### Neg

#### Interpretation and violation: appropriation requires the exclusive use of property with a sense of permanence - satellites don’t meet that criteria

Gorove 84 Stephen Gorove, Major Legal Issues Arising from the Use of the Geostationary Orbit, 5 MICH. J. INT'L L. 3 (1984). Available at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mjil/vol5/iss1/1> //RD Debatedrills

Crucial to a proper analysis of this issue is an understanding of the concept of "appropriation." The term "appropriation" in law is used most frequently to signify "the taking of property for one's own or exclusive use with a sense of permanence." 12 The word" thus indicates something more than just casual use. The question then becomes whether the continued exclusive occupation by a geostationary satellite of the same physical area is a violation of the ban on national appropriation. While a state may certainly exercise exclusive control over a traditional object, such as a ship, or an aircraft, or a part of airspace, it is not clear that a satellite in geostationary orbit would be able to maintain its exact position and occupy the same area over a period of time. 13 Even if a position could be accurately maintained, and thus possibly constitute an "appropriation" within the meaning of article II, the satellite would have to be kept in that orbit with a "sense of permanence" and not on a temporary basis. It has been suggested that the keeping of a solar power satellite in geostationary orbit for a period of thirty years would not constitute appropriation. 14 In point of fact, thirty years would probably satisfy the "sense of permanence" requirement, unless the geostationary orbit were considered a natural resource as characterized by the International Telecommunication Convention of 1973 (ITC) 15 and as claimed by the equatorial countries. Authority exists to support the view that the ban on national appropriation of outer space does not relate to resources. 16 In view of this and the additional fact that solar energy is an inexhaustible and unlimited resource, its utilization for transmission to earth by satellites does not appear to fall under the prohibition of article II of the 1967 Treaty.

#### Independently, satellite positioning is de facto appropriation, not appropriation proper – repeatedly upheld in application of space law

Matignon 19 [Louis de Gouyon Matignon, PhD in space law from Georgetown University, “ORBITAL SLOTS AND SPACE CONGESTION,” 06/03/19, *Space Legal Issues*, https://www.spacelegalissues.com/orbital-slots-and-space-congestion/, EA]

Near-Earth space is formed of different orbital layers. Terrestrial orbits are limited common resources and inherently repugnant to any appropriation: they are not property in the sense of law. Orbits and frequencies are res communis (a Latin term derived from Roman law that preceded today’s concepts of the commons and common heritage of mankind; it has relevance in international law and common law). It’s the first-come, first-served principle that applies to orbital positioning, which without any formal acquisition of sovereignty, records a promptness behaviour to which it grants an exclusive grabbing effect of the space concerned. Geostationary orbit is a limited but permanent resource: this de facto appropriation by the first-comers – the developed countries – of the orbit and the frequencies is protected by Space Law and the International Telecommunications Law. The challenge by developing countries of grabbing these resources is therefore unjustified on the basis of existing law. Denying new entrants geostationary-access or making access more difficult does not constitute appropriation; it simply results from the traditional system of distribution of access rights. The practice of developed States is based on free access and priority given to the first satellites placed in geostationary orbit.

#### Past international legal precedent is the only way to resolve legal ambiguities of space law and terminology – reject random lawyers writing their aff is topical

**Trapp 13** (TIMOTHY JUSTIN TRAPP, JD Candidate @ UIUC Law, ‘13, TAKING UP SPACE BY ANY OTHER MEANS: COMING TO TERMS WITH THE NONAPPROPRIATION ARTICLE OF THE OUTER SPACE TREATY UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LAW REVIEW [Vol. 2013 No. 4])//DebateDrills RD

As commercial space flight becomes more and more prevalent,153 the question of whether private entities can appropriate property in space becomes very important. Whereas once it took a nation to get into space, it will soon take only a corporation, and scholars have pondered whether these entities will be able to claim property in space.154 Though this seems allowable, since the treaty only prohibits “national appropriation,”155 allowing such appropriation would lead to an absurd result. This is because the only value that lies in recognition of a claim is the ability to have that claim enforced.156 If a nation recognized and enforced such a claim, this enforcement would constitute state action.157 It would serve to exclude members of other nations and would thus serve as a form of national appropriation, even though the nation never attempted to directly appropriate the property.158 Furthermore, the Outer Space Treaty also requires that non-governmental entities must be authorized and monitored by the entities’ home countries to operate in space.159 Since a nation cannot authorize its citizens to act in contradiction to international law, a nation would not be allowed to license a private entity to appropriate property in space.160 While this nonappropriation principle is great for allowing free access to space, thereby encouraging research and development in the field, it makes it difficult to create or police a solution to the space debris problem. A viable solution will have to work without becoming an appropriation. There is, however, very little substantive law on what actually counts as appropriation in the context of space.161 So, the best way to see what is and is not allowed is to look both at the general international law regarding appropriations and to look at the past actions of space actors to see what has been allowed (or at least tolerated) and what has been prohibited or rejected.

#### Precision comes first and link turns predictable limits – the resolution is the only predictable stasis point for dividing ground—any deviation justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by a predictable stasis point.

#### Predictable limits—including satellite slots offers huge explosion in the topic since they get permutations of different satellite systems – LEO MEO and GEO, plus different companies, plus sizes of constellations, et cetera. Letting temporary occupation be appropriation is a limits diaster - any aff about a single space ship, satellite, probe, or weapon would be T because they temporarily occupy space. Limits explodes neg prep burden and draws un-reciprocal lines of debate, where the aff is always ahead, turns their pragmatics offense

#### Topicality is a voting issue that should be evaluated through competing interpretations – it tells the negative what they do and do not have to prepare for—there’s no way for the negative to know what constitutes a “reasonable interpretation” when we do prep – reasonability is arbitrary and causes a race to the bottom, proliferating abuse

Dtd – no arg + norms

No rvis

Def whhat the entire aff is abt – if we win sats arent t vote neg on presumption – also applies to the only other exmpalin space cuz ehalisa aslo not permenent

### New Affs Bad

#### Interpretation—the aff must disclose the plan text, framework, and advantage areas 30 minutes before the round. To clarify, disclosure can occur on the wiki or over message.

#### Violation—they didn’t

#### Vote neg for prep and clash—two internal links—a) neg prep—4 minutes of prep is not enough to put together a coherent 1nc or update generics—30 minutes is necessary to learn a little about the affirmative and piece together what 1nc positions apply and cut and research their applications to the affirmative b) aff quality—plan text disclosure discourages cheap shot affs. If the aff isn’t inherent or easily defeated by 20 minutes of research, it should lose—this will answer the 1ar’s claim about innovation—with 30 minutes of prep, there’s still an incentive to find a new strategic, well justified aff, but no incentive to cut a horrible, incoherent aff that the neg can’t check against the broader literature.

### NC – CP

#### The Islamic Republic of Iran creating significant subsidies for private entites to create terrestrially accessible blockchain verification computing centers and cryptocurrency mining centers on the Moon is just. The appropriation of outer space by private entities in the The Islamic Republic of Iran for all other purposes is unjust.

