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#### International Relations is the royal science of empire – the aff engineers “sustainable warfare” through a mutating geopolitics of violence.

Grove ‘19

[Jarius, PoliSci at the University of Hawai’i. 2019. “Savage Ecology: War and Geopolitics in the Anthropocene.”] pat – ask me for the PDF!

Because I wanted this book to inspire curiosity beyond the boundaries of international relations (ir), I considered ignoring the field altogether, removing all mentions of ir or ir theory. However, upon closer reflection, I have decided to keep these references as I think they are relevant for those outside the discipline and for those who, like myself, often feel alienated within its disciplinary boundaries. In the former case, it is important to know that, unlike some more humble fields, ir has always held itself to be a kind of royal science. Scholarship in ir, particularly in the United States, is half research, and half biding time until you have the prince’s ear. The hallowed names in the mainstream of the field are still known because they somehow changed the behavior of their intended clients—those being states, militaries, and international organizations. Therefore, some attention to ir is necessary because it has an all-too-casual relationship with institutional power that directly impacts the lives of real people, and ir is all too often lethal theory. As an American discipline, the political economy of the field is impossible without Department of Defense money, and its semiotic economy would be equally dwarfed without contributory figures like Woodrow Wilson, Henry Kissinger, and Samuel Huntington. The ubiquity of Huntington’s “clash of civilizations” thesis and Kissinger’s particular brand of realpolitik are undeniable throughout the field, as well as the world. Each, in their own way, has saturated the watchwords and nomenclature of geopolitics from an American perspective so thoroughly that both political parties in the United States fight over who gets to claim the heritage of each. Although many other fields such as anthropology and even comparative literature have found themselves in the gravitational pull of geopolitics, international relations is meant to be scholarship as statecraft by other means. That is, ir was meant to improve the global order and ensure the place of its guarantor, the United States of America. Having spent the better part of a decade listening to national security analysts and diplomats from the United States, South Korea, Japan, Europe, China, Brazil, and Russia, as well as military strategists around the planet, I found their vocabulary and worldview strikingly homogeneous.

If this seems too general a claim, one should take a peek at John Mearsheimer’s essay “Benign Hegemony,” which defends the Americanness of the ir field. What is most telling in this essay is not a defense of the U.S. as a benign hegemonic power, which Mearsheimer has done at length elsewhere. Rather, it is his vigorous defense that as a field, ir theory has done well by the world in setting the intellectual agenda for global challenges, and for creating useful theoretical approaches to addressing those problems. For Mearsheimer, the proof that American scholarly hegemony has been benign is that there is nothing important that has been left out. A quick scan of the last ten or twenty International Studies Association conferences would suggest otherwise.

That issues like rape as a weapon of war, postcolonial violence, global racism, and climate change are not squarely in the main of ir demonstrates just how benign American scholarly hegemony is not. As one prominent anthropologist said to me at dinner after touring the isa conference in 2014, “it was surreal, like a tour through the Cold War. People were giving papers and arguing as if nothing had ever changed.” These same provincial scholars aspire and succeed at filling the advisory roles of each successive American presidency. One cannot help but see a connection between the history of the ir field, and the catastrophes of U.S. foreign policy during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. One could repeat the words of the anthropologist I mentioned to describe the 2016 presidential campaign debates over the future of U.S. foreign policy: it is as if “nothing had ever changed.” And yet these old white men still strut around the halls of America’s “best” institutions as if they saved us from the Cold War, even as the planet crumbles under the weight of their failed imperial dreams.

If international relations was meant to be the science of making the world something other than what it would be if we were all left to our own worst devices, then it has failed monumentally. The United States is once again in fierce nuclear competition with Russia. We are no closer to any significant action on climate change. We have not met any of the Millennium Development Goals determined by the United Nations on eradicating poverty. War and security are the most significant financial, creative, social, cultural, technological, and political investments of almost every nation-state on Earth. The general intellect is a martial intellect.

Despite all this failure, pessimism does not exist in international relations, at least not on paper. The seething doom of our current predicament thrives at the conference bar and in hushed office conversations but not in our research. In public, the darkness disavowed possesses and inflames the petty cynicisms and hatreds that are often turned outward at tired and predictable scapegoats.

After the fury of three decades of critique, most ir scholars still camp out either on the hill of liberal internationalism or in the dark woods of political realism. Neither offers much that is new by way of answers or even explanations, and each dominant school has failed to account for our current apocalyptic condition. One is left wondering what it is exactly that they think they do. Despite the seeming opposition between the two, one idealistic about the future of international order (liberals) and the other self-satisfied with the tragedy of cycles of war and dominance (realists), both positions are optimists of the positivist variety.

For both warring parties, ir optimism is expressed through a romantic empiricism. For all those who toil away looking for the next theory of international politics, order is out there somewhere, and dutifully recording reality will find it—or at least bring us closer to its discovery. For liberal internationalism, this will bring the long-heralded maturity of Immanuel Kant’s perpetual peace. For second-order sociopaths known as offensive realists, crumbs of “useful strategic insight” and the endless details that amplify their epistemophilia for force projection and violence capability represent a potential “advantage,” that is, the possibility to move one step forward on the global political board game of snakes and ladders. Still, the cynicism of ir always creeps back in because the world never quite lives up to the empirical findings it is commanded to obey. Disappointment here is not without reason, but we cynically continue to make the same policy recommendations, catastrophe after catastrophe.

I have an idea about where ir’s recent malaise comes from. I think it is a moment, just before the awareness of the Anthropocene, after the Cold War and before September 11, when the end of everything was only a hypothetical problem for those of a certain coddled and privileged modern form of life. The catastrophe of the human predicament was that there was no catastrophe, no reason, no generation-defining challenge or war. Now the fate of this form of life is actually imperiled, and it is too much to bear. The weird denial of sexism, racism, climate change, the sixth extinction, and loose nukes, all by a field of scholars tasked with studying geopolitics, is more than irrationalism or ignorance. This animosity toward reality is a deep and corrosive nihilism, a denial of the world. Thus ir as a strategic field is demonstrative of a civilization with nothing left to do, nothing left to destroy. All that is left is to make meaning out of being incapable of undoing the world that Euro-American geopolitics created. Emo geopolitics is not pretty, but it is real. The letdown, the failure, the apocalypse-that-was-not finally arrived, and we are too late.

Still, the United States of America continues to follow the advice of “the best and the brightest,” testing the imperial waters, not quite ready to commit out loud to empire but completely unwilling to abandon it. Stuck in between, contemporary geopolitics—as curated by the United States—is in a permanent beta phase. Neuro-torture, algorithmic warfare, drone strikes, and cybernetic nation-building are not means or ends but rather are tests. Can a polis be engineered? Can the human operating system be reformatted? Can violence be modulated until legally invisible while all the more lethal? Each incursion, each new actor or actant, and new terrains from brains to transatlantic cables—all find themselves part of a grand experiment to see if a benign or at least sustainable empire is possible. There is no seeming regard for the fact that each experiment directly competes with Thomas Jefferson’s democratic experiment. One wonders if freedom can even exist anywhere other than temporarily on the fringe of some neglected order. Is this some metaphysical condition of freedom, or is the world so supersaturated with martial orders that the ragged edges between imperial orders are all that we have left? It feels like freedom’s remains persist only in the ruins of everything else. No space is left that can be truly indifferent to the law, security, or economy. Such is the new life of a human in debt. The social contract has been refinanced as what is owed and nothing more: politics without equity. Inequity without equality.

