## Underview

A2 taylor

1. They don’t debate agaist trump- they talk abt nuke war and asteroids
2. Doesn’t’ isolate any net benefits of policy debating- just as applicable to any other style

A2 hird

1. They don’t bring policy ideas to fruitiion- they literally said it doesn’t do anything
2. Talks abt social analysis- you def don’t do that and I’m about to- proves I turn thsi

## 1-Tea Time

#### Interpretation- Debaters must defend the resolution resolved: The Appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

#### Violation- extrat

Bierson 21, Marshal Bierson, Topic Analysis by Marshal Bierson, Victory Briefs, Marshall is currently completing his PhD in Philosophy at Florida State University. His primarily studies the intersection of ethics and the nature of persons. Outside of Academia, Marshall also directs curricular design for high school debate camps with the Victory Briefs Institute. I have a pdf, r0w@n

Normally this distinction between morality and justice does not matter very much. But this resolution is different. Why? Because most LD resolutions that use ‘justice’ as the evaluative term focus on government actions. Here are some examples from the last decade: • Resolved: Predictive policing is unjust. • Resolved: The United States’ use of targeted killing in foreign countries is unjust. • Resolved: Placing political conditions on humanitarian aid to foreign countries is unjust. This is significant. There is a sense of the word ‘justice’ where it just describes the proper ordering of government and society. This is the sense of the word that John Rawls uses in his famous quote: “Justice is the first virtue of social institutions, as truth is of systems of thought. A theory however elegant and economical must be rejected or revised if it is untrue; likewise laws and institutions no matter how efficient and well‑arranged must be reformed or abolished if they are unjust.” But even if the difference between justice and morality is blurred when we talk about government action, it is quite clear (philosophically) when we talk about individual action. And this resolution is about whether the action of an individual is unjust. The resolution is not asking ‘should governments ban the private appropriation of outer space.’ Rather, it is asking if individuals commit an injustice in appropriating outer space. At camp, when teaching this resolution, some people read cases about how countries should ban the appropriation of outer space, or about how international law should prohibit such appropriation. But those cases did not actually affirm the resolution. Just because the government should make something illegal, that does not mean the act is unjust before the government passes a law. It was a good idea for the government to ban driving on the left side of the road. But before the government passed a law one way or the other, there was nothing unjust about driving on the left. Similarly, it might be that the government should raise taxes. But that does not mean I’m doing anything unjust by not sending my untaxed income to the state. To say an act is unjust is not the same thing as saying an act should be prohibited. It can be a good idea to pass laws against just acts 11 1 Topic Analysis by Marshall Bierson (like many driving regulations), and it can be a bad idea to pass laws against unjust acts (it is unjust to cheat on one’s spouse, but the government probably should not outlaw infidelity). While legality is connected with justice, it is not the same thing as justice. So, cases that say appropriation should be illegal, are not actually affirming the resolution. They don’t show that appropriation is unjust. 1.2.3 Arguments that Don’t Work This also means that many of the arguments people make on the resolution do not actu‑ ally affirm or negate. For example, I saw many debaters at camp read cases about how the appropriation of outer space resources will contribute to inequality. The basic idea is that only the rich can spend money to acquire resources from outer space, and so such appropriation will mean that the rich get richer. But how does that show the appropriation of outer space resources is unjust? It might well give governments a reason to regulate, or even ban, the appropriation of outer space. But it does not seem to show the appropriation itself is unjust. Rather, what’s unjust is either the rich hoarding resources, or else the government allowing the rich a leg up over everyone else. Either way, it’s not the appropriation itself that is a problem. For example, imagine that Bill Gates goes and appropriate a meteor, and then sets it up so that the proceeds of the meteor fund a charitable trust that redistributes resources to the global poor. If the objection to appropriation was income inequality, then clearly this act of appropriation is fine. What this shows is that it was not the appropriation of outer space resources that was unjust, rather it is the excessive concentration of wealth. Another common argument I saw at camp was the argument that people appropriating outer space resources might lead to an arms race in space. Now, I think there are lots of problems with this argument, but the most fundamental problem is that even if it’s true, it’s not clear that it shows that anyone acts unjustly when appropriating outer space resources. Suppose I know that if I get a good job, it will make my neighbor jealous such that they will begin stealing. Do I act unjustly in getting a good job? No, my neighbor does. But generally, just because my behavior leads someone else to act unjustly, that does not mean that my act itself is unjust. As many philosophers have argued, justice is not a consequentialist value. Indeed, many philosophers have argued that justice is fundamen‑ tally incompatible with utilitarianism. (The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy article on 12 1 Topic Analysis by Marshall Bierson “Justice” has a whole subsection titled: 4.2 Utilitarian theories of justice: three prob‑ lems.) There might, indeed, be utilitarian reasons to think it’s a bad idea to appropriate resources from outer space. But even if such utilitarian reasons show that such appro‑ priation is immoral, they don’t show its unjust. Why? Because those arguments don’t show that the act of appropriation itself wrongs anyone or violates any rights.

**1] Semantics outweigh:**

**A] Topicality is a constitutive rule of the activity and a basic aff burden, they agreed to debate the topic when they came to the tournament**

**B] Jurisdiction -- you can’t vote affirmative if they haven’t affirmed**

**C] It’s the only stasis point we know before the round so it controls the internal link to engagement, and there’s no way to use ground if debaters aren’t prepared to defend it.**

**2] Limits:**

**A] Quantitative – they let infinite affs that defend the res plus literally anything exist- makes neg prep impossible**

**B] Qualitative – they take away generic turns like appropriations good and functionally jettison "private entities" from the topic, which shifts away from the core topic lit – also means there is no universal DA to spec affs**

**3] TVA solves – just don’t read the extrat stuff – you’d still keep all your other offense**

**D] Paradigm Issues –**

**1] T is DTD – A] their abusive advocacy skewed the debate from the start B] DTA is incoherent because we indict their advocacy**

**2] Comes before 1AR theory -- A] If we had to be abusive it’s because it was impossible to engage their aff B] T outweighs on scope because their abuse affected every speech that came after the 1AC C] Topic norms outweigh on urgency – we only have a few months to set them**

**3] Competing interps first- reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention**

**4] No rvis**

**a-incentives good theory debaters to bait by being abusive**

**b-chills debaters from running theory on good teams even if they deserve it**

**c-illogical, you don’t win for proving you’re fair, comes first since logic is the only way to make decisions**

## 2-Buddhism K

#### Nice to meet you judge I’m you, you’re me, we’re all each other– now vote neg

Segura 11 (Alejandro Chavez Segura - PhD in Divinity (University of St. Andrews) Expert in AQAL integral approach Research interests: religion and politics, international political theory and philosophical approaches to peacebuilding Expert in Easter philosophy, mainly Buddhism and Taoism. A Theology of International Relations: A Buddhist Approach to Religion and Politics in an Interdependent World, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277090486_A_theology_of_international_relations_a_Buddhist_approach_to_religion_and_politics_in_an_interdependent_world>, r0w@n

