# 1NC

## Offs

### 1NC—CP

#### CP: Private entities ought not appropriate lunar heritage sites, except for the appropriation of lunar heritage sites in the Sea of Tranquility by helium-3 mining. States ought to clarify that the lunar mining of helium-3 is permissible under the Outer Space Treaty.

#### It’s a heritage site – 1AC Fessl ev talks specifically about the Tranquility base and lunar landing sites as protected sites

Villanueva 10 “Sea of Tranquility” JANUARY 14, 2010, JOHN CARL VILLANUEVA <https://www.universetoday.com/50525/sea-of-tranquility/> SM

The Sea of Tranquility is the landing site of Apollo 11, the mission that gave mankind its first ever walk on the Moon.

Walk? Yes, that’s right. The Sea of Tranquility is not actually a sea, so Neil Armstrong didn’t have to walk on water. In fact, there isn’t a single sea on the lunar surface. The Sea of Tranquility is actually a lunar mare. Now, although the plural of ‘mare’, ‘maria’, is a Latin word that means ‘seas’, these maria don’t have water in them.

#### Site classification uncertainty kills investment in He-3 mining.

Bilder 09 “A Legal Regime for the Mining of Helium-3 on the Moon: U.S. Policy Options” Richard B. Bilder [Foley & Lardner-Bascom Emeritus Professor of Law, University of Wisconsin Law School.] 10/8/2009 <https://media.law.wisc.edu/m/wndnj/bilder1489273mining_helium-3ftns.pdf> SM

B. Should the U.S. Attempt to Establish an International Lunar Resource Regime Outside of the Framework of the Present Moon Agreement? While I have suggested that there are now good arguments for the U.S. – preferably, collectively with other space powers – to ratify and accede to the Moon Agreement under arrangements which would ensure that the legal regime established pursuant to Article 11 fully met U.S. requirements, the fact remains that such ratification by the U.S. may not currently be politically attainable. As was the case when the Agreement was first presented to the Senate subcommittee in 1980, influential and respected individuals and groups in the U.S. continue to strongly oppose U.S. ratification, remaining convinced that the Agreement’s fundamental cast – especially, its provisions characterizing lunar resources as the “common heritage of mankind” and mandating the establishment of an “international regime” – will in practice inhibit the productive development and exploitation of He-3 and other lunar resources, and, in particular, create such uncertainty for private enterprise as to effectively discourage, if not prevent, private investment and industry from playing any meaningful role in the exploitation of such resources – a role they believe essential to the successful commercial development of such resources.61 It may be argued that, given the risks and uncertainty necessarily involved in the development of lunar He-3-based fusion energy, the enormous investment certainly required, and the likely very long time horizon before any financial return can hope to be achieved, the prospect of private enterprises choosing to play a leading role in He-3 or other lunar resource development – at least without substantial government assistance – is open to question.62 However, the 1980 Senate Hearings and subsequent lack of administration interest in the Agreement suggest that, if such opposition persists, the prospect for Senate ratification of the Agreement at any time soon may remain uncertain.

#### Especially since the most precise and formal delineation of heritage site borders is this blurry NASA screenshot

https://moon.nasa.gov/resources/53/lunar-heritage-sites/
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#### Mining on heritage sites lets us skip in the research project with human-obtained samples – that’s preferable to generic sites.

Glass 92 “Lunar Site Characterization and Mining” Charles E. Glass [registered professional geological engineer in the State of Arizona, this is from a NASA edited paper] 1992 <https://space.nss.org/settlement/nasa/spaceresvol3/lscam1.htm> SM

Before resources are committed to lunar mining, a significant amount of information will be needed. I hope that our workshop group will illuminate some of the more obscure areas, such as the specific requirements of an ore processing facility. Other important information can be acquired only through onsite exploration and testing.

Potential lunar mining sites can be divided into two general groups- generic sites and Apollo sites. Geologic data for both types of site are sparse and of poor spatial resolution

Generic sites have not been visited. They are potential mine sites only because they are in lunar regions with mineralogic properties that are generally understood by comparison of remotely sensed data with data from analysis of Apollo site samples; e.g., mare sites, highland sites, or transition sites. See figure 15. Generic sites will require exploration at a variety of scales.

Initial exploration using a satellite in lunar orbit will allow regional exploration of many generic sites. Polar sites, if suitable ones can be identified, have several advantages for a mining operation. First, the continuous solar radiation at the poles would enable continuous mining o perations under stable temperature and lighting conditions. (See figure 16.) Such an environment would eliminate the stress on mining equipment and personnel caused by the alternation of 2-week lunar nights and days at other sites. Second, the high thermal gradients encountered at the poles due to low Sun angles could help provide cryogenic storage for processing gases and product gases. Third, the potential occurrence of water frozen in the perpetually shadowed areas of the poles is an incentive for exploring polar sites.

Exploration of generic sites at intermediate scales is required to bridge the gap between the low- resolution remote sensing data and the more intensive measurements made by human beings. This intermediate-scale exploration could be done by automated rovers, which should be able to cover relatively large areas rather rapidly.

The automated nature of lunar exploration will demand advances in high-resolution sensing and in computer processing and integration of data acquired by different instruments on the same roving vehicle. Knowledge gained from terrestrial mineral exploration can be used for preliminary training of automated interpretation systems, but the unique conditions of the lunar environment will likely require an intelligent computer- vision system capable of "learning" and adjusting as new data become available.

[Images omitted]

Completion of these exploration programs should bring our knowledge of generic sites up to that of the Apollo sites, the second general category. Regional exploration is not deemed necessary for the Apollo sites because of the relatively extensive body of knowledge already assembled. However, detailed site investigations to obtain specific parameters for mine design will be required for the first mining attempt.

In outlining these exploration requirements, our workshop group made several assumptions. First, we assumed that the prototype lunar mining venture should be an unqualified success. Second, we assumed that the startup product would be liquid oxygen, with the subsequent addition of such byproducts as metals for structural use, ceramics, and bulk materials for shielding. Third, we assumed that the mining operation wou[a excavate lunar regolith and deliver a well-graded feedstock to the processing facility. (No crushing is required, with oversized material being removed mechanically.)

Specific Parameters for Mine Design

The final stage of the exploration program-to acquire specific parameters for mine design-will begin only after a chosen site has been as thoroughly explored as an Apollo site. Even for the Apollo sites, information is insufficient to assure the success of our first lunar mine. Factors that affect mining include mineralogy, grain size distribution, abrasiveness, depth of loosely compacted regolith, and surface topography. How these factors vary from place to place is not well understood. The Apollo missions were never intended to be resource appraisals. Nevertheless, a restudy of Apollo samples and survey data with an eye toward resource appraisal would be a promising first step toward obtaining the needed site detail.

#### Tranquility mining is key – it has the highest known density of He-3.

O’Reilly 16 LUNAR EXPLORATION FOR HE-3 Bryan O’Reilly The Ohio State University 2016 <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/159567253.pdf> SM

* Mare Tranquillitatis = science word for Sea of Tranquility

Schmitt (2006) summarized initial research on the exploration for lunar He-3 that identified potential areas of high He-3 concentration. Mare Tranquillitatis, for example, is considered a particularly attractive site for a manned lunar base and the mining of lunar He-3. This site also holds Fe, Ti, and other minerals important for cost-effective, on-site production of construction materials and O2 from mineralized oxygen. In siting a manned lunar base, water may be extracted atomically bound OH- and lunar ice, and other issues that need to be addressed in choosing a manned lunar base.

The present research study further tests the recommended locations (e.g. Mare Tranquillitatis) of high He-3 concentrations. In particular, the utility of satellite-based Gamma Ray Spectrometers (GRS) is investigated to indirectly map He-3 abundances in terms of the surficial abundances of gamma-radiating elements like titanium, oxygen and iron that reflect distributions of lunar ilmenite (e.g., Hasebe et al., 2008). In addition, satellite microwave measurements may be used to estimate regolith thickness, maturity, and dielectric constants to help map out He-3 concentrations and other lunar mineral deposits (Wang, 2010).

Satellite remote sensing data from past lunar missions are used to estimate TiO2 and hydrogen concentrations, and the solar wind flux over the crust to identify lunar He-3 prospects. These results may help constrain the fiscal and technological viability of mining lunar He-3.

Current uses of helium-3 far outpace its supply and production on Earth. This shortage is detrimental to areas ranging from national security to important physics and medical research. The growing decrease of He-3 stores also drastically limits efforts to make He-3-D fusion a realistic energy source. However, the growing demand may well be satisfied with the He-3 concentrations hosted within the regolith of our closest celestial neighbor, the Moon. Indeed, the mining of He-3 on the Moon is an imminent, if not the next, giant leap for space exploration (Schmitt, 2006).

Elements of this research were presented at the fall’15 Undergraduate Student Poster Forum and the spring’16 Denman Undergraduate Research Forum of The Ohio State University. Further aspects of this research were presented at the annual conferences of the Geologic Society of America (O’Reilly and von Frese, 2015) and NASA’s Lunar and Planetary Institute (O’Reilly and von Frese, 2016).

METHODS

National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) data collection

The elemental abundance data for this research were collected from NASA’s publicly available Planetary Data System (PDS) Geoscience Node. Specifically, the data were observed by the Lunar Prospector (LP) mission’s gamma ray and neutron spectrometer tools and processed by the LP Spectrometer Team as part of a NASA Lunar Data Analysis Program. Elemental abundances of Ti were derived from LP gamma ray spectrometer (Feldman et al., 1999) observations acquired during the high-altitude portion of the LP mission. For the Ti distribution, the data are given in units of elemental weight percent (Prettyman et al., 2002). The half-degree hydrogen abundances came from the LP neutron spectrometer epithermal neutron data that had been corrected by the thermal neutron data (Feldman et al., 2001). Equations 3 and 4 of Feldman et al. (2001) show how the corrected epithermal data were converted into hydrogen abundances as parts per million (ppm). Note, however, that these abundances can be unreliable in regions of high thorium and rare-Earth element abundances (Maurice et al., 2004).

In general, using the above method yields an average ±1.7 wt% uncertainty in the TiO2 estimates (Elphic et al., 2002). Estimates from areas with higher levels of TiO2 are considered to be more reliable than those from lower TiO2 areas. Uncertainties in H estimates are typically less than 1% over latitudes ±70° and increase significantly towards the poles (Feldman et al., 2001). Estimates of H taken from large lunar craters in the South Pole showed uncertainties averaging around 50% (Feldman et al., 2001).

Modeling

The raw elemental abundance data were converted from the original ASCII files to Microsoft Excel through the “paste special” tool for import into MATLAB. Once imported, the data were processed by the scripts in Appendix A to produce various lunar abundance maps. The script in Figure A1 produces contour maps of the elemental data on the lunar near and far sides using the M\_Map MATLAB mapping package (Pawlowicz 2014). This script uses the sinusoidal map projection to produce equal-area representations of the abundance data.

The script in Figure A2 produces stereographic projections of abundances in the lunar polar regions. Equation 1 (Fa and Ya-Qiu, 2007) was used to estimate crustal exposure to solar wind flux as a percentage in terms of lunar longitude (θ) and latitude (Φ) in degrees, and the constant flux (F0) at a subsolar point. Here, f represents the amount of time the lunar surface is fully shielded from solar winds by Earth’s magnetotail in the span of 28 days (one orbital period). To produce the normalized solar wind flux, the model assumed F0 = 0.5, and f = 0.25 based on the amount of time the moon is in the magnetotail. Equation 1 was implemented by the MATLAB script in Figure A3 to produce a contour map (Figure 2) of the lunar near and far side exposures in percent of the maximum solar wind flux over a single lunar orbital period. These maps in the sinusoidal map projection were obtained using the previously cited M\_map mapping package.

𝟐 + 𝒔𝒊𝒏(𝜽 − 𝒇𝝅) − 𝒔𝒊𝒏(𝜽 + 𝒇𝝅), |𝜽| ≤ 𝝅(. 𝟓 − 𝒇) 1) 𝑭(𝜱,𝜽)=𝑭𝟎𝒄𝒐𝒔(𝜱)∗{𝟏+𝒔𝒊𝒏(|𝜽|−𝒇𝝅),𝝅(𝟎.𝟓−𝒇)≤|𝜽|≤𝝅(.𝟓+𝒇)

𝟐, 𝝅(. 𝟓 + 𝒇) ≤ |𝜽| ≤ 𝝅

RESULTS

Solar Flux

Figure 2 shows that the Moon’s orbit around Earth largely affects the intensity of solar exposure on its surface, with the near side receiving significantly lower exposure than the far side. This is due to Earth’s magnetosphere which, during a full Moon when the near side is facing the Sun, rests within Earth’s magnetotail shielded from solar radiation.