What about the impending collapse of the post–World War II order, the self-destruction of the United States, the rise of China and a new world order? If humanity lasts long enough for China to put its stamp on the human apocalypse, I will write a new introduction. Until then, we live in the death rattle of Pax Americana. While I think the totality of this claim is true, I do not want to rule out that many of us throughout the world still make lives otherwise. Many of us even thrive in spite of it all. And yet, no form of life can be made that escapes the fact that everything can come to a sudden and arbitrary end thanks to the whim of an American drone operator, nuclear catastrophe, or macroeconomic manipulation like sanctions. There are other ways to die and other organized forms of killing outside the control of the United States; however, no other single apparatus can make everyone or anyone die irrespective of citizenship or geographic location. For me, this is the most inescapable philosophical provocation of our moment in time.

The haphazard and seemingly limitless nature of U.S. violence means that even the core principles of the great political realist concepts like order and national interest are being displaced by subterranean violence entrepreneurs that populate transversal battlefields, security corridors, and border zones. Mercenaries, drug lords, chief executive officers, presidents, and sports commissioners are more alike than ever. Doomsayers like Paul Virilio, Lewis Mumford, and Martin Heidegger foretold a kind of terminal and self-annihilating velocity for geopolitics’ technological saturation, but even their lack of imagination appears optimistic. American geopolitics does not know totality or finality; it bleeds, mutates, and reforms. Furthermore, the peril of biopolitics seems now almost romantic. To make life live? Perchance to dream. The care and concern for life’s productivity is increasingly subsumed by plasticity—forming and reforming without regard to the telos of productivity, division, or normative order.

There are, of course, still orders in our geoplastic age, but they are almost unrecognizable as such. When so many citizens and states are directly invested in sabotaging publicly stated strategic ends, then concepts like national interest seem equally quaint. We are witnessing creative and horrifying experiments in the affirmative production of dying, which also deprive those targeted and in some cases whole populations from the relief of death. To follow Rucker, I want to try to see the world for what it is. We can only say that tragedy is no longer a genre of geopolitics. Tragedy redeems. The occluded character of contemporary geopolitics shoehorned into experience produces the feeling that there is no relief, no reason, no victory, no defeats, and no exit within the confines of national security’s constricted world. This is not tragedy: it is horror. We live in an age of horror that, like the victims of gore movies who never quite die so that they can be tortured more, furthers our practice of collective violence and goes on for decades as a kind of sustainable warfare.

#### The aff’s managerial concerns over space debris is techno-sustainability – liberal governance over space as a “commons” is the exclusive domain of space-faring nations

Stroikos ‘16

[Dimitrios, University of York. 2016. “China, India in Space and the Orbit of International Society: Power, Status, and Order on the High Frontier.”] Pat

