their higher yearly losses, making satellites operations riskier and more expensive for governments and private companies alike. This increased amount of debris in LEO combined with the larger number of active satellites makes it approximately twice as likely that an active satellite will suffer a disabling hit or a total disintegration during its lifetime. It should be noted that this risk might possibly be offset by future improvements in satellite reliability, debris tracking, and navigation [17].

#### Uncertainty from debris collisions creates restraint not instability.

MacDonald 16, B., et al. "Crisis stability in space: China and other challenges." Foreign Policy Institute. Washington, DC (2016). (senior director of the Nonproliferation and Arms Control Project with the Center for Conflict Analysis and Prevention)//Elmer

In any crisis that threatens to escalate into major power conflict, political and military leaders will face uncertainty about the effectiveness of their plans and decisions. This uncertainty will be compounded when potential conflict extends to the space and cyber domains, where weapon effectiveness is largely untested and uncertain, infrastructure interdependencies are unclear, and damaging an adversary could also harm oneself or one’s allies. Unless the stakes become very high, no country will likely want to gamble its well-being in a “single cosmic throw of the dice,” in Harold Brown’s memorable phrase. 96 The novelty of space and cyber warfare, coupled with risk aversion and worst-case assessments, could lead space adversaries into a situation of what can be called “hysteresis,” where each adversary is restrained by its own uncertainty of success. This is conceptually shown in Figures 1 and 2 for offensive counter-space capabilities, though it applies more generally. 97 These graphs portray the hypothetical differences between perceived and actual performance capabilities of offensive counter-space weapons, on a scale from zero to one hundred percent effectiveness. Where uncertainty and risk aversion are absent for two adversaries, no difference would exist between the likely performance of their offensive counter-space assets and their confidence in the performance of those weapons: a simple, straight-line correlation would exist, as in Figure 1. The more interesting, and more realistic, case is notionally presented in Figure 2, which assumes for simplicity that the offensive capabilities of each adversary are comparable. In stark contrast to the case of Figure 1, uncertainty and risk aversion are present and become important factors. Given the high stakes involved in a possible large-scale attack against adversary space assets, a cautious adversary is more likely to be conservative in estimating the effectiveness of its offensive capabilities, while more generously assessing the capabilities of its adversary. Thus, if both side’s weapons were 50% effective and each side had a similar level of risk aversion, each may conservatively assess its own capabilities to be 30% effective and its adversary’s weapons to be 70% effective. Likewise, if each side’s weapons were 25% effective in reality, each would estimate its own capabilities to be less than 25% effective and its adversary’s to be more than 25% effective, and so on. In Figure 2, this difference appears, in oversimplified fashion, as a gap that represents the realistic worry that a country’s own weapons will under-perform while its adversary’s weapons will over-perform in terms of effectiveness. If both countries face comparable uncertainty and exhibit comparable risk aversion, each may be deterred from initiating an attack by its unwillingness to accept the necessary risks. This gap could represent an “island of stability,” as shown in Figure 2. In essence, given the enormous stakes involved in a major strike against the adversary’s space assets, a potential attacker will likely demonstrate some risk aversion, possessing less confidence in an attack’s effectiveness. It is uncertain how robust this hysteresis may prove to be, but the phenomenon may provide at least some stabilizing influence in a crisis. In the nuclear domain, the immediate, direct consequences of military use, including blast, fire, and direct radiation effects, were appreciated at the outset. Nonetheless, significant uncertainty and under-appreciation persisted with regard to the collateral, indirect, and climatological effects of using such weapons on a large scale. In contrast, the immediate, direct effects of major space conflict are not well understood, and potential indirect and interdependent effects are even less understood. Indirect effects of large-scale space and cyber warfare would be virtually impossible to confidently calculate, as the infrastructures such warfare would affect are constantly changing in design and technology. Added to this is a likely anxiety that if an attack were less successful than planned, a highly aggrieved and powerful adversary could retaliate in unanticipated ways, possibly with highly destructive consequences. As a result, two adversaries facing potential conflict may lack confidence both in the potential effectiveness of their own attacks and in the ineffectiveness of any subsequent retaliation. Such mutual uncertainty would ultimately be stabilizing, though probably not particularly robust. This is reflected in Figure 2, where each side shows more caution than the technical effectiveness of its systems may suggest. Each curve notionally represents one state’s confidence in its offensive counter-space effectiveness relative to their actual effectiveness. Until true space asset resilience becomes a trusted feature of space architectures, deterrence by risk aversion, and cross-domain deterrence, may be the only means for deterrence to function in space.