[Figure omitted] Figure 2. Solar flux as a percent of solar wind flux exposure per lunar cycle for the near (top) and far (bottom) sides of the lunar surface between 65°S - 65°N.

Titanium Distribution

The distribution of Ti correlates with large impact events (Schmitt, 2006), and thus the highest Ti concentrations are within the maria of the lunar near side (Figure 3). Mare Tranquillitatis, in particular, appears to have the highest overall concentration. On the moon, Ti occurs as the mineral ilmenite (FeTiO3) with the crystal structure that locks in the small He-3 atoms. The blank strip surrounding 180°E in Figure 3 reflects a no-data area due to lack of orbital coverage by the satellite (Feldman et al., 1999).

Diurnal Heating

Areas within ±60 ̊ latitudes experience large average daily temperature shifts. The Apollo 15 site (26.13224 N, 3.63400 E), for example, underwent a shift from 374 ̊K to 92 ̊K (Heiken et al., 1991). The areas around the poles typically stay within 10 ̊ of 115 ̊K with even smaller variations in permanently shadowed craters (Vasavada et al., 1999). Volatiles are essentially baked out of the regolith when subjected to these extreme temperature changes (Cocks, 2010).

Polar Migration

After volatiles are released from the lunar regolith, they are either redeposited on the lunar surface or released into space (Cocks 2010). Figure 4 shows the increase of hydrogen around the poles compared to lower longitudes. This measurable increase is attributed to permanently shadowed craters, which prevent massive temperature fluctuations and provide shielding from micrometeoroids. The blank strips surrounding 180°E in Figure 4 reflect areas with no data due to lack of orbital coverage by the satellite (Feldman et al., 1999).
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[Figure omitted] Figure 3. Weight percent Ti distribution for the near (top) and far (bottom) sides of the lunar surface from 65°S - 65°N. Mare Tranquillitatis is highlighted (8.5°N, 31.4°E) as an area of high Ti. Map statistics include the amplitude range (AR) of (max, min) values, amplitude standard deviation (ASD), amplitude mean (AM), and contour interval (CI) in weight %.
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[Figure omitted] Figure 4. Volatile hydrogen concentrations in ppm for the lunar north pole (top left) from 90°N - 65°N, south pole (top right) from 90°S - 65°S, and the far side (bottom) from 90°W - 90°E and from 65°S - 65°N of the lunar surface. Map statistics include amplitude range (AR) of (max, min) values, amplitude standard deviation (ASD), amplitude mean (AM), and contour interval (CI) in ppm.

DISCUSSION

The data above contain implications for the search for large concentrations of He-3. The only method for deposition of He-3 is through exposure of the regolith to solar radiation carrying the isotope. Figure 5 shows the geometry of the Moon’s exposure to solar radiation over a single orbital period (28 days). Accordingly, most of this exposure occurs on the far side of the Moon when it is between the Sun and Earth outside the magnetosphere.

In general, the areas of high solar exposure are also subject to extreme diurnal

[Figure omitted] Figure 5. A 2-D geometric rendering of the relationship between the Sun (orange), Earth (large circle), and the moon (small circle) throughout a lunar orbital period. The moon is positioned outside the magnetosphere (green dashed line) during a new moon exposing the far side (light blue). The moon is positioned inside the protective magnetotail (red dashed line) during a full moon preventing exposure of the near side (dark blue).

temperature fluctuations. During the lunar orbital period, these drastic temperature changes will occur due to the prolonged exposure or protection from solar radiation causing the deposited volatiles to leave the regolith and possibly be re-ionized and –deposited onto the lunar surface (Cocks, 2010). This implies that many of the volatiles initially deposited by solar wind exposure do not remain stably in place. The distribution of hydrogen measured in Figure 4 suggests that the volatiles in general may be concentrated around the poles.

Much like hydrogen, He-3 is also deposited in the regolith through solar wind. However, exposing these elements to extreme temperature shifts causes them to vaporize and leave the lunar surface. Some of these volatiles are re-ionized due to subsequent solar wind exposure and possibly deposited again near the poles where they are better protected from temperature changes (Cocks, 2010). This mechanism could help explain the larger polar accumulations of volatiles.

The lunar polar regions offer protection from extreme temperature variations, which also may be provided by the presence of permanently shadowed craters. These craters not only protect volatiles from vaporizing out of the regolith, but they also shield the regolith from micrometeorite impacts that disturb the surface encouraging the further release of volatiles. These polar regions are estimated by the Lunar Prospector team (Schmitt, 2000) to contain roughly 5 to 15 times more hydrogen. Figure 6 shows an example of the permanently shadowed Shackleton crater.

[Figure omitted] Figure 6. The Shackleton crater located near the South Pole, where the colors indicate the percentage of time illuminated during a single lunar orbital period. The rim of the crater contains zero (white) and near zero illumination values which identify it as a permanently shadowed crater (Zuber et al., 2012).

Another important aspect to consider is the relationship between titanium (Ti) and He-3. The majority of Ti on the Moon appears in the form of ilmenite (FeTiO3). Tests done on lunar ilmenite, olivine, pyroxene, and plagioclase show that for grains in the same size range from the same soil, ilmenite (FeTiO3) contains 10 to 100 more times as much He-3 (Fa and Ya-Qiu, 2007). The structure of ilmenite, seen in Figure 7, is better able to hold onto the small He-3 ions when subjected to extreme conditions. This suggests that He-3 is more protected from the effects of massive temperature shifts than other volatiles when high concentrations of Ti are present. Figure 3 shows that most of the Ti on the Moon appears in the large impact craters of the nearside.

[Figure omitted] Figure 7. The crystal structure of Ilmenite. The alternating layers of Fe and Ti along with the rhombohedral shape shown above allow for tighter confinement of loose He-3 ions (Ribeiro and Lazaro, 2014).

With all of these factors considered, two areas of particular interest are suggested for holding large concentrations of He-3. They include Mare Tranquillitatis (8.5 ̊N 31.4 ̊E) that has the highest concentration of Ti on the lunar surface, and thus also possible large He-3 stores. The second area of interest is the South Pole Aitken basin with large permanently shadowed craters that enhance its ability to hold volatiles like He-3 through diurnal heating shifts over the lunar orbital period. These permanently shadowed craters would protect the volatiles from temperature shifts and the regolith from being disturbed by micrometeorite impacts.

CONCLUSIONS

Lunar resource development is an extensive and expensive effort, however, this study seeks to introduce the need to explore for these resources. This study examined the shortage of available He-3 and the affected industries. Hopes in the distant future for clean fusion energy also rest on access to this valuable resource. As U.S. stockpiles diminish and demand continues, the economic incentive for the acquisition of He-3 deposits on the moon becomes an increasingly attractive option.

The objective of this study was to use available satellite data to estimate possible locations of large lunar He-3 deposits. From the analysis of NASA’s satellite gamma ray data, two areas were targeted for possibly holding large concentrations of He-3. Specifically, Mare Tranquillitatis was identified as holding enhanced ilmenite concentrations and other elements that would be essential in any mining mission. The South Pole Aitken basin was also targeted due to its large permanently shadowed areas that enhance its ability to hold volatiles and prevent their migration due to diurnal heating. In general, these results are also consistent with previous lunar site recommendations for locating large He-3 concentrations (e.g. Schmitt, 2006).

#### Only mining at Tranquility sites is economically feasible and profitable – it’s the only location with enough data to be categorized as a measured resource.

Schmidt 06 “Return to the Moon exploration, enterprise, and energy in the human settlement of space” Harrison Schmidt [an American geologist, retired NASA astronaut, university professor, former U.S. senator from New Mexico, and the most recent person living, and only civilian to have walked on the Moon. Schmitt is the last surviving crew member of Apollo 17] <https://www.amazon.com/Return-Moon-Exploration-Enterprise-Settlement/dp/0387242856> SM

Economic geologists — who study the value, quantity, and origin of mineral deposits — use the terms "measured," "indicated," and "inferred" to distinguish resources that are at decreasing levels of certainty in terms of available tonnage at a specified value (see Figure 6.4).87 Exploration, drilling, and sample analysis, or other direct means, have delineated "measured reserves" to the extent that further investments of capital for actual production are warranted. Of course, such investments only will be made if the value and tonnage, or volume, make economic sense in the time frame that the resource can be sold in a forecasted market. "Indicated resources" have enough geological definition to be included in long-term mine planning but will require additional investment in quantitative exploration before they can become defined as measured resources ready for production. "Inferred resources" are based on geological inference but are too speculative to be included in planning until further exploration takes place.

The current economic and geological position of lunar helium-3 in the titanium-rich portions of Mare Tranquillitatis is shown in Figure 6.4. Relative to the figure, upward, positive economic change in lunar helium-3 will be determined by increases in the cost of alternative sources of terrestrial energy, particularly coal. Downward, negative economic change would be caused by higher than anticipated lunar development costs. Increases in geological certainty could arise from direct sensing of helium-3 from orbital spacecraft; however, it definitely will come from detailed mapping and the fusion of all pertinent geochemical and geotechnical data prior to mining.

The first consideration an economic geologist makes relative to a potential resource must involve its estimated value, against which the costs of production can be weighed. What is the likely price per unit that can be realized in the marketplace at the point in the future when the production operations begin? The value of lunar helium-3 for fusion electrical power plants on Earth will be a function of the demand and supply of competitive energy sources. As already discussed in the previous chapter (Section 5.3), helium-3 will be in direct future competition with steam coal for power generation. Forecasting coal prices in the 2010-2015 time frame will be important to evaluating the competitive value of lunar helium-3. Prices for thermal or steam coal in Asia (4% of world demand, rising at 10% annually) have begun to rise rapidly, up 70-80% in 2004.88 In fact, some analysts expect steam coal to reach and hold over $2.50/million BTU in 2005.89 Spot prices have approached $2.00 in the United States for the eastern stoker coal in 2004.9° Therefore, forecasting coal prices of at least $2.50/million BTU, appears to be a reasonable planning assumption for 2010-2015.9' This gives a conservative estimate that the energy equivalent value of 100 kg of helium-3 in 2010-2015 would be about $140 million.

6.3.2 Mining analysis With this value of $140 million 100 kg in mind, how much helium-3 is reasonably available in the richest (highest grade or concentration) known portions of the lunar regolith? Working with the Wisconsin Fusion Technology Institute team in the 1980s, the late Professor Eugene Cameron,92 one of the world's foremost economic geologists, made the

[Figure omitted] FIGURE 6.4 Current position of lunar helium-3 in titanium-rich portions of Mare Tranquillitatis relative to demonstrated economic potential. (Graphic background courtesy of P. J. Brown, University of Wisconsin—Madison)

first estimates of the quantities of helium-3 expected to be present in titanium-rich regolith on the Moon. Cameron, using available spectro-scopic data on titanium concentration as discussed in Section 6.2.3, determined that the highest grade area for helium-3 totaled about 84,000 km2 and another 195,000 km2 of medium grade concentrations all within Mare Tranquillitatis. By geological inference, using photogeological mapping and remotely-sensed titanium concentrations, this is the region to which Apollo 11 samples apply, as well as those provided by Apollo 17. Cameron also studied the distribution of craters and estimated that about 50% of the 84,000 km2 would be minable by the Wisconsin Mark II miner (see Section 7.2.2). If mined to a depth of 3 meters with a helium-3 concentration of 20 wppb (Section 5.2), this highest grade area would yield about 2500 tonnes of helium-3. In 2010-2015, with coal at $2.50/ million BTU, this amount of helium-3 will probably have an energy equivalent value of about $3.5 trillion! Even at 2003's contract coal prices, the value would be about $1.75 trillion. This economic potential, and the policy and environmental advantages of helium-3 fusion, have been exciting enough to keep the interest of the Wisconsin group and the author since the late 1980s.