Moreover, it is necessary to briefly say something about how techno-nationalism as a primary institution interacts with some of the other institutions of international space society. First, in many ways, techno-nationalism is complimentary to sovereign statehood because sovereignty in space is largely embedded in cosmopolitan and solidarist conceptions. This is partly why highly visible space projects define spacefaring hierarchies. Second, and consequently, techno-nationalism is also closely linked to great power status and great power management in the sense that different space capabilities also confer different levels of status and responsibilities in the management of international order in space. Likewise, in relation to diplomacy, highly visible techno-nationalist space feats can also offer a seat at the table of diplomatic initiatives and negotiations. Seen in this light, ‘high-visibility’ projects, such as space programmes are part of ‘recognition games’, which states play in order to acquire the status of a great power (Suzuki, 2008). As Cunningham (2009: 74) notes, ‘to be a superpower, one must be a “spacefaring” nation’. The Space Market Arguably, the economic factor has been one of the most neglected issues in the English School literature. Discussing some of the shortcomings of Bull’s work, Miller (1990: 74) pointed out in 1990, ‘a basic criticism of Bull’s account of international society’ is ‘that it does not include a strong economic component’ dealing with rules regarding trade, navigation, and investment and the common interests that permeate the sphere of economic activities. Since then, some important work has been done to bring together the economic sector and the English School, especially in the context of globalisation (Buzan, 2004; Buzan, 2005; Hurrell, 2007: 194-215). However, the question of how to consider the economic sector within the English School remains rather underdeveloped. According to Buzan, one response is to treat capitalism as a master institution, but he prefers the use of the market as a more neutral term, which has the additional merit of encompassing other practices, such as trade (Buzan, 2004: 193-4, Buzan, 2014a: 136). Consequently, given the growing globalisation and commercialisation of space activities (OECD, 2014: 9-10), there are good reasons for considering the space market as an emerging primary institution of international space society. Significantly, in some ways, since the advent of the Space Age, the space market has followed a parallel trajectory to the market as a distinctive institution at the global level. In particular, although the market was a key primary institution of the Western global international society during much of the Cold War, it has emerged as a sort of a global institution in the post-Cold War era (Buzan, 2014a: 138). Likewise, the space market was initially confined to American-led space activities, beginning as a US government initiative with the Communications Satellite Act in 1962, which led to the creation of the International Telecommunications Satellite Consortium (Intelsat) in 1964 (Moltz, 2014: 94). However, during the early Cold War, commercial activities were largely limited to the field of satellite communications and even commercial transatlantic cooperation in space was determined to a large extent by political and strategic factors and technology transfer considerations (Krige, 2013b). Equally, the idea of the commercialisation of space remained contested not the least because of the opposition of the Soviet Union and communist China to the market in general. This began to change only in the 1980s, when a number of space players emerged, including Europe and Japan, that challenged the US leadership in the fields of satellite manufacturing, launching capability, and other commercial space services. It was also during this period that the Soviet Union and China became less reluctant to get involved with commercial space activities (Krige, 2013a: 16-7). But it was after the end of the Cold War that the globalisation and commercialisation of space activities gradually led to the emergence of a global space market, which points to its inclusion as a primary institution of the international space society. According to a recent report by the Space Foundation (2015: 2), the global space economy grew up by 9 percent in 2014, totalling $330 billion, with commercial space activities accounting for the 76 percent of the global space economy and direct-to-home television services accounting for more than three-quarters of the commercial space sector. Even in the launch field, which has been traditionally reserved to the state largely due to national security and cost considerations, US small private companies have emerged like Space Exploration Technologies Corporation, known as SpaceX, and XCOR Aerospace. As Newlove-Eriksson and Eriksson (2013) argue, the globalisation of space activities has been underpinned by the growing importance of private authority and transnational Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) and the blurred distinction between the military and civilian uses of space. Therefore, it makes sense to think of the space market as an institution of international space society. Yet, a number of points are worth noting here as they help to highlight the possibilities and limits of this move. First, despite all the attention paid to the privatisation of space travel promoted by space entrepreneurs of the likes of Elon Musk (SpaceX), Jeff Bezos (Blue Origin), and Richard Branson (Virgin Galactic), the privatisation of space should not be overstated. Not only does the degree of privatisation vary across space services and products (Moltz, 2014: 102-12), but governments also remain central actors in the space industry as key sources of initial investment and as customers for several space products and services (Brennan and Vecchi, 2011: 18, OECD, 2014: 17). Second, while it is clear that the argument over whether to have the market or not ended with the collapse of the Soviet Union, the tension between economic nationalism and economic liberalism is far from over, as there are not many states fully open to the forces of the global economy and many states support a form of capitalism that is embedded in economic nationalism. This points to the contested nature of the market as a primary institution in the sense that for many states the challenge of how to relate to the global market and make it more effective remains (Buzan, 2014a: 138). As far as international space society is concerned, it is necessary to note that the contested nature of the space market as an institution is reflected in the continuing dialectics between techno-nationalism and techno-globalism. It is commonplace among scholars to argue that Japan and China are two key examples of states that privilege a techno-nationalist approach to technology and innovation, including space technology. But even the United States has not been immune to techno-nationalist impulses. As Weiss (2014) shows, the enduring lead in high technology that the United States still enjoys is largely explained by the creation of not a liberal, but a hybrid political economy, whereby the national security state is interwoven with the commercial sector. NASA, of course, has been a key institution of the national security state since the beginning of the Space Age. But this has also been manifested in its recent efforts to catalyse the development of a commercial space industry through inviting competitive innovation (Weiss, 2014: 119-20, 27-8). This leads to the third point to make about how to understand the relationship between techno-nationalism and the space market. Because of the enduring influence of the former, it is tempting to see techno-nationalism as containing the space market (at least for the time being). Clearly, at one level, the space market can be understood as complementary to techno-nationalism in the ever-globalising international space society. Yet, at another level, the space market as a solidarist institution is staged as opposed to techno-nationalism. This tension is compounded by the fact that, in many ways, techno-nationalism occupies the crucial place of national sovereignty and territoriality in the sector of space considering that sovereignty in international space society is largely understood in cosmopolitan terms. Fourth, in discussing the market as a primary institution, Beeson and Breslin (2014) suggest that it makes more sense to treat the ‘developmental state’ and ‘regional production structures’ as primary institutions in East Asia rather than focusing on the market. This is an important consideration that serves to highlight how the global political economy is underpinned by significant regional derivations. Following from this, although it is apparent that the space market is a key feature of the social structure of international space society, it is possible to say that there are significant regional derivations. Perhaps the best expression of this is the Chinese and Indian variants of postcolonial techno-nationalism that still shape how the two rising Asian space powers relate to the space market. In light of the above, for now, it seems that there is some sort of hierarchy between techno-nationalism and the space market with the former subsuming the latter, especially with regards to space programmes in a postcolonial context. Certainly, the integration of China and India into the global space economy has accelerated over the last decades, but, as we shall see, techno-nationalism is still prominent in the ways in which the two Asian space powers approach space technology. Moreover, the space market remains contested as an emerging institution due to the ambiguity embedded in space law regarding space activities carried on by private actors. This process is further complicated by the inherent dual-use nature of space technology and the blurring of the distinction between the private and public realms (Newlove-Eriksson and Eriksson 2013). Environmental Stewardship There is now a burgeoning literature that deals with the relationship between international society and global environmentalism and assesses the extent to which environmental stewardship can be seen as a nascent institution of international society. Recent efforts to find ways to mitigate space debris as well as to create a normative framework for the sustainability of space are illustrative of how environmental stewardship is gradually becoming an institution in space. For example, in 2007, COPUOS adopted the ‘Space Debris Mitigation Guidelines’, which were wrought by the international Inter-Agency Debris Coordination Committee (IADC), consisting of experts from thirteen space agencies (United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs, 2010). Moreover, as discussed earlier, in 2010, COPUOS formed the Working Group on the Long-term Sustainability of Outer Space Activities. Notably, the European Union proposal for a Code of Conduct for Outer Space also includes provisions on space debris control and mitigation (Council of the European Union, 2008: 9; Dickow, 2009: 159). Thus, there are grounds for considering environmental stewardship as an emerging institution of international space society. Indeed, the growing number of governments, private firms, and non-state actors that emphasise the importance of the sustainable utilisation of space suggests that space sustainability has emerged as a key norm. However, what should be noted is that these developments reflect a more pragmatic approach to maintain the space environment sustainable for the effective use of space rather than an expression of cosmopolitan values. Consequently, in the subsequent chapters, rather than examining in detail the engagement of China and India with environmental stewardship as a nascent institution in space, the focus will be on the emerging norm of space sustainability as a key great power responsibility in managing international space order and the implications of this development for China and India as aspiring great powers. Concluding Remarks Although it is clear that there are a number of ways of understanding the international politics of space, it may be worth going beyond standard theoretical approaches to understand how order is maintained in space. Drawing on key English School concepts, this chapter suggests that it is possible to conceptualise space not merely as a system, but also as an international society with a distinct social structure. This exercise of concept development is important both analytically and hermeneutically, given the notion of an exclusive club of space-faring countries. The chapter developed this argument further by highlighting how the nature of outer space as a distinctive sectoral interstate society is manifested in the ways in which its primary institutions are differentiated from such institutions at the global level (space war, space law, cosmopolitan sovereignty, space diplomacy, balance of power, great power management, techno-nationalism, space market, and environmental stewardship) in a historical and comparative context. In doing so, the chapter helps to highlight the constitutive impact of these institutions on the norms that shape the behaviour of the space-faring states.

#### Revisionism scholarship around China is specifically rooted in a historical legacy of externalizing instability to the non-Western world to validate liberal order’s faux progressive nature – makes great power wars inevitable.

Turner and Nymalm ‘18

(Oliver, Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Edinburgh, Associate Editor of the British Journal of Politics and International Relations. He has acted as convenor and co-convenor of BISA's US Foreign Policy working group, and is a former visiting research fellow at the Swedish Institute of International Affairs. N. Nymalm, Associate Senior Lecturer/Assistant Professor in War Studies @ the Swedish Defence University, she was a postdoctoral research fellow at the Swedish Institute of International Affairs. “Morality and progress: IR narratives on international revisionism and the status quo,” Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 32:4, pp.407-428.)

