## 1AC—Plan

#### Plan: The United States Federal Government should ban the appropriation of outer space by private entities.

### Advantage – US/Russia Relations

#### NASA has a good scientific relationship with Russia now despite rapidly tanking political relations—but the rise of China’s space program pushes us to the brink of a new space race.

Gadd 9/30—Adam Gadd; “The US Cooperates With Russia in Space. Why Not China?”; September 30 2021; The Diplomat; <https://thediplomat.com/2021/09/the-us-cooperates-with-russia-in-space-why-not-china/>; (AG DebateDrills)

It seems that the narrative of China’s rise has not stayed on Earth. Hence, U.S. cooperation with China is arguably held back by fears that China’s space advances will seriously threaten U.S. leadership and prestige in space. While the U.S. role as the senior partner in its cooperation with Russia has never been in doubt, a Chinese space program growing stronger by the day could leave the United States the junior partner in the event of future Sino-U.S. cooperation. These fears, however, are more the product of hyperbole than of fact. While NASA currently plans for the United States to return to the moon in the coming years, China is still in the process of constructing its space station and only plans to undertake human missions to the moon in the 2030s, in a program that also includes Russia. The exact time frame for this program and what it entails, however, are unclear, as the Russian version of the agreement is more ambitious than the Chinese. The Chinese-Russian lunar program does illustrate, however, that the picture of a rapidly advancing Chinese space program poised to surpass that of the United States is dubious at best. Russia-U.S. cooperation in space shows that the China exclusion policy is motivated less by the security risks of opening up to China, and more by the U.S. fear of losing its leadership position. It also illustrates the loss of potential that the policy has meant for both sides. By drawing on each other’s strengths, the U.S. and Russian space programs have both benefited. While the United States has consistently taken the lead on both spending and scientific research in space, its cooperation with Russia has been a significant enabling factor. It was only through this partnership that the United States could continue its manned spaceflight program after it decommissioned its Space Shuttle in 2011. For Russia, the partnership might well have helped save a space industry faced with possible demise in the 1990s. More generally, the effects of international cooperation in space have not been confined to scientific research. Disaster management in particular has proved fruitful ground for international cooperation in space. Initiatives such as the International Charter: Space and Major Disasters showcase how space-based technology can have concrete effects on the ground across the world. Similarly, cooperation between other space agencies, such as the European Space Agency, and China has been successful in the field of earth observation. The lesson here, and from decades of Russo-U.S. cooperation, is that cooperation in specific fields can be conducted in spite of tense bilateral relations. The alternative to this can be seen in the Space Race that preceded the era of cooperation. The room for countries and organizations outside Russia and the United States to actively participate in, and reap the benefits of, space exploration and space-based technology simply did not exist in the confrontational Space Race between the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War. Bilateral competition for supremacy in space will only exclude possible partners and prevent the productive use of resources in these expensive endeavors. Instead of modeling the future on Cold War competition, recent decades have showcased more positive developments. They also point to the conclusion that competition with China in space will be detrimental not only for China and the United States, but also for the rest of the world.

#### The Space Act signaling American private appropriation of outer space is a core issue that tanks our relations—the plan creates a uniform understanding that resolves tensions.

Taichman 21 [Elya Taichman is currently obtaining his J.D. at Temple University Beasley School of Law where he is a Beasley Scholar, a Law and Public Policy Scholar, and a Staff Editor on the Temple Law Review. Elya Taichman is the former Legislative Director for Congresswoman Michelle Lujan Grisham (current Governor of New Mexico). Elya advised the Congresswoman on foreign policy, national security, space, and economic issues., 2021, The Artemis Accords: Employing Space Diplomacy to De-Escalate a National Security Threat and Promote Space Commercialization,https://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1131&context=nslb, 12-15-2021 amrita]

U.S. Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act of 2015 (“Space Act”): The Dawn of the Second Space Age Until recently, it did not matter that the OST was unclear, and the Moon Treaty failed to garner support. Space exploration remained the province of state actors like NASA because the sheer expense of rocketry and other technologies remained beyond the reach of private corporations and investors throughout the twentieth century.61 However, over the last two decades the industry has changed rapidly. In the United States alone, several of the most innovative companies have invested in space exploration technology.62 As the research accelerates, costs have decreased, and the potential for profits is tremendous – in 2018 the space economy was $360 billion.63 By 2040, its estimated worth is anywhere between $1.1 trillion and $1.7 trillion.64 However, investors demand certainty, and the uncertainty surrounding OST interpretation was reason to pause.65 After all, no investor or company wanted to pour millions, or even billions, into a company designed to mine liquid ice on the Moon only to discover that this violated international law and that the United States had decided to stop licensing such ventures. Just as President Eisenhower feared, the military-industrial complex, augmented by private industry, lobbied Congress heavily to reduce regulatory hurdles and legal uncertainty in space investment.66 In 2015, their efforts bore fruit when Congress passed the Space Act, which President Obama signed into law.67 Chapter 513 of Subtitle V – “Space Resource Commercial Exploration and Utilization” – was the shift that enabled the American private space industry to flourish. This affirmed that American citizens could own and sell any “space resources” that were obtained through “commercial recovery.”68 In one stroke, Congress guaranteed property rights to American citizens and companies on a “first come, first served basis.”69 Moreover, American courts would not permit foreign lawsuits accusing entrepreneurs and businesses of violating the OST.70 The law also required the executive branch to “discourage government barriers” to development and for regulation to “facilitate commercial utilization” in space.71 Finally, it required the President to promote the interest of the American space industry.72 Ever wary of the ambiguities of the OST, and likely out of concern that the Space Act might violate the treaty, the law included a disclaimer that it was the sense of Congress that nothing in the Space Act asserted American sovereignty over any celestial body.73 This disclaimer should be read as opinio juris of American interpretation of the OST. In 1967, the United States and the Soviet Union shared a concern that other nations would challenge their technological preeminence in space.74 In 2015, this proved no different, except, this time, the United States was alone in its preeminence. Russia, in fact, strongly objected and claimed that the Space Act violated international law.75 Russia submitted an objection to the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (“COPUOS”), claiming the Space Act demonstrated “tot al disrespect for international law order [sic].”76 Russia went on to declare that this law manifested a “doctrine of domination in outer space.”77 Nonetheless, a careful reading of Russia’s complaint to COPUOS elucidates that Russia never actually asserted that the United States violated the OST.78 To be sure, Russia came as close as possible to this, but never outright said it.79 Indeed, the Russians lag behind in investment in outer space and technology and fear American exploitation of space’s vast resources in space without their participation.80 American private investment has accelerated this gap with NASA paying companies like SpaceX $55 million per seat to ferry astronauts to the ISS instead paying the Russians more than $90 million to do the same.81 In fact, in its objection to the Space Act, Russia stated that the United States “could propose discussing the possibility to reach uniform understanding of the status of resources and set forth the structure of the doctrine that would include safety and security aspects.”82 It seems Russia is pining for its prior role of crafting space law with the United States. This also suggests that if Russia had the same capabilities as the United States, its policy would likely be comparable.83

#### Scenario 1 is the LIO replacement.

#### A private space race with Russia pushes them towards alliance with China and creates an Anti-American technocracy.

Taichman 2 [Elya Taichman is currently obtaining his J.D. at Temple University Beasley School of Law where he is a Beasley Scholar, a Law and Public Policy Scholar, and a Staff Editor on the Temple Law Review. Elya Taichman is the former Legislative Director for Congresswoman Michelle Lujan Grisham (current Governor of New Mexico). Elya advised the Congresswoman on foreign policy, national security, space, and economic issues., 2021, The Artemis Accords: Employing Space Diplomacy to De-Escalate a National Security Threat and Promote Space Commercialization,https://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1131&context=nslb, 12-15-2021 amrita]