Since Cameron's initial work, as discussed above, the helium-3 resources in Mare Tranquillitatis have moved close enough to being "measured resources" to warrant investment in the integrated analysis of all available sample and remote-sensing data. Cameron based his analysis on Apollo 11 sample data, the available spectroscopic definition of titanium distribution, and 1960s Lunar Orbiter photography.93 Apollos 15, 16, and 17 metric and panametric cameras, operating from orbit, gathered additional high-resolution and stereophotography of the area of interest in Mare Tranquillitatis. Subsequently, two additional data sets obtained by the Department of Defense and NASA promise to further refine our knowledge of the distribution of titanium in that region's regolith. Respectively, these data came from optical spectrometers aboard the Clementine mission in 199494 and from the neutron and gamma-ray spectrometers of the Lunar Prospector mission in 1998-1999.95 Further, improved optical specrometric data from Earth have been collected.96 As discussed above, nanophase native iron accumulates in the regolith as a function of exposure to micrometeor impact, so remotely-sensed concentrations of such iron measure the length of exposure to solar wind and, in turn, indirectly measure relative helium-3 concentrations. This accounts for the strong correlation between both titanium oxide concentration and regolith maturity.97

It may be possible, as well as desirable to potential investors, to directly map helium-3 distribution in the regolith. This could be done on a global scale by developing an advanced gamma-ray spectrometer for a special-purpose, low-cost lunar orbiter, mapping the 20.6 (and higher) MeV gamma-rays released when a helium-3 nucleus captures a solar cosmic-ray-induced neutron.98 (Significant in-situ understanding of neutron flux at the lunar surface was gained by the lunar neutron probe experiment deployed on Apollo 17.99) Telerobotic rovers could accomplish more specific and higher resolution mapping of a targeted mining site, albeit at significantly higher cost than an orbital sensor. The cost, however, of either an orbiter or surface rovers should not be incurred until the existing data sets are fully exploited and the need for one or the other becomes clear.

Although a major project that fuses all the available data sets is clearly necessary, there can be little doubt that very interesting concentrations (grades) of helium-3 are present in the upper 3 to 6 meters of Mare Tranquillitatis regolith. Based on analyses of Apollo samples to date, the average, undisturbed concentration of helium-3 in major portions of Mare Tranquillitatis appears to be at least 20 wppb, and conceivably higher. Analysis of drill cores from Apollo 15, 16, and 17, even though they have been depleted in volatiles by agitation and are highly variable from one buried ejecta blanket to another, indicates that this average grade will continue to a depth of at least 3 meters and probably to the base of the regolith.10°

#### Helium-3 fusion possible now—Solves warming and energy infrastructure reliability

**Whittington 21** (Mark, contributor to the Hill. “Solving the climate and energy crises: Mine the Moon's helium-3?”<https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/540856-solving-the-climate-and-energy-crises-mine-the-moons-helium-3> February 28, 2021)DR 22

Solar System Resources has agreed to provide 500 kilograms of helium-3 mined from the Moon to U.S. Nuclear Corp. in the 2028-2032 timeframe.

According to [a paper](https://mdcampbell.com/Helium-3version2.pdf) published by Jeff Bonde and Anthony Tortorello, helium-3 is an isotope that has been deposited in lunar soil over billions of years by solar wind. Roughly 1.1 million metric tons of the isotope exists on the Moon down to a depth of several meters. Twenty-five metric tons of helium-3, about a quarter of the cargo capacity of a SpaceX Starship, would suffice to fuel all the power needs of the United States for a year.

The announcement does not reveal how Solar System Resource proposes to mine the helium-3. The company’s website is very heavy on breathtakingly inspirational verbiage and light on how it intends to raise the money and develop the technology to mine the solar system’s resources. However, the paper suggests that a rover could scoop up lunar regolith, separate helium-3 along with oxygen and hydrogen, store them and eject the processed lunar soil. The gasses would be taken back to a lunar base where the oxygen and hydrogen would be put to good use and the helium-3 stored for later export to Earth.

The announcement also does not reveal what U.S. Nuclear Corp. intends to do with the helium-3 once it takes delivery. The company, which builds radiation detection devices, has a subsidiary, [Magneto-Inertial Fusion Technology, Inc.,](https://www.usnuclearcorp.com/magneto-inertial-fusion-technologies/) that is researching a fusion technology called [staged Z-pinch.](https://arpa-e.energy.gov/sites/default/files/04_WESSEL.pdf) This would create a fusion reaction long enough and sustained enough to become a power source. Presumably, an abundant store of helium-3 could be an asset for those experiments.

Fusion using helium-3 has advantages and disadvantages over using deuterium, an isotope of hydrogen and tritium, another isotope of hydrogen.

Deuterium and tritium fusion releases radioactive neutrons that will damage and weaken the containment vessel. Periodically, a fusion reactor using this method would have to be taken offline for decontamination. Tritium is also radioactive, making its handling difficult and dangerous. A deuterium and helium-3 fusion creates helium and charged protons as byproducts and few or no radioactive particles.

The main disadvantage of fusion using helium-3 is that it would take a far greater amount of energy to achieve it than the conventional deuterium and tritium variety. According to [Open Mind,](https://www.bbvaopenmind.com/en/science/physics/helium-3-lunar-gold-fever/#:~:text=In%201986%2C%20scientists%20at%20the,produce%20energy%20by%20nuclear%20fusion.) Frank Close, a physicist at the University of Oxford, regards fusion using helium-3 as “moonshine.” Close suggests that a deuterium and helium-3 fusion will still produce some radioactive neutrons.

Gerald Kulcinski, director of the [Fusion Technology Institute](https://fti.neep.wisc.edu/fti.neep.wisc.edu/index.html) at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, disagrees. Close’s objection is based on using conventional fusion technology. The Fusion Technology Institute has achieved some progress in minimizing radioactive neutron production using different technology.

Helium-3 fusion is an even more promising technology, albeit a more difficult and complicated one to develop. The consensus seems to be that such reactors will not be achieved for some decades, say mid-century.

No one can guarantee that enough helium-3 will be mined from the Moon to jump-start serious development of technology using the isotope as a fusion fuel in the foreseeable future. There is no guarantee that such a development will see practical results anytime soon. However, the effort would be well worth pursuing, with substantial money and effort deployed behind it. If not the two aforementioned companies, someone should undertake the effort. Fusion using helium-3 as fuel would change the world in profoundly beneficial ways.

The great problem civilization faces is access to clean, affordable and reliable energy. Recent [events](https://www.nbcnews.com/news/weather/knocked-out-texas-millions-face-record-lows-without-power-new-n1257964) in Texas prove that not having energy, even for a few days, can be catastrophic. At the same time, humankind needs sources of energy that do not harm the environment, especially by emitting greenhouse gasses.

It appears that humankind is returning to the Moon, at long last. [President Trump](https://thehill.com/people/donald-trump) [started](https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/482265-trump-goes-all-in-for-nasas-artemis-return-to-the-moon-program) the Artemis Project. [President Biden](https://thehill.com/people/joe-biden) has thrown his support behind the effort. There are many reasons to return to the Moon, from science, to commerce, to soft political power. Solving the decades-long energy crisis could be the singular benefit for expanding human activity to Earth’s nearest neighbor.

#### Extinction from energy collapse

Greene 19 [Sherrell R. Greene Mr. Greene received his B.S. and M.S. degrees in Nuclear Engineering from the University of Tennessee. He is a recognized subject matter expert in nuclear reactor safety, nuclear fuel cycle technologies, and advanced reactor concept development. Mr. Greene is widely acclaimed for his systems analysis, team building, innovation, knowledge organization, presentation, and technical communication skills. Mr. Greene worked at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) for over three decades. During his career at ORNL, he served as Director of Research Reactor Development Programs and Director of Nuclear Technology Programs. . "Enhancing Electric Grid, Critical Infrastructure, and Societal Resilience with Resilient Nuclear Power Plants (rNPPs)." <https://ans.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00295450.2018.1505357?needAccess=true> edited for ableist language in brackets[]]

Societies and nations are examples of large-scale, complex social-physical systems. Thus, societal resilience can be defined as the ability of a nation, population, or society to anticipate and prepare for major stressors or calamities and then to absorb, adapt to, recover from, and restore normal functions in the wake of such events when they occur. A nation’s dependence on its Critical Infrastructure systems, and the resilience of those systems, are therefore major components of national and societal resilience.

There are a variety of events that could deal ~~crippling~~ [Incapacitating] blows to a nation’s Grid, Critical Infrastructure, and social fabric. The types of catastrophes under consideration here are “very bad day” scenarios that might result from severe GMDs induced by solar CMEs, HEMP attacks, cyber attacks, etc.5

As briefly discussed in Sec. III.C, the probability of a GMD of the magnitude of the 1859 Carrington Event is now believed to be on the order of 1%/year. The Earth narrowly missed (by only several days) intercepting a CME stream in July 2012 that would have created a GMD equal to or larger than the Carrington Event.41 Lloyd’s, in its 2013 report, “Solar Storm Risk to the North American Electric Grid,” 42 stated the following: “A Carrington-level, extreme geomagnetic storm is almost inevitable in the future…The total U.S. population at risk of extended power outage from a Carrington-level storm is between 20-40 million, with durations of 16 days to 1-2 years…The total economic cost for such a scenario is estimated at $0.6-2.6 trillion USD.” Analyses conducted subsequent to the Lloyd’s assessment indicated the geographical area impacted by the CME would be larger than that estimated in Lloyd’s analysis (extending farther northward along the New England coast of the United States and in the state of Minnesota),43 and that the actual consequences of such an event could actually be greater than estimated by Lloyd’s.

Based on “Report of the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack: Critical National Infrastructures” to Congress in 2008 (Ref. 39), a HEMP attack over the Central U.S. could impact virtually the entire North American continent. The consequences of such an event are difficult to quantify with confidence. Experts affiliated with the aforementioned Commission and others familiar with the details of the Commission’s work have stated in Congressional testimony that such an event could “kill up to 90 percent of the national population through starvation, disease, and societal collapse.” 44,45 Most of these consequences are either direct or indirect impacts of the predicted collapse of virtually the entire U.S. Critical Infrastructure system in the wake of the attack.

Last, recent analyses by both the U.S. Department of Energy46 and the U.S. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine47 have concluded that cyber threats to the U.S. Grid from both state-level and substatelevel entities are likely to grow in number and sophistication in the coming years, posing a growing threat to the U.S. Grid.

These three “very bad day” scenarios are not creations of overzealous science fiction writers. A variety of mitigating actions to reduce both the vulnerability and the consequences of these events has been identified, and some are being implemented. However, the fact remains that events such as those described here have the potential to change life as we know it in the United States and other developed nations in the 21st century, whether the events occur individually, or simultaneously, and with or without coordinated physical attacks on Critical Infrastructure assets.

#### Extinction from warming—feedback loops bypass defense

Ng ’19 [Yew-Kwang; May 2019; Professor of Economics at Nanyang Technology University, Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences in Australia and Member of the Advisory Board at the Global Priorities Institute at Oxford University, Ph.D. in Economics from Sydney University; Global Policy, “Keynote: Global Extinction and Animal Welfare: Two Priorities for Effective Altruism,” vol. 10, no. 2, p. 258-266]

Catastrophic climate change

Though by no means certain, CCC causing global extinction is possible due to interrelated factors of non‐linearity, cascading effects, positive feedbacks, multiplicative factors, critical thresholds and tipping points (e.g. Barnosky and Hadly, [2016](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0005); Belaia et al., [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0008); Buldyrev et al., [2010](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0016); Grainger, [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0027); Hansen and Sato, [2012](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0029); IPCC [2014](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0031); Kareiva and Carranza, [2018](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0033); Osmond and Klausmeier, [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0056); Rothman, [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0066); Schuur et al., [2015](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0069); Sims and Finnoff, [2016](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0072); Van Aalst, [2006](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0079)).[7](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-note-1009_67)

A possibly imminent tipping point could be in the form of ‘an abrupt ice sheet collapse [that] could cause a rapid sea level rise’ (Baum et al., [2011](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0006), p. 399). There are many avenues for positive feedback in global warming, including:

* the replacement of an ice sea by a liquid ocean surface from melting reduces the reflection and increases the absorption of sunlight, leading to faster warming;
* the drying of forests from warming increases forest fires and the release of more carbon; and
* higher ocean temperatures may lead to the release of methane trapped under the ocean floor, producing runaway global warming.