A third wave of revisionist/status quo literature came with post-Cold-War debates over the US-led world order and emergence of ‘rising powers’. Authors in this wave utilize the logic of the PTT to interrogate the contemporary ‘rise’ of China in particular (see for example Lim 2015; Goldstein 2007). As Lemke (1997, 32) explains, threats to the post-war ‘Long Peace’ have now seemingly emerged, notably from ‘Chinese growth unaccompanied by a change in attitude toward the status quo’. To assuage these threats, ‘the United States and other leading satisfied Great Powers should continue patient cooperation with [China, and others such as Russia] … to encourage democratization and liberalization’. For Gerald Segal (1996, 108), ‘China is a powerful, unstable non-status quo power.’ China is also now argued to be demonstrating ‘significant revisionist objectives’ in the South China Sea (Lim et al. 2017) as well as by creating the AIIB (Wilson 2017, 150). Graham Allison writes that ‘war between the U.S. and China is more likely than recognized at the moment’, as his interpretation of the historical record stipulates that, in the majority of cases ‘in which a rising power has confronted a ruling power, the result has been bloodshed’ (Allison 2015).5 Beyond the PTT, a significant sub-literature explores whether rising powers in general, and especially a rapidly rising China, represent revisionist or status quo powers (see for example Ding 2010; Feng 2009; Kastner and Saunders 2012). We return to the role of these narratives in the policy realm in the next sub-section on public narratives. Third-wave IR debates around rising powers, then, quietly sustain the logics of the ordering narratives of morality and civilizational progress central to the first and second waves, perpetuating largely unquestioned understandings that international revisionism must inevitably emanate from beyond the Western core of international order. To begin with, the term ‘rising power’ is not neutral, bringing powerful connotations of instability and danger absent in such alternatives as ‘modernizing’ or ‘developing’. Crucially, the term ‘rising’, like ‘revisionist’, powers has most typically been used to refer only to non-Western states (see Turner 2014, 152–154). As noted earlier, the EU is rarely labelled ‘revisionist’ despite revisionism forming part of its self-identity. Explorations of the US as revisionist are also relatively absent, though counter-narratives exist, as examined shortly. The selective formations and constraining boundaries of mainstream conceptual IR narratives prevent the inclusion of the US and EU because the term does not logically fit the known character or plotline. The assumption here is not of an unproblematic separation between the ‘West’ and ‘non-West’, or of timeless challenges the latter poses to the former. Fears over a ‘rising’ India, for instance, rarely enter US security discourse as do those of a ‘rising’ China, despite numerous material similarities and both typically being identified as residing beyond the West. Moreover, and as already shown, earlier waves of IR revisionism–status-quo debate interrogated the vulnerabilities of the Anglo-American/Western order to Imperial and Nazi Germany. That Germany is now routinely located within the West, alongside members of the ‘Anglo-American world’, demonstrates the fluidity of such imagined geographies. Indeed, India’s broad absence from US threat discourses is explained partly by its (re)construction as a pseudo-member of the Western world (Turner 2016). Similarly, while post-1945 Japan quickly became seen as part of the Western Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) world, by the 1970s and 1980s it was ‘orientalized’ because its economic growth generated concerns of a challenge to US economic hegemony (Nymalm 2017). Today, it is those actors commonly labelled ‘non-Western’, in particular China, that have in many ways been seamlessly manoeuvred into spaces of IR debate once occupied by Wilhelmine and Nazi Germany. Members of ‘the West’ escape such interrogation, while China, like others before it, is now ideationally tied to well-rehearsed discourses of the enemy because its imagined Otherness makes it seemingly logical to do so (see Rousseau 2006). Mainstream scholarly/conceptual narratives of a ‘rising’ China are thus in important ways autobiographical narratives of Western authorship, with their meanings contingent on the worldview of a particular, prevailing (Western) disciplinary tradition.6 The ‘cognitive map’ of this tradition locates uncertainty and disorder, and an unravelling of gains made by the so-called liberal world order, as coming not from the central characters within it but from the global peripheries. China has become locked within narrativized understandings of what constitutes international order, on the one hand, and disorder (or chaos/backwardness/barbarism), on the other, and not only within academic circles. For centuries within wider US politics and society, China has been represented as lacking the essential standards of civilization and as a corresponding threat to US security and its enlightened, progressive values (Turner 2013). Chengxin Pan points to self-reflecting Western narrations of the ‘China threat’ when he argues that the ‘threat’ derives at least partly from the American self. ‘Thus, to fully understand the U.S. “China threat” argument, it is essential to recognize its autobiographical nature’ (Pan 2004, 313). This equally applies to expectations of China developing according to the Western model of liberal democratic capitalism. This kind of convergence thinking has been a recurrent theme in US China policy (Nymalm 2013). As highlighted earlier, among those who directly interrogate the question of whether ‘rising’ China exists as a revisionist or a status quo actor, most agree that it more closely resembles the latter. Despite this, it is China and other ‘rising powers’ that are routinely interrogated as potential sources of instability. This apparent contradiction is enabled by the power of narratives to steer and select our knowledges of the world and its constituent actors. First- and second-wave IR debates around international revisionism and the status quo cemented the disciplinary (conceptual) narrative of an imperial/unsatisfied non-Western threat to a stable Anglo-American/Western world order. Third-wave debates over China’s ‘rise’ align with, and reinforce, this story by retaining its authors as the central protagonists, most notably the US, before introducing China as the latest outsider to a functioning system, which it necessarily threatens to destabilize. The findings of the recent sub-literature within these debates on the explicit question of China as a revisionist or a status quo actor have not disrupted the more ingrained, overarching ‘truth’ that China should remain the principal object of study.

#### Voting negative adopts failed IR for a healthy dose of pessimism – at the end of the world, all we can do is hope to be buried alive together.

Grove ‘19

[Jarius, PoliSci at the University of Hawai’i. 2019. “Savage Ecology: War and Geopolitics in the Anthropocene.”] pat – ask me for the PDF!

Failed ir affirms the power of this kind of negative thinking as an alternative to the endless rehearsing of moralizing insights and strategic foresight. The negative is not “against” or reacting to something. Rather, it is the affirmation of a freedom beyond the limits of life and death. That is, it is making a life by continuing to think about the world, even if that thinking is not recuperative, and even if nothing we think can save us. In the face of it all, one celebrates useless thinking, useless scholarship, and useless forms of life at the very moment we are told to throw them all under the bus in the name of survival at all costs. This is a logic referred to lately as hope and it is as cruel as it is anxiety inducing. Hope is a form of extortion. We are told that it is our obligation to bear the weight of making things better while being chided that the failure of our efforts is the result of not believing in the possibility of real change. In such an environment, pessimism is often treated as a form of treason, as if only neoliberals and moral degenerates give up—or so goes the op-ed’s insisting upon the renewed possibility of redemption.

In response to these exhortations, pessimism offers a historical atheism, both methodologically and morally. The universe does not bend toward justice. Sometimes the universe bends toward the indifference of gravity wells and black holes. Affirming negativity, inspired by Achille Mbembe, is grounds for freedom, even if that freedom or relief is only fleeting and always insecure. I am not arrogant enough to think a book can attain freedom of this sort, but this book is inspired by refusals of critique as redemption in favor of useless critique and critique for its own sake.

That the pursuit of knowledge without immediate application is so thoroughly useless, even profane, is a diagnosis of our current moment. The neoliberal assault on the university is evidence of this condition, as is the current pitch of American politics. Our indifference as intellectuals to maximizing value has not gone unnoticed. We are still dangerous, worthy of vilification, of attack, sabotage, and derision because we fail so decadently. We are parasites according to Scott Walker, Donald Trump, and the rest. So be it. We are and shall remain irascible irritants to a worldwide assault on thinking that is well underway and facing few obstacles in other jurisdictions.