The Artemis Accords are a culmination of American space policy to enable commercialization of outer space. However, they pose a variety of problems. To start, any future agreements under the accords may violate international law – both the OST and the VCLT. While the Trump Administration appears willing to ignore this issue, violating international law is a dangerous precedent and should be avoided.118 Further, the dual nature of all space technology means that any commercial activity in space that the Artemis Accords enable could readily be converted for belligerent purposes.119 This would both violate international law and threaten national security. Despite these inherent dangers, the Trump Administration has maintained a bellicose rhetoric on its space policy.120 Although American technology and investments surpass those of Russia and China, such rhetoric serves to inflame[s] already tense relations. Russia and China are each pursuing their own space programs which threaten national security interests, but the United States has engaged neither in Artemis Accords diplomacy.121 A. Violations of International Law? At best, future Artemis Accords agreements exist in a gray area of international law. After all, the Moon Treaty failed to update and clarify the gaps in the OST on space exploration and resource exploitation by non-state actors. The Space Act and the Artemis Accords together represent American state practice and opinio juris as to the meaning of the OST. At worst, the Trump Administration would be blatantly and knowingly violat[e]ing international law, in particular the ban on national appropriation. Certainly, the Artemis Accords signal a willingness to push international law to the limit, if not to step over the line. In addition to potentially violating the OST, the Artemis Accords may also violate the VCLT. Though the United States has not ratified the VCLT, the “treaty on treaties” is customary international law and thus binding on all states. Article 41 of the VCLT permits two or more parties to a treaty to make bilateral, inter-se agreements or to modify a treaty among themselves.122 Yet, if these side deals are “incompatible with the effective execution of the object and purpose of the treaty as a whole” then the VCLT forbids them.123 NASA made clear that bilateral Artemis Accords agreements with other nations will be “grounded in the Outer Space Treaty” and that resource utilization will be conducted under the “auspices of the Outer Space Treaty.”124 Therefore, the United States appears ready to create bilateral, inter-se agreements every time it signs an Artemis Accords agreement. Because Article II of the OST clearly bans national appropriation, licensing non-state actors to create mining colonies on the Moon in safety zones verges on appropriation, especially when coupled with Article VI’s responsibility clause based on national activity.125 Overall, the Administration advances on very uneven legal footing, which is further compounded by the fact that space technologies are inherently dual purpose. B. Dual Purpose Any technology – from rocketry, to satellites, to mining equipment – introduced into space is inherently dual purpose. That is, it may readily be converted to military uses. The OST makes clear that nuclear weapons are prohibited in space. It also completely demilitarizes the Moon, under Article IV.126 However, military personal may participate in scientific research or other peaceful purposes – i.e., commercial ones.127 Hence, from a national security standpoint it would be legal for other rival nations, namely Russia and China, to create lunar bases or asteroid mines. But should conflict arise, such technology and infrastructure could readily be turned hostile and harnessed against American infrastructure in space. This is troubling because for a country like China there is no obvious distinction between public and private industry.128 And from China’s perspective, NASA is still teaming up with SpaceX in public-private partnerships and the DoD has many of similar agreements as well. In fact, in its 2020 Defense Space Strategy, the DoD proclaimed its eagerness to “[l]everage commercial technological advancements and acquisition processes.”129 An incident with Russia highlights the dangers of dual-purpose space technologies. On November 26, 2019, Russia launched what appeared to be a single satellite.130 Eleven days later the single satellite “birthed” a second.131 In mid-January the pair floated near KH-11, a multi-billion- dollar U.S. military reconnaissance satellite. The United States complained to Moscow, which moved the satellites away from KH-11. However, on July 15, 2020, the “birthed” satellite launched a missile into outer space. This is the first time the United States has alleged a space-based anti-satellite missile test.132 Although Russia claimed that the satellites are peaceful, it proved that even a so-called peaceful satellite could be secretly armed with military capabilities. Ironically, in a speech that same day to his counterparts in Brazil, India, China, and South Africa, Dmitry Rogozin, head of Russia’s space program, called for a “space free of weapons of any type, to keep it fit for long-term and sustainable use as it is today.”133 It requires little imagination to envision a Chinese or Russian base on the Moon doubling as a commercial mining post and as a secret military garrison. After all, when the Soviets feared American ICBM superiority and a first-strike capability in the early 1960s they chose to place missiles in Cuba.134 Nowadays, a similar dynamic exists, with the US enjoying a comparable advantage. C. Bellicose American Rhetoric The Trump Administration has provided mixed signals to rivals about American intentions in outer space. In 2017, Vice President Mike Pence declared that “America must be as dominant in the heavens as it is on Earth.”135 Citing the fear that Sputnik instilled in Americans, Pence later warned that Russia and China were racing to pass the United States in space technology, especially with respect to the military.136 In its 2020 Defense Space Strategy, the DoD pronounced, “China and Russia present the greatest strategic threat due to their development, testing, and deployment of counterspace capabilities and their associated military doctrine for employment in conflict extending to space.”137 More modestly, however, Stephen Kitay, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Space Policy, made clear that the United States is still superior in space capabilities; however, the gap is rapidly diminishing.138 Still, this rhetoric is somewhat misleading. American public investment in space dwarfs Russian and Chinese investments combined: in 2018, the United States invested $41 billion whereas China invested $5.8 billion, and Russia invested $4.2 billion.139 Moreover, this spending does not account for private investment in space. Unfortunately, this author has been unable to procure aggregate data on total U.S. private investment. However, for reference, Jeff Bezos has claimed he invests $1 billion each year of Amazon stock to finance Blue Origins.140 Elon Musk spent $100 million to found SpaceX in 2002.141 In 2019, the company raised $1.33 billion in three rounds of funding.142 Additionally, SpaceX has estimated its broadband satellite project, Starlink, will cost at least $10 billion to build and deploy.143 Finally, Bryce Technology reported that start up space ventures raised $5.7 billion in funding in 2019.144 Whatever the total number is, it is quite large and likely in the tens of billions a year. Russia and China simply do not have the same level of private investment. This is not to say that the Administration is wrong for taking foreign threats in outer space seriously. It should, precisely because the Russians and Chinese take these threats seriously. The United States should not, however, start a space race when it is already light years ahead of its rivals, as this would repeat the mistake of the first space race – permitting private industry, which Eisenhower warned against, to dictate American policy and thereby create a technocracy.145 Naturally, this talk of competition begs the question, what do the Russians and Chinese actually want in outer space? D. Engagement with Russia and China? i. Russia Russia has strongly rejected the Artemis Accords as a violation of international law.146 After the United States excluded Russia from the Artemis Accords, Dmitry Rogozin, Chief of Roscosmos, fumed, “The principle of invasion is the same, whether it be the Moon or Iraq. The creation of a ‘coalition of the willing’ is initiated. Only Iraq or Afghanistan will come out of this.”147 More recently, he called the Artemis Accords a “political project,” and compared it to NATO.148 When asked if Russia would partner with NASA on Artemis, Rogozin answered, “Frankly speaking, we are not interested in participating in such a project.”149 Ominously, Rogozin signaled a Russian shift towards partnering with the Chinese, “We respect their results…[China] is definitely our partner.”150 In a sign of how quickly this partnership is forming, just a few weeks later, Rogozin announced that he and the Director of the China National Space Administration, Zhang Kejian, had agreed to “probably” build a lunar research base together.151 On March 9, 2021, Russia and China signed an agreement to build this base together.152 This partnership is dripping with irony. Recall that, in 2016, Russia issued a complaint about the Space Act before COPUOS.153 But that complaint walked a fine line and never directly claimed that American resource exploitation in space violated the OST.154 Indeed, the Russians appeared more interested in signaling to the United States their interest in “discussing the possibility to reach uniform understanding of the status of resources and set forth the structure of the doctrine that would include safety and security aspects.”155 As discussed, the Russians care less about complying with international law than being able to shape it to suit their own interests. Though they may lack the level of investment and advanced technologies of the United States, they appear willing to join the Chinese who have a long-term plan to achieve space supremacy. Of course, the creation of Russo-Chinese partnership and system in space to challenge the Artemis Accords would render Rogozin’s fear of NATO a self-fulfilling prophecy.