## Corporate Colonialism ADV

### 1NC---Neolib Good

#### Neolib solves---

#### 1---War.

Mousseau 19—Professor in the School of Politics, Security, and International Affairs at the University of Central Florida (Michael, “The End of War: How a Robust Marketplace and Liberal Hegemony Are Leading to Perpetual World Peace,” International Security, Volume 44, Issue 1, Summer 2019, p.160-196, dml)

Is war becoming obsolete? There is wide agreement among scholars that war has been in sharp decline since the defeat of the Axis powers in 1945, even as there is little agreement as to its cause.1 Realists reject the idea that this trend will continue, citing states' concerns with the “security dilemma”: that is, in anarchy states must assume that any state that can attack will; therefore, power equals threat, and changes in relative power result in conflict and war.2 Discussing the rise of China, Graham Allison calls this condition “Thucydides's Trap,” a reference to the ancient Greek's claim that Sparta's fear of Athens' growing power led to the Peloponnesian War.3

This article argues that there is no Thucydides Trap in international politics. Rather, the world is moving rapidly toward permanent peace, possibly in our lifetime. Drawing on economic norms theory,4 I show that what sometimes appears to be a Thucydides Trap may instead be a function of factors strictly internal to states and that these factors vary among them. In brief, leaders of states with advanced market-oriented economies have foremost interests in the principle of self-determination for all states, large and small, as the foundation for a robust global marketplace. War among these states, even making preparations for war, is not possible, because they are in a natural alliance to preserve and protect the global order. In contrast, leaders of states with weak internal markets have little interest in the global marketplace; they pursue wealth not through commerce, but through wars of expansion and demands for tribute. For these states, power equals threat, and therefore they tend to balance against the power of all states. Fearing stronger states, however, minor powers with weak internal markets tend to constrain their expansionist inclinations and, for security reasons, bandwagon with the relatively benign market-oriented powers.

I argue that this liberal global hierarchy is unwittingly but systematically buttressing states' embrace of market norms and values that, if left uninterrupted, is likely to culminate in permanent world peace, perhaps even something close to harmony. My argument challenges the realist assertion that great powers are engaged in a timeless competition over global leadership, because hegemony cannot exist among great powers with weak markets; these inherently expansionist states live in constant fear and therefore normally balance against the strongest state and its allies.5 Hegemony can exist only among market-oriented powers, because only they care about global order. Yet, there can be no competition for leadership among market powers, because they always agree with the goal of their strongest member (currently the United States) to preserve and protect the global order based on the principle of self-determination. If another commercial power, such as a rising China, were to overtake the United States, the world would take little notice, because the new leading power would largely agree with the global rules promoted and enforced by its predecessor. Vladimir Putin's Russia, on the other hand, seeks to create chaos around the world. Most other powers, having market-oriented economies, continue to abide by the hegemony of the United States despite its relative economic decline since the end of World War II.6

To support my theory that domestic factors determine states' alignment decisions, I analyze the voting preferences of members of the United Nations General Assembly from 1946 to 2010. I find that states with weak internal markets tend to disagree with the foreign policy preferences of the largest market power (i.e., the United States), but more so if they are major powers or have stronger rather than weaker military and economic capabilities. The power of states with robust internal markets, in contrast, appears to have no effect on their foreign policy preferences, as market-oriented states align with the market leader regardless of their power status or capabilities. I corroborate that this pattern may be a consequence of states' interest in the global market order by finding that states with higher levels of exports per capita are more likely than other states to have preferences aligned with those of the United States; those with lower levels of exports are more likely to have interests that do not align with the United States, but again more so if they are stronger rather than weaker.