Therefore,  the  method  of  causality  will  be  used  throughout  the  thesis.  This method is rooted in a Buddhist understanding of the empty nature of all phenomena and thus the interdependent reality of everything in existence. Everything, from human existence to relations between states and institutions is a consequence of particular arrangements of causes and conditions. This implies a constant flux of emotions, 1 ‘The Heart Sutra’ in Buddhist Wisdom Books: The Diamond Sutra and the Heart Sutra, Edward Conze trans. (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1958), 81. 9 thoughts, actions and interests in play, driven by different emotions such as anger, hatred and delusion or compassion, generosity and mindfulness. The Buddha clearly established this dependent nature of all phenomena, and thus its emptiness of independent arising,2 in the formula: when there is this, there is that (imasmim sati idam hoti); when this arises, that arises (imassuppada idam uppajjati); when this is not, the other is not (imasmim asati idamna hoti); ceasing this, that ceases (imassa nirodha idam nirujhati). In this methodology, where everything is taken as interdependent, the levels of analysis are intertwined but primacy had been given to the individual level. This is not to overlook or dismiss the social, institutional, state, interstate or global levels but, to the contrary, this methodology argues that these levels are the projection of the sum of individual will and ways of thinking, which are institutionalized through the process of intersubjective consensus. Therefore, this Theology of International Relations is the result of the sum of a Buddhist theological root, an international validity, case studies which ratify its basic premises and, finally, the construction of variables and causal explanatory arguments to guide further study of the role of individuals in re-creating their own relative reality and the possibility of making this reality a compassionate and satisfactory existence.

#### The ego- or the fake perception of the individual- is the root of all suffering

De Silva, 98 (Padmasiri de Silva, Research Fellow in the Philosophy Department at Monash University, *Environmental Philosophy and Ethics in Buddhism*, pg 37-38)//DH+ r0w@n

The Buddhist analysis of ego-centricism may be explained in relation to a number of doctrinal strands**. The roots of unwholesome motivation are greed, aggression, and delusion**; and non-greed, non-aggression and non-delusion are the roots of wholesome motivation. Of these, as mentioned earlier, what is referred to as **delusion is** basically an existential confusion about the usage of conventional terms like the “self” and “ego”. What we call the **ego instincts** in Buddhism **is one of the forms of craving**. The three forms of craving are the craving for sensuous gratification, craving for egotistic pursuits and the craving for self-annihilation. **The craving for egotistical pursuits** **has** its **deeper spring in** the dogma of personal immortality. This is **the belief in an ego entity independent of the physical and the mental processes that constitute life.** The ego illusion (atta-ditthi) may also be related to an annihilationist belief, where the ego-entity is associated with the mental and physical processes that are assumed to come to an end at death. **Such** annihilationist **views** may be **closely related to hedonistic and materialistic lifestyles, destructive behavior and even suicide**. The Buddhist middle path accepts only the processes of physical and mental phenomena, which continually arise and disappear. This process, which is referred to as dependent origination, provides the basis for understanding the nature of the human-social-nature matrix within which we live. **The ego illusion is** not merely an intellectual construction, but is **fed by deeper affective processes.** Human traits like acquisitiveness, excessive possessiveness, the urge to hoard and acquire things more than needed, the impulse to outdo other, envy, and jealousy are reciprocally linked to the belief in an ego. Beliefs influence desires and desires influence beliefs. Some of **the social, economic and political structures that people build collectively** may turn out to be **more subtle expressions of their ego**, while other human creations may be expression caring and sharing. Apart from the tendency to construct a pure ego and the related expressions of excessive craving, there are also more subtle conceits(mana) which are only transcended at a later stage on the path to liberation from suffering. The Buddha in fact mentions twenty forms of wrong personality beliefs (de Silva, 1992b, 119-27).

#### Their IR has the wrong starting point- only love can destroy hatred

William J. Long, 21, Buddha on Politics, Economics, and Statecraft, SpringerLink, 2-16-2021, DOA: 12-28-2021, https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-68042-8\_3, r0w@n

Buddha on International Relations and Statecraft The Buddhist conception of politics as serving the common good extends to the international realm where our humanity and fundamental interdependence ultimately transcend national, racial, and other barriers, which are, at most, only conventional distinctions. This is not to say that the state must wither away in Buddhism. States, like our conventional designation of our “selves” as distinctive individual entities, can function effectively as long as one recognizes their nominal, transactional, and dependent nature and avoids grasping at them as inherently real. States can serve an important function by equitably supplying public goods. Likewise, a system of such like-minded states can “exist” and function effectively, if one recognizes and does not lose sight of the deeper, interconnected nature of all things. Thus, Buddhist statecraft is an international extension of Buddhist political and economic principles of equality, harmony, social welfare, nonviolence, conciliation, and mutually beneficial commercial exchange what has been summed up above as ruling in accord with the dharma, sometimes called “righteousness” in the Buddhist cannon.12 Buddha discusses statecraft mostly in parables,13 introducing the concept of world-ruler (cakkavatti in Pali, cakravartin in Sanskrit), who would provide exemplary leadership for states in the international system. The cakkavatti is a lesser or worldly Buddha that provides for the material welfare (more than the spiritual welfare) of mankind.14 By example and generosity (not violent conquest), this ruler (either a single individual or a representative body) establishes an ideal government with the consent of the governed which is followed by a series of similar democratic and constitutional states based on shared principles. This loose network of ideal states would constitute an international political system that served the interests of worldwide peace and prosperity. One can see certain parallels here with Kant’s vision of perpetual peace among like-minded representative states and with democratic peace theory and notions of an “international society” and cosmopolitanism in modern Western IR writings. Buddhist IR begins with the establishment of a righteous state, ruled by consent of the governed with policies consistent with the dharma. This government would work for the interest of its people with care, impartial justice, tolerance, and the equal promotion of material and spiritual welfare of society’s members. In modern parlance, the exemplar would be an enlightened democratic welfare state guaranteeing freedom and economic security and promoting equality, tolerance, and care for its citizens (Jayatilleke 1967). In time, this model would extend naturally and infectiously or “travel” to other parts of the world, via the Buddhist metaphor of a rolling “Wheel of Dharma,” much like Buddha’s initial teaching after his enlightenment set in motion a wheel of spiritual guidance. These other countries, in turn, would establish similar states with analogous governing principles and constitutions. The international system would not be centralized empire, but a loose constellation of states revolving around an archetypal entity (Tambiah 1976). In relating with other states, hostility and aggression is forbidden and the cultivation of friendliness and neighborliness and mutually beneficial commerce is endorsed, both to conform with the dharma and on grounds of expediency and efficacy, that is, aggression does not serve one’s self-interest in the long run. Buddha counseled, “Hatred never ceases by hatred in this world. Hatred ceases by love—this is the ancient law” (Dhp. 2007 at p. 105).15 A state could retain its army for defensive purposes but nonviolence is thought to be the higher ideal and Buddha counseled against the resort to war as a means of settling international disputes (King 2013).16 The first ethical principle in Buddhism is to refrain from killing or injuring any sentient being. There is little or no support for “just war” in Buddhism (Jerryson 2013; Jayasuriya 2009). Buddha said that wars only perpetuate future conflict. As noted, he also spoke out against the trading in weapons as “wrong livelihood.” In sum, in foreign affairs, the state has the obligation not to commit aggression and to cooperate with other states in a spirit of friendliness and equality for the common good of mankind. Like all Buddha’s advice, this admonition was offered for its practical benefits—it strengthened both the individual state and encouraged common bond of humanity that would bear fruit in international peace and prosperity. Buddha’s political doctrine of equality, democracy, popular sovereignty, and political institutions that serve the common good materially and spiritually find their ultimate fulfillment in a worldwide network of states each acting according to these principles. Hence, in Buddhism, states may exist, but they are artifacts that endure for the benefit of a broader humanity. Empirical Referents for Buddhist Statecraft: Aśoka’s Mauryan Empire and Contemporary Bhutan Buddhism has shaped many cultures throughout Asia and, more recently, has become influential in the West. Buddhism’s political impact has been more muted, however, in part, because from the start the Buddhist order, the democratic sangha, was to remain apart, although not wholly separate, from politics.17 The devoted practitioners of the sangha were to be considered a source of advice and example to the wider society and polity, but refrain from participating directly in the political process. So, there are few instances where one can find an empirical example of a political system founded truly on Buddhist principles or practicing what might be called Buddhist statecraft. This is not to say that Buddhism has not been used by politicians past and present to cloak their actions in Buddhist rhetoric, much as other religious traditions have been used, only that an authentic effort to align Buddhist principles with political practice is quite rare. I offer two possible cases of Buddhist statecraft—one ancient and one modern (an alpha and omega)—for consideration. The ancient case is the Mauryan Empire of King Aśoka, the first ruler of a Buddhist state, and the modern case is contemporary Bhutan—the only extant example of a democratic state that is rooted constitutionally, politically, and economically in Buddhism.18