Though there are also avenues for negative feedback, the scientific consensus is for an overall net positive feedback (Roe and Baker, [2007](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0065)). Thus, the Global Challenges Foundation ([2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0026), p. 25) concludes, ‘The world is currently completely unprepared to envisage, and even less deal with, the consequences of CCC’.

The threat of sea‐level rising from global warming is well known, but there are also other likely and more imminent threats to the survivability of mankind and other living things. For example, Sherwood and Huber ([2010](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0071)) emphasize the adaptability limit to climate change due to heat stress from high environmental wet‐bulb temperature. They show that ‘even modest global warming could … expose large fractions of the [world] population to unprecedented heat stress’ p. 9552 and that with substantial global warming, ‘the area of land rendered uninhabitable by heat stress would dwarf that affected by rising sea level’ p. 9555, making extinction much more likely and the relatively moderate damages estimated by most integrated assessment models unreliably low.

While imminent extinction is very unlikely and may not come for a long time even under business as usual, the main point is that we cannot rule it out. Annan and Hargreaves ([2011](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0004), pp. 434–435) may be right that there is ‘an upper 95 per cent probability limit for S [temperature increase] … to lie close to 4°C, and certainly well below 6°C’. However, probabilities of 5 per cent, 0.5 per cent, 0.05 per cent or even 0.005 per cent of excessive warming and the resulting extinction probabilities cannot be ruled out and are unacceptable. Even if there is only a 1 per cent probability that there is a time bomb in the airplane, you probably want to change your flight. Extinction of the whole world is more important to avoid by literally a trillion times.

#### 1AR theory is skewed towards the aff – a) the 2NR must cover substance and over-cover theory, since they get the collapse and persuasive spin advantage of the 3min 2AR, b) their responses to my counter interp will be new, which means 1AR theory necessitates intervention. Implications – a) reject 1AR theory since it can’t be a legitimate check for abuse, b) drop the arg to minimize the chance the round is decided unfairly, c) use reasonability with a bar of defense or the aff always wins since the 2AR can line by line the whole 2NR without winning real abuse

## Case

### Toplevel

#### 1AC Fessl is an alt cause – they highlighted the line for us and we made it red – it says a tourist’s hand brushing the dust is enough to sweep stuff away – if they have any solvency deficit to the PIC, then they definitively can’t solve the aff

Fessl 19 Sophie Fessl 7-10-2019 “Should the Moon Landing Site Be a National Historic Landmark?” <https://daily.jstor.org/should-the-moon-landing-site-be-a-national-historic-landmark/> (PhD King’s College London, BA Oxford)//Elmer

When Neil Armstrong set foot on the moon on July 20, 1969, the pictures sent to Earth captured a historical moment: It was the first time that any human set foot on another body in our solar system. Fifty years later, experts are debating how to preserve humankind’s first steps beyond Earth. Could a National Park on the moon be the solution to saving Armstrong’s bootprints for future archaeologists? Flags, rovers, laser-reflecting mirrors, footprint—these are just a few of the dozens of artifacts and features that bear witness to our exploration of the moon. Archaeologists argue that these objects are a record to trace the development of humans in space. “Surely, those footprints are as important as those left by hominids at Laetoli, Tanzania, in the story of human development,” the anthropologist P.J. Capelotti wrote in Archaeology. While the oldest then known examples of hominins walking on two feet were cemented in ash 3.6 million years ago, “those at Tranquility Base could be swept away with a casual brush of a space tourist’s hand.” Fragile Traces Just how fragile humankind’s lunar traces are was seen already during Apollo 12. On November 19, 1969, Charles “Pete” Conrad and Alan Bean manually landed their lunar module in the moon’s Ocean of Storms, 200 meters from the unmanned probe Surveyor 3, which was left sitting on the moon’s surface two years earlier, in 1967. The next day, Conrad and Bean hopped to Surveyor 3. As they approached the spacecraft, they were surprised: The spacecraft, originally bright white, had turned light brown. It was covered in a fine layer of moon dust, likely kicked up by their landing. Harsh ultraviolet light has likely bleached the U.S. flag bright white. Without Apollo 12 upsetting the moon dust, Surveyor 3 would likely have remained stark white. Unlike Earth, the moon has no wind that carries away the dust, no rain to corrode materials, and no plate tectonic activity to pull sites on the surface back into the moon. But the moon’s thin atmosphere also means that solar wind particles bombard the lunar surface, and harsh ultraviolet light has likely bleached the U.S. flag bright white. The astronauts’ first bootprints will likely be on the moon for a long time, and will almost certainly still be there when humans next visit—unless, by tragic coincidence, a meteorite hits them first. Had LunaCorp not abandoned the idea in the early 2000s, the company’s plan to send a robot to visit the most famous sites of moon exploration could have done a lot of damage. And with Jeff Bezos’ recent unveiling of a mock-up of the lunar lander Blue Moon, it is only a matter of time before corporate adventurers and space tourists reach the moon. Historians and archaeologists are keen to avoid lunar looting. Roger Launius, senior curator of space history at the National Air and Space Museum in Washington, D.C., warned: “What we don’t want to happen is what happened in Antarctica at Scott’s hut. People took souvenirs, and nothing was done to try to preserve those until fairly late in the game.” On the other hand, there is a legitimate scientific interest in investigating how the equipment that’s on the moon was affected by a decades-long stay there.

#### Tourism isn’t appropriation – they don’t solve

Trapp 13, Timothy Justin. "Taking up Space by Any Other Means: Coming to Terms with Nonappropriation Article of the Outer Space Treaty." U. Ill. L. Rev. (2013): 1681. (JD Candidate at UIUC Law School)//Re-cut by Elmer

The issues presented in relation to the nonappropriation article of the Outer Space Treaty should be clear.214 The ITU has, quite blatantly, created something akin to “property interests in outer space.”215 It allows nations to exclude others from their orbital slots, even when the nation is not currently using that slot.216 This is directly in line with at least one definition of outer-space appropriation.217

[\*\*Start Footnote 217\*\*Id. at 236 (“Appropriation of outer space, therefore, is ‘the exercise of exclusive control or exclusive use’ with a sense of permanence, which limits other nations’ access to it.”) (quoting Milton L. Smith, The Role of the ITU in the Development of Space Law, 17 ANNALS AIR & SPACE L. 157, 165 (1992)). \*\*End Footnote 217\*\*]

The ITU even allows nations with unused slots to devise them to other entities, creating a market for the property rights set up by this regulation.218 In some aspects, this seems to effect exactly what those signatory nations of the Bogotá Declaration were try3ing to accomplish, albeit through different means.219

#### It’s travel over a short duration – neither permanent nor limit other uses by other actors of a particular region of space

Henderson and Tsui 19 Henderson, I. L., and W. H. K. Tsui. "The role of niche aviation operations as tourist attractions." Air transport: A tourism perspective (2019): 233-244. (Massey University School of Aviation, Palmerston North, New Zealand)//Elmer

17.5 Space Tourism Space tourism is another niche segment of the aviation industry that seeks to give tourists the ability to become astronauts and experience space travel for recreational, leisure, or business purposes. Since space tourism is extremely expensive, it is a case of a very small segment of consumers that are able and willing to purchase a space experience. There are several options for space tourists. For example, Crouch et al. (2009) investigate the choice behaviour between four types of space tourism: high altitude jet fighter flights, atmospheric zero-gravity flights, short-duration suborbital flights, and longer duration orbital trips into space. Reddy et al. (2012) find the following motivational factors behind space tourism (in order of importance): vision of earth from space, weightlessness, high speed experience, unusual experience, and scientific contribution. Currently, only high-altitude jet fighter flights and atmospheric zero-gravity flights are commercially available to tourists in the space tourism sector. Accordingly, this section provides an example of each, whilst the potential for suborbital and longer duration orbital trips into space are discussed later in this chapter. Case Study 17.3 Examples of Space Tourism MiG-29 Edge of Space Flight One current option for space tourists is to be taken up into the stratosphere in a supersonic fighter jet (see MiGFlug, 2017a). MiGFlug acts as a sales agent for this unique space tourism activity, which usually involves reaching an altitude of 20–22 km. At such an altitude, the curvature of the earth can be seen, the sky is dark, and it is possible to see into space. As part of this space travel experience, tourists are also given an opportunity to control the aircraft and there are a number of aerobatic manoeuvres that are performed by an experienced pilot. This operation is based out of Russia. The Mikoyan MiG-29 Fulcrum is a Russian military fighter jet that allows for rates of climb of 330 m/s and a top speed of Mach 2.25 (2390 km/h). MiGFlug sells three different services in this aircraft. For €12,500 a passenger can enjoy a 25-min flight featuring a number of aerobatic manoeuvres but without supersonic flight. For €14,500 a passenger can enjoy a 45-min flight that includes higher aerobatics and supersonic flight. The ‘Edge of Space’ flight includes aerobatics, supersonic flight, and the experience of being taken up into the stratosphere and is sold for €17,500.

#### People can land outside the site and walk over and touch things which means the aff can’t solve.

### Neutrino

#### ISS and space stations solve neutrino experimentation – only moon key warrant is lack of atmospheric interference and gravity which doesn’t exist on stations

#### Evidence doesn’t say Neutrino research WOULD occur on the moon – just that it would be good if it did – prescriptive not predictive

#### Internal link to prolif isn’t causal – even if Neutrinos ensure detection of proliferation they haven’t read reasons why that would deter proliferation – the bulk of Iranian/north Korean proliferation has occurred while under sanctions regimes imposed because their proliferation was common knowledge

#### No impact – their ev says neutrino research has been lacking for decades BUT no second gen proliferators since North Korea – proves monitoring isn’t key and no impact to prolif it causes – every “prolif risk” in their Dalton ev is ALREADY a nuclear state

#### Dual use nuclear synthesis has existed for decades which is the only warrant in Dalton – nuclear power isnt a recent phenomenon BUT there hasn’t been a successful 2nd gen prolifeator since noko - neutrinos not key

#### Prolif doesn’t cause conflict – deterrence moderates aggression

Cohen ’16 –He is a senior lecturer in security studies at Macquarie University in Australia. Not the Michael D Cohen you’re thinking of. (Michael D, “How nuclear proliferation causes conflict: the case for optimistic pessimism,” The Nonproliferation Review, 23:3-4, https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.library.georgetown.edu/doi/pdf/10.1080/10736700.2016.1256541?needAccess=true)

Three of the four mechanisms long alleged to make nuclear proliferation cause interstate conflict find little to no empirical support when the endogeneity, omitted-variable bias, and conceptual-confusion issues addressed above are recognized and applied to the evidence. Preventive-war motivations, nonsurvivable arsenals, and organizational logics that lead to accidents do not cause armed conflict. The only mechanism that has systematically led to conflict is conventional aggression by weak revisionists after nuclear proliferation, but a few years of experience with nuclear weapons moderates the conflict propensity of new nuclear states. By failing to specify how frequently we should observe preventive motivations, their effect on nonsurvivable arsenals, or how organizational logics lead to conflict, accidents, and nuclear war, proliferation pessimist claims are unfalsifiable. Pessimist scholars need to specify how much longer we should observe them not leading to conflict before concluding that their threat has been greatly exaggerated.

The undesirability of nuclear use has prevented scholars from coming to terms with what a more careful and systematic reading of the historical record suggests about the relationship between these mechanisms and conflict. Sagan has argued that proliferation fatalism and deterrence optimism reduce incentives to combat proliferation.90 But these same dynamics have led scholars to vastly exaggerate the number of threats posed by the spread of nuclear weapons. If the greatest danger posed by nuclear proliferation is conventional aggression in the short-term, scholars need to rediscover how deterrence can moderate the high conflict propensity of new nuclear states.91 Arguments about the frequency of nuclear escalation, however, say nothing about its cost. Isn’t the possibility of nuclear escalation on the Korean peninsula, for example, evidence against the arguments made throughout this paper? A few cases of accidental, unintentional, or deliberate nuclear escalation could show that the mechanisms offered by pessimist scholars linking nuclear proliferation and conflict survive the criticisms leveled at them here. A lower bar for the proliferation-pessimist theory to pass might be one case of nuclear escalation. But after seventy years, nuclear weapons have not once led to conflict through the mechanisms addressed here.