#### The plan would destroy the basic value of crypto by making property rights reliant on government approval, which nukes adoption and value – appropriation is key

Rule & LeClair 21 [Dylan LeClair And Sam Rule Bitcoin Magazine. "Bitcoin’s Private Property Rights." https://www.nasdaq.com/articles/bitcoins-private-property-rights-2021-09-28]

Bitcoin’s Superior Private Property Rights

For the first time in history, bitcoin offers us a property option that does not rely on a local authority or legal system to enforce or protect it. It’s protected by the natural incentives of those participating in the network.

“Satoshi Nakamoto has created a form of property that can exist without relying on the state, centralized authority, or traditional legal structures.” - Eric D. Chason,"How Bitcoin Functions As Property Law"

It provides us with a store of value and savings technology where no government, central institution or voting bloc can seize, freeze or access it through violence or force when properly secured. Anyone in the world with an internet connection can secure this property without permission, and no other person or institution may take it away or erode its value. Whether it’s real estate, cash, equities, bonds, or gold, no other asset on the market provides this level of assurance and security.

What we know of strong, well-defined property rights is that they are the basis of human cooperation and economic activity. When private property rights flourish, so do the people. When we look at the nations of the world with the lowest ranking of property rights, we also find some of the key regions where bitcoin is making its mark.

#### Climate-motivated terrestrial mining regulations kill crypto now – those don’t get applied to space because of unique environments – that saves crypto with sufficient private investment

Greene 21 Greene, Tristan. Tristan covers human-centric artificial intelligence advances, quantum computing, STEM, Spiderman, physics, and space stuff. As far as I can tell his highest level of education was that he was in the Navy for a while. "What happens to Bitcoin when billionaires build cryptocurrency miners on the Moon?" TNW | Hardfork, 8 June 2021, thenextweb.com/news/bitcoin-billionaires-build-cryptocurrency-miners-on-moon-bitcoin.

Space exploration and exploitation have traditionally been nationalist endeavors. But the rise of the 12-digit billionaire has suddenly made outer space look like open territory. The players Jeff Bezos is stepping down from his position as the CEO of Amazon after 25 years ahead of his imminent launch into space aboard one of his own Blue Origin spaceships. This will be the future of fintech 6 trends that will dominate fintech in 2022 While it’s easy to imagine the long-time leader retiring to live out a childhood fantasy, there’s nothing in Bezos’ history as an incredibly ambitious person and businessman to indicate his he’ll just blast off into the sunset to live a life of quiet leisure. Simply put, Bezos’ interest in the space sector likely won’t end with offering consumer thrill rides. While it’s impossible to know where the soon-to-be-former CEO might take his ambition, it’s likely Amazon and/or Blue Origin is already looking for ways to exploit the space sector for profit. But, obviously, Bezos isn’t the only private citizen with a spaceship company. Elon Musk’s SpaceX has spent the last decade becoming the belle of NASA’s ball and he’s already all-in on the idea of sending humans to Mars. And we can’t forget Richard Branson. He may only be worth a paltry $5 billion (lol), but his Virgin Galactic company’s been banking on making some money in space tourism for a long time. Let’s also not forget that Virgin’s dabbled in everything from railroad technology to record labels. And the list goes on. Anyone with a few billion dollars has business options and opportunities that extend beyond our planet’s surface. Space for profit In the past, we’ve discussed the idea of mining space asteroids for profit. Some experts believe there are unimaginable fortunes floating around in space in the form of resource-rich asteroids. In fact, you can even get a degree in asteroid mining. And even Goldman Sachs has considered getting in on the action. But, at the end of the day, we still have to figure out where these resources are, build machines capable of extracting them, and get them safely to somewhere they can be useful. Right now, there’s not much value in investing in asteroid mining futures because the technology either doesn’t exist or isn’t ready yet. However, there’s more than one kind of mining you can do in space. Enter cryptocurrency and the future Elon Musk recently got involved in a friendly space race, but this time it has nothing to do with competition over rockets or government contracts. He’s racing against BitMEX, a cryptocurrency exchange and derivative platform, to see who can get a cryptocurrency on the Moon first. If you’re curious about how that works, here’s a snippet from BitMEX’s official announcement: BitMEX will mint a one-of-a-kind physical bitcoin, similar to the Casascius coins of 2013, which will be delivered to the Moon by Astrobotic. The coin will hold one bitcoin at an address to be publicly released, underneath a tamper-evident hologram covering. The coin will proudly display the BitMEX name, the mission name, the date it was minted and the bitcoin price at the time of minting. According to BitMEX, this isn’t just a ceremonial or token delivery. The coin itself is a hardware wallet containing an actual Bitcoin, so its value will change with the value of the BTC here on Earth. In other words, BitMEX is sending a literal treasure to the Moon for anyone brave (or rich) enough to retrieve it. Per the company’s blog post: A moon surface background with text superimposed, quote below Credit: BitMEX Come and Get It. When the physical coin lands, it will remain on the Moon until anyone deems it worthy of retrieval. Decades from now, what will it be worth? It’s a great question. Some experts have predicted a single bitcoin will one day be worth $100K, $1M, or even more. But an even better question is this: What’s the end game for cryptocurrency in space? Billionaires want to be trillionaires Back in 1999 Wired ran a feature about the imminent rise of the world’s first trillionaire. At the time, everyone assumed the richest man in the world, Microsoft CEO Bill Gates, would be the first trillionaire by a long shot. Here’s a quote from that article: The value of Bill’s Microsoft stake has grown from $233.9 million at the time of Microsoft’s 1986 IPO to $72.2 billion as of June 15, 1999 (disregarding stock sales). At this rate – 58.2 percent a year – he will become a trillionaire in March 2005, at age 49, and his Microsoft holdings will be valued at $1 quadrillion in March 2020, when he is 64. Of course, we still haven’t seen a trillionaire in modern history. As of the time of this writing, the richest person in the world is France’s Bernard Arnault, whose $193.6 billion empire edges out Jeff Bezos’ $189 billion. At some point, if Bezos wants to pull away with it or Elon Musk wants to close the widening gap between his $151.4 billion and a first place finish, the world’s richest people are going to have to do more than squeeze terrestrial markets for every last drop of profit. That’s why many experts view Elon Musk’s heavy involvement in cryptocurrency as the potential difference maker. On any given day the Tesla, SpaceX, and Neuralink founder’s total worth can skyrocket or plummet by tens of billions of dollars based on how his cryptocurrency holdings are performing. When you consider that market movements can be directly tied to Musk’s social media statements, the power proposition for billionaires holding cryptocurrency is unbridled. Simply put: Elon Musk has more control over the so-called “volatile” world of cryptocurrency than most. Putting a cryptocurrency in space, much like firing a Tesla off into the galaxy, is a PR move meant to generate interest in the burgeoning cryptomarket. But that’s not the only purpose they serve. These acts remind us that people like Musk and Bezos can do anything they want. If they want to put a coin on the Moon, they have the means to do it. And, for example, if Musk or Bezos suddenly wanted to solve the biggest problems with cryptocurrency mining – power consumption, carbon footprint, developing powerful-enough hardware – they’re in a unique position to do so. In space, no one can hear you mine Arguably, one of the biggest things stopping an apex whale like Elon Musk from spending a fair portion of his billions on cryptomining centers is the fact that such an operation would almost certainly draw universal condemnation for its potential effect on the global climate crisis. But the Moon’s atmosphere isn’t necessarily as fragile as the Earth’s. Hypothetically speaking, there’s nothing to stop a billionaire from building a facility on the Moon to mine cryptocurrency. They would, of course, need to be able to build their own batteries, have experience with artificial intelligence and supercomputers, and already have their own satellite network set up in space – all boxes Elon Musk can tick today. And, in the near-future, as we perfect deep space transmission technology, what’s to stop a billionaire from putting a supercomputer on a satellite and sending it somewhere in deep space to mine cryptocurrency 24/7 at near absolute-zero temperatures? All of this is conjecture, but the writing is on the wall. Cryptocurrency enthusiasts fear what the experts are consistently warning: regulation is coming. Eventually, it’s possible cryptocurrency mining could become regulated with harsh policies designed to keep mining operations from further damaging the environment. This could seriously hinder the market. If humanity walks away from terrestrial mining to save the planet, we’ll be leaving unfathomable amounts of money on table. Billionaires don’t become billionaires by doing that. The only logical path forward, barring some unknown new green mining technology, may be moving the cryptocurrency industry to space.