#### Their apocalyptic and dogmatic worldview is blind to the true complexity and indeterminacy of the world- only the alt can aid the complexity to improve human life

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 1-1-2022, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

For the better part of the last two-thousand years the people of the Western world have been conditioned to view our existence in terms of our history; not simply the recollection of events of the past, but a view of history as a revelatory process that carries with it the potential for a grand fulfillment of one kind or another. This is the root of the apocalyptic worldview; a reading of historical events as a preordained means of facilitating an absolute end to all things. It is a way of looking at the world with certainty that a specific outcome is inevitable. These outcomes naturally vary depending on one’s dominant ideology, religion, or political perspective, but in as much as they serve as a way of interpreting the past with the intention of moving toward a particular future, they can be said to be apocalyptic. While the word apocalyptic often carries with it a religious connotation, evoking images of the fulfillment of God’s plan by means of rapture, judgement, and the destruction of the world as we know it, the apocalyptic focus on inevitable ends are present in many of the prevailing ideologies of the West as well, even those which may seem fundamentally opposed to each other. For example, proponents of free market capitalism tend to argue that, when left to its naturally self-regulating state, capitalism will eventually solve issues of poverty, homelessness, and the like. While income disparity and general economic inequality may exist for any number 36 of reasons, for the capitalist it is a certainty that all boats will indeed rise if only given the chance. From the opposing position of the Marxist, capitalism’s tendency towards crisis, one of its hallmark characteristics, ensures that such a mode of political economy will inevitably be abandoned and replaced with socialism and eventually communism. While modern Marxists would no doubt argue that their political goals are no longer subject to the orthodoxy of Marx’s ‘laws of motion of modern society’, the fact remains that the Marxist position is one which is driven toward a specific conclusion built upon historical conditions. These are merely examples meant to convey the general form of the apocalyptic worldview, but what of its function? Spellmeyer (2010) points out that this way of looking at the world is so appealing because it provides certainty in the face of an increasingly complex reality. This complexity is all encompassing in modernity, challenging both traditional ways of understanding the world, such as religion, and our individual and collective confidence in a reliable preordained future of any kind. As is often the case when systems of belief, either formal or informal, are challenged, the response to this uncertainty has been a widespread clinging to the apocalyptic worldview. In addition to the certainty provided by such beliefs, they can also be seen as providing one’s life with a sense of order and a connection to some transcendent value system. That sense of transcendent cosmic order can be internalized and the individual believer is suddenly made to feel his life newly purposeful and in touch with eternity. More than just a sense of immortality, he experiences himself in alliance with the deity – or with history – enabling him to share in His or its ultimate power to destroy and re-create. Feelings of weakness or despair can be replaced by a surge of life power or even omnipotence (Lifton, 2003:61). Lifton further suggests that it is because such views satisfy the psychological needs for order and purpose that the holders of these beliefs are strongly driven to impose them on others. In cases where these beliefs fall in stark contrast to contemporary scientific or rational understanding this active proselytization serves to both stifle internal conflict and self-doubt and affirm one’s convictions. The most obvious example of this would be the prevalence of religious fundamentalism in recent years. Whether in reference to religiously inspired conflict or acts of 37 terrorism, or the influence of Christian fundamentalism on public policy, we are presented with daily reminders that in spite of the technological and scientific advancement we have undergone as a species, these self-reinforcing beliefs are, for lack of a better word, inevitable under current conditions. Taken as a whole, the apocalyptic tendency of modern society ultimately frames all problems in these familiar and disruptive terms. Issues are framed in terms of past or future, as resulting from a single cause, or as the work of divinity. They are then discussed in similarly apocalyptic language which becomes detrimental to the possibility of legitimate public discourse and engagement. If the patterns of argument typical of religious prophecy are also observable in any public discourse that anticipates or predicts catastrophe, then we should be skeptical of the public’s ability to reasonably evaluate any appeal to urgency in the face of disaster. At the same time, we also run the risk of dismissing valid threats because they are couched in the form, if not the language, of traditional prophetic warnings. (O’leary, 1997:310, in Foust & William, 2009) This process is harmful to progress at all levels. It makes all problems the result of a particular mindset; a product of our collective way of approaching reality. Perhaps most importantly it is exploited at every turn by news media and politicians to reinforce public support for existing power structures, which at the moment represent the best hope for addressing many of the most pressing contemporary issues faced by humanity as a whole. As we have seen, the revolutionary potential for a Buddhist critical social theory to provoke mass change is found in individual agency, and in addressing the issue of an apocalyptic worldview the emphasis remains the same. However, rather than focus on specific individual mental states as they contribute to personal suffering, the creation of a Buddhist worldview in defiance of the apocalyptic position requires the cultivation of a global mindfulness and situation in the present moment. It can be understood as facilitating the embrace of the chaos and complication of the world rather than its destruction. However, before I delve into the specifics of the Buddhist worldview a note of clarification is in order.