Liberal scholars of international politics have long offered explanations for why the incidence of war may decline, generally beginning with the assumption that although the security dilemma exists, it can be overcome with the help of factors external to states.7 Neoliberal institutionalists treat states as like units and international organization as an external condition.8 Trade interdependence is dyadic and thus an external condition.9 Democracy is an internal factor, but theories of democratic peace have an external dimension: peace is the result of the expectations of states' behavior informed by the images that leaders create of each other's regime types.10 In contrast, I show that the security dilemma may not exist at all and how peace can emerge in anarchy with states pursuing their interests determined entirely by internal factors.11

#### 2---Inequality and Poverty.

Teixeira and Judis 17—senior fellow at both The Century Foundation and American Progress AND editor-at-large at Talking Points Memo, former senior writer at The National Journal and a former senior editor at The New Republic (Ruy and John, “Why The Left Will (Eventually) Triumph: An Interview With Ruy Teixeira,” <http://talkingpointsmemo.com/cafe/why-left-will-eventually-win-ruy-teixeira>, dml)

Judis: In your book, you explain at several points that you are no longer a socialist and instead support a reformed capitalism. When we met many years ago, we were in a socialist organization. When did this transformation occur? Teixeira: What happened is that I began to think a lot about how economies actually work. When I was a socialist, I **didn’t think very carefully** and **long** about what **actually** a socialist economy would look like. I had this **general idea** that the capitalist system was **inefficient** and **prone to crisis** and that one should **somehow tamp down the profit motive** and limit the freedom of action of capitalists. But **the more I thought** about how economies worked, it was **hard to gainsay** that the market was **absolutely essential** for the efficient delivery of goods and services. And the more I read, the more I realized my viewpoint was closer to social democrats than to socialists. Capitalism needs to be **regulated**, it needs to be **pointed in the right direction**, you **need to have a big safety net**, but you **can’t replace it**. Judis: Was there something that happened, a book you read, that changed your mind? Teixeira: I would say it was an obscure book by Alec Nove called “The Economics of Feasible Socialism.” Judis: That’s amazing. I was deeply influenced by the same book. Teixeira: Nove was a historian of the Soviet Union. He came from a Menshevik family, and he basically laid out the way the standard conceptions of socialism that a lot of people on the left had couldn’t work. If you wanted to **think rationally about what’s feasible**, the way economies and people tend to work, you **had to have a market**. The goal as I see it is a mixed economy that works as well as possible, and of course you have not gotten that in the West for the last several decades. The mixed economy just needs improvement and modification. Judis: And what kind of improvements would that be? Teixeira; I favor what economists are calling a model of **equitable growth**. It would mean **substantial government investment** in creating new opportunities for the middle and aspirational classes. It could include a dramatic expansion of the educational system and a Manhattan-style investment in bringing down the price of clean energy and building the infrastructure to match. Granted, these kind of proposals would not get through Congress now, but it is the kind of agenda that I am optimistic that the Democrats will endorse and that the country will **eventually embrace**. The Left Prospers in Prosperity Judis: Your book is titled “The Optimistic Leftist,” but if you look at the terrain of politics today, the center-left or left of center parties are decimated. The Democrats haven’t been in such bad shape nationally and in the states since the 1920s. The Dutch Labor Party got less than 10 percent in the recent election. Jeremy Corbyn and British Labor may be routed in June. The French Socialist candidate came in fifth with 6 percent. Why is this happening? And given that this is happening, what grounds do you have for thinking that the left will suddenly find itself on top? Teixeira: The way I look at it we are going through a **long transition** from an industrial capitalist system to a **post-industrial services-based capitalist system**. So far this transition has **not gone well**. It hasn’t had the outcomes that people want. We have **slow productivity growth** and **rising inequality**. The central point I’d make is that **by and large**, **poor economic times** are **not good for the left**. They **make people reactive**, **pessimistic**, **trying to hold onto their own**, and **not supportive of collective endeavors** to help the way society functions. And we’ve seen all that in spades in the last decade. Really that kind of situation is **best for the right**, and the left has had a very difficult time figuring out a way forward. The Democrats have their problems, but in Europe, you see the problems crystallized. Europe’s mainstream left was based in the industrial working class and has had a terrible time adjusting to the transition to post-industrial capitalism and figuring out what a new model of capitalism and capitalist growth would look like. They have thrown in their lot with a much more right-wing approach, beginning with the Third Way in the ’90s. The idea behind it was that capitalism can pretty well function on its own and we just have to let it rip. We’re still coming out of that phase, and I think the mainstream social democrats with their collaboration with austerity in places like France and the Netherlands