What would failed scholarship do? Learn to die, learn to live, learn to listen, learn to be together, and learn to be generous. These virtues are useless in that they do not prevent or manage things. They do not translate into learning objectives or metrics. Virtues of this order are selfsame, nontransferable experiences. They are meaningful but not useful. These are luxurious virtues. Like grieving or joy, they are ends unto themselves. But how will these ideas seek extramural grants, contribute to an outcomes-based education system, or become a policy recommendation? They will not, and that is part of their virtue.

Even if there is no straight line to where we are and where we ought to be, I think we should get over the idea that somehow the U.S. project of liberal empire is conflicted, or “more right than it is wrong,” or pragmatically preferable to the alternatives. I hope this book can contribute to the urgent necessity to get out of the way by reveling in the catastrophic failure that should inspire humility but instead seems to embolden too many to seek global control yet again. Demolition may be an affirmative act if it means insurgents and others can be better heard. And yet this may fail too. If we can accomplish nothing at all, we can at least, as Ta-Nehisi Coates and other pessimists have said, refuse to suborn the lie of America any longer. Telling the truth, even if it cannot change the outcome of history, is a certain kind of solace. In Coates’s words, there is a kind of rapture “when you can no longer be lied to, when you have rejected the dream.” Saying the truth out loud brings with it the relief that we are not crazy. Things really are as bad as we think.

If there are those of us who want to break from this one-hundred-year-old race to be the next Henry Kissinger, then why do we continue to seek respect in the form of recognizable standards of excellence? I am not sure where the answer finally lies, but I do know that professionalization will not save us. To appear as normal and recognizably rigorous will not be enough to stave off the neoliberal drive to monetize scholarship, or to demand of us strategically useful insights. The least we can do in the face of such a battle is to find comfort in meaningful ideas and the friendships they build rather than try to perform for those we know are the problem. Some will ask, who is this “we” or is that “they”—where is your evidence? More will know exactly what I am talking about.

The virtues I seek are oriented toward an academy of refuge, a place we can still live, no matter how dire the conditions of the university and the classroom. It is not the think tank, boardroom, or command center. We are, those of us who wish to be included, the last of the philosophers, the last of the lovers of knowledge, the deviants who should revel in what Harney and Moten have called the undercommons.

In one of his final lectures, Bataille speaks of the remnants of a different human species, something not quite so doomed, something that wasted its newly discovered consciousness and tool-being on the art that still marks the walls of prehistoric caves. This lingering minor or vestigial heritage is philosophy’s beginning. Philosophy survives war, atrocity, famine, and crusades. Thinking matters in a very unusual way. Thinking is not power or emancipation. Thinking matters for a sense of belonging to the world, and for believing in the fecundity of the world despite evidence to the contrary.

How do you get all this from pessimism, from failure? Because willing failure is a temptation, a lure to think otherwise, to think dangerous thoughts. Pessimism is a threat to indifferentism and nihilism in the sense of the phenomenon of Donald Trump. Pessimism is a provocation and an enemy of skepticism, particularly of the metaphysical variety. It is not redemption from these afflictions, but in pessimism there is solace in the real. To put it another way, to study the world as it is means to care for it.

The exhortation that our care or interest should be contingent on how useful the world is and how much of it conforms to our designs is as much opposed to care as it is to empiricism. We can study airports, poetry, endurance races, borders, bombs, plastic, and warfare, and find them all in the world. To consider the depth of their existence can be an invitation to the world rather than a prelude to another policy report. One cannot make a successful political career out of such pursuits, but you might be able to make a life out of it, a life worth repeating even if nothing else happens.

At the end of Jack Halberstam’s The Queer Art of Failure, we are presented with the Fantastic Mr. Fox’s toast as an exemple of something meaningful in these dark times of ours.

They say all foxes are slightly allergic to linoleum, but it’s cool to the paw—try it. They say my tail needs to be dry cleaned twice a month, but now it’s fully detachable—see? They say our tree may never grow back, but one day, something will. Yes, these crackles are made of synthetic goose and these giblets come from artificial squab and even these apples look fake—but at least they’ve got stars on them. I guess my point is, we’ll eat tonight, and we’ll eat together. And even in this not particularly flattering light, you are without a doubt the five and a half most wonderful wild animals I’ve ever met in my life. So let’s raise our boxes—to our survival.

Halberstam says of this queer moment:

Not quite a credo, something short of a toast, a little less than a speech, but Mr. Fox gives here one of the best and most moving—both emotionally and in stop-motion terms—addresses in the history of cinema. Unlike Coraline, where survival is predicated upon a rejection of the theatrical, the queer, and the improvised, and like Where the Wild Things Are, where the disappointment of deliverance must be leavened with the pragmatism of possibility, Fantastic Mr. Fox is a queerly animated classic in that it teaches us, as Finding Nemo, Chicken Run, and so many other revolting animations before it, to believe in detachable tails, fake apples, eating together, adapting to the lighting, risk, sissy sons, and the sheer importance of survival for all those wild souls that the farmers, the teachers, the preachers, and the politicians would like to bury alive.

Although not as much fun as Halberstam’s monument to low theory, Savage Ecology is for all the other wild animals out there studying global politics. May we be buried alive together.

#### The Role of the Judge is to adopt martial empiricism.

Bousquet et al ‘20

[Antoine Bousquet, University of London, Jairus Grove, University of Hawai‘i at Manoa, and Nisha Shah University of Ottawa. 2020. “Becoming war: Towards a martial empiricism,” <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0967010619895660>] pat

Haunting the formations and deformations of global life, war confronts us as an abyss in the face of which cherished interpretative frameworks perilously buckle and warp. Indeed, Tarak Barkawi and Shane Brighton (2011: 129) accurately identify a ‘conceptual black hole surrounding the notion of war’ that has insistently gnawed at the study of the phenomenon. Locating the source of this lacuna in the absence of an ‘ontology of war’, they propose to ground one in ‘fighting’ (Barkawi and Brighton, 2011: 136). Although we concur on the diagnosis, we take issue with the suggested remedy. War does not obey any neat philosophical division between epistemology and ontology. For us, the resolute elusiveness of any definitive understanding of war is inherent in that very object. Every attempt to conceptually shackle war is undone by the creative advance of its new modes, residences and intensities. This speaks against the value of ontology per se less than it calls for a strange, paradoxical and provisional ontology that is consonant with the confounding mutability of war. Such an ontology, suspended between infinity and totality, being and nothingness, the sheer fecundity and utter catastrophe of war, may not be too uncanny for its object. In fairness, Barkawi and Brighton (2011: 133) gesture towards this in acknowledging ‘war’s recalcitrance as an object of knowledge’ and allowing for war to unmake any truth. Yet they seem unwilling to embrace the full force of their own insight, which Marc von Boemcken (2016: 239) ultimately declares: ‘even the statement that “war is fighting” may well be eventually undone by war. In a very fundamental manner, war escapes human intelligibility.’

This special issue on ‘Becoming War’ grapples with war as obdurate mystery. In its recurring persistence yet constant reinvention, its paradoxical ordering of life for the generation of death, or its stubborn affront to the better world we all purport to want, war never ceases to perplex us. Our world is one shot through by war, manifest in the nation-states we inhabit, the ecologies of technics that bind us to one another, and the very thoughts ricocheting through our communities of sense. And yet we still do not know war.