#### Debaters have the wrong intent- that means they will NEVER overcome attitudes of self-cherishment which condemns their policies and their analysis to structural failure and they will fail to overcome their own internal suffering

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 1-1-2022, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

If their work is to be truly impactful and accessible in the spirit of the Bodhisattva ideal it must be undertaken with the intent to advance more than idle knowledge. This is not to condemn pure research; but simply to place it outside of the scope of our concern at the moment. As has been previously discussed, it is the intent behind one’s actions rather than the act itself which determines its karma. This altruistic intent, bodhicitta, allows one to overcome an attitude of self-cherishing which is strongly associated with the generation of suffering within the self (Hattam, 2004). The mind which cultivates bodhicitta works not for the benefit of self but instead from a quality of mind characterized by love and compassion. It utilizes a logic of basic 43 goodness which disregards preconception and expectation and acts in the moment for positive ends. For the critical theorist this intent should be fairly straight forward. Those whose work is aimed at the provocation of liberatory action of all sorts can be said to have this right intent. In fact, one of the few tropes present in existing engagements between critical theory and Buddhism is that of Marx as bodhisattva. For Marx, the ultimate goal of the theorist is not simply to facilitate an understanding of the world but to change the material conditions which contribute to suffering. It is not a vehicle for the advancement of a particular political agenda, although this may be an unintended consequence of knowledge gained through critical inquiry. Turning again to Marx, his advocacy of socialism was not the sole purpose of his work but rather the necessary result of his formulation and understanding of political economy and the alienating forces contained therein. Simply put, to undertake the task of critical inquiry with a particular agenda in mind makes one’s work a slave to that agenda.

#### No action is disconnected from liberation- the aff’s indulgence in contemporary politics condemns us to their fear-machines

John M. Yowell, 15, “IF THE HELLS ARE NOT EMPTY”: A FRAMEWORK FOR A BUDDHIST CRITICAL SOCIAL THEORY, The University of Texas at Arlington, May 2015, DOA: 12-29-2021, https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/25077/Yowell\_uta\_2502M\_13122.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, r0w@n

Buddhism, as we have seen, is fundamentally revolutionary in its history and teachings. From the Buddha’s sudden abandonment of his worldly life to seek out liberation, this revolutionary spirit has been cultivated throughout Buddhist philosophy as a means of promoting the immediate possibility of enlightenment and liberation. This immediacy is what sets Buddhism apart from much of the world’s dominant religions and philosophies. It is also what makes it especially well suited to the task of understanding and responding to the pressing issues of the present, the resolution of which cannot possibly be sought through gradualist means. Buddhist philosophy further operates through an understanding that each individual is intrinsically interconnected and therefore must operate as though every action, no matter how superficially benign, is meaningful in that it contributes to the collective activity of society, writing its social karma, and moving society either closer to or further away from liberation in that moment. The individual agency to affect change is meaningless without this understanding, particularly in light of the various alienating forces of modernity; conditions which we must all concern ourselves with. Gary Snyder, in 1961, described the importance of individual action based on Buddhist principles in response to the social, political, and economic conditions of his time: No one today can afford to be innocent, or indulge himself in ignorance of the nature of contemporary governments, politics and social orders. The national polities of the modern world maintain their existence by deliberately fostered craving and fear: monstrous protection rackets. The “free world” has become economically dependent on a fantastic system of stimulation of greed which cannot be fulfilled, sexual desire which cannot be satiated and hatred which has no outlet against oneself, the persons one is supposed to love, or the revolutionary aspirations of pitiful, poverty-stricken marginal societies... They create populations of “preta” – hungry ghosts, with giant appetites and throats no bigger than needles. The soil, the forests and all animal life are being consumed by these cancerous collectivities; the air and water of the planet is being fouled by them (1969). 35 Despite the more than fifty years which have passed since Snyder authored this characterization, painfully little has been done in the way of alleviating the political, social, and economic roots of the innumerable sufferings of humanity.

#### Thus the alternative is to embrace the politics of mindfulness- a methodological rejection of desire and individuality

Matthew J. Moore, 16, Buddhism, Mindfulness, and Transformative Politics, California Polytechnic State University, 2016, DOA: 1-4-2021, <https://digitalcommons.calpoly.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1028&context=poli_fac>, r0w@n

The Buddha laid out his core teachings in his first sermon (the Dhammacakkappavattana Sutta6). The teachings begin with the Four Noble Truths. The first is that life is dukkha, which means “suffering” but also can mean something a bit less harsh: that life is inevitably and persistently unsatisfactory. The second noble truth is that suffering is caused by clinging (ta૽hā; the word literally means “thirst”) to ideas, sensations, desires, and other phenomena of our experience. The third truth teaches that suffering can be stopped (nirodha; “cessation”) by learning not to cling, and the fourth identifies following the Noble Eightfold Path as the way to cease clinging, by practicing right understanding, intention, speech, action, livelihood, effort, mindfulness, and concentration. In the Satipatଣଣhāna Sutta, the Buddha identified mindfulness—non-judgmental present-moment awareness—as an especially helpfulpath toward overcoming clinging and achieving enlightenment. The Buddha describes how one can build thefour establishments of mindfulness, which are awareness of the body (sensation), feeling(emotion), mind (thoughts), and phenomena (other mental activity): Monks, this is the one-way path for the purification of beings, for the surmounting of sorrow and lamentation, for the passing away of pain and dejection, for the attainment of the true way, for the realization of Nibbāna [Sanskrit: Nirvana]—namely, the four establishments of mindfulness. What are the four? Here monks, a monk dwells contemplating the body in the body, ardent, clearly comprehending, and mindful, having subdued longing and dejection in regard to the world**.** [The same formula is repeated for feeling, mind, and phenomena.]….And how, monks, does a monk dwell contemplating the body in the body? Here a monk, gone to the forest, to the foot of a tree, or to an empty hut, sits down; having folded his legs crosswise, straightened his body, and established mindfulness in front of him, just mindful he breathes in, mindful he breathes out. [Similar instructions are given for feeling, mind, and phenomena.]7 In essence, mindfulness is the opposite of clinging. One is simply, non-judgmentally aware of one’s experience, without either chasing after pleasant experiences or avoiding unpleasant experiences. The four foundations of mindfulness—body, feeling, mind, and phenomena— collectively exhaust the possible objects of experience, so that there is nothing excluded from one’s mindful awareness. Later in the same text, the Buddha says that someone who could practice this for seven days would either achieve Nibbāna or would suffer only one further rebirth before achieving enlightenment.8