#### Stong Sino-Russian alliance sets the stage for the replacement of the ILO—that turns Riders.

Kevin 3-25 [Tony Kevin, Russia and China are sending Biden a message: don't judge us or try to change us. Those days are over, 3-25-2021,Conversation,https://theconversation.com/russia-and-china-are-sending-biden-a-message-dont-judge-us-or-try-to-change-us-those-days-are-over-157771, 12-15-2021 amrita]

Putin’s message to the new US president The tense test of strength began when Biden was asked about Putin in an interview with ABC News’ George Stephanopoulos and agreed he was “a killer” and didn’t have a soul. He also said Putin will “pay a price” for his actions. Putin then took the unusual step of going on the state broadcaster VGTRK with a prepared five-minute statement in response to Biden**. In an unusually pointed manner, Puti**n recalled the US history of genocide of its Indigenous people, the cruel experience of slavery, the continuing repression of Black Americans today and the unprovoked US nuclear bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the second world war. He **suggested states should not judge others by their own standards:** Whatever you say about others is what you are yourself. Some American journalists and observers have reacted to this as “trolling”. It was not. It was the preamble to Putin’s most important message in years to what he called the American “establishment, the ruling class”. He said the US leadership is determined to have relations with Russia, but only “on its own terms”. Although they think that we are the same as they are, we are different people. We have a different genetic, cultural and moral code. But we know how to defend our own interests. And we will work with them, but in those areas in which we ourselves are interested, and on those conditions that we consider beneficial for ourselves. And they will have to reckon with it. They will have to reckon with this, despite all attempts to stop our development. Despite the sanctions, insults, they will have to reckon with this. **This is new** for Putin. He has **for years made the point**, always politely, **that Western powers need to deal with Russia on a basis of correct diplomatic protocols and mutual respect** for national sovereignty, if they want to ease tensions. But never before has he been as blunt as this, saying in effect: do not dare try to judge us or punish us for not meeting what you say are universal standards, because we are different from you. Those days are now over. **China pushing back against the US**, too Putin’s forceful statement is remarkably similar to the equally firm public statements made by senior Chinese diplomats to US Secretary of State Antony Blinken in Alaska last week. Blinken opened the meeting by lambasting China’s increasing authoritarianism and aggressiveness at home and abroad - in Tibet, Xinjiang, Hong Kong and the South China Sea. He **claimed** such **conduct was threatening “the rules-based order that maintains global stability**”. Yang Jiechi, Chinese Communist Party foreign affairs chief, responded by denouncing American hypocrisy. He said The US does not have the qualification to say that it wants to speak to China from a position of strength. The US uses its military force and financial hegemony to carry out long-arm jurisdiction and suppress other countries. It abuses so-called notions of national security to obstruct normal trade exchanges, and to incite some countries to attack China. He said the US had no right to push its own version of democracy when it was dealing with so much discontent and human rights problems at home. **Russia and China drawing closer together** Putin’s statement was given added weight by two diplomatic actions: Russia’s recalling of its ambassador in the US, and Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov’s meeting in China with his counterpart, Wang Yi. Beijing and Moscow agreed at the summit to stand firm against Western sanctions **and boost ties between their countries to reduce** their **dependence on the US** dollar in international trade and settlements. Lavrov also said, We both believe the US has a destabilising role. It relies on Cold War military alliances and is trying to set up new alliances to undermine the world order. Though Biden’s undiplomatic comments about Putin may have been unscripted, the impact has nonetheless been profound. Together with the harsh tone of the US-China foreign ministers meeting in Alaska — also provoked by the US side — **it is** clear there has been **a major change** in the atmosphere of US-China-Russia relations. What will this mean in practice? Both Russia and China are signalling they will only deal with the West where and when it suits them. Sanctions no longer worry them. The two powers are also showing they are increasingly comfortable working together as close partners, if not yet military allies. They will step up their cooperation in areas where they have mutual interests and the development of alternatives to the Western-dominated trade and payments systems.**Countries** in Asia and further afield **are closely watching** the development of **this alternative international order**, led by Moscow and Beijing. And they **can also recognise** the **signs of increasing US econ**omic and political **decline**. It is a new kind of Cold War, but not one based on ideology like the first incarnation. It is **a war for international legitimacy**, a struggle for hearts and minds and money in the **very large part** of the world **not aligned to the US** or NATO. The US and its allies will continue to operate under their narrative, while Russia and China will push their competing narrative. This was made crystal clear over these past few dramatic days of major power diplomacy. **The global balance of power is shifting**, and for many nations, the smart money might be on Russia and China now.

#### Multipolarity causes extinction.

Rebecca Friedman Lissner & Mira Rapp-Hooper 18, \*Lissner: a Research Fellow at Perry World House, the University of Pennsylvania’s global policy research center, \*\*Rapp-Hooper: a Senior Fellow at the Paul Tsai China Center and Senior Research Scholar at Yale Law School, “The Liberal Order Is More Than a Myth,” Foreign Affairs, July 31, 2018, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/world/2018-07-31/liberal-order-more-myth>