#### Cryptocurrency reach a wide rollout---that builds resilience to survive inevitable existential filters.

Alex McShane 21, Writer and Head of Video for Bitcoin Magazine, BA from the University of Iowa, Degree from the University College Dublin, Degree from Kirkwood Community College, “Bitcoin and Existential Risk”, Bitcoin Magazine, 9/5/2021, https://bitcoinmagazine.com/culture/bitcoin-and-existential-risk-alex-mcshane

TL;DR - An existential risk is the possibility of an event or series of events that could drastically curtail humanity’s potential. A hypothetical global catastrophe could be anthropogenic or non-anthropogenic and internal or external in nature. The adoption of Bitcoin will better position us to address these risks as a society.

EXTERNAL NON-ANTHROPOGENIC

A catastrophic collision with an astronomical object, such as an asteroid impact would be an external non-anthropogenic risk. This has already occurred here several times. During the Permian Triassic period (ending 250 million years ago) an astronomical impact killed 90 percent of the species on Earth. It took tens of millions of years for life on Earth to repopulate and Earth’s intelligence potential to recover.

One interesting external non-anthropogenic risk is Earth’s reflected light, which could be measured by an external intelligence who then come to extinguish us. (The topic of our own signal bringing about this death by misadventure is discussed further below.)

What does this have to do with Bitcoin?

Generally, hard money facilitates greater innovation and technological process. At this point one might argue that if we do not migrate to some degree from Earth as a species, and are subsequently wiped out by an astronomical object impact or a super-volcanic event, the risk becomes anthropogenic in nature. We are a centralized species on a grand scale, and at this point one could say we have through consensus chosen to remain vulnerable to a single vector of attack by staying here.

Bitcoin is not only the hardest money known to man, it is the most responsible from this standpoint. Bitcoin as it currently operates is currency that can provide a monetary framework on which humans can achieve greater capital growth, collaboration, resource allocation, and therefore technological progress. Because the terminal supply of Bitcoin is capped, we can store value in it indefinitely as a society.

66 Million years ago the Cretaceous-Paleogene Extinction Event extinguished the life and intelligence potential of the non-avian dinosaurs. This series of events was external, and broadly non-anthropogenic in the sense that no form of life on Earth at the time contributed to its own demise, but more specifically, at the time of those astronomical impacts the first humans hadn’t split from chimpanzee lineages. This split is thought to have occurred between between 4 and 8 million years ago.

An important distinction between astronomical impacts or super-volcanic events of the past and such events if they were to happen today is that one could argue that our intelligence potential is now mature enough to tackle certain of the external existential risks. Today, the risk posed by an asteroid impact or something similar would still be external in its origin, but at what point does the burden of responsibility to migrate off of the planet fall upon our population? We can surely solve for some external existential risks, and in any case, no one is going to do it for us. You could say that failing to collectively pursue a solution when technically we could have would recategorize a civilization-extinguishing asteroid impact as an external but anthropogenic risk.

At what point do innovation dampening authoritarian states and their mandated broken money cause society to stall at a local optimum? Surely the government has already caused this. It’s only a matter of time before another object strikes the Earth with devastating consequence. I would argue it is irresponsible to continue life here with government money. Government money is an existential risk. Bitcoin is not only a solution, it is a societal responsibility.

INTERNAL ANTHROPOGENIC

Nuclear war is one example of an internal anthropogenic risk. That is, should nuclear war arise, it would be both self destructive, and relatively self contained on a cosmic scale. It follows that biological warfare is an internal anthropogenic risk, the reality of which we as a species can surely understand now. If I were to hazard a guess I would say virtual emergencies and cyber pandemics are next. These self constructed catastrophes are the government’s misguided attempts at proof of work. This is a topic for another time. Do not surrender your ability to think and speak freely.

The second law of thermodynamics can summed thus, processes that involve the transfer or conversion of heat energy are irreversible. The law indicates we have not observed a spontaneous transfer of energy from cold to hot. Another way to think of this is that there is no such thing as cold, only lesser degrees of hot. Nothing cannot transfer. So broadly, within a closed system, the second law of thermodynamics would indicate that all differences tend to level out.

So what has this got to do with Bitcoin?

Well firstly, all hardware is subject to entropy. The distributed nature of the blockchain increases the probability that it will survive centralized entropy. At Bitcoin’s inception, imagine a failure because Satoshi’s computer randomly crashed. Distributed networks are inherently hedged against this particular centralized form of existential risk.

The second law of thermodynamics also suggests that on a grander scale, relatively isolated (centralized) systems will degenerate more and more into disordered states. Proof of work, and network growth are two ways Bitcoin fights against falling into disrepair.

Bitcoin uses proof of work to stave off entropy. The system cannot stay dormant. It must continue to use proof of work to advance the state of the chain, and to fight entropy to secure the monetary value all of the users have stored in the network. The U.S. dollar, as many have pointed out, relies on proof of war, or distributed political energies to maintain dominance. Its methodology can be described as haphazard at best.

INTERNAL NON-ANTHROPOGENIC

One internal non-anthropogenic risk is that of a super-volcanic eruption, provided it wasn’t humans who brought about the eruption. Just like with external non-anthropogenic risks, Bitcoin alone cannot prevent them, but it can help humans prepare for them such that we may survive these relatively small intelligence filters the universe throws our way.

Bitcoin allows for fundamental capital accumulation and human innovation, and promotes collaboration to such a degree that we will find an increased collective problem solving power as humans the further Bitcoin adoption spreads. It is worth mentioning that Bitcoin also maintains and appreciates wealth to such a degree that often those of us to chose to live our lives on a Bitcoin standard will experience relatively greater freedoms, and vastly greater amounts of free time than our peers who chose to continue their lives on a fiat standard, and are perpetually working to outpace their chronic debt. Many Bitcoiners will likely forego that newfound free time to work and continue to provide value to others in whatever area interests them, because Bitcoin incentivizes the collaborative accumulation of capital but also the responsible reallocation of it.