#### Meditation and reflection unifies the body and the mind- shedding us from the ego and helping us embrace ethicality

Forge, 97, (Paul G. La Forge, Divine Word Missionary and professor in the Business Management Department of Nanzan University, Nagoya, Japan, Masters Degree in Clinical-Counseling Psychology, he holds a third class black belt in Kodokan Judo, Journal of Business Ethics, Vol. 16, No. 12/13, From the Universities to the Marketplace: The Business Ethics Journey: The Second Annual Internationa Vincentian Conference Promoting Business Ethics (Sep., 1997), pp. 1283-1295, “Teaching Business Ethics through Meditation”, JSTOR)//LOH + r0w@n

Business Ethics taught only from books and textual materials may occupy an important place in education, but my purpose is different. My goal is to help the students become ethical persons. This requires an ability to perform three seemingly simple tasks: First, to recognize ethical issues; second, to analyze them; and third, to act upon them. The ethical principles derived from textual materials covered in a Business Ethics course have their place, but only as a tool or a standard used by an ethical person. The purpose of this article is to show how **meditation can be used to** help the student to **become an ethical person**. My purpose in using meditation to teach Business Ethics is to produce people with an "Ethical Vision". Meditation gives students an awareness of ethical issues in their lives and leads to the discovery and application of models of ethical conduct to serve as guides to behavior in general and to ethical decision making in particular. In effect, I use meditation to stop the world. There are many ways to stop the world and many kinds of meditation. I will restrict myself to two forms, namely, discursive and non-dis cursive meditation. The classroom communica tion process between the instructor and the students is slowed down by both non-discursive and discursive meditation so that students can learn to use meditation to accomplish the three tasks mentioned above. Non-discursive **meditation greatly contributes to the process of constructing** a vision because it gives people **a sense of themselves and their place in the world.** Discursive meditation, in its many forms, gives substance to an ethical vision because it leads to an awakening to the existence and importance of ethical issues in life. In part one, I will describe how the students are led through non-discursive meditation to discover themselves as ethical persons. They are also given the tools to explore ethical issues through non-discursive meditation. In part two, I will discuss a transition state between non-discursive and discursive medita tion. After discovering themselves as ethical persons, the students are led to use non-discur sive meditation as a technique to construct their own ethical value system and apply it to their own lives. At this transition stage, an art medium is extremely useful for discovering and analyzing meanings, especially ethical meanings. Through non-discursive meditation, the indi vidual is taught to become aware of him/herself and his/her place in the world. However, non discursive meditation is not an end in itself. Discursive meditation, as is explained in more detail in part three, gives the participant a chance to compare who he/she is with what he/she should be. Here the student is encouraged to compare the values he/she has discovered about him/herself during non-discursive meditation with an ideal, and construct a system of ethical principles for him/herself using discursive meditation. Textual materials are recommended here and the student is encouraged to search for the ideal. The result is the development of a person with an ethical vision through meditation in both non-discursive and discursive forms. I. Discovering ethical issues through non-discursive meditation An ethical person must become aware of his/her self, his/her ethical values, and his/her place in the world. Non-discursive meditation can be a powerful device **to teach** students how they can stop their world and take stock of their lives because **the body itself participates in the meditation as the locus of experience and insight, inseparably one with the mind** (Takeuchi, 1993, p. xx). At this point, the process is entirely self centered and observational, without the con straint of reference to any system of ethics or values. Thus viewed, it is only a first step, but a very necessary first step **to** becoming an ethical person. Because this step is only a means to an end, virtually any school of non-discursive meditation will suffice. There are many kinds of non-discursive meditation techniques, such as Taikyokken, Zen, and Yoga; these teach people to look at and reflect on their place in the world. The goal is to teach students a way of stopping and reflecting, to provide a context for devel oping and applying their own values. Therefore, non-discursive meditation is not used as an end in itself. Taikyokken, Yoga, or Zen all have their proponents, but in an ethics class, they serve only as a tool, not as a philosophy. **Non-discursive meditation serves to** stop the world. Students, like business people, lead busy, active, stressful lives. Non-discursive meditation serves to put a brake on the activities of a busy day. The ethical person must be able to stop this world and reflect upon life. This is an ability to step aside from normal activities in order to recognize ethical issues that arise in business or personal life.

## Case

Presumpiton

Their epistemological orientation is wrong- that means their starting point will always lead to the impacts they say are bad and they can’t solve anything even if they resolve spec nuke war scenarios

A2 Tronchetii

1. Says theres’ still debates about what the ost actually says- proves will never actually work
2. No warrants hwy people follow it better post aff- us obv doesn’t follow now
3. No warrant why states will try the mining

A2 foster 16

1. “This has led the international community to move in the direction of creating a better regulatory framework”- proves no reason aff key
2. Entire thing is speculation on mining from a non-scientist

A2 macwhorter

1. Says that bindingness key- the aff doesn’t’ do that
2. Names 4 other treaties that exist- their failure proves space ilaw useles

A2 Mallick & Rajagopalan

1. Card talks abt russian vs us COMPANIES not governments- spaceex dosen’t have nukes
2. Says mining is clearly illegal now- proves the aff does nothing
3. No warrant why these norms are key to global collapse- the us breaks drug treaties and human rights treaties every day

A2 funnell

1. Conflict doesn’t mean war- esp when they’ve only outlined compnaies doing the mining
2. Says that any resources cause conflict- proves their war scenarios inevitable whenever we dicover smth new to mine
3. Proves plan doesn’t solve- their link is tripped by the DISCOVERY of the new materials

A2 jamasmi

1. Uniqueness all spec to trump aggressing- obv not in power
2. Says that russia and china have already signed the accords- proves collab inevitable

A2 grego

1. Earth is offensive dominiant- we can have subs 10 miles off russia’s coast
2. No space key warrants ANYWHERE in the card

A2 starr

1. They conveniently skip out on the highlighting that says nuke war kills “the majority” of humans instead of all- that’s an independent voter on ev ethics
2. None of these impacts matter for people on remote islands or people in bunkers

#### Meteoroids alt cause

1AC Boley & Byers 21 [Aaron C., Department of Physics and Astronomy @ The University of British Columbia\*, and Michael, Department of Political Science @ The University of British Columbia; Published: 20 May 2021; Scientific Reports; “Satellite mega-constellations create risks in Low Earth Orbit, the atmosphere and on Earth,” <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-021-89909-7>] brett