are reaping the whirlwind. But if you look at other parts of the left, they are actually doing relatively well. If you look at the Netherlands election, the green left did very well, and if you add up the votes of the Socialist Party (a left-socialist party), the greens, Democrats 66 (a left social-liberal party) and the social democrats, the left **hasn’t been totally decimated**. What has really been decimated is the Party of Labor, as the social democrats in the Netherlands are called. We are seeing the same thing in France where the Socialist Party (the French social democrats) candidate did terribly, but [independent socialist Jean-Luc] Melenchon did quite well. The left **still has strength**, but it is **divided up among different political tendencies**. It is going to have to **reorganize itself around an economic program** that is going to deliver what people want, which is **better growth** and **better distribution**. Until that happens, the left will be **in a quagmire**. Judis: I want to look more closely at your argument that the left does better in good times and the right in bad times. Bill Clinton got elected in the wake of a recession in 1992, Barack Obama might not have won the presidency in 2008 if the financial crash hadn’t happened that September. The Populists came out of the farm crisis in 1880s and early 1890s; the New Deal out of the Great Depression. I am not saying that bad times is better for the left, but only that there isn’t a necessary connection in either case and that you are making too facile an assumption about which times promote which politics. Teixeira: Bad times do propel people into motion and produce protest and reaction, but looked at from when you can accomplish the goals of the left of **making society better** and **implementing important reforms**, I think it is **typically easier** when the economy is **expanding fairly rapidly** and **living standards are going up** than when the reverse is true. It is **not a perfect relationship**, but **by and large** I think it’s true. So yeah, Obama can get elected in a situation where he was aided by an economic downturn, but his ability to **put together a progressive coalition** that could **stick together for a long time** and continue to implement reforms was **very much undermined by the economic situation**. Judis: Let’s turn it around and look at the connection between the right and good and bad times. In America, the 1920s were relatively good times, and the Republicans controlled the government the whole decade. Teixeira: The 1920s were not nearly as good a time people think it was. It was a time of relatively slow per capita income growth. It was very unequally distributed, the industrial working class did somewhat well, but the rural areas did poorly, and there were four recessions between 1918 and 1929. It was not such a great time. It was relatively poor compared to the Progressive Era. Judis: So the Republicans did well in the 1920s because they were really bad times? Teixeira: There was a sense of real uncertainty, real economic paranoia. Judis: I don’t think you could call the 1920s bad times. You could call it uneven times. “Bad times” is stretching it. In addition, you have the real bad times of the Depression staring you in your face which is the time of the greatest advance in terms of a left and social democracy in our history. Teixeira: Desperate times make for desperate measure sometimes. There is **no guarantee they will help the left rather than the right**. I think that’s what we saw in the U.S. Obviously it didn’t work out so well in Europe. When I make the general analysis that the left is better off in a period of economic expansion and rising living standards, it doesn’t correspond exactly to the political outcomes you’ll have in those different periods. I am saying that **in a general sense**, the left has the **easiest time making advances** and **improving society** when things are going well **rather than when are going poorly**. Judis: Let’s look at Europe. In some of the countries in Northern Europe that are doing well, the center-right parties are in charge. Teixeira: Yes, but I think you can make the case the center-right parties aren’t exactly in charge in Europe. They also have their problems. The rise of populism in Europe is blowing apart the party system. Judis: You have got Holland, Denmark, Germany, and Austria. Those are all countries that are doing pretty well compared to the rest of the EU and that have center-right governments. Teixeira: The Netherlands is not doing that well. It’s all relative. Their recovery has been somewhat better. Their employment level has been high compared to other European countries, but there are a number of cuts in social services, wages haven’t been going up much, there is a lot more insecurity. Judis: Isn’t Germany doing well? Teixeira:. Germany is doing relatively well, but it hasn’t been a period of expansive growth for them either. There is a lot of wage stagnation and compression there. I **never meant to imply** that you can **perfectly predict social reform from economic outcomes**. But I think it **provides an important lens** on when the left does well and when the left does poorly. By and large when you look at Europe, you see the ~~straitjacket~~ [**dilemma**] that the Eurozone has created in the economies. People are **fearful**, they are **pessimistic**, they are **passive**. This is **very bad for the left**. Until you **break out** of that [dilemma] ~~straitjacket~~, the left is **not going to be able to do that well**, and the right is **going to continue to do relatively well** compared to them, and you’ll see the **continued rise in populism** because people have no faith in the system. So what I am trying to do is to get the left to focus on **getting to a new stage of capitalist growth** and **being able actually to deliver rising