EXTERNAL ANTHROPOGENIC

An external anthropogenic risk has the least probability of occurring. This is a problem of reach. Imagine human intelligence being sent into the cosmos and signaling or generally causing an external intelligence or astronomical object to come back to extinguish us. This is a most improbable extinction by misadventure.

The probability that we send messages of consequence into the cosmos that in turn cause some other far-flung intelligence, with knowledge enough to reach us, to come and bring about our own destruction is next to zero, but it isn’t zero.

I would posit that the probability increases every day that Bitcoin survives, with each person that chooses to hold Bitcoin over fiat, because on a fiat standard we are again, stuck at a local optimum at best, and each day the global monetary system devolves further into chaos. The fiat world may continue to be habitable chaos, but our technological progress and our greatest capacity for innovation cannot be achieved on a fiat standard.

A Bitcoin standard is not only our current best bet, it is the only monetary vehicle that will take us from here, or enable us to build technology that can effectively communicate with places in the universe where other intelligence has emerged. The other reason this fatal miscommunication is unlikely to occur is that once through a Bitcoin standard we have manage to build a society that can effectively reach and communicate at greater depths of the cosmos we will at that time have already become a multi-planetary, if not transitory, if not multi-solar system species. The topic of Bitcoin in space and planetary interoperability will be discussed in a later essay.

The most distant human made object from the earth is the Voyager 1, which is over 13 billion miles away. (For perspective, Apha Centuri, the nearest star system to Earth, is 25 trillion miles away.) Human radio signals have announced our presence and our intelligence to the cosmos since around 1900. The first human radio signals have all ready traveled 114 light years, that is 681,920,540,000,000 miles. Although the reach of our radio signals is very great, the probability of us being heard and subsequently extinguished is negligible. External anthropogenic risks are the least of our concerns at the moment.

As Bitcoin adoption grows, it serves to promote advances in artificial intelligence and nanotechnology. External anthropogenic risks will become more relevant to human intelligence at a much later time. External non-anthropogenic risks are similarly out of our hands for the time being. That is, at the moment there is nothing we can do to prevent the Sun from becoming a red giant star and subsuming the Earth.

But we do already have the monetary technology upon which to engineer solutions to some of these problems. We have the potential as humans to prevent internal global catastrophes, both those set on by us and not. Survival and longevity is arguably our greatest task as a species. Adopting Bitcoin, and protecting this network is proceeding with diligence and a long eye toward the future in all of our political and scientific affairs. The existential risks of living are great, though it is human nature for our ambitions to out pace our current abilities. The only evidence of life is change. To change is to exit fiat currency, it is to use Bitcoin instead.

## Advantage

**1NC –ME War Defense**

#### Public sector alt cuase – incentives to develop m sisles, - their unq proves that its learng which pmeans the have capability

Def applies to nioko -= abt relatsions between countires

Their card about phow it’s the private ctor does not sayh anthign abtou tep riave sector

Halive is just some random new things – not miltiary – 8 things not war

#### No great power draw in – stays regional, presumes Russia

Trofimov 2020 [Yaroslav Trofimov is an award-winning author and journalist who serves as Chief Foreign-Affairs Correspondent at The Wall Street Journal. Previously he wrote a weekly column on the Greater Middle East, Middle East Crossroads, in The Wall Street Journal. Iran Lacks Allies in Confronting the U.S. January 5, 2020. https://www.wsj.com/articles/iran-lacks-allies-in-confronting-the-u-s-11578253765]

Instead of leaving, President Trump now is sending thousands more American troops to the Middle East to confront Iran. As for Russia and China, they have shown little desire to get embroiled in an increasingly unpredictable conflict.

This means that despite the feverish talk of Gen. Soleimani’s death sparking a World War III, Iran nowadays can only count on itself—and on the network of irregular Shiite militias and proxies that the Quds Force commander had nurtured in Lebanon, Iraq, Syria, Yemen and beyond.

“Iran is one of the most strategically lonely countries in the world. It considers dozens of countries around the world its adversary, and its only reliable friend has been the Assad regime in Syria,” said Karim Sadjadpour, an Iran specialist at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington.

As for Russia, Mr. Sadjadpour added, “it benefits from an isolated, anti-American Iran that can’t exploit its energy resources.”

While observers say Beijing and Moscow would be happy to watch the U.S. get bogged down even deeper in the Middle East—a diversion that would give them a freer hand in their own neighborhoods—they have no appetite for exposing themselves to the risks of a possible confrontation.

“Russia doesn’t have the slightest intention of getting involved in this squabble, and is trying to distance itself from it as far as possible—even though it will keep expressing support for Iran with very loud declarations,” said Ruslan Pukhov, director of the Center for Analysis of Strategies and Technologies, a Moscow think tank that advises Russia’s defense establishment.

“Short-term at least, this is all beneficial to Russia: oil prices are up, and the Iranians—a very difficult partner—are being forced to become much more cooperative,” he added.

Iran’s strategic isolation perhaps explains a tone of caution that has accompanied its denunciations of Gen. Soleimani’s death. Iranian Armed Forces spokesman Brig. Gen. Abolfazl Shekarchi on Saturday promised a revenge that will be “tough”—but “not hasty,” an indication that Tehran may seek to avoid an immediate escalation that could risk sparking an all-out war with the U.S.

“Iran is talking about a response, a revenge, and not about initiating a war,” said Abas Aslani, senior fellow at the Center for Middle East Strategic Studies in Tehran.

Should such a direct conflict erupt, he added, “I don’t think Iran expects Russia and China to start a war with the U.S. on its behalf. The help they may offer to Iran is different: political support, support in some international institutions. Whether that can also be applicable to providing Iran with some equipment, that is the question.”

Iran certainly craves military hardware to replace its obsolete warplanes, ships and tanks—but neither Russia nor China can legally supply such equipment until October at the earliest, the date when United Nations sanctions on most military sales to Tehran are set to expire.

Russia did deliver an S-300 air-defense system to Iran in 2016, but even that happened after six years of delays that ended only as a result of Moscow’s alienation from the West following its invasion of Ukraine.

In their official reactions, both Moscow and Beijing condemned the strike against Gen. Soleimani—but stopped short of pledging to do anything about it.

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov said in a phone call Friday with Secretary of State Mike Pompeo that the killing “grossly violates the norms of international law” and urged Washington to “solve all problems at the negotiating table,” according to a Russian foreign ministry statement.

China’s foreign minister, Wang Yi, a day later told his Iranian counterpart that Beijing condemns “the military adventurist act by the U.S.” and that China will continue to “play a constructive role in safeguarding peace and security in the Gulf region.”

Though China has promised to invest hundreds of billions of dollars in Iran’s oil and gas infrastructure, so far U.S. economic sanctions on Iran have hobbled such plans.

Russia and Iran have teamed up in Syria—with Russian warplanes using Iranian airspace and even briefly operating out of an air base in Iran—but as the Syrian regime stabilized and Moscow found a new accommodation with Turkey in recent months, Moscow’s and Tehran’s interests there have begun to diverge.

Both Moscow and Beijing maintain friendly ties with Iran’s archenemies in the region: Saudi Arabia and Israel.