Rather than endeavour yet again to ‘say something fundamental about what war is’ (Barkawi and Brighton, 2011: 134, emphasis in original), we choose to explore how war becomes. This is not to say that we deny any durability or regularities in the phenomenon of war over time. Simply that, as Alfred Whitehead (1978: 35) puts it, ‘there is a becoming of continuity, but no continuity of becoming’. Accordingly, we seek to trace the lines of becoming that congeal into what comes to count as war, even as it continually frays at the edges and insolently defies habituated frames of reference. We do not, therefore, offer a theory of continuity, a formula for what all lines of becoming war might have in common, but instead sketch a style of investigation that encompasses both the enduring cohesion and the radical dispersion of war. We call this endeavour ‘martial empiricism’ to renounce attempts to devise a definitive theory of war. Instead, we favour an open-ended conceptual arsenal for following the trail of war wherever it leads us, as opposed to camping in the places where we already expect to find it.

Although we do not aim to circumscribe the remit of its investigations, martial empiricism is nonetheless inherently situational, spurred by the impulse to grasp the present martial condition we inhabit in all its calamity and promise. We would be far from the first to point out the growing inadequacy of the conceptual frameworks of war inherited from the Westphalian historical interval. Yet we still collectively flounder in the face of a combined and uneven landscape of armed conflict populated by metastasizing war machines encompassing overseas contingency operations, fullspectrum hybrid theatres, ethno-supremacist militias, crowd-sourced paramilitaries, Incel shooters and narco-state assassins. The game is definitely up when a task force led by the former head of United States Central Command can write that ‘basic categories such as “battlefield,” “combatant” and “hostilities” no longer have clear or stable meaning’ (Abizaid and Brooks, 2014: 35). Confronted with this reality and the persistent bewilderment it induces, we contend that a certain epistemic humility is in order. Rather than professing to know where war begins and ends, martial empiricism starts in the middle, with only the barest tentative intuitions necessary to explore the logistics, operations and embodiments that engender armed conflict as an unremitting condition of global life.

# Case

## 1NC – Util

#### Utilitarian calculus doesn’t account for the geopolitical structure of aggregate conceptions of the good – that makes it incapable of grappling with the causes of apocalypse.

Grove ‘19

[Jarius, PoliSci at the University of Hawai’i. 2019. “Savage Ecology: War and Geopolitics in the Anthropocene.”] pat – ask me for the PDF!

Rather than see these two career trajectories as opposed, I think Crutzen’s thinking displays a continuous concern for the Northern Hemisphere and a particular cartography, rather than a geography, of human survival. Crutzen, as well as the concept of the Anthropocene itself, cannot escape preceding geopolitical conceptions of the Earth. Crutzen and others who rush so quickly to the necessity to transition efforts from climate abatement to climate modification are unsurprisingly not moved by claims that artificial cooling will likely cause droughts and famines in the tropics and subtropical zones of the global south; nor are they moved by how such plans may accelerate ocean acidification. The utilitarian risk calculus that favors the greatest good for the greatest number has no geographical or historical sensibility of how unequally aggregate conceptions of the good are distributed around the planet.

Global thinking, even in its scientific and seemingly universalist claims to an atmosphere that “we” all share, belies the geopolitics that enlivens scientific concern, as well as the global public policy agenda of geoengineering that seeks to act on behalf of it. Saving humanity as an aggregate, whether from nuclear war, Styrofoam, or climate turbulence, has never meant an egalitarian distribution of survivors and sacrifices. Instead, our new cosmopolitanism—the global environment—follows almost exactly the drawn lines, that is, the cartography or racialized and selective solidarities and zones of indifference that characterize economic development, the selective application of combat, and, before that, the zones of settlement and colonization. More than a result of contemporary white supremacy or lingering white privilege, the territorialization of who lives and who dies, who matters and who must be left behind for the sake of humanity, represents a five-hundred-year geopolitical tradition of conquest, colonization, extraction, and the martial forms of life that made them all possible through war and through more subtle and languid forms of organized killing.

I am not suggesting that Crutzen and others are part of a vast conspiracy; rather, I want to outline how climate change, species loss, slavery, the elimination of native peoples, and the globalization of extractive capitalism are all part of the same global ordering. That is, all of these crises are geopolitical. The particular geopolitical arrangement of what others have called the longue durée, and what I am calling the Eurocene, is geologically significant but is not universally part of “human activity” despite the false syllogism at the heart of popular ecological thinking that a global threat to humanity must be shared in cause and crisis by all of humanity.

Departing from Sloterdijk, I am hesitant to so easily locate modernity or explication as the root or cause of the global catastrophe. No single strategy, war, act of colonization, technological breakthrough, or worldview fully explains the apocalypse before us. However, there is something like what Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari call a refrain that holds the vast assemblage together, a geopolitical melody hummed along with the global expansion of a form of life characterized by homogenization rather than diversification. Accordingly, if we are to make some sense of such a vast world that is, even for Crutzen and Birks, “quite complex and difficult to model,” I think we must consider the particular refrain of geopolitics that is capable of, by scientific as well as more humbly embodied standards, destroying worlds along with the world. To eschew geopolitics simply because, as a refrain, it is too big, too grand, or too universal would ignore the conditions of possibility for nuclear weapons, power politics, and carbon-based globalization, and would greatly impoverish the explanatory capability of even the best climate models. So maybe it is not so strange that Crutzen and others’ attention to the nuclear threat of great powers has all but disappeared despite the fact that Russia and the United States still possess thousands of nuclear weapons, and as of late have been all too vocal about using them. Instead, the Anthropocene, as envisioned by Crutzen as a universal concern, requires with it a depoliticization of the causes of that concern.

#### We link turn the lexical prerequisite – only our theory explains how to act throughout the constant crisis of imperialism and we’ve impact turned their understanding of crisis as a one off event

#### Grove answers the extinction first block – their analysis of catastrophe as a one off event in the future is wrong and abstracts away from the ongoing ecological extinctions of the status quo – their crisis oriented politics are the link

#### Don’t hold the status quo hostage for future generations – it’s the same logic as banning abortions to protect possible future lives

#### Plan focus is bad – our Grove ev proves that the justifications for policy create imperial conclusions – prefer martial empiricism

### – A2 Fairness

#### This is fair – arguments like realism true or extinction first aren’t intrinsic to the plan, but it plan still relies on them to justify its outcome – if they get that as offense, those should obviously be fair game for the negative – anything else isn’t reciprocal.

#### Fairness isn’t an impact because it can’t give a telos to debate – at minimum unfairness is inevitable because of structural factors like resources and experience so they can’t solve it.

### – A2 Clash

#### We solve clash with regards to disproving the aff, but their model forecloses the 5:50 of the 1AC that wasn’t plan text, which shreds neg ground and shuts down discussions of ideological commitments.