Eighteen months into U.S. President Donald Trump’s administration, domestic and foreign policy analysts alike are in the midst of a bitter awakening: U.S. policy, whether social, economic, or international, may never be the same again. Among the most common refrains from the foreign policy cognoscenti is the warning that Trump has imperiled the liberal international order—the norms, rules, laws, and institutions that have supported U.S. power since 1945. The president’s vengeful unilateralism, we are told, is dismantling a cherished system that has brought peace and stability to the world. In his recent Foreign Affairs article (“The Myth of the Liberal Order,” July/August 2018), Graham Allison provides a useful corrective to this baleful narrative, joining a chorus of contrarian foreign policy thinkers who decry the “myth of the liberal order.” Defenders of the myth, Allison argues, mistakenly credit the liberal order with 70 years of great power peace and misattribute the motivations behind U.S. overseas engagement. The post–World War II system led by the United States was never fully liberal, international, rules based, or orderly. At its core, it was driven by a struggle for global dominance between the United States and the Soviet Union. It was the balance of power between these two nuclear behemoths—and U.S. hegemony in more recent decades—that prevented another world war. For Allison, Trump’s disregard for liberal values may be worrisome, but rather than dreaming of a bygone era of unrivaled liberal hegemony, the United States should focus on rebuilding a robust democracy at home. Although a welcome antidote to the many reverent paeans to the liberal international order and attendant calls for its pristine preservation, Allison’s critique does not fully rhyme with his conclusions. Liberal order may not have been the sole determinant of 70 years of geopolitics, but that does not warrant a wholesale dismissal of the concept as a matter of statecraft or scholarship. And although a restoration of the same liberal system propped up by an indispensable United States is a fantasy, U.S. grand strategy should not discard altogether the notion of international order, even if the world becomes more multipolar and the United States focuses on the defense of democracy at home. MORE THAN A MYTH Critics of the liberal international order are right to draw attention to this often praised but rarely scrutinized concept. Far from a single crystalline structure with ubiquitous reach, the post–World War II order emerged and evolved gradually over the course of the twentieth century. It was initially created as a largely Western project designed for postwar rehabilitation and flourished during the Cold War. It diffused into Asia, Africa, and Latin America following decolonization, cracked and listed during the economic stagnation of the 1970s, and claimed universalism only with its competitors’ demise in the 1990s. To obscure this often disjointed, 70-plus-year evolution by appealing to some monolithic ideal does little justice to the liberal order’s complex history. Yet this labyrinthine trajectory does not obviate the notion of liberal order writ large, whether as an analytic construct or as a grand strategic goal. Granted, the phrase “liberal international order” has always been shorthand for U.S. global leadership—a structure sustained by American power in service of largely Western preferences. As the most powerful state in the system, the United States has disproportionately shaped its rules while reserving the right to periodically flout them. But acknowledging this relationship does not imply that the international liberal system order is purely a reflection of raw power. Even as the U.S.-Soviet Cold War rivalry emerged from bipolarity, the United States’ embrace of liberal internationalism guided its approach to international institutions and structured cooperation within the Western bloc. Unrivaled in the unipolar moment, U.S. grand strategy has been more remarkable for its restraint than its unfettered exercise of coercive power, despite a slew of regrettable excesses. Indeed, the concept of international order is relevant even in a hard power world precisely because it is not reducible to unilateral U.S. interests or to the global distribution of military and economic might. Rather, it emerged and endured through many states’ collective efforts. Where rules are institutionalized in organizations or legal regimes, they reflect painstaking diplomatic efforts to identify convergent interests and codify standards of state behavior. Where rules develop organically, in norms or customary law, they reflect decades of strategic interaction, during which repeated patterns of conflict and cooperation have generated predictability. By design, the U.S.-led liberal system incorporated such attributes. As a result, it offered both stability and considerable political, economic, and security gains to other states. When Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, German Chancellor Angela Merkel, Japanese Premier Shinzo Abe, and other U.S. allies invoke the beleaguered liberal order today, it is because they want to preserve those advantages. Far from dismissing the order as a mere euphemism for U.S. hegemony, they see their own national interests at stake in it. They also recognize that those interests cannot be protected without a powerful—and committed—United States. Even China, the order’s most formidable challenger-in-waiting, finds value in selectively embracing its tenets. THE COMING ENTROPY? The liberal international order is a useful frame for understanding the contours and endurance of U.S. grand strategy over the past 70 years, but it will not persist immutably for another seven decades. Never having achieved the universal acceptance to which post–Cold War triumphalists aspired, the present order is threatened by adverse shifts in the balance of power: China is revisionist in its ascent, and Russia is revanchist in its decline. Global influence is shifting eastward, pushing the United States and Europe into second place. The formal and informal arrangements that govern interstate interaction—which is to say, the international order—must adapt to this new reality if it is to avoid abject decay. But changing power balances alone do not make the order’s demise a foregone conclusion. For the next several decades, the United States will still remain the world’s most powerful state in military, economic, and diplomatic terms. No other country will have the same capacity to shape international order, even as Washington will wield its authority on fundamentally different terms. Put differently, the twilight of the unipolar moment is not the same as the end of U.S. global leadership or preeminence. Given this, how the United States adapts its grand strategy to domestic turmoil and considerable flux abroad will matter a great deal for the future of global order. Other states, chief among them China, will cement their own power in regional and global rules and institutions. This trend is well under way, and some aspects of it are nonthreatening, such as when Beijing requests a greater voting share at the International Monetary Fund. Elsewhere, however, Beijing is fashioning new institutions governed by rules that are decidedly illiberal, as with its Belt and Road Initiative. It would be a grave mistake for the United States to abandon the idea of international order as an empty grand strategic ambition and settle for regional influence over its own neighborhood. Spheres of influence are a form of balance-of-power order but have historically been a fundamentally less stable one and would certainly degrade U.S. security and prosperity. Instead of letting rivals carve out spheres of influence, the United States needs a novel grand strategic vision that rejects both radical retreat and creativity-numbing nostalgia. Any new approach must account for rapidly shifting power relations and technological change. It should also reflect more critically on the universalist ambitions of post–Cold War U.S. grand strategy and may require a greater tolerance for regime diversity than liberal triumphalists could have possibly imagined at the apex of U.S. power. For the United States to lead abroad, it must also confront the dysfunction that is hollowing out support for internationalism at home. As we have argued, and as Allison rightly points out, Trump may be more avatar than architect of the United States’ domestic unraveling. To be sure, Trump’s transactional and visceral approach to foreign policy is itself wreaking havoc on the predictability underlying the postwar order and will require global recompense of epochal proportions from any new leader. But we cannot assess the extent or endurance of his destructiveness just 18 months into his term. What we do know is that Trump’s victory was not an isolated political shock—a fact that many analysts miss by fixating on Trump’s heterodox administration and anticipating his eventual exit. In some ways, Trump’s policies are merely a modern projection of old impulses, most notably the deep unilateralism of the Jacksonian school of foreign policy. Trump’s contemporary version, however, rests on populist and nativist impulses activated in part by socioeconomic dislocation that will only intensify. Automation and the changing nature of work, inequality, political and media polarization, and demographic changes are likely to intersect with an increasingly turbulent international environment, making it more difficult still to articulate a coherent foreign policy built around age-old liberal values and institutions. These domestic undercurrents must be faced squarely—not only for the sake of restoring a sustainable U.S. social compact but in order to build a consensus on the United States’ role in the world. NEW ORDER Less than halfway through Trump’s first term, the U.S. foreign policy establishment, cut off from the levers of power, watches in a state of shock as the country stumbles from one international indignity to another. But the domestic and international forces that carried Trump to power will accelerate with his presidency and outlast his tenure. The United States, in other words, is only just commencing a strategic reckoning, the likes of which it has not undertaken since the years immediately following World War II. In the new strategic environment, the old liberal order built on unrivaled U.S. power will no doubt prove obsolete and untenable. But that should not imply giving up on the system altogether—particularly since it has advanced U.S. interests at a lower cost than any known alternative. As in previous eras, the United States’ global power position will condition, but not predetermine, Washington’s strategic choices. In this process of reorientation, domestic renewal and international restoration are not, as Allison suggests, mutually exclusive. In fact, they are complements, and any serious reevaluation of U.S. strategy must address them simultaneously. The liberal international order may be less foundational than often argued, but it serves more than just narrative purposes. In its hour of duress, a new vision for U.S. strategy must assess threats and advantages at home and abroad and adapt the institutions that have been the foundation of American power. If successful, the United States will navigate an epoch of disruptive change, both domestic and international, in a manner that is peaceful and redounds to U.S. interests. It is a formidable task to be sure, but this moment demands no less.