Companies are placing satellites into orbit at an unprecedented frequency to build ‘mega-constellations’ of communications satellites in Low Earth Orbit (LEO). In two years, the number of active and defunct satellites in LEO has increased by over 50%, to about 5000 (as of 30 March 2021). SpaceX alone is on track to add 11,000 more as it builds its Starlink mega-constellation and has already filed for permission for another 30,000 satellites with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC)1. Others have similar plans, including OneWeb, Amazon, Telesat, and GW, which is a Chinese state-owned company2. The current governance system for LEO, while slowly changing, is ill-equipped to handle large satellite systems. Here, we outline how applying the consumer electronic model to satellites could lead to multiple tragedies of the commons. Some of these are well known, such as impediments to astronomy and an increased risk of space debris, while others have received insufficient attention, including changes to the chemistry of Earth’s upper atmosphere and increased dangers on Earth’s surface from re-entered debris. The heavy use of certain orbital regions might also result in a de facto exclusion of other actors from them, violating the 1967 Outer Space Treaty. All of these challenges could be addressed in a coordinated manner through multilateral law-making, whether in the United Nations, the Inter-Agency Debris Committee (IADC), or an ad hoc process, rather than in an uncoordinated manner through different national laws. Regardless of the law-making forum, mega-constellations require a shift in perspectives and policies: from looking at single satellites, to evaluating systems of thousands of satellites, and doing so within an understanding of the limitations of Earth’s environment, including its orbits.

Thousands of satellites and 1500 rocket bodies provide considerable mass in LEO, which can break into debris upon collisions, explosions, or degradation in the harsh space environment. Fragmentations increase the cross-section of orbiting material, and with it, the collision probability per time. Eventually, collisions could dominate on-orbit evolution, a situation called the Kessler Syndrome3. There are already over 12,000 trackable debris pieces in LEO, with these being typically 10 cm in diameter or larger. Including sizes down to 1 cm, there are about a million inferred debris pieces, all of which threaten satellites, spacecraft and astronauts due to their orbits crisscrossing at high relative speeds. Simulations of the long-term evolution of debris suggest that LEO is already in the protracted initial stages of the Kessler Syndrome, but that this could be managed through active debris removal4. The addition of satellite mega-constellations and the general proliferation of low-cost satellites in LEO stresses the environment further5,6,7,8.

Results

The overall setting

The rapid development of the space environment through mega-constellations, predominately by the ongoing construction of Starlink, is shown by the cumulative payload distribution function (Fig. 1). From an environmental perspective, the slope change in the distribution function defines NewSpace, an era of dominance by commercial actors. Before 2015, changes in the total on-orbit objects came principally from fragmentations, with effects of the 2007 Chinese anti-satellite test and the 2009 Kosmos-2251/Iridium-33 collisions being evident on the graph.

Figure 1

[Figure 1 omitted]

Cumulative on-orbit distribution functions (all orbits). Deorbited objects are not included. The 2007 and 2009 spikes are a Chinese anti-satellite test and the Iridium 33-Kosmos 2251 collision, respectively. The recent, rapid rise of the orange curve represents NewSpace (see "Methods").
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Although the volume of space is large, individual satellites and satellite systems have specific functions, with associated altitudes and inclinations (Fig. 2). This increases congestion and requires active management for station keeping and collision avoidance9, with automatic collision-avoidance technology still under development. Improved space situational awareness is required, with data from operators as well as ground- and space-based sensors being widely and freely shared10. Improved communications between satellite operators are also necessary: in 2019, the European Space Agency moved an Earth observation satellite to avoid colliding with a Starlink satellite, after failing to reach SpaceX by e-mail. Internationally adopted ‘right of way’ rules are needed10 to prevent games of ‘chicken’, as companies seek to preserve thruster fuel and avoid service interruptions. SpaceX and NASA recently announced11 a cooperative agreement to help reduce the risk of collisions, but this is only one operator and one agency.

Figure 2

[Figure 2 omitted]

Orbital distribution and density information for objects in Low Earth Orbit (LEO). (Left) Distribution of payloads (active and defunct satellites), binned to the nearest 1 km in altitude and 1° in orbital inclination. The centre of each circle represents the position on the diagram, and the size of the circle is proportional to the number of satellites within the given parameter space. (Right) Number density of different space resident objects (SROs) based on 1 km radial bins, averaged over the entire sky. Because SRO objects are on elliptical orbits, the contribution of a given object to an orbital shell is weighted by the time that object spends in the shell. Despite significant parameter space, satellites are clustered in their orbits due to mission requirements. The emerging Starlink cluster at 550 km and 55° inclination is already evident in both plots (Left and Right).
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When completed, Starlink will include about as many satellites as there are trackable debris pieces today, while its total mass will equal all the mass currently in LEO—over 3000 tonnes. The satellites will be placed in narrow orbital shells, creating unprecedented congestion, with 1258 already in orbit (as of 30 March 2021). OneWeb has already placed an initial 146 satellites, and Amazon, Telesat, GW and other companies, operating under different national regulatory regimes, are soon likely to follow.

Enhanced collision risk

Mega-constellations are composed of mass-produced satellites with few backup systems. This consumer electronic model allows for short upgrade cycles and rapid expansions of capabilities, but also considerable discarded equipment. SpaceX will actively de-orbit its satellites at the end of their 5–6-year operational lives. However, this process takes 6 months, so roughly 10% will be de-orbiting at any time. If other companies do likewise, thousands of de-orbiting satellites will be slowly passing through the same congested space, posing collision risks. Failures will increase these numbers, although the long-term failure rate is difficult to project. Figure 3 is similar to the righthand portion of Fig. 2 but includes the Starlink and OneWeb mega-constellations as filed (and amended) with the FCC (see “Methods”). The large density spikes show that some shells will have satellite number densities in excess of n=10−6 km−3.

Figure 3

[Figure 3 omitted]

Satellite density distribution in LEO with the Starlink and OneWeb mega-constellations as filed (and amended) with the FCC. Provided that the orbits are nearly circular, the number densities in those shells will exceed 10–6 km−3. Because the collisional cross-section in those shells is also high, they represent regions that have a high collision risk whenever debris is too small to be tracked or collision avoidance manoeuvres are impossible for other reasons.
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Deorbiting satellites will be tracked and operational satellites can manoeuvre to avoid close conjunctions. However, this depends on ongoing communication and cooperation between operators, which at present is ad hoc and voluntary. A recent letter12 to the FCC from SpaceX suggests that some companies might be less-than-fully transparent about events13 in LEO.

Despite the congestion and traffic management challenges, FCC filings by SpaceX suggest that collision avoidance manoeuvres can in fact maintain collision-free operations in orbital shells and that the probability of a collision between a non-responsive satellite and tracked debris is negligible. However, the filings do not account for untracked debris6, including untracked debris decaying through the shells used by Starlink. Using simple estimates (see “Methods”), the probability that a single piece of untracked debris will hit any satellite in the Starlink 550 km shell is about 0.003 after one year. Thus, if at any time there are 230 pieces of untracked debris decaying through the 550 km orbital shell, there is a 50% chance that there will be one or more collisions between satellites in the shell and the debris. As discussed further in “Methods”, such a situation is plausible. Depending on the balance between the de-orbit and the collision rates, if subsequent fragmentation events lead to similar amounts of debris within that orbital shell, a runaway cascade of collisions could occur.