Russia’s and Iran’s mutual history is rife with hostility. Russians remember the murder of Russia’s ambassador and playwright Alexander Griboedov when the Russian embassy in Tehran was sacked in 1829, and the Islamic Republic’s support for anti-Soviet rebels in Afghanistan in the 1980s.

Looming in Iran’s national memory are lands that Russia annexed from the Persian Empire over the centuries, and the Soviet military invasions and occupations of Iran in 1920 and 1941.

“Nobody in Russia really cares about Iran, the society doesn’t see Iran as a partner, and certainly not as a friend worth dying for,” said Alexander Gabuev, chair of the Russia in the Asia-Pacific program at the Carnegie Moscow Center.

Both Russia and China, he added, are secretly delighted by the rise of tensions between the U.S. and Iran, hoping that a conflict in the Middle East would give them a few years of respite by distracting American attention away from their own core areas of interests in Eastern Europe and Asia, respectively.

Even though China is now the biggest buyer of Middle Eastern oil, experts in the country’s security and foreign-policy establishment have long argued that Beijing should resist the temptation of getting involved in the volatile region—in part because oil has continued to flow despite the political shocks of recent decades.

“The Middle East presents a falling significance in the grand strategy of China,” Niu Xinchun, director of the Institute of Middle East Studies at CICIR, a think tank affiliated with China’s Ministry of State Security, wrote in a 2017 policy paper. “As a matter of fact, since 2011, many Middle Eastern countries have descended into civil war at the same time, which failed to exert material impacts on China’s economy.”

China’s participation in the December naval exercises with Iran is “more symbolic than substantial,” added Zhu Feng, director of the Institute of International Studies at Nanjing University. “I don’t think China has any interest in getting involved in the escalation of tensions there.”

#### No great power draw in

McConnell 14 – Scott McConnell, Ph.D in history at Columbia University, founding editor of The American Conservative, 2014 (“The Middle East Doesn’t Matter,” *The American Conservative*, October 15th, <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/the-middle-east-doesnt-matter/>)

What silver lining? It’s rooted in the fact that the Mideast may now actually matter much less than we think it does. We do have the option of pretty much ignoring it, if we choose. Its contribution to the world economy is negligible. Its oil will reach the market one way or another. The security and well-being of the American people is not linked to the survival of a Shi’ite regime in Baghdad, a medieval monarch in Riyadh, or, for that matter, a Jewish state in Jerusalem. Recognition of this fact is only beginning to seep into the discourse: Justin Logan argues persuasively here that virtually nothing that goes on in the Middle East can threaten us very much, that no country in the region is worth starting a war over, and that the amount of money we’ve spent combatting terrorism in the region is wildly disproportionate to the actual threat. (It goes without saying that American bombing, with its inevitable “collateral damage,” will create a growing class of Muslims who have concrete reason to want to harm Americans.) In an recent interview, Francis Fukuyama elaborates on this view. 9/11 didn’t “change everything” as many claimed, or shouldn’t have; it was essentially a lucky shot. “These are really marginal people who survive in countries where you don’t have strong states … Their ability to take over and run a serious country that can master technology and stay at the forefront of great-power politics is almost zero,” he says. Elsewhere he notes that the crisis over ISIS is really a subset of the Sunni-Shia civil war, and America’s ability to have any lasting impact on that is also almost zero. This perspective—that the Mideast isn’t actually all that important to American security and we should pay much less attention to it—should now become a critical part of the American conversation. The thinkers cited here—Logan and Fukuyama, and one should add the popular blogger Andrew Sullivan, also writing along these lines—are far from knee-jerk “isolationists.” Fukuyama posits particularly that we should use military offshore balancing to ensure that no single power controls the oil fields; and obviously Iran would not want or allow ISIS to shut off its ability to export oil. But beyond that, we can afford to take the region much less seriously.

#### Middle East war won’t go nuclear – balanced alliances, Chinese non-intervention, and cooperation prevent great power draw-in

Mead 14 – Walter Russell Mead, James Clarke Chace Professor of Foreign Affairs and Humanities at Bard College and Professor of American foreign policy at Yale University, Editor-at-Large of The American Interest magazine and a non-resident Scholar at the Hudson Institute, 2014 (“Have We Gone From a Post-War to a Pre-War World?” *Huffington Post*, July 7th, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/walter-russell-mead/new-global-war_b_5562664.html>)

The Middle East today bears an ominous resemblance to the Balkans of that period. The contemporary Middle East has an unstable blend of ethnicities and religions uneasily coexisting within boundaries arbitrarily marked off by external empires. Ninety-five years after the French and the British first parceled out the lands of the fallen Ottoman caliphate, that arrangement is now coming to an end. Events in Iraq and Syria suggest that the Middle East could be in for carnage and upheaval as great as anything the Balkans saw. The great powers are losing the ability to hold their clients in check; the Middle East today is at least as explosive as the Balkan region was a century ago.

GERMANS THEN, CHINESE NOW

What blew the Archduke's murder up into a catastrophic world war, though, was not the tribal struggle in southeastern Europe. It took the hegemonic ambitions of the German Empire to turn a local conflict into a universal conflagration. Having eclipsed France as the dominant military power in Europe, Germany aimed to surpass Britain on the seas and to recast the emerging world order along lines that better suited it. Yet the rising power was also insecure, fearing that worried neighbors would gang up against it. In the crisis in the Balkans, Germany both felt a need to back its weak ally Austria and saw a chance to deal with its opponents on favorable terms.

Could something like that happen again? China today is both rising and turning to the sea in ways that Kaiser Wilhelm would understand. Like Germany in 1914, China has emerged in the last 30 years as a major economic power, and it has chosen to invest a growing share of its growing wealth in military spending.

But here the analogy begins to get complicated and even breaks down a bit. Neither China nor any Chinese ally is competing directly with the United States and its allies in the Middle East. China isn't (yet) taking a side in the Sunni-Shia dispute, and all it really wants in the Middle East is quiet; China wants that oil to flow as peacefully and cheaply as possible.

AMERICA HAS ALL THE ALLIES

And there's another difference: alliance systems. The Great Powers of 1914 were divided into two roughly equal military blocs: Austria, Germany, Italy and potentially the Ottoman Empire confronted Russia, France and potentially Britain.

Today the global U.S. alliance system has no rival or peer; while China, Russia and a handful of lesser powers are disengaged from, and in some cases even hostile to, the U.S. system, the military balance isn't even close.

While crises between China and U.S. allies on its periphery like the Philippines could escalate into US-China crises, we don't have anything comparable to the complex and finely balanced international system at the time of World War I. Austria-Hungary attacked Serbia and as a direct result of that Germany attacked Belgium. It's hard to see how, for example, a Turkish attack on Syria could cause China to attack Vietnam. Today's crises are simpler, more direct and more easily controlled by the top powers.