#### Scenario 2 is space wars

#### American private appropriation pushes Russia to asteroid mine as well - that increases the likelihood for tensions to escalate.

Mallick and Rajagopalan 19 [Senjuti Mallick and Rajeswari Pillai Rajagopalan, If space is ‘the province of mankind’, who owns its resources?, 1-24-2019,ORF,https://www.orfonline.org/research/if-space-is-the-province-of-mankind-who-owns-its-resources-47561/, 12-16-2021 amrita]

Meanwhile, **a few other countries**—**which have been critical of the US and** Luxembourg, **at the forefront of** the **space mining** efforts—**have** also **decided to join** the field. **The increasingly competitive and contested nature** of outer space activities is spurring major spacefaring nations to **push the boundaries in** their **space exploration**. **Asteroid mining** could possibly become the next big thing and **is** already **seeing a race** among the space powers. The US and Luxembourg are at the forefront in space resource extraction in terms of the policy frameworks and funding.[xxxvi] **Even as the US has clarified that the** US Space **Act** 2015 **is** being **misunderstood** and that there is no change in the US policy towards national appropriation of space, **the reality** is that it has already **spurred a** major **debate**.[xxxvii] China and Russia are among those countries that are following on the path of the US and Luxembourg in undertaking mining missions in space. According to media reports, Ye Peijian, chief commander and designer of China’s lunar exploration programme has stated that China would send the first batch of asteroid exploration spacecraft around 2020.[xxxviii] Speaking to China’s Ministry of Science and Technology-run newspaper, Science and Technology Daily, Ye said that these asteroids have a high concentration of precious metals, which could rationalise the huge cost and risks involved in these activities as their economic value could run into the trillions of US dollars. Therefore, extraction, mining and transporting them back to Earth through robotic equipment will be a significant activity. Chinese scientists are working on missions to “bring back a whole asteroid weighing several hundred tonnes, which could turn asteroids with a potential threat to Earth into usable resources.”[xxxix] Ye was also quoted as saying that China has plans of “using an asteroid as the base for a permanent space station.”[xl] Helium mining on the moon is also part of China’s goals.[xli] **Russia,** for its part, **is** also **responding to the space-mining developments** of the last decade. For one, it plans to have a permanent lunar base somewhere between 2015 and 2020 for possible extraction of Helium.[xlii] **Even as** Russia’s **official position** on asteroid mining **is that it is forbidden** under the 1967 OST—which states that space is the “province of mankind”—the Russian **industry players** are of the view that they **must follow the** lead taken by the **US** and Luxembourg.[xliii] In early 2018, the director of the Scientific-Educational Center for Innovative Mining Technologies of the Moscow-based National University of Science and Technology MISIS (NUST MISIS), Pavel Ananyev, spoke about the Russian ambitions and proposed activities including space drilling rigs, water extraction on the Moon and 3D printers at space stations.[xliv] **Russia’s private space companies** including Dauria Aerospace, one of the first Russian private space companies, also **hold the opinion that they must go forward** in the same direction and call for a larger space to private sector to engage in extracting space resources.[xlv] **Moscow may not have** yet **actively pursued space mining** and resource extraction, **but it is likely to pick up pace** in the coming years alongside global efforts. Moscow clearly has a capacity gap in terms of funding because its earlier plans to have a permanent base in the Moon by 2015 is yet to happen.

#### Asteroid mining furthers tensions between the US, China and Russia and escalates to space war

Jamasmie 21 Cecilia Jamasmie [Cecilia has covered mining for more than a decade. She is particularly interested in Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), Diamonds and Latin America. Cecilia has been interviewed by BBC News and CBC among others and has been a guest speaker at mining conventions, including MINExpo 2016 and the World’s Copper Conference 2018. She is also member of the expert panel on Social License to Operate (SLO) at the European project MIREU (Mining and Metallurgic Regions EU). She holds a Master of Journalism from the University of British Columbia, and is based in Nova Scotia.], 2-2-2021, "Experts warn of brewing space mining war among US, China and Russia," MINING, <https://www.mining.com/experts-warn-of-brewing-space-mining-war-among-us-china-and-russia/> DD AG

A brewing war to set a mining base in space is likely to see China and Russia joining forces to keep the US increasing attempts to dominate extra-terrestrial commerce at bay**, experts warn.**

**The** Trump Administration took an active interest in space**,** announcing that America would return astronauts to the moon by 2024 andcreating the Space Force as the newest branch of the US military.It also proposed global legal framework for mining on the moon, called the Artemis Accords, encouraging citizens to mine the Earth’s natural satellite and other celestial bodies with commercial purposes. The directive classified outer space as a “legally and physically unique domain of human activity” instead of a “global commons,” paving the way for mining the moon without any sort of international treaty. Spearheaded by the US National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the Artemis Accords were signed in October by Australia, Canada, England, Japan, Luxembourg, Italy and the United Emirates “Unfortunately, the Trump Administration exacerbated a national security threat and risked the economic opportunity it hoped to secure in outer space by failing to engage Russia or China as potential partners,” says Elya Taichman, former legislative director for then-Republican Michelle Lujan Grisham. “Instead, the Artemis Accords have driven China and Russia toward increased cooperation in space out of fear and necessity,” he writes.Russia’s space agency Roscosmos was the first to speak up, likening the policy to colonialism. “There have already been examples in history when one country decided to start seizing territories in its interest — everyone remembers what came of it,” Roscosmos’ deputy general director for international cooperation, Sergey Saveliev, said at the time.China, which made history in 2019 by becoming the first country to land a probe on the far side of the Moon, chose a different approach. Since the Artemis Accords were first announced, Beijing has approached Russia to jointly build a lunar research base. President Xi Jinping has also he made sure China planted its flag on the Moon, which happened in December 2020, more than 50 years after the US reached the lunar surface.

#### Space wars go nuclear

Grego 18 – Laura, Senior Scientist in the Global Security Program at the Union of Concerned Scientists, Postdoctoral Researcher at the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, PhD in Experimental Physics at the California Institute of Technology, Space and Crisis Stability, Union of Concerned Scientists, 3-19-18, <https://www.law.upenn.edu/live/files/7804-grego-space-and-crisis-stabilitypdf>