Fragmentation events are not confined to their local orbits, either. The India 2019 ASAT test was conducted at an altitude below 300 km in an effort to minimize long-lived debris. Nevertheless, debris was placed on orbits with apogees in excess of 1000 km. As of 30 March 2021, three tracked debris pieces remain in orbit14. Such long-lived debris has high eccentricities, and thus can cross multiple orbital shells twice per orbit. A major fragmentation event from a single satellite could affect all operators in LEO.

Even if debris collisions were avoidable, meteoroids are always a threat. The cumulative meteoroid flux15 for masses m > 10–2 g is about 1.2 × 10–4 meteoroids m−2 year−1 (see “Methods”). Such masses could cause non-negligible damage to satellites16. Assuming a Starlink constellation of 12,000 satellites (i.e. the initial phase), there is about a 50% chance of 15 or more meteoroid impacts per year at m > 10–2 g. Satellites will have shielding, but events that might be rare to a single satellite could become common across the constellation.

One partial response to these congestion and collision concerns is for operators to construct mega-constellations out of a smaller number of satellites. But this does not, individually or collectively, eliminate the need for an all-of-LEO approach to evaluating the effects of the construction and maintenance of any one constellation.

#### Even minimal satellites cause Kessler syndrome – it only requires 1080 and Starlink is 12,000 minimum

Bernat 20 – Pawel, 2020, Military University of Aviation, [“ORBITAL SATELLITE CONSTELLATIONS AND THE GROWING THREAT OF KESSLER SYNDROME IN THE LOWER EARTH ORBIT,” SAFETY ENGINEERING OF ANTHROPOGENIC OBJECTS, Volume 4, PDF] Justin

5. Orbital satellite constellations and the growing threat of the Kessler syndrome Space 2.0 – the new era of space exploration that we witness now in the 21st century means, in words of Buzz Aldrin, “moving human enterprise into space” (Pyle, 2019, p. xiv). The process of commercialization of outer space has already begun and is not limited to private companies providing technologies and services for national or international space agencies, as it was in the past. On the contrary, private companies from the space sector have now matured to carry out their own independent projects. As for 2020, SpaceX is a company that serves as the best example – it launches satellites to the orbit, both for state and private contractors, it successfully realized two crew missions to the International Space Station, and is in the process of constructing Starlink satellite constellation that will provide high-speed internet access across the planet. Each satellite weighs around 260 kg, is equipped with an ion propulsion system, autonomous collision avoidance system, and orbits Earth at approximately 540-560 km altitude (Starlink, 2020). At the beginning of November 2020, more than 860 Starlink satellites were orbiting the Earth (Jewett, 2020). Immediate plans include launching 12,000 satellites, but they assume a potential later extension to 42,000 (Henry, 2019a). Of course, SpaceX has employed, at least declaratively, all necessary measures to keep the space clean – the satellites are equipped with the deorbiting system, and in the event of inoperability of the propulsion system (Starlink, 2020). The orbital collisions are, however, inevitable. As it was shown before, the possibility of collisions grows with the number of orbital objects. Bastida Virgili with the team compared (2016, p. 154-155) orbital debris environment development without and with a large hypothetical constellation consisting of merely 1080 satellites, distributed across 20 orbital planes at 1,100 km altitude (Fig. 5).
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It has to be noted that although SpaceX’s Starlink is the only constellation that is being built in orbit, it is not the only one planned. There are at least a few initiatives aiming at the same goal – to construct internet infrastructure at the Earth’s orbit. The planned Kuiper Systems LLC, which is a subsidiary of Amazon and intends to place 3,236 broadband satellites in the LEO, is one of Starlink’s biggest competitors (Henry, 2019b). Now, there is even a rivalry between the two companies because Kuiper’s lowest orbital shell is planned to be 590 km, with a tolerance of 9 km either above or below (Cao, 2020), which is the altitude of Starlink satellites. Moreover, the race for space in orbit is now at the beginning. The outer space is vast. It increasingly becomes more cluttered with both operational satellites and space debris. The threat of collisions increases and no institution or body has enough power to license, coordinate and regulate what is sent to the orbit. The UNOOSA has not such power. National states decide what the companies from the space industry can launch to space. In the United States, which is most advanced in the area of private constellations, it is the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) that issues the appropriate approvals. The race to put broadband internet satellites bears similarities to the gold rush – there are no rules, at the global level, apart from first-come, first-served.

#### Means post plan, countries can still launch asteroids with assistance from private entities which still causes Kessler

#### Space debris includes natural debris which the aff can’t solve – proves their impacts are inevitable so try or die neg

NASA ’21 [https://www.nasa.gov/mission\_pages/station/news/orbital\_debris.html]//pranav

Space debris encompasses both natural meteoroid and artificial (human-made) orbital debris. Meteoroids are in orbit about the sun, while most artificial debris is in orbit about the Earth (hence the term “orbital” debris).

#### Aff doesn’t solve – there’s already millions of undetectable objects

1AC Dockrill 16 [Peter; 2016; Award-winning science & technology journalist. “Space Junk Accidents Could Trigger Armed Conflict, Study Finds.” <https://www.sciencealert.com/space-junk-accidents-could-trigger-armed-conflict-expert-warns>] brett

The increasingly crowded space in Earth's low orbit could set the stage for an international armed conflict, says a new study. Researchers from the Russian Academy of Sciences warn that accidents stemming from the steady rise in space junk floating around the planet could incite political rows and even warfare, with nations potentially mistaking debris-caused incidents as the results of intentional aggressive acts by others. In a paper published in Acta Astronautica, the team suggests that space debris in the form of spent rocket parts and other fragments of hardware hurtling at high speed pose a "special political danger" that could dangerously escalate tensions between nations. According to the study, destructive impacts caused by random space junk cannot easily be told apart from military attacks. "The owner of the impacted and destroyed satellite can hardly quickly determine the real cause of the accident," the authors write. The risks of such an event occurring are compounded by the sheer volume of debris now orbiting Earth. Recent figures from NASA indicate that there are more than 500,000 pieces of space junk currently being tracked in orbit, travelling at speeds up to 28,160 km/h (17,500 mph). The majority of those objects are small – around the size of a marble – but some 20,000 of them are bigger than a softball. In addition to these 500,000 or so fragments – which are big enough for scientists to know about them – NASA estimates that there are millions of undetectable pieces of debris in orbit that are too small to be monitored. But even extremely small fragments such as these pose a threat – in fact, they're considered a greater risk than trackable debris, as their invisible status means spacecraft and satellites can't do anything to avoid them until it's too late. As NASA observed in 2013: "Even tiny paint flecks can damage a spacecraft when travelling at these velocities. In fact a number of space shuttle windows have been replaced because of damage caused by material that was analysed and shown to be paint flecks… With so much orbital debris, there have been surprisingly few disastrous collisions." While we may have been lucky in the past, we can't rely on that to continue. The study by the Russian team cites the repeated sudden failures of defence satellites in past decades that were never explained. The researchers attribute two possible causes: either unrecorded collisions with space junk, or aggressive actions from adversaries. "This is a politically dangerous dilemma," the authors write.