#### No Mid East escalation

* Proxy wars stay localized

They are cheaper to change the status quo

Gives countries the opportunity to deny conflict

Non-state actors can’t escalate because of institutional capacity

* Consensus of international scholars and data conclude

Imran 2/6/19 [Myra Imran, writer for The News International. Citing the international seminar on “Strategic Dimensions of Peace and Conflict in South Asia and the Middle East”. Seminar on ‘Strategic dimensions of peace and conflict in South Asia, Middle East’. 2/6/19, https://www.thenews.com.pk/print/428298-seminar-on-strategic-dimensions-of-peace-and-conflict-in-south-asia-middle-east]

Islamabad : There is a need to study the causes of proxy wars, and what are the potential impacts of such wars on the overall conflict. These thoughts in a daylong international seminar on ‘Strategic Dimensions of Peace and Conflict in South Asia and the Middle East,’ organised by Pak Institute for Peace Studies (PIPS), an Islamabad-based think tank, participated by prominent national and international scholars.

Prof. Shahram Akbarzadeh, Deakin University, Australia, argued there is significant gap in the literature on non-state actors. He called for empirical research, along with concrete policy suggestions, on the topic, so as to mitigate the conflicts in the region, in particular South Asia and Middle East.

Speakers grappled at the notion of non-state actors and proxy wars: PIPS director Muhammad Amir Rana said non-state actors often evoke memories of violent elements. This despite that as per definition, non-state actors include organizations working for human rights.

Prof. Syed Rifaat Hussain, Department of Government and Public Policy, NUST, said the term “proxy wars” is a contested notion. There is no universal agreement on its definition, nor on the set of circumstances behind such wars. Interestingly, he said, proxy wars are as old as the phenomena of conventional war itself.

Speakers noted proxy wars are instruments of state power. As to why states go for it, it was argued, it is because they are often cheap undertaking to change the status quo.

Participants noted over the decades, much of the conflict involves non-state actors. Interstate conflict, on the other hand, has declined. In recent times, he said tit-for-tat tactics on behalf of such actors have reduced their appeal.

Dr. Ibrahim Fraihat, Doha Institute of Graduate Studies, Doha, termed proxy war as an arms conflict between two parties, though one of them is not directly involved. This way, domestic conflicts are escalated by external power intervention. At the same time, proxy war, if unresolved, can take the shape of conventional war, the most significant example was of Vietnam War. In contemporary times, he lamented, the Middle East has been rendered a stock market of proxy organizations.

William Gueriache, Associate Professor American University in the Emirates Dubai, said on surface, all states support open diplomacy and multilateralism. Yet the survival of patronage has paved the way for foreign intervention during conflicts in the whole Middle East.

Dr. Marwan Kablan, Director Policy Analysis at the Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies Doha, also hinted multiplicity of actors involved in Syrian conflict, calling it as mother of conflicts in the region. It was said that wars cannot be ended unless patron states achieve their interests.

Dr. Shaheen Akhtar, Professor National Defence University Islamabad focused on the apprehension of Pakistan about India’s involvement in Afghanistan. She said Pakistan’s uneasy relationship with Kabul reinforces a perception of encirclement while growing US-India strategic cooperation further aggravates these apprehensions.

Dr. Muhammad Riaz Shad, National University of Modern Languages (NUML) Islamabad, said fighting through proxies gives states an opportunity of deniability.

#### Limited Middle Eastern War is good

#### Oil prices are sliding – two days in a row, dollar strength, Ida, increased production, and tapering asset purchases

Paraskova 9/20/21 [Tsvetana is a writer for Oilprice.com with over a decade of experience writing for news outlets such as iNVEZZ and SeeNews. "Oil Prices Fall As Traders Anxiously Await Fed’s Decision." https://oilprice.com/Energy/Oil-Prices/Oil-Prices-Fall-As-Traders-Anxiously-Await-Feds-Decision.html]

Oil prices dropped early on Monday as the U.S. dollar continues to strengthen ahead of the Fed’s much-anticipated policy meeting this week, which could announce the beginning of stimulus easing.

As of 9:05 a.m. EDT, WTI Crude was losing 1.75% at $70.71 and Brent Crude prices were down 1.49% at $74.21.

The oil market is down for a second consecutive day after Friday’s session settled in the red, as broader markets are anxiously watching whether the Federal Reserve will announce the start of asset purchase tapering at its meetings on Tuesday and Wednesday. The U.S. dollar gains were depressing the oil market

as a stronger greenback makes oil buying more expensive for holders of other currencies.

The risk to U.S. oil production in the Gulf of Mexico is now diminishing as more output is being restored in the wake of Hurricane Ida. The return of more production from the U.S. offshore also weighed on oil prices early on Monday.

“As this week starts, much of the US market tightening on account of Ida is already baked into prices, while outages in offshore oil production and Louisiana refining capacity are continuing to ease,” Vanda Insights said in a note early on Monday.

The U.S. dollar and the Fed meeting will be the key external factors that will determine oil’s direction this week, apart from the usual U.S. inventory reports by the API and EIA, ING strategists Warren Patterson and Wenyu Yao say.

“All eyes will be on the FOMC meeting on Wednesday, where some believe we could already see the Fed announce its intentions to start tapering asset purchases, though our US economist is of the view that an announcement is more likely in November. A tapering announcement this week would likely put some downward pressure on oil and the broader commodities complex,” they noted.

#### Oil prices will decline – OPEC will increase production – our ev is predictive

Julia Fanzeres 9-30-21, "Biden renews OPEC outreach as oil prices climb 10% in September," 9-30-2021 https://www.worldoil.com/news/2021/9/30/biden-renews-opec-outreach-as-oil-prices-climb-10-in-september

The rising price of oil “is of concern for the U.S.,” said White House press secretary Jennifer Psaki. The U.S. has been in touch with OPEC about oil prices, she said at a press briefing. Heading into next week’s meeting between OPEC and its partners, there is increased speculation that the organization will consider raising production more than the previously announced hike of 400,000 barrels a day.

“With oil prices at multi-year highs, we think that OPEC will come under increasingly intense pressure from Washington to increase production,” RBC analyst Helima Croft said in report.

#### Middle East war is good—it raises oil prices

Lynch 18 [Michael Lynch spent nearly 30 years at MIT as a student and then researcher at the Energy Laboratory and Center for International Studies. He then spent several years at what is now IHS Global Insight and was chief energy economist. Currently, Lynch serves as the president of Strategic Energy and Economic Research, Inc., and lectures MBA students at Vienna University. He’s been president of the US Association for Energy Economics and serves on the editorial boards of three publications. Will Oil Prices Blow Up With The Middle East? April 12, 2018. https://www.forbes.com/sites/michaellynch/2018/04/12/will-the-oil-price-blow-up-with-the-middle-east/#166754c23d19]