Why space is a particular problem for crisis stability For a number of reasons, space poses particular challenges in preventing a crisis from starting or from being managed well. Some of these are to do with the physical nature of space, such as the short timelines and difficulty of attribution inherent in space operations. Some are due to the way space is used, such as the entanglement of strategic and tactical missions and the prevalence of dual-use technologies. Some are due to the history of space, such the absence of a shared understanding of appropriate behaviors and consequences, and a dearth of stabilizing personal and institutional relationships. While some of these have terrestrial equivalents, taken together, they present a special challenge. The vulnerability of satellites and first strike incentives Satellites are inherently fragile and difficult to protect; in the language of strategic planners, space is an “offense-dominant” regime. This can lead to a number of pressures to strike first that don‘t exist for other, better-protected domains. Satellites travel on predictable orbits, and many pass repeatedly over all of the earth‘s nations. Low-earth orbiting satellites are reachable by missiles much less capable than those needed to launch satellites into orbit, as well as by directed energy which can interfere with sensors or with communications channels. Because launch mass is at a premium, satellite armor is impractical. Maneuvers on orbit need costly amounts of fuel, which has to be brought along on launch, limiting satellites‘ ability to move away from threats. And so, these very valuable satellites are also inherently vulnerable and may present as attractive targets. Thus, an actor with substantial dependence on space has an incentive to strike first if hostilities look probable, to ensure these valuable assets are not lost. Even if both (or all) sides in a conflict prefer not to engage in war, this weakness may provide an incentive to approach it closely anyway. A RAND Corporation monograph commissioned by the Air Force15 described the issue this way: First-strike stability is a concept that Glenn Kent and David Thaler developed in 1989 to examine the structural dynamics of mutual deterrence between two or more nuclear states.16 It is similar to crisis stability, which Charles Glaser described as ―a measure of the countries‘ incentives not to preempt in a crisis, that is, not to attack first in order to beat the attack of the enemy,‖17 except that it does not delve into the psychological factors present in specific crises. Rather, first strike stability focuses on each side‘s force posture and the balance of capabilities and vulnerabilities that could make a crisis unstable should a confrontation occur. For example, in the case of the United States, the fact that conventional weapons are so heavily dependent on vulnerable satellites may create incentives for the US to strike first terrestrially in the lead up to a confrontation, before its space-derived advantages are eroded by anti-satellite attacks.18 Indeed, any actor for which satellites or space-based weapons are an important part of its military posture, whether for support missions or on-orbit weapons, will feel “use it or lose it” pressure because of the inherent vulnerability of satellites. Short timelines and difficulty of attribution The compressed timelines characteristic of crises combine with these “use it or lose it” pressures to shrink timelines. This dynamic couples dangerously with the inherent difficulty of determining the causes of satellite degradation, whether malicious or from natural causes, in a timely way. Space is a difficult environment in which to operate. Satellites orbit amidst increasing amounts of debris. A collision with a debris object the size of a marble could be catastrophic for a satellite, but objects of that size cannot be reliably tracked. So a failure due to a collision with a small piece of untracked debris may be left open to other interpretations. Satellite electronics are also subject to high levels of damaging radiation. Because of their remoteness, satellites as a rule cannot be repaired or maintained. While on-board diagnostics and space surveillance can help the user understand what went wrong, it is difficult to have a complete picture on short timescales. Satellite failure on-orbit is a regular occurrence19 (indeed, many satellites are kept in service long past their intended lifetimes). In the past, when fewer actors had access to satellite-disrupting technologies, satellite failures were usually ascribed to “natural” causes. But increasingly, even during times of peace operators may assume malicious intent. More to the point, in a crisis when the costs of inaction may be perceived to be costly, there is an incentive to choose the worst-case interpretation of events even if the information is incomplete or inconclusive. Entanglement of strategic and tactical missions During the Cold War, nuclear and conventional arms were well separated, and escalation pathways were relatively clear. While space-based assets performed critical strategic missions, including early warning of ballistic missile launch and secure communications in a crisis, there was a relatively clear sense that these targets were off limits, as attacks could undermine nuclear deterrence. In the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, the US and Soviet Union pledged not to interfere with each other‘s ―national technical means‖ of verifying compliance with the agreement, yet another recognition that attacking strategically important satellites could be destabilizing.20 There was also restraint in building the hardware that could hold these assets at risk. However, where the lines between strategic satellite missions and other missions are blurred, these norms can be weakened. For example, the satellites that provide early warning of ballistic missile launch are associated with nuclear deterrent posture, but also are critical sensors for missile defenses. Strategic surveillance and missile warning satellites also support efforts to locate and destroy mobile conventional missile launchers. Interfering with an early warning sensor satellite might be intended to dissuade an adversary from using nuclear weapons first by degrading their missile defenses and thus hindering their first-strike posture. However, for a state that uses early warning satellites to enable a “hair trigger” or launch-on-attack posture, the interference with such a satellite might instead be interpreted as a precursor to a nuclear attack. It may accelerate the use of nuclear weapons rather than inhibit it. Misperception and dual-use technologies Some space technologies and activities can be used both for relatively benign purposes but also for hostile ones. It may be difficult for an actor to understand the intent behind the development, testing, use, and stockpiling of these technologies, and see threats where there are none. (Or miss a threat until it is too late.) This may start a cycle of action and reaction based on misperception. For example, relatively low-mass satellites can now maneuver autonomously and closely approach other satellites without their cooperation; this may be for peaceful purposes such as satellite maintenance or the building of complex space structures, or for more controversial reasons such as intelligence-gathering or anti-satellite attacks. Ground-based lasers can be used to dazzle the sensors of an adversary‘s remote sensing satellites, and with sufficient power, they may damage those sensors. The power needed to dazzle a satellite is low, achievable with commercially available lasers coupled to a mirror which can track the satellite. Laser ranging networks use low-powered lasers to track satellites and to monitor precisely the Earth‘s shape and gravitational field, and use similar technologies. 21 Higher-powered lasers coupled with satellite-tracking optics have fewer legitimate uses. Because midcourse missile defense systems are intended to destroy long-range ballistic missile warheads, which travel at speeds and altitudes comparable to those of satellites, such defense systems also have inherent ASAT capabilities. In fact, while the technologies being developed for long-range missile defenses might not prove very effective against ballistic missiles—for example, because of the countermeasure problems associated with midcourse missile defense— they could be far more effective against satellites. This capacity is not just theoretical. In 2007, China demonstrated a direct-ascent anti-satellite capability which could be used both in an ASAT and missile defense role, and in 2009, the United States used a ship-based missile defense interceptor to destroy a satellite, as well. US plans indicated a projected inventory of missile defense interceptors with capability to reach all low earth orbiting satellites in the dozens in the 2020s, and in the hundreds by 2030.22 Discrimination The consequences of interfering with a satellite may be vastly different depending on who is affected and how, and whether the satellite represents a legitimate military objective. However, it will not always be clear who the owners and operators of a satellite are, and users of a satellite‘s services may be numerous and not public. Registration of satellites is incomplete23 and current ownership is not necessarily updated in a readily available repository. The identification of a satellite as military or civilian may be deliberately obscured. Or its value as a military asset may change over time; for example, the share of capacity of a commercial satellite used by military customers may wax and wane. A potential adversary‘s satellite may have different or additional missions that are more vital to that adversary than an outsider may perceive. An ASAT attack that creates persistent debris could result in significant collateral damage to a wide range of other actors; unlike terrestrial attacks, these consequences are not limited geographically, and could harm other users unpredictably. In 2015, the Pentagon‘s annual wargame, or simulated conflict, involving space assets focused on a future regional conflict. The official report out24 warned that it was hard to keep the conflict contained geographically when using anti-satellite weapons: As the wargame unfolded, a regional crisis quickly escalated, partly because of the interconnectedness of a multi-domain fight involving a capable adversary. The wargame participants emphasized the challenges in containing horizontal escalation once space control capabilities are employed to achieve limited national objectives. Lack of shared understanding of consequences/proportionality States have fairly similar understandings of the implications of military actions on the ground, in the air, and at sea, built over decades of experience. The United States and the Soviet Union/Russia have built some shared understanding of each other‘s strategic thinking on nuclear weapons, though this is less true for other states with nuclear weapons. But in the context of nuclear weapons, there is an arguable understanding about the crisis escalation based on the type of weapon (strategic or tactical) and the target (counterforce—against other nuclear targets, or countervalue—against civilian targets). Because of a lack of experience in hostilities that target space-based capabilities, it is not entirely clear what the proper response to a space activity is and where the escalation thresholds or “red lines” lie. Exacerbating this is the asymmetry in space investments; not all actors will assign the same value to a given target or same escalatory nature to different weapons.