## 1NC – War Adv

### 1NC – Space War

### 1NC – Thumpers

#### No miscalc or escalation

James Pavur 19, Professor of Computer Science Department of Computer Science at Oxford University and Ivan Martinovic, DPhil Researcher Cybersecurity Centre for Doctoral Training at Oxford University, “The Cyber-ASAT: On the Impact of Cyber Weapons in Outer Space”, 2019 11th International Conference on Cyber Conflict: Silent Battle T. Minárik, S. Alatalu, S. Biondi, M. Signoretti, I. Tolga, G. Visky (Eds.), <https://ccdcoe.org/uploads/2019/06/Art_12_The-Cyber-ASAT.pdf>

A. Limited Accessibility Space is difficult. Over 60 years have passed since the first Sputnik launch and only nine countries (ten including the EU) have orbital launch capabilities. Moreover, a launch programme alone does not guarantee the resources and precision required to operate a meaningful ASAT capability. Given this, one possible reason why space wars have not broken out is simply because only the US has ever had the ability to fight one [21, p. 402], [22, pp. 419–420]. Although launch technology may become cheaper and easier, it is unclear to what extent these advances will be distributed among presently non-spacefaring nations. Limited access to orbit necessarily reduces the scenarios which could plausibly escalate to ASAT usage. Only major conflicts between the handful of states with ‘space club’ membership could be considered possible flashpoints. Even then, the fragility of an attacker’s own space assets creates de-escalatory pressures due to the deterrent effect of retaliation. Since the earliest days of the space race, dominant powers have recognized this dynamic and demonstrated an inclination towards de-escalatory space strategies [23]. B. Attributable Norms There also exists a long-standing normative framework favouring the peaceful use of space. The effectiveness of this regime, centred around the Outer Space Treaty (OST), is highly contentious and many have pointed out its serious legal and political shortcomings [24]–[26]. Nevertheless, this status quo framework has somehow supported over six decades of relative peace in orbit. Over these six decades, norms have become deeply ingrained into the way states describe and perceive space weaponization. This de facto codification was dramatically demonstrated in 2005 when the US found itself on the short end of a 160-1 UN vote after opposing a non-binding resolution on space weaponization. Although states have occasionally pushed the boundaries of these norms, this has typically occurred through incremental legal re-interpretation rather than outright opposition [27]. Even the most notable incidents, such as the 2007-2008 US and Chinese ASAT demonstrations, were couched in rhetoric from both the norm violators and defenders, depicting space as a peaceful global commons [27, p. 56]. Altogether, this suggests that states perceive real costs to breaking this normative tradition and may even moderate their behaviours accordingly. One further factor supporting this norms regime is the high degree of attributability surrounding ASAT weapons. For kinetic ASAT technology, plausible deniability and stealth are essentially impossible. The literally explosive act of launching a rocket cannot evade detection and, if used offensively, retaliation. This imposes high diplomatic costs on ASAT usage and testing, particularly during peacetime. C. Environmental Interdependence A third stabilizing force relates to the orbital debris consequences of ASATs. China’s 2007 ASAT demonstration was the largest debris-generating event in history, as the targeted satellite dissipated into thousands of dangerous debris particles [28, p. 4]. Since debris particles are indiscriminate and unpredictable, they often threaten the attacker’s own space assets [22, p. 420]. This is compounded by Kessler syndrome, a phenomenon whereby orbital debris ‘breeds’ as large pieces of debris collide and disintegrate. As space debris remains in orbit for hundreds of years, the cascade effect of an ASAT attack can constrain the attacker’s long-term use of space [29, pp. 295– 296]. Any state with kinetic ASAT capabilities will likely also operate satellites of its own, and they are necessarily exposed to this collateral damage threat. Space debris thus acts as a strong strategic deterrent to ASAT usage.

#### No Sino-Russian alliance---too many conflicting interests

Beckley 18—Assistant professor of political science at Tufts University and an associate in the International Security Program at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard's Kennedy School [Michael, 2018, *Unrivaled Why America Will Remain the World’s Sole Superpower*, Chapter 5: Future Prospects, pgs 106-7, Cornell University Press, Accessed through the Wake Forest Library] AMarb

Russia and China currently maintain a “strategic partnership,” but this relationship is unlikely to become a genuine alliance, because the two countries share a 2,600-mile border and a desire to dominate Eurasia—a goal that one side can accomplish only by subjugating the other. Perhaps a shared hatred of the United States will bring Russia and China together, but history suggests otherwise. 35 At the start of the Cold War, China initially aligned with the Soviet Union, but by the 1960s the two Communist powers were literally at war with each other, and in the 1970s China offi - cially switched sides and aligned with the United States. 36 Today, many Russian and Chinese strategists warn their respective governments not to place too much faith in a sustainable partnership. 37 Foreign analysts come to similar conclusions. As one study explains: “[SinoRussian] cooperation is limited to areas where their interests already overlap, like bolstering trade. In the parts of the world that matter most to them, Russia and China are more rivals than allies.” 38 For every example of Sino-Russian cooperation, there is a counterexample of competition. For instance, Russia sells weapons to China, but it recently reduced sales to China while increasing sales to China’s rivals, most notably India and Vietnam. 39 Russia and China conduct joint military exercises, but they also train with each other’s enemies and conduct unilateral exercises simulating a Sino-Russian war. 40 The two countries share an interest in developing Central Asia, but Russia wants to tether the region to Moscow via the Eurasian Economic Union whereas China wants to reconstitute the Silk Road and link China to the Middle East and Europe while bypassing Russia. 41 Collectively, these confl icting interests have placed Russia and China “on a trajectory toward intensifying competition from latent to emergent rivalry.” 42

#### Space hotlines check miscalc – specifically with China.

Roman 15—freelance writer at Tech Times [Julienne, 11/24/2015, “US, China Set Up Space Hotline To Avoid Satellite Warfare”, Tech Times, <http://www.techtimes.com/articles/109998/20151124/us-china-set-up-space-hotline-to-avoid-satellite-warfare.htm>] AMarb

The United States and China have set up a space hotline between them. This connection will be used to facilitate the exchange of information between the two countries and prevent satellite-related conflicts and misunderstandings. There have been fears of the possibility of warfare in space after China blew up a satellite during one of its test runs of its anti-satellite technology back in 2007. Military operations and intelligence-gathering efforts that are dependent on satellites could be severely derailed by such weapons. The two powerhouse nations have been investing in weaponry that can destroy satellites that can be used during military operations. Frank Rose, U.S. assistant secretary of state, said that China has been testing out anti-satellite weapons. In order to prevent the space tests from causing misunderstandings that would then result into space wars, the new hotline will provide quick access between authorities in China and the United States. The direct link will make it easier to convey certain necessary information to prevent any conflicts.