It's said that a woman once approached 19th century German Chancellor Bismarck and asked him to explain the controversy over Schleswig-Holstein, to which Bismarck responded, “Madam, only three people have ever understood Schleswig-Holstein. One is dead, the second has gone mad, and I’m the third and I’ve quite forgot.” This summarizes how I feel about the current Middle East situation. The public rhetoric (including tweets) suggests that the U.S. and Russia are both willing to attack each other’s forces -- the U.S. is planning an attack on Syrian forces that might affect Russian personnel and Russia is apparently threatening to shoot down U.S. planes. This is obviously concerning, and while incidental Russia casualties might not lead to a direct military response, if Russia shot down a U.S. plane (as opposed to an unmanned missile), the U.S. would almost certainly respond. Given that the Russians know this, they are unlikely to take such a step. An additional factor is the possibility that Iranian forces in Syria would be hit by any U.S. attack, which might invite retaliation. Iran is unlikely to be able to attack U.S. forces in the Mediterranean directly, but forces in Iraq and Syria might be subject to ‘asymmetrical warfare,’ i.e., small-scale attacks, possibly including suicide bombers. The threat to oil markets come if Iranian actions encourage President Trump to refuse to recertify the Iranian nuclear agreement in mid-May. While many of Iran’s customers in Asia would not be concerned, there might be some drop in sales from companies fearful of U.S. legal action. Sanctions on financial transfers would also deter the more conventional customers, but the Iranians should be able to work around that after a brief pause. Could this also mean an escalation in the conflict between Iran and Saudi Arabia (or more broadly but less accurately, Shia versus Sunni regimes)? Given that the Saudis have been attacking Iranian-supported Houthis in Yemen without direct response by Iran for some time now, any Saudi actions in Syria seem unlikely to be a provocation that would worsen the situation in the Gulf. FDR’s comment that ‘we have nothing to fear but fear itself’ seems appropriate for oil traders. Bombs and missiles flying in the greater Middle East always creates a bullish impetus on prices, even if the oil fields remain distant from the actual violence.

The death of Russian personnel would worsen this, as it implies a greater probability of retaliation and continuation of the conflict which, again, would push up oil prices. And naturally, should Iranian personnel be affected, there would be very rational concerns that they might respond with some sort of attack that could affect Gulf oil trade. The worst case scenarios -- ongoing U.S.-Russian combat or direct Saudi-Iranian fighting -- seem very unlikely to happen. But as long as the possibility exists, oil prices will remain elevated, with WTI perhaps hitting $70 or higher, and only coming down when it has become clear that the violence is diminishing and will not spread. Until then, expect a bumpy ride.

#### Low prices destroy Chinese foreign investment

Tao ’16 (Wang Tao – PhD in Environmental Economics @ the University of York, Nonresident scholar in Carnegie’s Energy and Climate Program base at the Carnegie–Tsinghua Center for Global Policy. “WILL LOW OIL PRICES DESTABILIZE THE WORLD?” 20 January 2016, http://www.newsweek.com/will-low-oil-prices-destabilize-world-417885)

Counterintuitively, China, as the world’s largest oil importer, is not applauding the current low oil price. It is true that low oil prices could mean large savings for China in terms of oil imports, but Beijing’s non-transparent pricing of domestic oil products increased discontent among the public when China’s price adjustment of gasoline failed to follow international trends. Chinese citizens dismissed the government’s excuse of protecting the environment, despite three air pollution red alerts in Beijing in four weeks at the end of 2015. The low oil price has made many of China’s overseas oil investment projects uneconomical, like the oil and gas import contracts that China’s national oil companies signed recently. In the case of Venezuela, where China has invested billions of dollars and still holds dozens of billions of dollars in unpaid loans, the risk to the governing regime

and to China’s assets is accumulating at a worrying rate.

#### That causes Chinese lash out and global war

Tweed ’15 (David Tweed – Hong Kong based report for Bloomberg, editor for Bloomberg Europe, “Five Million Reasons Why China Could Go to War.” 15 June 2015, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-06-15/five-million-reasons-china-may-be-drawn-into-foreign-conflicts)

With five million citizens to protect and billions of investment dollars at stake, China is rethinking its policy of keeping out of other countries’ affairs. China has long made loans conditional on contracts for its companies. In recent years it has sent an army of its nationals to work on pipelines, roads and dams in such hot spots as South Sudan, Yemen and Pakistan. Increasingly, it has to go across borders to protect or rescue them. That makes it harder to stick to the policy espoused by then-premier Zhou Enlai in 1955 of not interfering in “internal” matters, something that has seen China decline to back international sanctions against Russia over Ukraine or the regime of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad. As President Xi Jinping’s “Silk Road” program of trade routes gets under way, with infrastructure projects planned across Central Asia, the Indian Ocean and the Middle East to Europe, China’s footprint abroad will expand from the $108 billion that firms invested abroad in 2013, up from less than $3 billion a decade earlier. That is forcing China to take a more proactive approach to securing its interests and the safety of its people. With more engagement abroad there’s a risk that China, an emerging power with a military to match, is sucked into conflicts and runs up against the U.S. when tensions are already flaring over China’s disputed claims in the South China Sea.

### 1NC – AT: Space War

#### No space war – it’s hype and systems are redundant

Johnson-Freese and Hitchens 16 [Dr. Joan Johnson-Freese is a member of the Breaking Defense Board of Contributors, a Professor of National Security Affairs at the Naval War College and author of Space Warfare in the 21st Century: Arming the Heavens. Views expressed are those of the author alone. Theresa Hitchens is a Senior Research Scholar at the Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland (CISSM), and the former Director of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) in Geneva, Switzerland. Stop The Fearmongering Over War In Space: The Sky’s Not Falling, Part 1. December 27, 2016. https://breakingdefense.com/2016/12/stop-the-fearmongering-over-war-in-space-the-skys-not-falling-part-1/]

In the last two years, we’ve seen rising hysteria over a future war in space. Fanning the flames are not only dire assessments from the US military, but also breathless coverage from a cooperative and credulous press. This reporting doesn’t only muddy public debate over whether we really need expensive systems. It could also become a self-fulfilling prophecy. The irony is that nothing makes the currently slim possibility of war in space more likely than fearmongering over the threat of war in space.

Two television programs in the past two years show how egregious this fearmongering can get. In April 2015, the CBS show 60 Minutes ran a segment called “The Battle Above.” In an interview with General John Hyten, the then-chief of U.S. Air Force Space Command, it came across loud and clear that the United States was being forced to prepare for a battle in space — specifically against China — that it really didn’t want.

It was explained by Hyten and other guests that China is building a considerable amount of hardware and accumulating significant know-how regarding space, all threatening to space assets Americans depend on every day. If viewers weren’t frightened after watching the segment, it wasn’t for lack of trying on the part of CBS.

Using terms like “offensive counterspace” as a 1984 NewSpeak euphemism for “weapons,” it was made clear that the United States had no choice but to spend billions of dollars on offensive counterspace technology to not just thwart the Chinese threat, but control and dominate space. While it didn’t actually distort facts — just omit facts about current U.S. space capabilities — the segment was basically a cost-free commercial for the military-industrial complex.

In retrospect though, “The Battle Above” was pretty good compared to CNN’s recent special, War in Space: The Next Battlefield. The latter might as well have been called Sharknado in Space – because the only far-out weapons technology our potential adversaries don’t have, according to the broadcast, seems to be “sharks with frickin’ laser beams attached to their heads!”

First, CNN needs to hire some fact checkers. Saying “unlike its adversaries, the U.S. has not yet weaponized space” is deeply misleading, like saying “unlike his political opponents, President-Elect Donald Trump has not sprouted wings and flown away”: A few (admittedly alarming) weapons tests aside, no country in the world has yet weaponized space. Contrary to CNN, stock market transactions are not timed nor synchronized through GPS, but a closed system. Cruise missiles can find their targets even without GPS, because they have both GPS and precision inertial measurement units onboard, and IMUs don’t rely on satellite data. Oh, and the British rock group Pink Floyd holds the only claim to the Dark Side of the Moon: There is a “far side” of the Moon — the side always turned away from the Earth — but not a “dark side” — which would be a side always turned away from the Sun.