#### Reverse causal—plan institutionalizes policies against traditional strengthening of alliances which allows for tensions to defuse while preserving unilateralism.

Crawford 21-- Crawford, Timothy W. professor of political science, boston college; "How to Distance Russia from China." The Washington Quarterly 44.3 (2021): 175-194. (AG DebateDrills)

But the last five years have proven that the most important cause of Russia’s and China’s moves toward military alignment is the spread of the US alliance system around their borders, especially Russia’s. (This is not the same thing as saying that US preponderance and pursuit of primacy drives them together, because a large and ever-growing alliance system is not necessary for the United States to preserve its relative power position and could, on net, weaken it.) The alliance system’s role as a general source of their convergence is easy to discern: the network of US military ties expanded in a big way after the Cold War, well before Russia and China began serious moves toward alliance, and it continues to sweep forward in US efforts to groom new allies and strategic partners around Eurasia. Given this expansion, it would be strange if Russia and China did not increasingly align. Eventually, the basic dynamic of an alliance “spiral” goes to work, with one alliance’s growth feeding fears that prompt another’s.[9](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0163660X.2021.1970903?casa_token=ujiE1wzexN4AAAAA:-lrqqcqr1jVqUz_4q9uc4ulCMHvQuV1qZ9ooPTvm-7JsXMWZcdEq0pSPFlYMHCIRStlbbuXTuSDN)9 Glenn H. Snyder, “The Security Dilemma in Alliance Politics,” World Politics 36, no. 4 (July 1984), 462, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2010183>.View all notes The Trump administration’s distinctive approach helped get a firmer grasp on the cause of alignment But it is possible to get a firmer grasp on the matter now, thanks to the Trump administration’s distinctive approach to competing with Russia and China. When Trump took office in 2017, the White House dialed down ideological and institutional competition. He praised the governing prowess of Vladimir Putin and Xi Jinping, winked at their success in entrenching personal rule, and routinely flattered other authoritarian “strongmen.”[10](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0163660X.2021.1970903?casa_token=ujiE1wzexN4AAAAA:-lrqqcqr1jVqUz_4q9uc4ulCMHvQuV1qZ9ooPTvm-7JsXMWZcdEq0pSPFlYMHCIRStlbbuXTuSDN)10 David Shepardson, “Trump Praises Chinese President Extending Tenure for Life,” Reuters, March 3, 2018, <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-trump-china/trump-praises-chinese-president-extending-tenure-for-life-idUSKCN1GG015>; Domenico Montanaro, “6 Strongmen Trump Has Praised,” NPR, May 2, 2017, <https://www.npr.org/2017/05/02/526520042/6-strongmen-trumps-praised-and-the-conflicts-it-presents>.View all notes He ignored the human rights agenda. It is hard to imagine a more decisive reversal of the “color revolution” cheerleading of previous administrations. Trump also often disparaged the competency and reliability of allied liberal democratic governments while cultivating deeper strategic ties with authoritarian regimes. At the level of the liberal rules-based order, the Trump administration, with its “America First” formula, targeted multilateral enterprises—like the Trans Pacific Partnership, the WTO, the Paris Accords, and the JCPOA—that expressed US leadership in global trade, climate, and non-proliferation agendas.[11](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0163660X.2021.1970903?casa_token=ujiE1wzexN4AAAAA:-lrqqcqr1jVqUz_4q9uc4ulCMHvQuV1qZ9ooPTvm-7JsXMWZcdEq0pSPFlYMHCIRStlbbuXTuSDN)11 Ivo Daalder and James Lindsay, Empty Throne: America’s Abdication of Global Leadership (Public Affairs, 2018).View all notes It largely neglected the United Nations, where Russia and China—with permanently institutionalized peer status at the apex of the organization—gained practical influence as a result. In sum, many of the conditions thought to drive Russia and China convergence were sharply weakened by the White House in those years. But with military alignments, it was rather different. There, the Trump administration continued military counters to Russian and Chinese activism. The president’s rhetorical slams on NATO free-riders notwithstanding, Washington bolstered the alliance—especially the eastern flank—in significant ways. It turned the 2014 European Reassurance Initiative into the European Deterrence Initiative (EDI) to accentuate its anti-Russia focus and multiplied the DoD budget for EDI activities.[12](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0163660X.2021.1970903?casa_token=ujiE1wzexN4AAAAA:-lrqqcqr1jVqUz_4q9uc4ulCMHvQuV1qZ9ooPTvm-7JsXMWZcdEq0pSPFlYMHCIRStlbbuXTuSDN)12 Congressional Research Service, “The European Deterrence Initiative: A Budgetary Overview,” updated June 16, 2020, <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IF/IF10946/5>View all notes It pressured NATO allies into higher levels of defense spending and approved NATO membership for Montenegro and North Macedonia. It ratcheted up US troop rotations in Poland, the Baltics, and Romania; programs to prepare longer-term basing arrangements in such countries; and naval activities in the Black Sea region. It adopted a more confrontational approach to security assistance for Ukraine and Georgia. In Asia, meanwhile, it revived efforts to consolidate an anti-China front with Japan, Australia, and India, via the “Quad” (Quadrilateral Security Dialogue). It launched the 2019 “Indo-Pacific Strategy” to restore US primacy in the region by building up its own forces and investing in old allies and new strategic partners to lean against China’s growing power and influence. It forged new agreements to deepen strategic partnership with India, courted Vietnam, boosted arms sales to Taiwan, and encouraged important increases in Japanese defense spending. And to complete the picture, the Trump administration—along with allied governments—sought to promote stronger strategic linkages between the NATO and Indo-Pacific alignment networks.[13](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0163660X.2021.1970903?casa_token=ujiE1wzexN4AAAAA:-lrqqcqr1jVqUz_4q9uc4ulCMHvQuV1qZ9ooPTvm-7JsXMWZcdEq0pSPFlYMHCIRStlbbuXTuSDN)13 Shannon Tiezzi, “NATO Huddles with Asia-Pacific Democracies to Talk China, The Diplomat, December 3, 2020, <https://thediplomat.com/2020/12/nato-huddles-with-asia-pacific-democracies-to-talk-china/>.View all notes All of this activity culminated in a rapid magnification of military alignments against Russia and China. It is not surprising, then, that some of Russia’s and China’s most eye-catching moves toward military partnership occurred in the last few years, including step-level changes in the pattern and qualities of military technology transfers, collaboration and planning, and joint training exercises and maneuvers.[14](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0163660X.2021.1970903?casa_token=ujiE1wzexN4AAAAA:-lrqqcqr1jVqUz_4q9uc4ulCMHvQuV1qZ9ooPTvm-7JsXMWZcdEq0pSPFlYMHCIRStlbbuXTuSDN)14 For details see Kofman, “The Emperor’s League”; Weitz, Expanding China-Russia Defense Partnership.View all notes The Office of the Director of National Intelligence’s annual worldwide threat assessments provide a useful barometer of the progression. The 2016, 2017, and 2018 reports discussed at length the challenges posed by Russia and China in their respective regions and at the level of global influence, but they did not raise alarms about their military cooperation.