incomes**. There is No Alternative to the Left Judis: So let’s talk about how this political change will come about. What I took from your book is that we are currently suffering from secular stagnation, and that to get to a new stage of growth, we will have to implement the kind of left program that you describe. I worry that this argument contains a contradiction. On the one hand, the left can’t get its program enacted as long as times are bad. On the other hand, the only way to get out of bad times is for the left to get its program enacted. Teixeira: I see what you are asking. I think it is going to be **two steps forward**, **one step back**. We are sort of **slouching** toward the next stage of capitalism. I **don’t think it’s going to be pretty**. Political and economic factors are going to propel us in that direction. Ultimately, people want things to work better, they want their problems to be solved. And the **only way** we are going to get there is along the road I have described. I think this **equitable growth** approach that the Democrats united around is the future. The level of growth is going to vary over time, but I think the Democrats are the ones who are going to put us there and I think they are going to be rewarded for it. Judis:. But how does that happen? Isn’t there a crisis scenario implicit in your account? At some time, the current Third Way or neoliberal approach results in another Great Recession and at that point people will buy into a left-wing approach, the left-wing approach will create prosperity and at that time we will have an enduring left-wing or Democratic majority. Isn’t a step like this missing from your argument? Teixeira:. That certainly could be the way it goes down, but it’s **not clear we are required to have a recession** on the level we did in 2007 and 2008, or whether this sort of rolling crisis we have combined with other political events might do it. I don’t know, it’s hard to predict, but I think the great economist Herbert Stein said, if something cannot go on forever, it will stop. Judis: The great socialist Rosa Luxembourg said the choice was socialism or barbarism. I am not saying we are heading toward barbarism, but I think there is a determinism in your argument. I think you are saying that people will eventually choose a politics that will best help them. Reason will prevail. And I am not sure if that holds up historically. When you talk about the EU, you say eventually they will consolidate into a fiscal monetary union. I am not sure that is going to happen. It’s also possible that the Eurozone could break up and that there could be a lot of chaos. We have periods in history where things don’t happen in the best of all possible ways. Teixeira: The trajectory is **ultimately going to take us** to a **different** and **better place**. I think **eventually we will adapt** and we will **get something better** than we have because it is the **only solution to the ongoing problems**. **There is no alternative**. Judis: Countries are sometime structurally unable to do what is in their best interest. In the U.S., we have this strong anti-statist tradition going back to the revolution that seems to get in the way every time we want to do something like what you are proposing. It is possible that contrary to Hegel, the rational won’t turn out to be the real. Teixeira: Of course it is possible, but if you look at the history of the United States, **despite the anti-statist bias** and **despite all the other political problems**, the way the country has evolved over time is toward a **larger government** that **does more** and **provides more for people**. And we **obviously have evolved tremendously** in the social realm as well. Governments don’t do what is rational in the short term, at least rational in the sense you are describing it, but political systems **evolve over time** in a way that is consistent with the values and priorities of the left, and I expect that to continue over time. The 2016 Election Judis: Let’s talk about the 2016 election. Why did Clinton lose to such a weak opponent? Teixeira: The Democrats have an evolving majority that consists of groups like minorities, professionals, young people, single women and what have you, and that’s a true fact. It’s growing over time and it will continue to grow, but it was always mathematically true that if you take the declining group, the white non-college voters, and they move sufficiently in the direction of the other party, that will be enough to undermine your coalition. You won’t win. That’s exactly what happened in 2016. These voters moved rapidly away from the Democrats both in local and state races and in the presidential election. Judis: Why did they move? Teixeira: They do not have any faith that the Democrats share their values and are going to deliver a better life for them and their kids, and I think Hillary Clinton was a very efficient bearer of that meme. Whether she wanted to or not, the message she sent to these voters is that you are really not that important and I don’t take your problems seriously, and frankly I don’t have much to offer you. And that’s despite the fact that her economic program and policies would have actually been very good for these people. There was a study of campaign advertising in 2016 that showed Hillary outspent Trump significantly and that almost none of her advertising was about what she would actually do. Almost all of it was about how he was a bad dude. Voters were **fed up with stagnation** and with the Democrats and they **turned to someone who thought could blow up the system**. The way the Democrats and the left could **mitigate that problem** is to show these voters that they **take their problems seriously** and have their interests in mind, and could improve their lives. I **don’t think there is any way of doing that** without a **new model of economic growth**.