More nefariously, the segment sensationalized nuggets of truth within a barrage of half-truths, backed by a heavy bass, dramatic soundtrack (and gravelly-voiced reporter Jim Sciutto) and accompanied by sexy and scary visuals.

Make no mistake there are dangers in space, and the United States has the most to lose if space assets are lost. The question is how best to protect them. Here are a few facts CNN omitted.

The Reality

The U.S. has all of the technologies described on the CNN segment and deemed potentially offensive: maneuverable satellites, nano-satellites, lasers, jamming capabilities, robotic arms, ballistic missiles that can be used as anti-satellite weapons, etc. In fact, the United States is more technologically advanced than other countries in both military and commercial space.

That technological superiority scares other countries; just as the U.S. military space community is scared of other countries obtaining those technologies in the future. The U.S. military space budget is more than 10 times greater than that of all the countries in the world combined. That also causes other countries concern.

More unsettling still, the United States has long been leery of treaty-based efforts to constrain a potential arms race in outer space, as supported by nearly every other country in the world for decades. Indeed, under the administration of George W. Bush, the U.S. talking points centered on the mantra “there is no arms race in outer space,” so there is no need for diplomat instruments to constrain one. Now, a decade later, the U.S. military – backed by the Intelligence Community which operates the nation’s spy satellites – seems to be shouting to the rooftops that the United States is in danger of losing the space arms race already begun by its potential adversaries. The underlying assumption — a convenient one for advocates of more military spending — is that now there is nothing that diplomacy can do.

However, it must be remembered that most space-related technologies – with the exception of ballistic missiles and dedicated jammers – have both military and civil/commercial uses; both benign — indeed, helpful — and nefarious uses. For example, giving satellites the ability to maneuver on orbit can allow useful inspections of ailing satellites and possibly even repairs.

Further, the United States is not unable to protect its satellites, as repeated during the CNN broadcast by various interviewees and the host. Many U.S. government-owned satellites, including precious spy satellites, have capabilities to maneuver. Many are hardened against electro-magnetic pulse, sport “shutters” to protec

t optical “eyes” from solar flares and lasers, and use radio frequency hopping to resist jamming.

Offensive weapons, deployed on the ground to attack satellites, or in space, are not a silver bullet. To the contrary, U.S. deployment of such weapons may actually be detrimental to U.S. and international security in space (as we argued in a recent Atlantic Council publication, Towards a New National Security Space Strategy). Further, there are benefits to efforts started by the Obama Administration to find diplomatic tools to restrain and constrain dangerous military activities in space.

These diplomatic efforts, however, would be undercut by a full-out U.S. pursuit of “space dominance.” This includes dialogue with China, the lack of which Gen. William Shelton, retired commander of Air Force Space Command, lamented in the CNN report.

Given CNN’s “cast,” the spin was not surprising. Starting with Ghost Fleet author Peter Singer set the sensationalist tone, which never altered. The apocalyptic opening, inspired by Ghost Fleet, posited a scenario where all U.S. satellites are taken off-line in nearly one fell swoop. Unless we are talking about an alien invasion, that scenario is nigh on impossible. No potential adversary has such capabilities, nor will they ever likely do so. There is just too much redundancy in the system.

### AT NoKo War

#### No North Korean war or draw-in---all sides have huge incentives to limit conflict

Michael C. Horowitz 18, professor of political science and the associate director of Perry World House at the University of Pennsylvania; and Elizabeth N. Saunders, associate professor of political science at George Washington University, 1/3/18, “Analysis: Why nuclear war with North Korea is less likely than you think,” https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/world/analysis-why-nuclear-war-with-north-korea-is-less-likely-than-you-think/ar-BBHPJfL

Last night, in response to Kim Jong Un’s claim to have a nuclear button on his desk, President Trump tweeted, “I too have a Nuclear Button, but it is a much bigger & more powerful one than his, and my Button works!” This is not the first time that things have gotten personal in the U.S.-North Korea standoff. Much of the rhetoric between the two leaders and media commentary on the risk of war focuses on the leadership of Trump and Kim — or “Little Rocket Man,” as Trump has called the North Korean leader. But how much could these two singular leaders really propel us to a nuclear war? Trump’s tweets and other actions certainly can increase the risk of conflict — consistent with our research on how the decisions of individual leaders affect military conflict. However, in this case, other factors, including geography and military capabilities, will matter more than tweets or the characteristics of leaders. And these factors reduce the likelihood of war. Leaders can be important for international conflict For the past few generations, political scientists who write about the outbreak of conflict mainly argued that leaders were irrelevant, focusing instead on international factors such as great power relations or domestic political factors such as whether the two countries involved had democratic institutions. But more and more scholarship suggest that leaders make a large difference in determining whether and how countries go to war. And it’s not just in dictatorships such as North Korea; even more constrained leaders, such as U.S. presidents, matter. Leaders’ beliefs and experiences before coming into office can be critical in determining whether a country goes to war and what military strategy will be used in the event of war. But structural forces are strong in this case Even if leaders have discretion, they are constrained by material and situational constraints. No U.S. or North Korean leader can realistically change or avoid some of these constraints. One constraint stems from the two sides’ formidable military capabilities, which mean that a general war with North Korea would be devastating, as Barry Posen argued last year. Even before it acquired a nuclear capability, North Korea’s artillery put tremendous pressure on South Korea. Add to that its missile arsenal — which, as nuclear experts have chronicled, can now probably deliver an intercontinental ballistic missile armed with a nuclear warhead against the United States. A second unavoidable constraint is geography, which may make war less likely. North Korean artillery points directly at Seoul, just 35 miles from the demilitarized zone (DMZ). South Korea may oppose a war, which could influence U.S. behavior. North Korea also borders China, a powerful country whose economic support keeps North Korea afloat. But China faces its own geographic reality with respect to North Korea, and China is increasingly frustrated with North Korea’s behavior. In the event of war, China does not want refugees flooding across the border into China. Yet China also does not want a unified Korean Peninsula with U.S. troops on its border. Indeed, in the Korean War, the United States tested geographic constraints by pushing beyond the prewar dividing line, the 38th parallel, in an attempt to unify Korea. China intervened to prevent such an outcome, and the conflict stopped where it started. All sides know that a war would be a huge and difficult military and political problem. So there are strong incentives to try to deter the other side, rather than escalate. U.S. and North Korean leaders have reason to make war even less likely Although the focus on Trump and Kim almost always suggests that their behavior increases the risk of war, they actually have strong incentives to reduce the prospect of wa

r. Despite rhetoric about North Korea’s irrationality, Kim’s pursuit of nuclear weapons and long range missiles was rational. He wants to stay in power, and nuclear weapons constitute invasion insurance. But a war would probably spell the end of the regime, giving North Korea little reason to start a war. On the U.S. side, few wars have probably been war-gamed more than a conflict on the Korean Peninsula. U.S. decision-makers know how costly a war might be. Knowledge of these costs makes war less likely.