This is not the place for a lengthier treatment of how the United States and its allies should deal with the challenges posed by a North Korean (or possible Iranian) nuclear bomb. But the historical record suggests that Israeli, South Korean, and others’ preventive motivations to strike will not lead to military action, and that any strike would likely not escalate to conflict unless the United States or its allies decide to topple the regimes in Tehran and Pyongyang. The nonsurvivability of an Iranian or North Korean arsenal will not tempt others to strike. The arguments made here have contrasting findings for preventive-strike considerations. On the one hand, strikes are less costly than many believe because they rarely cause escalation. On the other hand, strikes are less necessary than many believe because the costs of nuclear proliferation are much lower than usually assumed. Nuclear accidents may occur, but these will likely only cause conventional or nuclear escalation if Tehran or Pyongyang have already attempted to revise their status quo. The historical record also suggests that a few years of experience with the bomb will teach Tehran and Pyongyang the limits of nuclear coercion and that any conflict will stop short of nuclear escalation. Future research should further refine proliferation pessimism and integrate it with optimist perspectives through addressing what causes new nuclear states to moderate their aggression and what policies by the United States and its allies might cause this. An optimistic pessimism toward the spread of nuclear weapons can better come to terms with how and when they lead to interstate conflict and form the basis for better policies to reduce the dangers.

#### ‘Rogues’ won’t start wars

Walt 16

Stephen M. Walt is the Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international relations at Harvard University, Foreign Policy, September 8, 2016, “My Top 5 Foreign-Policy Unicorns — and Why I Want to Kill Them”, http://foreignpolicy.com/2016/09/08/my-top-5-foreign-policy-unicorns-and-why-i-want-to-kill-them/

2. Nuclear rogues. While we’re on the subject of nuclear weapons, let’s also dispense with a dangerous mythical beast: the “nuclear rogue.” Since the dawn of the nuclear age, threatmongers have repeatedly argued that various new nuclear-armed states would be eager to use their weapons for blackmail or worse — that they’d be impossible to deter, prepared to essentially commit suicide in a radioactive ~~holocaust~~. Potential nuclear rogues have included just about every aspiring nuclear leader we didn’t like: Joseph Stalin, Nikita Khrushchev, Mao Zedong, North Korea’s Kim family, along with assorted Pakistanis, Iraqis, Libyans, and Iranians.

Yet in every one of the cases where a state actually got across the nuclear threshold, its leaders have proceeded to behave responsibly, at least in this arena. Why? Because it doesn’t take a genius to figure out that even a small nuclear exchange would ruin your whole day. The people who have run some nuclear-armed states are sometimes heartless or cruel, and they can miscalculate as much as the next world leader, but they also appear to have very well-developed instincts for self-preservation.

Pretending that nuclear rogues are a real phenomenon distorts the entire discussion on how to deal with proliferation — among other things, it makes preventive war sound more attractive — and diverts attention and effort from more promising steps to manage nuclear security. It would be better to treat them like the figments of our imagination that they really are.

### Aquaculture

#### No internal link to food insecurity—they say crop production is key but aquaculture only produces seafood—they can’t solve.

#### No overfishing impact – fishies are vibing

Mossler 20 [Max Mossler (Max studied environmental perception & policy in grad school. He thinks a lot about how other people think about the planet. He is the managing editor at Sustainable Fisheries UW.), 1-13-2020, "Fish populations around the world are improving," Sustainable Fisheries UW, https://sustainablefisheries-uw.org/fish-populations-are-improving/ || belle]

Let’s enjoy some unequivocal, inarguable good news: a paper published today in PNAS, Hilborn et al. 2020, shows that on average, scientifically-assessed fish populations around the world are healthy or improving. And, for fish populations that are not doing well, there is a clear roadmap to sustainability. With Australia on fire and scares of World War III, the start of 2020 and the new decade has been awful; hopefully Hilborn et al. 2020 can kickstart a decade of ocean optimism.

Hilborn et al. 2020 counters the perception that fish populations around the world are declining and the only solution is closing vast swaths of ocean to fishing. Instead, Hilborn et al. 2020 argues that increasing scientific, management, and enforcement capacity will lead to more abundant and sustainable oceans. The major takeaway of the paper is that fishery management works—when fisheries are managed, they are sustained. The key is following the science-to-management blueprint. Scientific data collection and fishery assessment comes first, then fishing regulation and enforcement of fishing policies. With the blueprint in place, most fisheries around the world are sustainable or improving.

The paper uses updates to the RAM Legacy Stock Assessment Database, a decades-long project to assemble data on fish populations that are scientifically assessed. As of 2019, the database contains data on 882 marine fish populations, representing about half of reported wild-caught seafood. In 2009, the database contained data on only 166, representing a much smaller proportion of global seafood. Researchers have spent the last 10 years adding to the database, and with today’s publication, update the global status of fish stocks. They found that, on average, fish populations are above target levels. Not every stock is doing well, but on average, things are much better than they were 2 decades ago. How nice: an environmental story where things are better now than they were in the past!

The paper describes the global status of fish stocks, but it also tells the story of fishery sustainability from the past 50 years.

A brief history of commercial fishing and fishery science

A very general history of industrial fishing goes like this: before the 1950s, commercial fishing was a niche industry supplying a small proportion of the world’s protein. Then, starting in the 1950s, a global effort to increase food security led governments to invest heavily in fishing—often too heavily. Over the next few decades, it became clear that many fisheries were overcapitalized, meaning there were too many boats, too many fishermen, or some combination of the two. Put simply: fishing pressure was too high and eventually led to unsustainable, depleted fish stocks. In the 1990s, the collapse of several prominent fisheries and many high-profile media stories and scientific publications pressured governments to start taking action to protect their fish stocks. The U.S. in 1996 and the EU in 2002 began mandating their fishery policies to be based on fishery science. Take a look at the last 50 years of fish stocks:

You can see a big increase in fishing pressure and declining abundance through the mid-1990s, then a decrease in fishing pressure and recovery of abundance to the present day.

RAM Database: From Worm et al. 2009 to Hilborn et al. 2020

In 2009, Worm et al. was published. It was the first paper to put together and present global fish abundance data over time. It is now one of the most important and highly-cited fisheries paper in history. The data from that paper eventually became the RAM Legacy Stock Assessment database, where anyone could access information about specific stock assessments from around the world. When the paper was published, it showed a general trend of stabilization in the 166 fish populations it reported on. However, it was criticized for mainly including stocks from North America, Europe, and Oceania, painting a global picture with data from only a few regions. Hilborn et al. 2020 updates that work to 882 populations including a much broader global scope. The added decade of data also shows a more positive, upward trend: 78% of fisheries considered overfished in Worm et al. 2009 are improved in Hilborn et al. 2020.

#### Marine ecosystems are resilient to everything

Nield 17 [David Nield, freelance journalist who has been writing about technology, science, apps, gadgets and the web since 2002. Extensively citing "Impact of the Late Triassic mass extinction on functional diversity and composition of marine ecosystems," written by Alexander M. Dunhill, William J. Foster, James Sciberras, and Richard J. Twitchett. Marine Ecosystems Can Survive The Worst Mass Extinction Events, Study Shows. October 23, 2017. <https://www.sciencealert.com/marine-ecosystems-cling-on-to-life-through-some-of-the-worst-mass-extinction-events>]

Researchers have studied fossil records from the Late Triassic mass extinction, which happened around 201.3 million years ago, and found that marine life did not fundamentally change, even though the vast proportion of species were killed off.

The international team of researchers says that while marine species were still badly affected by the event, enough life survived underwater to keep the ecosystems functioning. The findings could help us understand more about how the changing climate of today could affect the planet.

"While the Late Triassic mass extinction had a big impact on the overall number of marine species, there was still enough diversity among the remaining species that the marine ecosystem was able to function in the same way it had before," says lead researcher Alex Dunhill from the University of Leeds in the UK.

It's thought that huge volcanic eruptions, and the subsequent warming of the planet caused by the greenhouse gases produced, was behind the Late Triassic extinction event.

At least half the species on Earth at that time were wiped out by the rise in temperatures, and in the event's aftermath, dinosaurs came to dominate life on our planet.

The researchers analysed fossils dated between the Middle Triassic to the Middle Jurassic periods, a time span of around 70 million years, covering life before and after the mass extinction event.

Ocean-dwelling animals were classified by how they moved, where they lived, and how they fed, and the study showed that none of these categories of life completely disappeared after the extinction event.

That said, there were major impacts on different regions and the environment as a whole, and some specific marine ecosystems were badly damaged.

"We're not saying nothing happened," says one of the researchers, palaeontologist William Foster from the University of Texas at Austin. "Rather, global oceans in the extinction's aftermath were a bit like a ship manned by a skeleton crew – all stations were operational, but manned by relatively few species."

The idea of a skeleton crew of lifeforms keeping the lights on in an ecosystem was first raised by Foster and his colleague Richard J. Twitchett in 2014, after another study focussed on the Late Permian mass extinction event about 252 million years ago.

The current study found one of the hardest-hit underwater organisms were corals, and the fossil record shows it took some 20 million years before tropical reef ecosystems recovered from the Late Triassic extinction, even though the ecosystem as a whole carried on functioning.

With corals again under threat from rising temperatures in the modern day, the new research could provide a blueprint for the potential damage we're going to see – and perhaps give us some clues for how to prevent it.

On a more positive note, it shows life underwater is incredibly resilient, and capable of surviving through even the worst times of environmental upheaval on our planet.

#### No tipping point

* Permian-Triassic extinction proves resiliency
* No data on tipping points
* Ecosystems never outright collapse
* 600 models prove no ecosystem collapse

Hance 18 [Jeremy Hance, wildlife blogger for the Guardian and a journalist with Mongabay focusing on forests, indigenous people, climate change and more. He is also the author of Life is Good: Conservation in an Age of Mass Extinction. Could biodiversity destruction lead to a global tipping point? Jan 16, 2018. https://www.theguardian.com/environment/radical-conservation/2018/jan/16/biodiversity-extinction-tipping-point-planetary-boundary]

Just over 250 million years ago, the planet suffered what may be described as its greatest holocaust: ninety-six percent of marine genera (plural of genus) and seventy percent of land vertebrate vanished for good. Even insects suffered a mass extinction – the only time before or since. Entire classes of animals – like trilobites – went out like a match in the wind.

But what’s arguably most fascinating about this event – known as the Permian-Triassic extinction or more poetically, the Great Dying – is the fact that anything survived at all. Life, it seems, is so ridiculously adaptable that not only did thousands of species make it through whatever killed off nearly everything (no one knows for certain though theories abound) but, somehow, after millions of years life even recovered and went on to write new tales.

Even as the Permian-Triassic extinction event shows the fragility of life, it also proves its resilience in the long-term. The lessons of such mass extinctions – five to date and arguably a sixth happening as I write – inform science today. Given that extinction levels are currently 1,000 (some even say 10,000) times the background rate, researchers have long worried about our current destruction of biodiversity – and what that may mean for our future Earth and ourselves.

In 2009, a group of researchers identified nine global boundaries for the planet that if passed could theoretically push the Earth into an uninhabitable state for our species. These global boundaries include climate change, freshwater use, ocean acidification and, yes, biodiversity loss (among others). The group has since updated the terminology surrounding biodiversity, now calling it “biosphere integrity,” but that hasn’t spared it from critique.

A paper last year in Trends in Ecology & Evolution scathingly attacked the idea of any global biodiversity boundary.

“It makes no sense that there exists a tipping point of biodiversity loss beyond which the Earth will collapse,” said co-author and ecologist, José Montoya, with Paul Sabatier Univeristy in France. “There is no rationale for this.”

Montoya wrote the paper along with Ian Donohue, an ecologist at Trinity College in Ireland and Stuart Pimm, one of the world’s leading experts on extinctions, with Duke University in the US.

Montoya, Donohue and Pimm argue that there isn’t evidence of a point at which loss of species leads to ecosystem collapse, globally or even locally. If the planet didn’t collapse after the Permian-Triassic extinction event, it won’t collapse now – though our descendants may well curse us for the damage we’ve done.

Instead, according to the researchers, every loss of species counts. But the damage is gradual and incremental, not a sudden plunge. Ecosystems, according to them, slowly degrade but never fail outright.