[15](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0163660X.2021.1970903?casa_token=ujiE1wzexN4AAAAA:-lrqqcqr1jVqUz_4q9uc4ulCMHvQuV1qZ9ooPTvm-7JsXMWZcdEq0pSPFlYMHCIRStlbbuXTuSDN)15 Worldwide Threat Assessment of the US Intelligence Community, before the Senate Armed Services Committee, 114th Cong. (February 9, 2016) (statement of James R. Clapper, Director of National Intelligence), <https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/SASC_Unclassified_2016_ATA_SFR_FINAL.pdf>; Worldwide Threat Assessment of the US Intelligence Community, before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, 115th Cong. (May 11, 2017) (statement of Daniel R. Coats, Director of National Intelligence), <https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/Newsroom/Testimonies/SSCI> Unclassified SFR - Final.pdf; Worldwide Threat Assessment of the US Intelligence Community, before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, 116th Cong. (February 13, 2018) (statement of Daniel R. Coats, Director of National Intelligence), <https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/Newsroom/Testimonies/2018-ATA---Unclassified-SSCI.pdf>.View all notes The 2019 report, however, placed special emphasis on this cooperation and warned that the two powers had become more aligned than they had been at any time since the early Cold War.[16](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0163660X.2021.1970903?casa_token=ujiE1wzexN4AAAAA:-lrqqcqr1jVqUz_4q9uc4ulCMHvQuV1qZ9ooPTvm-7JsXMWZcdEq0pSPFlYMHCIRStlbbuXTuSDN)16 Worldwide Threat Assessment of the US Intelligence Community, before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, 116th Cong. (January 29, 2019) (statement of Daniel R. Coats, Director of National Intelligence), <https://www.odni.gov/files/ODNI/documents/2019-ATA-SFR---SSCI.pdf>.View all notes The 2021 report treats deep military cooperation between the two as a given.[17](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0163660X.2021.1970903?casa_token=ujiE1wzexN4AAAAA:-lrqqcqr1jVqUz_4q9uc4ulCMHvQuV1qZ9ooPTvm-7JsXMWZcdEq0pSPFlYMHCIRStlbbuXTuSDN)17 Annual Threat Assessment of the U.S. Intelligence Community (Washington, DC: Office of the Director of National Intelligence, April 9, 2021), 6, 9. <https://www.dni.gov/files/ODNI/documents/assessments/ATA-2021-Unclassified-Report.pdf>.View all notes When other ideological and institutional factors thought to encourage Russia-China convergence were most muted, their military partnership advanced rather significantly. What were not muted at that time—indeed were intensified—were US efforts to strengthen and enlarge military alignments against them both. Many obscure, if not altogether ignore, this driver. The latter approach appeared in former Secretary of Defense James Mattis’ September 2018 assertion: “I see little in the long term that aligns Russia and China.”[18](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0163660X.2021.1970903?casa_token=ujiE1wzexN4AAAAA:-lrqqcqr1jVqUz_4q9uc4ulCMHvQuV1qZ9ooPTvm-7JsXMWZcdEq0pSPFlYMHCIRStlbbuXTuSDN)18 Quoted in Alexander Gabuev, “Why Russia and China are Strengthening Security Ties,” Foreign Affairs, September 24, 2018, 1, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2018-09-24/why-russia-and-china-are-strengthening-security-ties>.View all notes Ironically, he was then leading the long-term project of expanding US military presence in Eastern Europe and the rollout of a new Indo-Pacific strategy aimed at extending and deepening military partnerships in South and East Asia. A similar kind of omission appears in more serious analyses calling for the United States to ratchet up military and economic pressure on Russia that do not note that such actions will drive Russia deeper into alignment with China much less consider the costs for US grand strategy of such consequences.[19](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0163660X.2021.1970903?casa_token=ujiE1wzexN4AAAAA:-lrqqcqr1jVqUz_4q9uc4ulCMHvQuV1qZ9ooPTvm-7JsXMWZcdEq0pSPFlYMHCIRStlbbuXTuSDN)19 Michael McFaul, “How to Contain Putin’s Russia: A Strategy for Countering a Rising Revisionist Power,” Foreign Affairs, January 19, 2021, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/ukraine/2021-01-19/how-contain-putins-russia>; Daniel Fried and Alexander Vershbow, “How the West Should Deal with Russia,” Atlantic Council/Eurasia Center, November 23, 2020, <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/in-depth-research-reports/report/russia-in-the-world/>; Victoria Nuland, “Pinning Down Putin: How a Confident US Should Deal with Russia,” Foreign Affairs 99, no. 4 (July/August 2020), <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/russian-federation/2020-06-09/pinning-down-putin>.View all notes Even when one recognizes that US military policies stimulate Russia-China convergence, it is easy to minimize or obscure the implications of that mechanism.[20](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0163660X.2021.1970903?casa_token=ujiE1wzexN4AAAAA:-lrqqcqr1jVqUz_4q9uc4ulCMHvQuV1qZ9ooPTvm-7JsXMWZcdEq0pSPFlYMHCIRStlbbuXTuSDN)20 For example, see Stokes and Smith, “Facing Down the Sino-Russian Entente,” 140; Kendall-Taylor and Shullman, Navigating the Deepening Russia-China Partnership, 4.View all notes So it is with the claim that the two regimes’ authoritarianism and revisionist hostility to the US-led liberal order makes their alignment natural and inevitable.[21](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0163660X.2021.1970903?casa_token=ujiE1wzexN4AAAAA:-lrqqcqr1jVqUz_4q9uc4ulCMHvQuV1qZ9ooPTvm-7JsXMWZcdEq0pSPFlYMHCIRStlbbuXTuSDN)21 Haas, “Ideological Polarity and Balancing in Great Power Politics,” 750–52.View all notes Presuming these to be primary drivers of their convergence makes the growing US alliance system seem epiphenomenal and implies that their alignment trajectory cannot be changed by any restraint in America’s. National security strategist Matthew Kroenig goes further, suggesting that closer Russia-China military ties would not be so bad for American security because the authoritarian defect that unites them also makes them poor cooperators “unlikely to form an enduring and coordinated alliance that will pose a major threat to the United States.”[22](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0163660X.2021.1970903?casa_token=ujiE1wzexN4AAAAA:-lrqqcqr1jVqUz_4q9uc4ulCMHvQuV1qZ9ooPTvm-7JsXMWZcdEq0pSPFlYMHCIRStlbbuXTuSDN)22 Matthew Kroenig, “The United States Should Not Align with Russia Against China,” Foreign Policy, May 13, 2020, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/05/13/united-states-should-not-align-russia-against-china-geopolitical-rivalry-authoritarian-partnership/>. The implications of the mainspring are also obscured in the new mantra that the American alliance system is a powerful source of “leverage” against the Russia-China combination.23 There is an obvious truth in this, if we think of leverage like investors do, as borrowed power. But the image skips over the way that the creeping expansion of the alliance system—especially toward Russia’s border—can backfire and drain leverage by weakening the unity within NATO that helps deter Russia and by strengthening the Russia-China alignment that makes it harder to deter China.

### Framework

#### The standard is maximizing expected well-being.

#### 1. Death is bad and outweighs – agents can’t act if they fear for their bodily security which constrains every ethical theory

#### 2. Intuitions outweigh - since they’re the foundational basis for any argument and theories that contradict our intuitions are most likely false even if we can’t deductively determine why

#### 3. Extinction outweighs -

Pummer 15 [Theron, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford. “Moral Agreement on Saving the World” Practical Ethics, University of Oxford. May 18, 2015] AT

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But that is a huge mistake. Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; it is not the view that the latter don’t matter. Even John Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view. They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. We should also take into account moral uncertainty. What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)