And the ev literally concludes there were satellites destroyed from debris in the past but no escalation – empirics flow neg

#### Asteroid mining offsets terrestrial growth that ruins the environment and enables many more solar power satellites – both solve climate change

**Taylor 19** Chris Taylor is a veteran journalist. Previously senior news writer for Time.com a year later. In 2000, he was named San Francisco bureau chief for Time magazine. He has served as senior editor for Business 2.0, West Coast editor for Fortune Small Business and West Coast web editor for Fast Company. Chris is a graduate of Merton College, Oxford and the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism. "How asteroid mining will save the Earth — and mint trillionaires." Mashable, 2019, mashable.com/feature/asteroid-mining-space-economy. [Quality Control]

The mission is essential, Joyce declares, to save Earth from its **major problems**. First of all, the fictional billionaire wheels in a fictional Nobel economist to demonstrate the actual truth that the entire global economy is sitting on a **mountain of debt**. It has to keep growing or it will **implode**, so we might as well take the majority of the **industrial growth off-world where it can’t do any more harm to the biosphere.**

Secondly, there’s the **climate change fix**. Suarez sees asteroid mining as the only way we’re going to build **solar power satellites.** Which, as you probably know, is a form of uninterrupted solar power collection that is theoretically more effective, inch for inch, than any solar panels on Earth at high noon, but operating 24/7. (In space, basically, **it’s always double high noon).**

The power collected is beamed back to large receptors on Earth with large, low-power microwaves, which researchers think will be harmless enough to let humans and animals pass through the beam. A space solar power array like the one China is said to be working on could reliably supply 2,000 gigawatts — or **over 1,000 times more power than the largest solar farm currently in existence.**

“We're looking at a 20-year window to **completely replace human civilization's power infrastructure,**” Suarez told me, citing the report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change on the coming catastrophe. Solar satellite technology “has existed since the 1970s. What we were missing is **millions of tons of construction materials** in orbit. **Asteroid mining can place it there.”**

The Earth-centric early 21st century can’t really wrap its brain around this, but the idea is not to bring all that building material and precious metals down into our gravity well. Far better to create a whole new commodities exchange in space. You mine the useful stuff of asteroids both near to Earth and far, thousands of them taking less energy to reach than the moon. That’s something else we’re still grasping, how relatively easy it is to ship stuff in zero-G environments.

2100, the U.N. estimates. So if optimism is always a matter of perspective, the possibility of four degrees shapes mine.

#### That outweighs conflict on probability- cc is already happening but we haven’t seen any wars

#### Also short circuits- CC drives resource wars which is confirmed empirically- famines are disproportionately conflict zones

**No ‘space war’ – Insurmountable barriers and everyone has an interest in keeping space peaceful**

**Dobos 19** [(Bohumil Doboš, scholar at the Institute of Political Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic, and a coordinator of the Geopolitical Studies Research Centre) “Geopolitics of the Outer Space, Chapter 3: Outer Space as a Military-Diplomatic Field,” Pgs. 48-49] TDI

Despite the theorized potential for the achievement of the terrestrial dominance throughout the utilization of the ultimate high ground and the ease of destruction of space-based assets by the potential space weaponry, the utilization of space weapons is with current technology and no effective means to protect them far from fulfilling this potential (Steinberg 2012, p. 255). In current global international political and technological setting, the utility of space weapons is very limited, even if we accept that the ultimate high ground presents the potential to get a decisive tangible military advantage (which is unclear). This stands among the reasons for the lack of their utilization so far. Last but not the least, it must be pointed out that the states also develop passive defense systems designed to protect the satellites on orbit or critical capabilities they provide. These further decrease the utility of space weapons. These systems include larger maneuvering capacities, launching of decoys, preparation of spare satellites that are ready for launch in case of ASAT attack on its twin on orbit, or attempts to decrease the visibility of satellites using paint or materials less visible from radars (Moltz 2014, p. 31). Finally, we must look at the main obstacles of connection of the outer space and warfare. The first set of barriers is comprised of physical obstructions. As has been presented in the previous chapter, the outer space is very challenging domain to operate in. Environmental factors still present the largest threat to any space military capabilities if compared to any man-made threats (Rendleman 2013, p. 79). A following issue that hinders military operations in the outer space is the predictability of orbital movement. If the reconnaissance satellite's orbit is known, the terrestrial actor might attempt to hide some critical capabilities-an option that is countered by new surveillance techniques (spectrometers, etc.) (Norris 2010, p. 196)-but the hide-and-seek game is on. This same principle is, however, in place for any other space asset-any nation with basic tracking capabilities may quickly detect whether the military asset or weapon is located above its territory or on the other side of the planet and thus mitigate the possible strategic impact of space weapons not aiming at mass destruction. Another possibility is to attempt to destroy the weapon in orbit. Given the level of development for the ASAT technology, it seems that they will prevail over any possible weapon system for the time to come. Next issue, directly connected to the first one, is the utilization of weak physical protection of space objects that need to be as light as possible to reach the orbit and to be able to withstand harsh conditions of the domain. This means that their protection against ASAT weapons is very limited, and, whereas some avoidance techniques are being discussed, they are of limited use in case of ASAT attack. We can thus add to the issue of predictability also the issue of easy destructibility of space weapons and other military hardware (Dolman 2005, p. 40; Anantatmula 2013, p. 137; Steinberg 2012, p. 255). Even if the high ground was effectively achieved and other nations could not attack the space assets directly, there is still a need for communication with those assets from Earth. There are also ground facilities that support and control such weapons located on the surface. Electromagnetic communication with satellites might be jammed or hacked and the ground facilities infiltrated or destroyed thus rendering the possible space weapons useless (Klein 2006, p. 105; Rendleman 2013, p. 81). This issue might be overcome by the establishment of a base controlling these assets outside the Earth-on Moon or lunar orbit, at lunar L-points, etc.-but this perspective remains, for now, unrealistic. Furthermore, no contemporary actor will risk full space weaponization in the face of possible competition and the possibility of rendering the outer space useless. No actor is dominant enough to prevent others to challenge any possible attempts to dominate the domain by military means. To quote 2016 Stratfor analysis, "(a) war in space would be devastating to all, and preventing it, rather than finding ways to fight it, will likely remain the goal" (Larnrani 20 16). This stands true unless some space actor finds a utility in disrupting the arena for others.

## 2NR

## EXT