“Of more than 600 experiments of biodiversity effects on various functions, none showed a collapse,” Montoya said. “In general, the loss of species has a detrimental effect on ecosystem functions...We progressively lose pollination services, water quality, plant biomass, and many other important functions as we lose species. But we never observe a critical level of biodiversity over which functions collapse.”

### Basing

#### Moon basing causes US-China war due to competing property claims

Copp 21 If China and the US Claim the Same Moon-Base Site, Who Wins? TARA COPP [SENIOR PENTAGON REPORTER, DEFENSE ONE] AUGUST 8, 2021 <https://www.defenseone.com/technology/2021/08/if-china-and-us-claim-same-moon-base-site-who-wins/184352/> SM

If China and the US Claim the Same Moon-Base Site, Who Wins?

Relatively few craters are attractive, and there’s no consensus about avoiding conflict over them.

There’s a not-so-quiet race back to the moon underway, but the two largest factions, with China and Russia on one side, and the United States and its partners on the other, are not recognizing each others’ proposed rules on what’s allowed once they get there.

Lawmakers and space policy analysts are concerned: How do you avoid conflict in space if the international laws and policies on Earth no longer apply?

“Many terrestrial military doctrines are not applicable in space, or at least not as applicable. If you get beyond 50 miles, or at least 62 miles, suddenly different rules apply. We need to start being aware of that,” says Rep. Jim Cooper, D-Tenn.

There’s already some aggressive international elbowing over the rules of satellite operations. As with the moon, there’s no consensus yet on how to respond to aggression in Earth orbit, the head of U.S. Space Command Gen. James Dickinson told attendees at last week’s Sea Air Space conference.

“The behavior of some of our adversaries in space may surprise you,” Dickinson said. “If similar actions have been taken in other domains, they'd likely be considered provocative, aggressive, or maybe even irresponsible. And in response, the U.S. government would take corresponding actions using all levers of national power, a demarche, or a sanction or something to indicate we won't tolerate that type of behavior, but we're not quite there yet in space policy.”

In 1967, the U.N. General Assembly adopted a treaty on the use of outer space that promised cooperation and banned nuclear weapons, military maneuvers, and military installations off-planet. The agreement also requires countries to take “appropriate international consultations” before making any moves that would “cause potentially harmful interference” with other space programs, and allows countries to “request consultation” if they believe such interference is likely.

This treaty “forecasted very well” the issues that that might arise as space exploration expanded, said James Lake, a senior associate at Canyon Consulting who co-wrote an article on lunar security issues in this month’s Space Force Journal. “The question remains: is that text sufficient? That’s something we are going to find out fairly soon.”

Notably, a treaty annex that prohibits military activity on the moon went unratified by Russia, China, and the United States. It’s likely both the China-Russia and U.S.-led partnerships will begin their moon bases without any sort of agreement between them in place.

In June, the China National Space Agency and Russia’s Roscosmos announced they would begin surveying locations for their International Lunar Research Station this year, and pick a site by 2025.

In 2020, NASA, together with the nations partnering with the U.S. under the Artemis Accords, outlined its Artemis Base Camp project. The Artemis nations aim to to send astronauts back to the moon by 2024.

In addition to those two major alliances, private firms such as Blue Origin are also working on private moon bases.

But there may be only a few locations on the moon where it would make economic sense to build a base, said Bleddyn Bowen, a professor at the University of Leicester and author of War in Space: Strategy, Spacepower, Geopolitics.

“Water ice, for example, might be in limited pockets, for example, making the territories around certain craters on the polar regions, perhaps more desirable,” Bowen said.

So what happens if each decides on the same crater as the best spot to begin moon operations?

“If you have a situation like that, where you're trying to do something in the exact same spot, it’s essentially who gets there first,” said Alex Gilbert, a researcher and space resources doctoral student at the Payne Institute at the Colorado School of Mines. “And if you're not first, then the only alternative is to forcibly remove the current occupant.”

The Artemis nations have endorsed the idea of “safety zones” on the moon, to require communication between two space operations that want to operate in the same area.

“Even if you set up a base and you declare a safety zone, people can still go into that safety zone. It's just something that it's really to be used as a tool to get parties to talk to each other,” he said.

But there’s already a risk those zones will instead be used as a way to rope off sites from competitors, he said.

“One thing that is really kind of important to understand about safety zones is that everyone kind of has their own definition,” Gilbert said.

“Whoever gets there first can use the resources, but no nation can ‘claim’ the territory,” said Laura Duffy, a space systems engineer with Canyon Consulting who co-wrote “Cislunar Spacepower, The New Frontier,” with Lake with Lake in this month’s Space Force Journal.

It’s not just water, but rare earth metals and helium-3 that will be up for grabs on the moon, making a treaty for its peaceful use critical, Duffy said.

“The Moon must be available for open and free use, according to the Artemis Accords and Outer Space Treaty,” she said.

But neither Russia nor China are expected to join the Artemis Accords.

Until now, U.S. space defense has largely concentrated around the objects orbiting Earth. That changed this year, when the U.S. Space Force and U.S. Space Command were tasked with protecting U.S. assets up to 272,000 miles away, a volume called “cislunar space” that extends slightly beyond the Moon’s orbit.

They have some catching up to do, said Rep. Frank Lucas, R-Okla., the ranking member of the Science, Space and Technology Committee. Lucas believes the 2019 landing of China’s Chang'e-4 spacecraft on the far side of the moon should have been this generation’s Sputnik moment.

“But with all of the chaos in the world, and COVID-19, and all of this environment we're working in, we missed it,” he said.

Those far-side moon operations meant China had developed the technology to operate and communicate with its landed rover out of line of sight—and out of view of almost all of the U.S. ability to see what they’re doing.

The achievement allows China “to accomplish scientific, military, or other endeavors without observation or repercussion,” Duffy and Lake wrote. The authors urged that the U.S. needs to speed its monitoring efforts, such as the Cislunar Highway Patrol System, or CHPS, that is being developed by the Air Force Research Laboratory.

#### US-China war goes nuclear

Talmadge 18, Caitlin [**PoliSci PhD from MIT**, Government BA from Harvard, Prof of Security Studies at Georgetown’s Walsh School of Foreign Service.] “Beijing’s Nuclear Option.” Foreign Affairs. October 15, 2018. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2018-10-15/beijings-nuclear-option> TG

As China’s power has grown in recent years, so, too, has the risk of war with the United States. Under President Xi Jinping, China has increased its political and economic pressure on Taiwan and built military installations on coral reefs in the South China Sea, fueling Washington’s fears that Chinese expansionism will threaten U.S. allies and influence in the region. U.S. destroyers have transited the Taiwan Strait, to loud protests from Beijing. American policymakers have wondered aloud whether they should send an aircraft carrier through the strait as well. Chinese fighter jets have intercepted U.S. aircraft in the skies above the South China Sea. Meanwhile, U.S. President Donald Trump has brought long-simmering economic disputes to a rolling boil.

A war between the two countries remains unlikely, but the prospect of a military confrontation—resulting, for example, from a Chinese campaign against Taiwan—no longer seems as implausible as it once did. And the odds of such a confrontation going nuclear are higher than most policymakers and analysts think.

Members of China’s strategic com­munity tend to dismiss such concerns. Likewise, U.S. studies of a potential war with China often exclude nuclear weapons from the analysis entirely, treating them as basically irrelevant to the course of a conflict. Asked about the issue in 2015, Dennis Blair, the former commander of U.S. forces in the Indo-Pacific, estimated the likelihood of a U.S.-Chinese nuclear crisis as “somewhere between nil and zero.”

This assurance is misguided. If deployed against China, the Pentagon’s preferred style of conventional warfare would be a potential recipe for nuclear escalation. Since the end of the Cold War, the United States’ signature approach to war has been simple: punch deep into enemy territory in order to rapidly knock out the opponent’s key military assets at minimal cost. But the Pentagon developed this formula in wars against Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, and Serbia, none of which was a nuclear power.

China, by contrast, not only has nuclear weapons; it has also intermingled them with its conventional military forces, making it difficult to attack one without attacking the other. This means that a major U.S. military campaign targeting China’s conventional forces would likely also threaten its nuclear arsenal. Faced with such a threat, Chinese leaders could decide to use their nuclear weapons while they were still able to.

As U.S. and Chinese leaders navigate a relationship fraught with mutual suspicion, they must come to grips with the fact that a conventional war could skid into a nuclear confrontation. Although this risk is not high in absolute terms, its consequences for the region and the world would be devastating. As long as the United States and China continue to pursue their current grand strategies, the risk is likely to endure. This means that leaders on both sides should dispense with the illusion that they can easily fight a limited war. They should focus instead on managing or resolving the political, economic, and military tensions that might lead to a conflict in the first place.

#### Independently causes space militarization

O’Donnell 19 “The Political Realities behind Establishing a Moon Base” Wes O’Donnell [Managing Editor, Edge] 2/26/2019 <https://amuedge.com/the-political-realities-behind-establishing-a-moon-base/> SM

International Conflicts May Expand to Space

No nation has placed weapons in orbit, but some advanced military nations have become dependent on space-based systems for everything from weapons targeting and navigation to intelligence collection. As nations look to establish a semi-permanent presence on the moon, conflict will become inevitable with the lunar surface having a role in how events on Earth play out. In much the same way as the Wright brothers’ plane evolved into a strategic bomber, earthly conflict will expand to spacecraft and a manned presence on the moon.

It seems far-fetched to think in these terms, but mankind has proven adept at turning many scientific achievements into weapons of war. For example, during the past 30 years, Internet access has become nearly omnipresent. But the Internet also serves as a venue for disinformation campaigns and cyberattacks.

It’s also relevant to point out that the systems that maintain human life in space would work equally well for soldiers. All of these advancements to further scientific research and maintain life aboard the International Space Station can easily be adapted to military purposes. It’s now just a matter of funding to build military space systems based on established technology.

In 1959, the U.S. Army conducted a study called Project Horizon that considered establishing a moon base with construction occurring throughout the 1960s. The formal establishment of NASA in February 1958 shelved the project. However, the study demonstrated the military’s long-held desire for a permanent space presence.

Repairing and Protecting Technological Assets in Space

With space-based systems now ubiquitous, there is a need for platforms in space to protect technological assets and repair them when necessary. That will mean having humans in space to manage these systems.

The U.S., China and Russia have the capability to shoot down satellites. Replacing these satellites would require rocket launches with replacement equipment on board.

With space-based systems, however, those assets could be repaired or replaced faster from orbiting stock or from a lunar base. From a U.S. perspective, this would save time and money. Also, it would lessen the potential impact of losing launch centers at Vandenberg AFB and Cape Canaveral in an international conflict involving missile attacks.

Militarization of the Moon

It is certainly a possibility that the moon will be militarized in some fashion. China’s questioning the limits of national sovereignty in space puts in doubt Beijing’s adherence to the 1967 Outer Space Treaty.

That treaty defines the moon as the “province of all mankind” and reserves it for peaceful purposes. But the speed with which contemporary leaders have forsaken international treaties could throw this status into doubt.

Some Chinese legal scholars, for instance, claim that the space above China, at least that which is in geosynchronous orbit, is sovereign Chinese territory. Clearly, by including anything within that geosynchronous orbit, these scholars are referring to the moon in much the same way that China makes claims to nearby territorial waters.

Currently, there is no treaty that delineates the vertical extent of a nation’s sovereignty into space. However, the Chinese claim suggests that Beijing might ignore existing international norms if they conflict with China’s interests.

The Unspoken Moon Race

The first manned mission to the moon was for the benefit “of all mankind.” Today’s extension of military affairs into space suggests that the once-peaceful endeavor of a lunar landing will eventually take on a combat dimension.

Scientific breakthroughs are currently taking the headlines and attention away from the pressing matter of preventing space-based military moves. The U.S., Russia and China have lunar missions planned into the 2030s. Whether those missions will actually take place largely depends on political will and national budgets.

A conventional conflict involving the U.S., Russia or China would be an impetus for the expansion of space-based military assets. That would make the current ventures to the moon ever more pressing during peacetime.

In essence, the current race to the moon certainly appears peaceful. But the potential to use the lunar body for war is certainly not lost on political or military leaders.