#### 3---Climate.

Fickling 20 (David, Bloomberg Opinion columnist covering commodities, as well as industrial and consumer companies, citing a report from the International Energy Agency, “Capitalism Caused Climate Change; It Must Also Be the Solution,” Bloomberg, 10/14/20, <https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2020-10-14/capitalism-caused-climate-change-it-must-also-be-the-solution>, ccm)

After that, though, things fall apart. Thanks to ongoing economic weakness, governments and businesses lose the capacity to carry out the spending needed to remake the world’s energy system. Investment in fossil fuels falls by 10% relative to expectations under current policies, but spending on renewables and nuclear drops by 5% as well, so that $2.2 trillion less is spent by 2030.

Rather than investing to replace our power plants and appliances with lower-carbon alternatives, we eke out their polluting lives a little bit longer. By 2030, annual emissions are about 29% higher than they would be under Sustainable Development.

This desktop model of how the world could develop reflects a profound truth. The atmosphere can accommodate about 500 billion metric tons more carbon dioxide to give an even chance of keeping warming below 1.5 degrees — but the world’s current industrial base is currently pumping out roughly 33 billion tons a year, and will continue to do so unless we can replace it.

Retrofitting the world’s energy systems is going to require vast sums of money. Renewable power alone will need an average $569 billion of investment every year over the coming decade under the IEA’s Sustainable Development Scenario. That’s almost twice the rate seen over the past five years, and not far behind what the entire oil and gas sector would spend under the same settings. If anything, the world needs a target that’s more ambitious still.

If we can get up to speed, that volume of spending will create its own momentum. One justified complaint of anti-capitalist climate activists is that our political systems frequently put their thumbs on the scale to favor powerful incumbent businesses, which at present are mostly the polluting ones. But a system where investment dollars are flowing away from fossil fuels and toward decarbonization is one where power, too, is shifting away from the carbon economy.

Even under the IEA’s less ambitious Stated Policies Scenario, the $15.14 trillion that gets spent globally on fossil fuel generation and production by 2040 is smaller than the $15.97 trillion spent on renewables and nuclear — and doesn’t include the amounts that go to energy efficiency and grid networks.

Under the Sustainable Development Scenario, which has historically often been a better guide to the path of the energy transition, low-carbon power ends up with $2.70 of spending for every $1 going to fossil fuel extraction and generation. That’s a world in which renewables will increasingly set the rules of the game, encouraging governments to remove the remaining subsidies that support oil, gas and coal.

Since the industrial revolution, the fossil-fueled engine of capitalist growth has conspired to put the world in its current climate crisis. Harnessing that power to drive the carbon transition is now our best hope of turning that disaster around.