#### Their Taichman evidence does not say either Russia or China escalate or go to war – they just say that they don’t like it with vague allusions to a Trump’s NSP that Biden hasn’t committed himself to

#### No Russian space Pearl Harbor

Kyle L. Evanoff 19, research associate for international institutions and global governance at the Council on Foreign Relations, "Big Bangs, Red Herrings, and the Dilemmas of Space Security", Council on Foreign Relations, https://www.cfr.org/blog/big-bangs-red-herrings-and-dilemmas-space-security

More important, U.S. policymakers should avoid making decisions on the basis of a possible, though highly improbable, space Pearl Harbor. They should recognize that latent counterspace capabilities—as exemplified in 2008’s Operation Burnt Frost, which saw the United States repurpose a ballistic missile interceptor to destroy a satellite—are more than sufficient to deter adversaries from launching a major surprise attack in almost all scenarios, especially in light of the aforementioned deep interdependence in the space domain. Adding to the deterrence effect are uncertain offensive cyber capabilities. The United States continues to launch incursions into geopolitical competitors’ critical systems, such as the Russian power grid, and has demonstrated a willingness to employ cyberattacks in the wake of offline incidents, as it did after Iran shot down a U.S. drone last week. Unlike in the nuclear arena, where anything short of the prospect of nuclear retaliation holds limited dissuasive power, space deterrence can stem from military capabilities in various domains. For this reason, an attack on a U.S. satellite could elicit any number of responses. The potential for cross-domain retaliation, combined with the high strategic value of space assets, means that any adversary risks extreme escalation in launching a major assault on American space architectures. Again, well-conceived diplomatic efforts are useful in averting such scenarios altogether.

#### No one’s going to war over a downed satellite

Bowen 18 [Bleddyn Bowen, Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Leicester. The Art of Space Deterrence. February 20, 2018. https://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/commentary/the-art-of-space-deterrence/]

Space is often an afterthought or a miscellaneous ancillary in the grand strategic views of top-level decision-makers. A president may not care that one satellite may be lost or go dark; it may cause panic and Twitter-based hysteria for the space community, of course. But the terrestrial context and consequences, as well as the political stakes and symbolism of any exchange of hostilities in space matters more. The political and media dimension can magnify or minimise the perceived consequences of losing specific satellites out of all proportion to their actual strategic effect.

#### Won’t go nuclear – seen as a normal conventional attack because of integration with ground forces

Firth 7/1/19 [News Editor at MIT Technology Review, was Chief News Editor at New Scientist. How to fight a war in space (and get away with it). July 1, 2019. MIT Technology Review]

Space is so intrinsic to how advanced militaries fight on the ground that an attack on a satellite need no longer signal the opening shot in a nuclear apocalypse. As a result, “deterrence in space is less certain than it was during the Cold War,” says Todd Harrison, who heads the Aerospace Security Project at CSIS, a think tank in Washington, DC. Non-state actors, as well as more minor powers like North Korea and Iran, are also gaining access to weapons that can bloody the noses of much larger nations in space.

### 1NC – Circumvention – Other Precedents Fill-In

#### Non-appropriation doesn’t stop mining. Companies justify extractive activities using multiple precedents.

**Wrench 19** (John G. Wrench received his law degree from the Case Western Reserve University School of Law in 2019. During law school, he served as editor in chief of the Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law and was a member of the Federalist Society. John interned in his law school’s First Amendment Litigation Clinic and was a judicial extern to the Honorable Paul E. Davison in the Southern District of New York. John graduated from Pace University in 2015 with a Bachelor of Arts in Philosophy and Religious Studies., 51 Case W. Res. J. Int'l L. 437 (2019) “Non-Appropriation, No Problem: The Outer Space Treaty Is Ready for Asteroid Mining”.)

**The prior appropriation doctrine** serves as a unique example for space law because of how it conceptualizes land ownership. Underlying land is available for use not because it is “unowned,” but because it is owned by a community who has the right to make productive use of it.148 Because the community owns the land, claimants have an obligation to use the land properly and the government is responsible for stewardship.149 This **framing fits neatly with proponents of the idea that outer space is collectively “owned” by the international community**. **Regardless,** stewardship and government ownership do not necessarily displace the potential for productive use. **Parties do not violate the non-appropriation principle simply by extracting**—or as here, diverting—resources from the land. **At no point does extraction equate to a sovereign claim over the land.** In instances where non-productive use or the like violates those principles, property rights disappear. **Furthermore, the OST encourages the idea that outer space is to be used to benefit the broader international community.**150 **The prior appropriation doctrine illustrates that parties can establish** and transfer robust **property rights in resources independent from land-ownership**, while promoting beneficial use. Conclusion The non-appropriation doctrine restricts parties from making sovereign claims over underlying land—the same restriction embedded in each of previous section’s legal regimes. Without violating the nonappropriation principle, those regimes grant parties the right to extract resources from land they do not own, transfer that right, and limit wasteful use. Each system similarly vests an entity with the authority to regulate and enforce those rules. With some tailoring, those rules could graft onto the uniqueness of outer space resource extraction. The property regimes explored in Part II do not provide answers for all claims likely to arise in cases involving outer space resource extraction. One looming issue is that some attempts at resource extraction are bound to straddle the line between use and sovereign claims over land. For example, in instances where parties continually seek extensions on mining permits (to the exclusion of others) or take blatant steps to unreasonably exclude other parties from nearby locations. Those seeking to preserve the line between use and ownership would be wise to police it. Answers to these granular regulatory questions will require some regulatory flexibility, but these issues are only different in scale from those addressed by our existing property regimes. At least one author explicitly criticizes what they describe as attempts to “merely superimpose an earth-based system of rules and regulations on the realm of space.”151 This reasoning is rooted in the observation that Antarctica and the high seas are property regimes “inexorably…linked to the Earth itself,” reflecting the idea that “a landowner has dominion from the depths of the Earth to the stars above.”152 This is a curious observation, as the laws governing the seas and Antarctica conceive of land ownership as separate from nonwasteful use of that land.

### 1NC – Circumvention – Public Private Partnerships

#### Plan gets circumvented. It gets funneled through public private partnerships with space agencies.

**Davenport 20** (Christian Davenport covers NASA and the space industry for The Washington Post's Financial desk. He joined The Post in 2000 and has served as an editor on the Metro desk and as a reporter covering military affairs. He is the author of "The Space Barons: Elon Musk, Jeff Bezos and the Quest to Colonize the Cosmos". “A dollar can’t buy you a cup of coffee but that’s what NASA intends to pay for some moon rocks”. December 3, 2020.)

**NASA** **announced** Thursday **that several companies had won contracts to mine the moon** and turn over small samples to the space agency for a small fee. In one case, a company called Lunar Outpost bid $1 for the work, a price NASA jumped at after deciding the Colorado-based robotics firm had the technical ability to deliver. “You’d be surprised at what a dollar can buy you in space,” Mike Gold, NASA’s acting associate administrator for international and interagency relations, said in a call with reporters. But the modest financial incentives are not the driver of the program. Nor to a large extent is the actual lunar soil. NASA is asking for only small amounts — between 50 and 500 grams (or 1.8 ounces to about 18 ounces). While there would be scientific benefits to the mission, **it’s** really **a tech**nology **development program, allowing companies to practice extracting resources from the lunar surface** and then selling them. It would also establish a legal precedent that would pave the way for companies to mine celestial bodies in an effort blessed by the U.S. government to help build a sustainable presence on the moon and elsewhere. To do that, **NASA** says it **needs its astronauts**, like the western pioneers, to “live off the land,” **using the resources in space instead of hauling them from Earth**. The moon, for example, has plenty of water in the form of ice. **That’s not only key to sustaining human life, but** the hydrogen and oxygen in water **could also be used as rocket fuel, making the moon a potential gas station in space** that could help explorers reach farther into the solar system. **Asteroids also have significant resources, particularly precious metals that could be used for in-space manufacturing.**