#### Unknown legal thresholds make inadvertent space escalation highly likely

MacDonald ’18 – senior director of the Nonproliferation and Arms Control Project with the Center for Conflict Analysis and Prevention, Adjunct Lecturer at Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies. Bruce MacDonald, “Chapter 2. Space and Escalation” in *Outer Space; Earthly Escalation? Chinese Perspectives on Space Operations and Escalation*, A Strategic Multilayer Assessment (SMA) Periodic Publication, August 2018, <https://nsiteam.com/social/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/SMA-White-Paper_Chinese-Persepectives-on-Space_-Aug-2018.pdf>

Another dimension of the problem is the issue of the scale of the attack, both qualitatively and quantitatively. While jamming one or two satellites in isolation appears unlikely to quickly escalate into all-out space war (given the longstanding role of electronic warfare in past conflicts), attacking multiple intelligence-gathering satellites would carry a far higher risk of escalation. Somewhere between these two extremes, however, is an uncertain and unknowable boundary that divides offensive space actions that modestly threaten stability from those that are clearly destabilizing and escalatory. In this unpredictable environment, a country with no desire to spark an all-out space war may still prompt rapid escalation with modest offensive actions that inadvertently cross an unknown threshold. In addition, for technological, commercial, and other reasons the space and cyber domains are evolving far more rapidly than the conventional and nuclear domains, potentially rendering space and cyber strategies ineffective or irrelevant within a few years. In both space and cyberspace, we may learn firsthand how much escalation is too much only after it is too late to stop. Evolving space dynamics could undermine whatever current understanding we may have of crisis and strategic stability in space, and this imperfect grasp of general principles can only add to our uncertainty about the space and cyber offensive capabilities of particular adversaries. Therefore, uncertainty, bluffs, and worst-case thinking are bound to remain prominent forces in the strategic landscape of space. For example, rendezvous and proximity operations on satellites will become more common in the years to come, but they could easily be viewed in a crisis as potentially hostile acts—or in fact be used to commit hostile acts.

#### Lunar basing causes collisions and space junk – independently turns the aff.

Mann 13 “Space: The Final Frontier of Environmental Disasters?” Adam Mann 7/15/2013 <https://www.wired.com/2013/07/space-environmentalism/> SM

Commercial or scientific bases on the lunar surface will need satellites for communication and navigation. Because of the moon’s size and mass, there aren’t stable orbits that hover above a certain spot analogous to the geostationary orbits around Earth. In order to provide a continuous link or GPS-like triangulation, there will need to be a constellation of satellites around the moon. Multiple satellites with multiple operators increase the chance of collision.

Unlike our planet, the moon lacks an atmosphere and it isn’t covered in oceans. This means that nothing can burn up and there’s no good way to dispose of dead satellites. The atmospheric friction that naturally drags down objects around Earth doesn't exist around the moon. And anything that is commanded to fall down to the lunar surface will remain intact until it impacts the ground, potentially hitting an astronaut or Apollo-era artifact. Mars, with its very thin atmosphere, could have similar problems with orbital debris. If nothing is done, space junk might be exported beyond low-Earth orbit, potentially endangering our exploration of other worlds.

#### Collisions cause miscalc and go nuclear.

Blatt 20 [Talia, joint concentration in Social Studies and Integrative Biology at Harvard, specialization in East Asian geopolitics and security issues] “Anti-Satellite Weapons and the Emerging Space Arms Race,” Harvard International Review, May 26, 2020, <https://hir.harvard.edu/anti-satellite-weapons-and-the-emerging-space-arms-race/> TG

Despite their deterrent functions, ASATs are more likely to provoke or exacerbate conflicts than dampen them, especially given the risk they [pose](https://thebulletin.org/2019/06/arms-control-in-outer-space-the-russian-angle-and-a-possible-way-forward/) to early warning satellites. These satellites are a crucial element of US ballistic missile defense, capable of [detecting missiles](https://www.globalsecurity.org/space/world/japan/warning.htm) immediately after launch and tracking their paths.

Suppose a US early warning satellite goes dark, or is shut down. Going dark could signal a glitch, but in a world in which other countries have ASATs, it could also signal the beginning of an attack. Without early warning satellites, the United States is much more susceptible to nuclear missiles. Given the strategy of counterforcing—[targeting](https://www.belfercenter.org/sites/default/files/files/publication/isec_a_00273_LieberPress.pdf) nuclear silos rather than populous cities to prevent a nuclear counterattack—the Americans might believe their nuclear weapons are imminently at risk. It could be [twelve hours](https://books.google.com/books?id=ET8lDwAAQBAJ&pg=PA1&lpg=PA1&dq=%22Protecting+Space+Assets%22+johnson-freese&source=bl&ots=6Oq0IdeBjw&sig=ACfU3U1G6Hj8QdP4JlCRNxA6i5XplZwHyg&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwj1n-jT2YzpAhUugnIEHUuMCu4Q6AEwA3oECAkQAQ#v=onepage&q=%22Protecting%20Space%20Assets%22%20johnson-freese&f=false) before the United States regains satellite function, which is too long to wait to put together a nuclear counterattack. The United States, therefore, might move to mobilize a nuclear attack against Russia or China over what might just be a piece of debris shutting off a satellite.

Additionally, accidental warfare, or strategic miscalculation, is uniquely likely in space. It is [much easier](https://books.google.com/books?id=VyXTDwAAQBAJ&pg=PA339&lpg=PA339&dq=space+offense+dominant&source=bl&ots=Mw0bgJ51qf&sig=ACfU3U3DeZiEHpr9nfszlCbJZIoyyssIpg&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjrs-WD3IzpAhVulHIEHbL0AE4Q6AEwCXoECAoQAQ#v=onepage&q=space%20offense%20dominant&f=false) to hold an adversary’s space systems in jeopardy with destructive ASATs than it is to [sustainably defend](https://www.cnas.org/publications/commentary/the-us-military-should-not-be-doubling-down-on-space) a system, which is expensive and in some cases not technologically feasible because of limitations on satellite movement. Space is therefore [considered](https://books.google.com/books?id=VyXTDwAAQBAJ&pg=PA339&lpg=PA339&dq=space+offense+dominant&source=bl&ots=Mw0bgJ51qf&sig=ACfU3U3DeZiEHpr9nfszlCbJZIoyyssIpg&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjrs-WD3IzpAhVulHIEHbL0AE4Q6AEwCXoECAoQAQ#v=onepage&q=space%20offense%20dominant&f=false) offense-dominant; offensive tactics like weapons development are prioritized over defensive measures, such as [improving GPS](https://www.politico.com/story/2018/04/06/outer-space-war-defense-russia-china-463067) or making satellites more resistant to jamming.

As a result, countries are left with poorly defended space systems and rely on offensive posturing, which increases the risk that their actions are perceived as aggressive and incentivizes rapid, risky counterattacks because militaries cannot rely on their spaced-based systems after first strikes.

There are several hotspots in which ASATs and offensive-dominant systems are particularly relevant. Early warning satellites [play](https://www.politico.com/story/2018/04/06/outer-space-war-defense-russia-china-463067) a central role in US readiness in the event of a conflict involving North Korea. News of North Korean missile launches comes from these satellites. Given North Korea’s [history](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-pacific-11813699) of nuclear provocations, unflinchingly hostile rhetoric towards the United States and South Korea, and diplomatic opacity, North Korea is always a threatening, unknowable adversary, but recent developments have magnified the risk. With the health of Kim Jong-un [potentially in jeopardy](https://apnews.com/f5d302ae65b03838173e40848223b771), a succession battle or even civil war on the peninsula [raises the chances](https://www.express.co.uk/news/world/1273890/Kim-Jong-un-dead-North-Korea-nuclear-weapon-news-latest-death-US) of loose nukes. If the regime is terminal, traditional MAD risk calculus will become moot; with nothing to lose, North Korea would have no reason to hold back its nuclear arsenal. Or China [might decide](https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/04/28/kim-jong-un-china-north-korea/) to seize military assets and infrastructure of the regime. If the US does not have its early warning satellites because they have been taken out in an ASAT attack, the US, South Korea, and Japan are all in imminent nuclear peril, while China could be in a position to fundamentally reshape East Asian geopolitics.

The South China Sea is another hotspot in which ASATs could risk escalation. China [is developing](https://missiledefenseadvocacy.org/missile-threat-and-proliferation/todays-missile-threat/china-anti-access-area-denial-coming-soon/) Anti-Access Area Denial (A2/AD) in the South China Sea, a combination of long range radar with air and maritime defense meant to deny US freedom of navigation in the region. Given the disputed nature of territory in the South China Sea, the United States and its allies do not want China to successfully close off the region.

#### Moon basing key to China-Russia counterbalancing – guts US space dominance.

Goswami 21 “The Strategic Implications of the China-Russia Lunar Base Cooperation Agreement” [Dr. Namrata Goswami is an independent scholar on space policy, great power politics, and ethnic conflicts.] March 19, 2021 <https://thediplomat.com/2021/03/the-strategic-implications-of-the-china-russia-lunar-base-cooperation-agreement/> SM

The Strategic Implications of the China-Russia Lunar Base Cooperation Agreement

With their agreement, the partners are signalling an alternative to a U.S.-led order in space.

On March 9, 2021, the China National Space Administration (CNSA) and Russian Space Agency (ROSCOSMOS) signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for the joint construction of an autonomous lunar permanent research base. Employing the language of the Outer Space Treaty of 1967, China and Russia emphasized that the MoU is about scientific discovery as well as the use of lunar terrain. The agreement describes the planned International Lunar Research Station (ILRS) as “a comprehensive scientific experiment base with the capability of long-term autonomous operations, built on the lunar surface and/or on the lunar orbit that will carry out multi-disciplinary and multi-objective scientific research activities such as the lunar exploration and utilization, lunar-based observation, basic scientific experiment, and technical verification.”

These two major space faring nations have agreed to promote the ILRS to gain international partners for their joint lunar mission, especially by broadcasting China’s lunar South Pole environment and resource survey mission, the Chang’e 7 and Russia’s Luna-Resurs-1 Russian Orbital Spacecraft (OS) Mission.

That China and Russia would cooperate on exploration and utilization of lunar resources comes as no surprise. Both countries, especially Russia, keenly watched as the United States announced the Artemis Accords for creating an international mechanism for lunar development led by the U.S. and partner nations. ROSCOSMOS, in reaction to the Artemis Accords and especially former President Donald Trump’s April 6, 2020 executive order on the utilization of space resources for international partnerships stated, via its deputy director for international cooperation, Sergei Savelyev, that “attempts to expropriate outer space and aggressive plans to actually take over other planets” go against the principle of international cooperation. The Kremlin likened Trump’s executive order to the colonization of space, with Kremlin spokesman Dmitry Peskov coming out strong, stating that it would be “unacceptable” for the U.S. to privatize and colonize space.

While China officially did not respond to the Artemis Accords, the CNSA’s Space Law Center Deputy Director Guoyu Wang argued in an article in The Space Review that the accords cannot be viewed as an extension of the OST, but are instead an attempt to create norms outside of established international regulatory frameworks.

The Moon Is Strategic

The moon is no longer seen as a dead rock where humanity lands for a few days, shows off technology, and then journeys back to Earth. Today the discourse on the moon is about its resource potential, including the presence of water ice, solar power, and rare earth elements like platinum, titanium, scandium, and yttrium. Chinese space scientists and engineers have long recognized the economic potential of space resources to include a $10 trillion return on investments from the Earth-moon zone annually by 2050.

All the way back in 2002, Ouyang Ziyuan, lead scientist and founder of China Lunar Exploration Program (CLEP) specified that “China’s long-term aim and task is to set up a base on the moon to tap and make use of its rich resources.” His perspective was supported at the highest level of CNSA leadership. China’s subsequent demonstrations of lunar capacity include a far side lunar landing in 2019 and an autonomous lunar sample return mission in 2020.

Other benefits highlighted by Chinese scientists are the potential of lunar propellant made from water-ice lowering the cost of access and movement throughout the entire volume of cislunar space. Launching from the moon is 22 times more efficient than launching from Earth due to Earth’s gravity well. In order to access those lunar resources, a long-term permanent presence, first robotic, then human, will be necessary. This aspect of first mastering autonomous robotic lunar basing capacities is highlighted in the China-Russia MoU.

Similar to China’s long-term plans for a permanent presence on the moon and a lunar research base by 2036, Russia in 2018 announced its own lunar plan, which included resource extraction ambitions, backed by a three phase base construction plan between 2025 and 2040. The first stage is a lunar orbiter module (2025); the second phase will be the construction of a lunar base (2025-2034); and the third phase (2040) will involve the construction of an “integrated manned moon exploration system.” The former chief designer of Russia’s manned space programs, the late Yevgeny Mikrin, in an interview with state run RIA Novosti news in November 2018, specified that the construction of the moon colony was to begin in 2025.

The strategic recognition of the critical role of the Earth-moon economic zone for future space development and utilization is the first peg on which the China-Russia MoU stands. Besides that, there are two other specific geopolitical and regime constriction considerations at play here.

Geopolitical Considerations

The future of space is its economy, with possible returns in the trillions of dollars. And robust economic growth leads to military and other power projection capacities. Both China and Russia understand the impact of space on the future of global leadership. China wants to become the foremost space power by 2045, in time for the centenary of the establishment of the People’s Republic in 2049. President Xi Jinping has repeatedly highlighted the intrinsic contribution of space to Chinese global leadership. The idea behind China’s space philosophy is to demonstrate high-end technology, including human missions, lunar soft landings (near and far side), lunar sample returns, and Mars missions, to be followed by construction of a permanent space station, space-based solar power satellites, and deep space probes.

For China, the MoU with Russia came at the appropriate geopolitical moment, especially after it has successfully demonstrated high end indigenous space capacity like lunar far side landing, autonomous lunar sample return, and a Mars mission. China no longer has to worry about the age-old cliché that all Chinese space technology is reengineered Russian space technology.

For Russia, joining in with China’s lunar base goal, even as a junior partner, means that the two nations can pool their joint international resources to register opposition to a U.S.-led space order, something both sides are uncomfortable with. For Russia and especially President Vladimir Putin, it is about taking back the space leadership position it enjoyed as the erstwhile Soviet Union.

This lunar MoU is a continuation of the two nations’ geopolitical behavior on Earth, where China and Russia have established alternative security systems like the Shanghai Cooperation Organization and the Chinese-led Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), of which Russia is a participating country. By establishing an alternative lunar base development effort, China and Russia are questioning the legitimacy of the Artemis Accords and signaling that they do not view U.S. efforts, both public and private, as the only mechanism for cooperation in space

. Basically, this is clear indication that leadership in space is contested. Once they draw in enough partners and signatories to their lunar research base, China and Russia will have the power and influence to create an alternative state-centric preamble and lunar accord crafting the regulatory regime around lunar exploration and development. Both wield enormous clout internationally via their U.N. Security Council permanent memberships and veto power as well as advocacy in U.N. space bodies.

Signing an MoU for lunar development has several long-term strategic implications for both as well. First, Russia gets access to an international structure already in place under China’s BRI, in which nearly 140 countries are now participating. Both sides get access to launch sites, ground stations, and receiver stations in China and Russia, as well as access to a universal scientific talent pool, to include growing Chinese and Russian space expertise, and burgeoning employment opportunities in China where aerospace salaries are becoming globally competitive. They will also be able to divide the long-term costs of research and development. Finally, the MoU offers a rather flexible international partnership for countries. A decision on inclusion lies primarily with either Xi or Putin, unlike U.S. space partnerships, which have to pass through several interagency clearance processes and time-consuming bureaucratic procedures.

Strategic Regime Constriction

China and Russia have expressed opposition to the U.S. policy moves to enable the private sector and commercialization of space in Artemis Accords signatory countries, as well as national legislation like the U.S. Commercial Space Launch Competitive Act 2015 (CSLCA). Beijing and Moscow are especially worried by the prospect of the private space sector taking the lead in developing space technology breakthroughs. This implies fast enhancement of capability (think SpaceX and Blue Origin reusable rockets, lunar landers), truly democratizing space beyond just the state-owned institutions currently at the forefront of space policy, technology development, and missions. This has serious economic consequences in a globally competitive trillion-dollar space market. This aspect was evident in Kremlin spokesperson Dmitry Peskov’s vocal opposition to the U.S. focus on the privatization of space.

China, and to a larger extent Russia, do not yet have a vibrant private space sector capable of competing with the U.S. private sector globally, even though China under Xi has created enormous financial and ideological incentives for Chinese private space startups since 2014. China has, however, excelled in and utilized state-based policies to rein in its own private space sector under its strict Civil-Military Fusion Strategy and its new National Defense Law 2021.

The CSLCA, which supports U.S. private citizens’ ownership of space resources; the Artemis Accords’ emphasis on commercial activities on the moon, establishment of safety zones, and utilization of space resources; and the April 6, 2020 executive order calling for space resource utilization efforts based on international partnerships have galvanized the China-Russia MoU, an alternative lunar development mechanism led by authoritarian state-owned space agencies. Both China and Russia fear that with the Artemis Accords, the private space sector has been strengthened legally to invest in lunar breakthroughs that would take their own state-owned space agencies years to compete with or catch up to. They also fear that the Cold War-based space governance mechanisms that limit private development of space might be unraveling, especially if today’s leading space-faring states become flexible on the regulatory mechanisms set up during the Cold War that have stifled private innovation in space by creating incentives for state funded and owned space activities.

Innovation in technology will be a game changer in space going forward, and both China and Russia realize the impact of, say, SpaceX’s reusable heavy lift rocket, Starship, scheduled for launch by 2023, with plans for crewed missions to the moon and Mars (with orbital refueling). Starship will be the world’s most advanced reusable rocket, with a lift capacity of 100 metric tonnes to low earth orbit (LEO). In comparison, China has plans for a reusable Long March 8 rocket (with a lift capacity of 8.4 metric tonnes to LEO) designed by the state-owned China Academy of Launch Vehicle Technology (CALT), but this is clearly not in the same class of rockets like Starship.

Their vocal oppositions to the entry of the U.S. private space sector buys time for China and Russia to catch up over the next decade or so. By 2030, China has its own plans for a heavy lift rocket, the Long March 9, which will have a lift capacity of 140 metric tonnes to LEO, and also aspires to master reusability in the next 20 years. However, time is of the essence in space power projection and a single technology can change the game, as reusability has done for launch infrastructure.

A Changed Reality

China and Russia’s lunar base MoU has changed the alignment structures around space cooperation and sends a clear signal to the United States and the seven other Artemis Accords partners that space is contested. China and Russia are offering avenues for alternate partnership, especially to encourage countries like Saudi Arabia and Turkey to join, both of whom have aspirations to develop their space sector. Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan recently announced Turkish ambitions to make first contact with the moon by 2023 (the 100th year celebration of the establishment of the Turkish republic) with the help of international partnerships.

Despite the U.S. private space sector advantages identified above, the U.S. suffers from a lack of continuity and emphasis in its space sector at the policy level due to changing space priorities across presidential administrations. We saw such uncertainty creep in with regard to its Artemis Accords (established under the Trump administration), the Space Force, and the reconstitution of the National Space Council after President Joe Biden was sworn in. Biden has offered little insight into his administration’s space priorities, including on critical concepts like space resource utilization and development. Such uncertainties can stifle international partnerships and technology development.

In contrast, despite lacking a similarly vibrant private sector, China’s clear articulation of its long-term steady lunar missions, and its ability to commit resources without having to worry about a change in missions with a change in administrations, showcases its long-term assurance that it can meet its goal of establishing a lunar base, now in partnership with Russia. While technology is a game changer, a nation cannot succeed in space without long-term strategic vision.

#### US space dominance prevents global war

**Zubrin 15** [(Robert Zubrin, president of Pioneer Energy, a senior fellow with the Center for Security Policy) “US Space Supremacy is Now Critical,” Space News, 1/22/15, https://spacenews.com/op-ed-u-s-space-supremacy-now-critical/] TDI

The United States needs a new national security policy. For the first time in more than 60 years, we face the real possibility of a large-scale conventional war, and we are woefully unprepared. Eastern and Central Europe is now so weakly defended as to virtually invite invasion. The United States is not about to go to nuclear war to defend any foreign country. So deterrence is dead, and, with the German army cut from 12 divisions to three, the British gone from the continent, and American forces down to a 30,000-troop tankless remnant, the only serious and committed ground force that stands between Russia and the Rhine is the Polish army. It’s not enough. Meanwhile, in Asia, the powerful growth of the Chinese economy promises that nation eventual overwhelming numerical force superiority in the region. How can we restore the balance, creating a sufficiently powerful conventional force to deter aggression? It won’t be by matching potential adversaries tank for tank, division for division, replacement for replacement. Rather, the United States must seek to totally outgun them by obtaining a radical technological advantage. This can be done by achieving space supremacy.To grasp the importance of space power, some historical perspective is required. Wars are fought for control of territory. Yet for thousands of years, victory on land has frequently been determined by dominance at sea. In the 20th century, victory on both land and sea almost invariably went to the power that controlled the air. In the 21st century, victory on land, sea or in the air will go to the power that controls space. The critical military importance of space has been obscured by the fact that in the period since the United States has had space assets, all of our wars have been fought against minor powers that we could have defeated without them. Desert Storm has been called the first space war, because the allied forces made extensive use of GPS navigation satellites. However, if they had no such technology at their disposal, the end result would have been just the same. This has given some the impression that space forces are just a frill to real military power — a useful and convenient frill perhaps, but a frill nevertheless. But consider how history might have changed had the Axis of World War II possessed reconnaissance satellites — merely one of many of today’s space-based assets — without the Allies having a matching capability. In that case, the Battle of the Atlantic would have gone to the U-boats, as they would have had infallible intelligence on the location of every convoy. Cut off from oil and other supplies, Britain would have fallen. On the Eastern front, every Soviet tank concentration would have been spotted in advance and wiped out by German air power, as would any surviving British ships or tanks in the Mediterranean and North Africa. In the Pacific, the battle of Midway would have gone very much the other wa

y, as the Japanese would not have wasted their first deadly airstrike on the unsinkable island, but sunk the American carriers instead. With these gone, the remaining cruisers and destroyers in Adm. Frank Jack Fletcher’s fleet would have lacked air cover, and every one of them would have been hunted down and sunk by unopposed and omniscient Japanese air power. With the same certain fate awaiting any American ships that dared venture forth from the West Coast, Hawaii, Australia and New Zealand would then have fallen, and eventually China and India as well. With a monopoly of just one element of space power, the Axis would have won the war. But modern space power involves far more than just reconnaissance satellites. The use of space-based GPS can endow munitions with 100 times greater accuracy, while space-based communications provide an unmatched capability of command and control of forces. Knock out the enemy’s reconnaissance satellites and he is effectively blind. Knock out his comsats and he is deaf. Knock out his navsats and he loses his aim. In any serious future conventional conflict, even between opponents as mismatched as Japan was against the United States — or Poland (with 1,000 tanks) is currently against Russia (with 12,000) — it is space power that will prove decisive. Not only Europe, but the defense of the entire free world hangs upon this matter. For the past 70 years, U.S. Navy carrier task forces have controlled the world’s oceans, first making and then keeping the Pax Americana, which has done so much to secure and advance the human condition over the postwar period. But should there ever be another major conflict, an adversary possessing the ability to locate and target those carriers from space would be able to wipe them out with the push of a button. For this reason, it is imperative that the United States possess space capabilities that are so robust as to not only assure our own ability to operate in and through space, but also be able to comprehensively deny it to others. Space superiority means having better space assets than an opponent. Space supremacy means being able to assert a complete monopoly of such capabilities. The latter is what we must have. If the United States can gain space supremacy, then the capability of any American ally can be multiplied by orders of magnitude, and with the support of the similarly multiplied striking power of our own land- and sea-based air and missile forces be made so formidable as to render any conventional attack unthinkable. On the other hand, should we fail to do so, we will remain so vulnerable as to increasingly invite aggression by ever-more-emboldened revanchist powers. This battle for space supremacy is one we can win. Neither Russia nor China, nor any other potential adversary, can match us in this area if we put our minds to it. We can and must develop ever-more-advanced satellite systems, anti-satellite systems and truly robust space launch and logistics capabilities. Then the next time an aggressor commits an act of war against the United States or a country we are pledged to defend, instead of impotently threatening to limit his tourist visas, we can respond by taking out his satellites, effectively informing him in advance the certainty of defeat should he persist. If we desire peace on Earth, we need to prepare for war in space.